



**PRA**<sup>TM</sup>

Political Rating Agency

# **Political Maturity and Global Power**

A comparative framework for rating states based on 16 criteria

## **VOLUME 1**

Analytical Framework and Key Findings

**Academic Edition 2025 — Updated Q1 2026 (March 2026)**

Author: Edmond Saint Samoht

[contact@politicalratingagency.org](mailto:contact@politicalratingagency.org)

© 2026 PRA<sup>TM</sup> — Political Rating Agency

## Table of Contents

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b>   | <b>PREAMBLE</b> .....  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>KEY RESULTS</b> .....   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>2.1</b> | <b>POLITICAL MATURITY AND GLOBAL POWER</b> .....                                       | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>DECOMPOSITION OF POLITICAL MATURITY: STRUCTURAL AND CONTEXTUAL COMPONENTS</b> ..... | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>TEMPORAL DRIFT: EVOLUTION FROM T0 TO Q1 2026</b> .....                              | <b>10</b> |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>KEY FINDINGS</b> .....  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>THE INTERNATIONAL HIERARCHY DOES NOT REFLECT POLITICAL MATURITY</b> .....           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>FRAGMENTATION OF ADVANCED DEMOCRACIES</b> .....                                     | <b>12</b> |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>Q1 2026 DYNAMICS: TRAJECTORIES AND BREAKS</b> .....                                 | <b>13</b> |
| 3.3.1      | SIGNIFICANT DECLINES .....   | 14        |
| 3.3.2      | NOTABLE IMPROVEMENTS .....   | 14        |
| 3.3.3      | NOTE ON EX-POST ADJUSTMENTS.....   | 14        |
| 3.3.4      | HYBRID CONFIGURATIONS AND NEW FORMS OF POWER .....                                     | 15        |
| 3.3.5      | THE STRUCTURING ROLE OF CONVICTION RIGIDITY .....                                      | 15        |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>STRUCTURAL / CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS</b> .....  | <b>16</b> |
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>STRUCTURE AS A FOUNDATION OF RESILIENCE</b> .....                                   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>4.2</b> | <b>CONTEXT AS A REVEALER OF TENSIONS</b> .....   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>4.3</b> | <b>INTERACTION OF THE TWO DIMENSIONS</b> .....   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK</b> .....  | <b>18</b> |
| <b>5.1</b> | <b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b> .....   | <b>18</b> |
| <b>5.2</b> | <b>CONSTRUCTION OF RATINGS</b> .....   | <b>18</b> |
| <b>5.3</b> | <b>GLOBAL POWER AS AN EXTERNAL VARIABLE</b> .....                                      | <b>19</b> |
| <b>5.4</b> | <b>NOTE ON DOCUMENTARY BIAS</b> .....  | <b>19</b> |
| <b>6</b>   | <b>CONCLUSION</b> .....  | <b>19</b> |

## Editorial — On Objectivity, Values, and the Purpose of Political Rating

The academic edition of this report, devoted to the concept of political rating, raises two fundamental questions: that of objectivity and neutrality, and that of its practical usefulness.

On the first point, a key distinction must be made. The results produced in this study do not reflect any personal opinion. They derive from an explicit, transparent, and reproducible methodology, based on the analysis of multiple sources and a predefined set of criteria. As such, they can be understood as a form of methodological objectivity.

Absolute neutrality, however, cannot be claimed. The very selection of evaluation criteria—particularly those related to fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, and democratic standards—necessarily reflects a historically situated value framework. This framework is consciously rooted in the intellectual and institutional heritage of Western democracies, shaped in part by philosophical, humanist, and Judeo-Christian traditions.

This orientation is not a weakness of the model, but rather a condition of its existence. Any attempt at political rating rests, explicitly or implicitly, on a particular conception of progress. The one adopted here is grounded in a civilizational perspective of progress, as opposed to ideological trajectories that may at times lead to forms of regression or even barbarism. In this context, progress is understood as the capacity of societies to sustain the coexistence of freedoms, regulate internal conflicts, and ensure institutional stability.

From this perspective, the model should be seen as a compass rather than a judgment tool. It does not claim to prescribe what political systems ought to be, but rather provides a framework to analyze their trajectories.

As for its usefulness, this approach is primarily intended for observers of political phenomena—researchers, academics, journalists, and analysts—by offering a structured and comparable analytical framework. It also aims, more indirectly, to inform public decision-makers by highlighting discrepancies between internal political dynamics and international influence.

Some results illustrate this approach particularly clearly. Switzerland, for instance, emerges as a point of equilibrium between institutional strength, contextual stability, and controlled power. Conversely, several major powers reveal significant gaps between global influence and internal coherence—precisely one of the central objects of this analysis.

And if a naïve compass were to indicate its north, it might suggest the following: humanity would be elevated if guided by sages, philosophers, and poets.

