

الحكم الرشيد وتداخله مع النهج الجديد للأمن القومي

Good Governance & its Overlap with the New Approach of National Security

أ. م. د. سعيدة شريفية نجف آبادي

قسم العلاقات الدولية والدبلوماسية - جامعة جيهان - اربيل - العراق

Assist. Prof. D. Saeideh Shariati Najafabadi

Dep. of Int'l Relations & Diplomacy - Cihan Uni.- Erbil- Iraq

saeideh.shariati@cihanuniversity.edu.iq

2023

المستخلص :

الحكم الرشيد هو واحد من أهم القضايا التي أثرت في العلوم السياسية في العقود القليلة الماضية ويرتبط ارتباطاً وثيقاً بالأمن القومي. تحلل هذه المقالة العلاقة النظرية لهذه الفكرة مع مفهوم الأمن القومي بطريقة تحليلية وصفية. وتبين النتيجة أنه مع تحول الحكم إلى الحكم الرشيد وتحويل الأمن من الكلاسيكية إلى الحديثة ، وجد هذان المفهومان آثاراً وظيفية ويعرفان بأنها أساس بعضها البعض. وبعبارة أخرى ، يؤدي تنفيذ الحكم الرشيد إلى تحقيق الأمن المستدام .

Abstract:

Good governance is one of the most important issues raised in political science in the last few decades and is closely related to national security. This article analyzes the theoretical relationship of this idea with the concept of national security with a descriptive analytical method. The result shows that with the transformation of governance to good governance and the transformation of security from classical to modern, these two concepts have found functional implications and are known as the basis of each other. In other words, the implementation of good governance leads to the realization of sustainable security.

Keywords: governance, good governance, national security, new security

Introduction

One of the concepts that has become popular in the literature of humanities and social sciences in the last two decades is the concept of good governance. which has found many applications in various fields of management, economy, public policy, political science, etc. One of the areas that is directly affected by good governance is the area of national security. Because good governance has indicators and results that are directly linked to the national security of societies. This paper intends to analyze these two concepts from an analytical point of view and show how in recent decades, the idea of good governance has been proposed in parallel with the evolutionary rethinking of national security approaches, its conceptual development and application and it was able to be presented as a method of governing and drawing the functions of the government and determining its relationship with the civil society and the private sector in the way it brings security for the society. This paper seeks to answer the basic question, what is the relationship between the two concepts of good governance and national security? The paper is of an applied type with a qualitative method using a descriptive

and analytical approach. And it is inspired by the idea of good governance and its indicators that have been proposed by thinkers and international communities. And by using the ideas of modern approach and national security software, focuses on the ratio between the two variables from the point of view of shared components and implementation results. The main assumption of the paper is that similar objective and social contexts, dealing with common elements and components, and the positive consequences of good governance on ensuring and improving security all demonstrate the close connection between the two.

Definition and indicators of good governance

Good governance a term that came into vogue in 1990 with the World Bank leading the charge, has assumed the status of a mantra for donor agencies as well as donor countries for conditioning aid upon the performance of the recipient government (Ved P., 2006). However, its meaning, goals, and dimensions have evolved over time according to considerations and changing conditions until today it has become a central topic of the last two decades in many related literatures at the international level which is a

necessary condition for achieving sustainable development and eradicating poverty.

The concept of "governance" is as old as human civilization. Simply put "governance" means: the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented).(UN ESCAP, 2009

The concept has been around in both political and academic discourse for a long time, referring in a