## Introductory Synthesis

The PRA™ model provides a comparative assessment of the political maturity of 55 countries. It highlights a central finding: the global hierarchy of power does not reflect the political maturity of states.

Some of the most influential countries appear weakened in their internal coherence, while less powerful states demonstrate remarkable levels of institutional stability. This gap constitutes the starting point of the present report.

The analysis is based on a fundamental distinction between structure—long-term institutional foundations—and context—recent sociopolitical dynamics. This framework allows for a clear differentiation between temporary fragilities and systemic vulnerabilities.

The integration of the Q1 2026 update introduces a decisive temporal dimension. It shows that political maturity is not a fixed state but a trajectory: some countries improve despite periods of tension, while others decline under the impact of internal shocks.

Several key insights emerge:

- a persistent dissociation between geopolitical power and political maturity;
- increasing contextual fragility in several advanced democracies;
- remarkable stability in certain institutional models;
- the central role of polarization and conviction rigidity in processes of political deterioration.

The comparison between political maturity and global power highlights structural imbalances. When a state's influence is not matched by sufficient internal coherence, systemic vulnerabilities tend to emerge.

Beyond national trajectories, the results suggest a gradual structuring of the international system around major spheres of influence, without forming homogeneous blocs. This evolution reflects the emergence of an unstable multipolar order, in which equilibrium depends as much on internal coherence as on power.

These initial findings will be further developed in a forthcoming special edition, scheduled for April, dedicated to the evolution of contemporary geopolitical balances:

“From Bipolar Stability to Multipolar Uncertainty: Understanding the New World Order.”

# 1 Preamble

This volume is part of a broader effort to provide a comparative analysis of contemporary political systems at the global level. Its objective is to offer a rigorous measure of the political maturity of states—that is, their ability to maintain stable institutional balances, manage internal tensions, and act in a coherent and predictable manner in a rapidly evolving international environment.

In a context marked by intensifying geopolitical tensions, rising social divisions, and shifting power balances, traditional analytical tools—largely focused on material power—are showing their limits. The PRA™ model proposes a complementary approach, articulating two fundamental dimensions that are too often considered separately:

- the political maturity of societies, measured through both structural and contextual components;
- global power, integrated as an independent external variable.

This first volume presents the main results, key analytical insights, and the methodological elements necessary for their interpretation. The full methodological framework—criteria architecture, scoring protocols, and validation processes—is detailed in Volume 2.

Reading note: The tables presented in this volume are based on a sample of approximately 25 countries, selected for their geopolitical relevance and analytical representativeness.

The full dataset (55 countries) is provided in Volume 2.

All ratings are based on multiple documentary sources per criterion and per country.

# 2 Key Results

The tables presented in this section constitute the analytical core of this volume. Each highlights a specific dimension of the model. They are deliberately limited to essential variables: supplementary tables, provided at the end of this section and in Volume 2, offer a higher level of detail for readers seeking a deeper analysis.

Following the example of major financial rating agencies—Standard & Poor's, Moody's, and Fitch—which assess the strength of states and corporations through widely recognized synthetic indicators, PRA™ proposes a comparative political rating of states. As one of the first structured

initiatives of its kind, it is built on a progressive, transparent, and reproducible architecture: each global index is broken down into intermediate indices, themselves constructed from documented and replicable elementary criteria.

To illustrate concretely how the different components of the model interact, the table below presents a limited sample of countries. It highlights how structural and contextual ratings combine to form political maturity, which is then cross-referenced with global power to produce an overall composite rating.

This reduced format allows for an immediate understanding of the model’s mechanisms before their application to the full set of countries analyzed.

It can be observed, in particular, that some countries combine high political maturity with moderate power (Switzerland), while others display significant power despite more limited maturity (United States, Russia), thereby illustrating the central dissociation analyzed in this report.

Main PRA™ Political Rating Indices

| <b>Country</b> | <b>Structural Rating</b> | <b>Contextual Rating</b> | <b>Political Maturity</b> | <b>Global Power</b> | <b>Overall Rating</b> |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Switzerland    | 93.9                     | 90                       | 92                        | 80.3                | 86.2                  |
| Japan          | 80.2                     | 85                       | 82.6                      | 95.8                | 89.2                  |
| Australia      | 88.9                     | 71.2                     | 80.1                      | 89.4                | 84.8                  |
| United States  | 72                       | 43.8                     | 57.9                      | 100                 | 79                    |
| France         | 71.2                     | 36.2                     | 53.7                      | 93                  | 73.3                  |
| Russia         | 31.2                     | 34.4                     | 32.8                      | 99.3                | 66                    |

**Structural Index** — Aggregate of eight criteria reflecting the stable and long-term dimensions of a political system.

**Contextual Index** — Aggregate of eight criteria sensitive to recent developments and events.

**Political Maturity** — Combined result of the two previous indices, reflecting the overall quality of a political system.

**Overall Rating** — Composite index integrating political maturity and global power (source: Global Firepower Index). It positions each state at the intersection of its internal coherence and its capacity for international action.

## 2.1 Political Maturity and Global Power

The table below cross-references, for each country, its political maturity ranking (combined structural and contextual components) with its Power Rank (global power index, source: Global Firepower Index). It allows for the identification of countries where maturity and power converge—and, more frequently, those where they significantly diverge.

| <b>Political Maturity and Global Power on t0</b> |                           |                      |                     |                   |                       |                    |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Country</b>                                   | <b>Political Maturity</b> | <b>Maturity Rank</b> | <b>Global Power</b> | <b>Power Rank</b> | <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Global Rank</b> |
| Japan  | 82.6                      | 2                    | 95.8                | 7                 | 89.2                  | 1                  |
| Switzerland                                      | 92                        | 1                    | 80.3                | 16                | 86.2                  | 2                  |
| Australia  | 80.1                      | 3                    | 89.4                | 11                | 84.8                  | 3                  |
| South Korea                                      | 71.3                      | 6                    | 97.2                | 4                 | 84.2                  | 4                  |
| Italy  | 66.3                      | 9                    | 93.7                | 8                 | 80                    | 5                  |
| Spain  | 69.2                      | 7                    | 88.7                | 12                | 79                    | 6                  |
| United States                                    | 57.9                      | 14                   | 100                 | 1                 | 79                    | 6                  |
| United Kingdom                                   | 60.7                      | 11                   | 96.5                | 5                 | 78.6                  | 8                  |
| Canada   | 74.8                      | 5                    | 81.7                | 15                | 78.2                  | 9                  |
| Germany  | 65.4                      | 10                   | 90.8                | 9                 | 78.1                  | 10                 |
| Brazil   | 56                        | 15                   | 92.3                | 10                | 74.2                  | 11                 |
| India  | 50                        | 18                   | 97.9                | 3                 | 74                    | 12                 |
| France   | 53.7                      | 16                   | 93                  | 13                | 73.3                  | 13                 |
| Israel   | 47.5                      | 21                   | 88                  | 14                | 67.8                  | 14                 |
| China  | 36.9                      | 24                   | 98.6                | 2                 | 67.8                  | 14                 |
| South Africa                                     | 57                        | 14                   | 77.5                | 17                | 67.2                  | 16                 |
| Ukraine  | 43.8                      | 22                   | 90.1                | 9                 | 66.9                  | 17                 |
| Turkey   | 38                        | 23                   | 94.4                | 6                 | 66.2                  | 18                 |
| Russia   | 32.8                      | 25                   | 99.3                | 2                 | 66                    | 19                 |
| Egypt  | 33.4                      | 24                   | 94.4                | 6                 | 63.9                  | 20                 |
| Saudi Arabia                                     | 35.3                      | 23                   | 84.5                | 14                | 59.9                  | 21                 |
| Iran   | 25.4                      | 26                   | 90.8                | 9                 | 58.1                  | 22                 |
| Morocco  | 50                        | 18                   | 57.7                | 18                | 53.9                  | 23                 |
| Kazakhstan                                       | 46.9                      | 20                   | 59.9                | 17                | 53.4                  | 24                 |
| Venezuela  | 26.6                      | 25                   | 68.3                | 16                | 47.5                  | 25                 |

Reading note: Ratings are expressed on a 100-point scale. A score of 100 represents the highest theoretical level observed within the sample. The PRA overall rating results from the combination of political maturity and global power.

A country with high maturity but low power illustrates the fundamental dissociation highlighted by the PRA™ model. Conversely, a powerful country with low maturity signals a structural imbalance associated with elevated risk.

The international hierarchy does not reflect political maturity

One of the central findings of the PRA™ model is the growing dissociation between global power and political maturity.

Major global powers display contrasting profiles:

- The United States (57.9, maximum power) maintains strong global influence despite significant internal tensions;
- China (67.8) and Russia (66.0) illustrate configurations in which high power coexists with comparatively lower political maturity.

Conversely, some countries exhibit more balanced profiles:

- Switzerland (86.2), Japan (89.2), and Australia (84.8) combine internal stability with strong institutional coherence;
- While not dominant in raw power, these countries occupy central positions from an analytical standpoint.

This dissociation constitutes a structuring result of the model.

## 2.2 Decomposition of Political Maturity: Structural and Contextual Components

Political maturity is not monolithic. The model distinguishes between two components of a different nature:

- Structural rating — reflecting institutions, foundational values, and long-term equilibria. It evolves slowly and constitutes the stability baseline of a political system;
- Contextual rating — capturing tensions, crises, and recent dynamics. Sensitive to events, it measures a system's ability to absorb shocks without becoming destabilized.

This distinction is a core element of the PRA™ model. It makes it possible to separate what pertains to the enduring foundations of a political system from what results from its recent

dynamics. A country may therefore exhibit strong institutions while undergoing a phase of contextual tension, or conversely display apparent stability despite deep structural fragilities.

| Code | Label                          | Brief Description  | Component            |
|------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| C1   | Democratic Level               | Quality of democratic institutions and governance.                               | Structural           |
| C5   | Respect for Universal Values   | Adherence to fundamental rights and shared values.                               | Structural           |
| C6   | Fundamental Freedoms           | Freedom of expression, association, and the press.                               | Structural           |
| C7   | Conviction Rigidity            | Strength of dominant beliefs and tolerance for pluralism.                        | Structural           |
| C8   | Rule of Law                    | Judicial independence and equal application of the law.                          | Structural           |
| C9b  | Religious Tolerance            | Religious pluralism: freedom of worship, coexistence, absence of discrimination. | Structural           |
| A1   | Electoral Dynamics             | Quality and transparency of recent electoral processes.                          | Structural           |
| A2   | Government Stability           | Stability and continuity of governing institutions.                              | Both struct and conj |
| C2   | Presence of Extreme Ideologies | Influence of radical movements (religious, political, identity-based).           | Conjunctural         |
| C3   | Civilizational Replacement     | Perceived major cultural or identity threats.                                    | Conjunctural         |
| C4   | Social Fragmentation           | Intensity of social, ethnic, and religious divisions.                            | Conjunctural         |
| C9   | Political Violence             | Level of internal political violence (protests, repression).                     | Conjunctural         |
| C10  | Belligerence                   | Propensity for conflict and international aggressiveness.                        | Conjunctural         |
| A2   | Government Stability           | Dual structural and conjunctural contribution (see above).                       | Conjunctural         |
| AL1  | Alert – Antisemitism           | Intensity and evolution of antisemitic acts.                                     | Conjunctural         |
| AL2  | Alert – Narco-State Risk       | Influence of drug trafficking on political and social                            | Conjunctural         |

\* The A2 criterion (Government Stability) contributes to both components: it reflects both a long-term institutional feature and a variable sensitive to recent developments. This dual attribution is intentional and avoids artificial weighting.

The above table presents these two dimensions for each country, along with the resulting overall political maturity rating.

## Methodological Note

The contextual scale is inverted.

For each elementary score, a country that generates little analytical or media attention receives a score close to 10. A country generating intense analytical coverage receives a score below 5.

The rating displayed in the table above corresponds to the aggregation of the 8 elementary scores (maximum 80), subsequently normalized to 100.

This convention is intentional: it measures observable stability, not virtue.

### 2.3 Temporal Drift: Evolution from t0 to Q1 2026

The 2025 edition incorporates a contextual update (Q1 2026) covering the period from October 2025 to March 2026. This temporal drift table constitutes one of the distinctive contributions of this edition: it enables the observation, on a country-by-country basis, of changes in global rankings between the two periods and the identification of upward and downward trajectories.

This dynamic perspective complements the static analysis of maturity levels. It highlights not only the relative position of states, but also their trajectory over time. A highly ranked country may thus be undergoing deterioration, while a lower-ranked country may experience rapid improvement.

The most significant shifts are discussed in the analytical section that follows.

## 3 Key Findings

The cross-analysis of the results highlights five major findings, which form the core analytical message of this edition.

### 3.1 The International Hierarchy Does Not Reflect Political Maturity

This is the central finding of the model. Geopolitical power—measured through military, economic, and diplomatic capabilities—and political maturity do not converge. They evolve according to distinct, often divergent dynamics.

This dissociation constitutes one of the fundamental contributions of the PRA™ model: it highlights the relative autonomy of internal political dynamics from external influence capabilities.

Several major powers display levels of political maturity that fall below their rank in global power. Conversely, smaller or less influential states exhibit remarkably coherent political structures. This gap is not a flaw in the model—it is precisely what the model is designed to capture.

| <b>Political Maturity and Global Power on t0</b> |                           |                      |                     |                   |                       |                    |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Country</b>                                   | <b>Political Maturity</b> | <b>Maturity Rank</b> | <b>Global Power</b> | <b>Power Rank</b> | <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Global Rank</b> |
| Japan  | 82.6                      | 2                    | 95.8                | 7                 | 89.2                  | 1                  |
| Switzerland                                      | 92                        | 1                    | 80.3                | 16                | 86.2                  | 2                  |
| Australia  | 80.1                      | 3                    | 89.4                | 11                | 84.8                  | 3                  |
| South Korea                                      | 71.3                      | 6                    | 97.2                | 4                 | 84.2                  | 4                  |
| Italy  | 66.3                      | 9                    | 93.7                | 8                 | 80                    | 5                  |
| Spain  | 69.2                      | 7                    | 88.7                | 12                | 79                    | 6                  |
| United States                                    | 57.9                      | 14                   | 100                 | 1                 | 79                    | 6                  |
| United Kingdom                                   | 60.7                      | 11                   | 96.5                | 5                 | 78.6                  | 8                  |
| Canada   | 74.8                      | 5                    | 81.7                | 15                | 78.2                  | 9                  |
| Germany  | 65.4                      | 10                   | 90.8                | 9                 | 78.1                  | 10                 |
| Brazil   | 56                        | 15                   | 92.3                | 10                | 74.2                  | 11                 |
| India  | 50                        | 18                   | 97.9                | 3                 | 74                    | 12                 |
| France   | 53.7                      | 16                   | 93                  | 13                | 73.3                  | 13                 |
| Israel   | 47.5                      | 21                   | 88                  | 14                | 67.8                  | 14                 |
| China  | 36.9                      | 24                   | 98.6                | 2                 | 67.8                  | 14                 |
| South Africa                                     | 57                        | 14                   | 77.5                | 17                | 67.2                  | 16                 |
| Ukraine  | 43.8                      | 22                   | 90.1                | 9                 | 66.9                  | 17                 |
| Turkey   | 38                        | 23                   | 94.4                | 6                 | 66.2                  | 18                 |
| Russia   | 32.8                      | 25                   | 99.3                | 2                 | 66                    | 19                 |
| Egypt  | 33.4                      | 24                   | 94.4                | 6                 | 63.9                  | 20                 |
| Saudi Arabia                                     | 35.3                      | 23                   | 84.5                | 14                | 59.9                  | 21                 |
| Iran   | 25.4                      | 26                   | 90.8                | 9                 | 58.1                  | 22                 |
| Morocco  | 50                        | 18                   | 57.7                | 18                | 53.9                  | 23                 |
| Kazakhstan                                       | 46.9                      | 20                   | 59.9                | 17                | 53.4                  | 24                 |
| Venezuela  | 26.6                      | 25                   | 68.3                | 16                | 47.5                  | 25                 |

Illustrative examples:

- United States, China, Russia: top-tier power with comparatively lower political maturity—reflecting deep internal divisions or fragile governance structures.
- Switzerland, Australia, Japan: moderate power with high political maturity—characterized by strong institutional systems, low internal conflict, and high coherence.
- Spain, India, South Korea: intermediate profiles with strong composite ratings—combining satisfactory maturity with significant global influence.

This dissociation represents a major analytical challenge for traditional geopolitical approaches and supports the relevance of composite indicators integrating internal political dynamics.

## 3.2 Fragmentation of Advanced Democracies

One of the most striking findings of this edition concerns established democracies. Their Q1 2026 trajectories are uneven: some consolidate their positions, while others experience significant decline due to intense contextual shocks.

This reflects an ongoing trend: political polarization is intensifying, social and economic divisions are widening, and institutional capacity to reconcile competing interests is eroding. The PRA™ model captures this through several contextual criteria—presence of extreme ideologies, social cleavages, and recent institutional crises.

Illustrative cases (Q1 2026):

- France: mixed trajectory—government instability and inconsistencies in foreign policy weigh on political credibility indicators.
- Canada: marked decline—one of the most significant among established democracies during the period.
- Russia: continued deterioration, consistent with the persistence of the war in Ukraine and increasing institutional control.

Conversely, several democracies show clear improvement:

- United Kingdom: noticeable recovery—political stabilization following years of post-Brexit turbulence.
- Germany: institutional consolidation over the period.

- Ukraine: counterintuitive but consistent—remarkable institutional resilience despite wartime conditions.

Analytical point: in all these cases, structural ratings remain the stabilizing factor. These are resilient systems experiencing divergent contextual trajectories—not systems in systemic collapse. This distinction is a key added value of the model.

### 3.3 Q1 2026 Dynamics: Trajectories and Breaks

The Q1 2026 update reveals contrasting trajectories, some of which may appear counterintuitive at first glance.

| <b>Political Maturity and Global Power 1Q2026</b> |                      |                     |                    |                   |                      |                    |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Country</b>                                    | <b>Political Mat</b> | <b>Maturity Ran</b> | <b>Global Powe</b> | <b>Power Rank</b> | <b>Overall Ratin</b> | <b>Global Rank</b> |
| Japan   | 82.6                 | 2                   | 95.8               | 7                 | 89.2                 | 1                  |
| Switzerland                                       | 92                   | 1                   | 80.3               | 29                | 86.2                 | 1                  |
| Australia   | 80.1                 | 3                   | 89.4               | 16                | 84.8                 | 5                  |
| South Korea                                       | 71.3                 | 8                   | 97.2               | 5                 | 84.2                 | 4                  |
| Italy   | 66.3                 | 11                  | 93.7               | 10                | 80                   | 6                  |
| Spain   | 69.2                 | 9                   | 88.7               | 17                | 79                   | 7                  |
| United States                                     | 57.9                 | 17                  | 100                | 1                 | 79                   | 7                  |
| United Kingdom                                    | 60.7                 | 13                  | 96.5               | 6                 | 78.6                 | 8                  |
| Canada  | 74.8                 | 6                   | 81.7               | 27                | 78.2                 | 9                  |
| Germany   | 65.4                 | 12                  | 90.8               | 14                | 78.1                 | 10                 |
| Brazil  | 56                   | 18                  | 92.3               | 12                | 74.2                 | 12                 |
| India   | 50                   | 21                  | 97.9               | 4                 | 74                   | 14                 |
| France  | 53.7                 | 19                  | 93                 | 11                | 73.3                 | 13                 |
| Israel  | 47.5                 | 23                  | 88                 | 18                | 67.8                 | 19                 |
| China   | 36.9                 | 25                  | 98.6               | 3                 | 67.8                 | 18                 |
| South Africa                                      | 57                   | 16                  | 77.5               | 33                | 67.2                 | 16                 |
| Ukraine   | 43.8                 | 24                  | 90.1               | 15                | 66.9                 | 20                 |
| Turkey  | 38                   | 26                  | 94.4               | 9                 | 66.2                 | 19                 |
| Russia  | 32.8                 | 27                  | 99.3               | 2                 | 66                   | 21                 |
| Egypt   | 33.4                 | 26                  | 94.4               | 9                 | 63.9                 | 23                 |
| Saudi Arabia                                      | 35.3                 | 25                  | 84.5               | 23                | 59.9                 | 24                 |
| Iran  | 25.4                 | 28                  | 90.8               | 14                | 58.1                 | 22                 |
| Morocco   | 50                   | 21                  | 57.7               | 61                | 53.9                 | 22                 |
| Kazakhstan  | 46.9                 | 23                  | 59.9               | 58                | 53.4                 | 25                 |
| Venezuela   | 26.6                 | 27                  | 68.3               | 46                | 47.5                 | 26                 |

### 3.3.1 Significant Declines

Israel records a significant decline. The combination of the Gaza–Lebanon conflict, tensions with Iran, and internal political divisions surrounding the Netanyahu government generates a notable contextual deterioration across multiple criteria—political violence, social cleavages, and institutional tensions. Its unchanged structural rating reflects underlying institutional resilience: this is a deep contextual crisis, not a systemic collapse.

Canada also shows a marked decline—one of the most significant among advanced democracies.

Russia and Morocco complete this pattern: the former due to increasing institutional centralization linked to the Ukrainian conflict, the latter due to regional tensions and persistent social fragilities.

### 3.3.2 Notable Improvements

Spain and the United Kingdom illustrate the opposite dynamic: relative political stabilization following periods of turbulence leads to significant improvement. In Spain, easing Catalan tensions and government consolidation reduce systemic instability. In the United Kingdom, the gradual resolution of post-Brexit instability produces a similar effect.

The composite table confirms this: some mid-level powers—such as India, Spain, and South Korea—display more balanced profiles, combining satisfactory political maturity with significant international projection capacity.

Ukraine stands out as one of the most counterintuitive results of this edition. Despite being at war, the country shows strong improvement. This illustrates a key feature of the model: the contextual rating measures internal political cohesion, not external security conditions. Ukraine’s institutional resilience—continuity of governance, preservation of democratic structures, and national cohesion—is precisely what the model captures and values.

### 3.3.3 Note on Ex-Post Adjustments

Six contextual ratings were moderately adjusted following a consistency review, in order to correct potential documentary biases—overrepresentation of highly mediatized countries or underrepresentation of countries with limited international coverage.

These adjustments were conducted according to a defined methodology and are documented in Volume 2.

The direction of change remains consistent with the original trend.

### 3.3.4 Hybrid Configurations and New Forms of Power

The analysis highlights the emergence of political configurations that fall outside traditional categories. These reflect a broader reconfiguration of contemporary political equilibria, in which external performance no longer guarantees internal coherence.

Neither fully democratic nor fully authoritarian, several states exhibit hybrid models combining:

- strong international projection capacity, supported by real material power;
- fragile internal coherence, marked by deep divisions or opaque governance.

These configurations—observable in countries such as Turkey, Hungary, and Saudi Arabia—raise a central analytical question: to what extent can power be sustained over time without sufficient political maturity?

The PRA™ model does not resolve this question—it frames it with precision.

### 3.3.5 The Structuring Role of Conviction Rigidity

Extended research conducted within this project highlights a relationship between conviction rigidity and the diffusion of certain contemporary ideologies characterized by strong identity or normative components.

Conviction rigidity appears as a facilitating factor in their spread—independently of their specific ideological content.

Within the model's structural criteria, conviction rigidity—defined as the strength of dominant beliefs combined with low tolerance for pluralism—occupies a particular analytical position.

This criterion does not merely measure the presence of strong opinions. It captures the reversibility of public debate: to what extent are dominant positions open to revision in light of new evidence? High conviction rigidity reduces the adaptive capacity of political systems, reinforces collective validation mechanisms, and accelerates the diffusion of extreme ideological positions.

This phenomenon extends beyond traditional political dynamics. It may be compared to processes of social contagion, where the spread of beliefs follows patterns closer to epidemiological dynamics than to purely rational deliberation. It thus appears as a transversal and structuring factor across multiple contextual criteria.

Further research identifies a documented association between conviction rigidity and the diffusion of several major contemporary ideological movements, including identity-based political movements, forms of religious radicalism, and antisemitism. Conviction rigidity emerges as a common transmission vector—independent of the specific content of these ideologies.

## 4 Structural / Contextual Analysis

The distinction between structural and contextual ratings constitutes the central analytical axis of the PRA™ model. It allows the analysis to move beyond a static snapshot and capture the dynamic behavior of political systems.

| <b>Decomposition of Political Maturity</b> |                          |                          |                           |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Country</b>                             | <b>Structural Rating</b> | <b>Contextual Rating</b> | <b>Political Maturity</b> |
| Switzerland                                | 93.9                     | 90                       | 92                        |
| Australia                                  | 88.9                     | 71.2                     | 80.1                      |
| Canada                                     | 88.3                     | 74.2                     | 81.1                      |
| Japan                                      | 80.2                     | 85                       | 82.6                      |
| South Korea                                | 78.9                     | 63.7                     | 71.3                      |
| Germany                                    | 78.3                     | 60                       | 69.2                      |
| Spain                                      | 78.3                     | 60                       | 69.2                      |
| United Kingdom                             | 77                       | 60.7                     | 68.9                      |
| Italy                                      | 73.9                     | 58.5                     | 66.3                      |
| United States                              | 72                       | 43.8                     | 57.9                      |
| France                                     | 71.2                     | 36.2                     | 53.7                      |
| South Africa                               | 67.7                     | 46.3                     | 57                        |
| Brazil                                     | 66.4                     | 45.6                     | 56                        |
| Israel                                     | 60.6                     | 34.4                     | 47.5                      |
| India                                      | 54.5                     | 45.6                     | 50                        |
| Ukraine                                    | 43.8                     | 44                       | 43.8                      |
| Turkey                                     | 39.2                     | 36.9                     | 38                        |
| Kazakhstan                                 | 35                       | 48.8                     | 46.9                      |
| Russia                                     | 31.2                     | 34.4                     | 32.8                      |
| Saudi Arabia                               | 31.2                     | 39.4                     | 35.3                      |
| Egypt                                      | 31.2                     | 33.4                     | 33.4                      |
| China                                      | 30                       | 43.8                     | 36.9                      |
| Iran                                       | 18.8                     | 32                       | 25.4                      |
| Venezuela                                  | 25                       | 28.1                     | 26.6                      |
| Morocco                                    | 49.4                     | 50                       | 50                        |

## 4.1 Structure as a Foundation of Resilience

The structural rating aggregates eight criteria reflecting the stable and enduring dimensions of a political system: the quality of democratic institutions, respect for fundamental freedoms, rule of law, and institutional stability. These criteria evolve slowly—over decades rather than quarters—and constitute a country’s political capital.

A high structural rating provides the system with a capacity to absorb contextual shocks. Conversely, a weak structural foundation—such as in Syria or Somalia—signals systemic vulnerability, where even a temporarily calm context offers limited protection.

## 4.2 Context as a Revealer of Tensions

The contextual rating aggregates eight criteria sensitive to recent developments: presence of extreme ideologies, social cleavages, political violence, institutional crises, religious tolerance, antisemitism, and the influence of narco trafficking. Its scale is inverted: 10 indicates the absence of observable tensions, while 0 reflects major contextual instability.

This convention deserves clarification. It does not reflect a value judgment about the countries assessed; rather, it measures the analytical intensity generated by a country over the observed period. A country that attracts little analytical coverage—few reports, alerts, or media attention—is, within this framework, considered stable, and its contextual rating reflects this.

## 4.3 Interaction of the Two Dimensions

The combination of the two ratings produces analytically rich profiles. Four typical configurations emerge:

| Configuration          | Structural | Contextual | Examples                                |
|------------------------|------------|------------|---|
| Stabilized democracy   | High       | High       | Switzerland, Japan, New Zealand         |
| Democracy under strain | High       | Degraded   | United States, France, Israel (Q1 2026) |
| Unstable power         | Low        | Variable   | Russia, China, Turkey                   |
| Disorganized state     | Low        | Low        | Syria, Somalia, Venezuela               |

The most analytically significant configuration is that of democracies under strain: strong structural foundations coexist with degraded contextual conditions. This profile signals a robust system temporarily weakened—capable of recovery if contextual pressures subside. This is precisely what the Q1 2026 temporal drift analysis helps to document.

Conversely, the disorganized state configuration combines structural fragility with degraded contextual conditions. In such cases, the absence of institutional foundations deprives the system of any shock-absorbing capacity: even moderate contextual disturbances may trigger lasting destabilization.

## 5 Methodological Framework

This section presents the methodological elements necessary for interpreting the results. It clarifies the key methodological choices that shape the reading of the findings. Full developments—criteria architecture, scoring protocols, validation processes, and treatment of circularity—are provided in Volume 2.

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria

The PRA™ model is based on 16 criteria, divided into two components of eight criteria each:

- Eight structural criteria: democratic level, respect for universal values, fundamental freedoms, rule of law, religious tolerance, conviction rigidity, electoral dynamics, and government stability;
- Eight contextual criteria: presence of extreme ideologies, civilizational replacement, social cleavages, belligerence, political violence, internal crises and tensions, antisemitism, and narco-state influence.

The A2 criterion (Government Stability) contributes to both components: it reflects both a long-term institutional feature and a variable sensitive to recent developments. This dual attribution is intentional and avoids artificial weighting.

### 5.2 Construction of Ratings

For a given country, each criterion is scored on a 0–10 scale, producing an elementary rating. This rating is generated using artificial intelligence, based on the synthesis of multiple documentary sources.

The scoring process follows an explicit methodology designed to ensure consistency, traceability, and reproducibility.

Structural and contextual ratings are unweighted aggregates of their respective criteria. No explicit weighting is applied between criteria. This choice is intended to preserve the transparency of the model and to allow readers, if they wish, to apply their own weighting assumptions.

### 5.3 Global Power as an External Variable

The Power Rank—derived from the regularly published Global Firepower Index—is integrated as an independent variable.

This reflects a fundamental methodological choice: global power must not contaminate the measurement of internal political maturity.

It constitutes a complementary dimension, not a component of maturity.

### 5.4 Note on Documentary Bias

Contextual ratings are based on the synthesis of open-source documentation. As such, they are subject to an inherent bias: countries receiving extensive international media coverage may have their tensions overestimated, while countries with limited coverage may have their vulnerabilities underestimated.

In the Q1 2026 edition, six contextual ratings were moderately adjusted *ex post* to correct for this bias. These adjustments, carried out according to a defined methodology, are documented in Volume 2.

These corrections do not alter the overall structure of the results but aim to enhance their analytical robustness.

## 6 Conclusion

The 2025–Q1 2026 edition extends and deepens previous findings by incorporating a new temporal dimension. The observed drift between t0 and Q1 2026 is not merely a sequence of individual movements; it reveals an underlying systemic logic.

States whose power rests on solid institutions and preserved internal cohesion tend to progress or stabilize. Those whose power operates without such foundations—or whose institutions are under intense contextual pressure—tend to decline, sometimes sharply.

This divide does not follow the conventional distinction between democracies and authoritarian regimes. It cuts across both categories: some established democracies decline (Canada, France), some non-democratic regimes stabilize (Iran, Kazakhstan), while some states at war improve (Ukraine). It is precisely this transversal nature that gives the model its distinctive analytical value.

Three major trends structure this edition and define directions for future work:

- The dissociation between maturity and power is intensifying across several major configurations—it is no longer an anomaly but a structural trend, calling for a reassessment of traditional geopolitical hierarchies;
- The fragmentation of advanced democracies constitutes a documented and cross-cutting warning signal—these systems are protected from collapse by strong structural foundations, but not from gradual degradation;
- The structure/context distinction provides a diagnostic tool not offered by traditional indices: it allows differentiation between what is absorbable and what is systemic—thus enabling anticipation rather than mere observation.

These findings are intended to inform both academic reflection and operational geopolitical analysis. They will be further developed and contextualized in future editions, as the documentary base expands and the external validation process is progressively implemented.

PRA™ — Political Rating Agency | Volume 1 — Academic Edition 2025 — Q1 2026

[contact@politicalratingagency.org](mailto:contact@politicalratingagency.org) | [www.politicalratingagency.org](http://www.politicalratingagency.org)

© 2026 PRA™ — Political Rating Agency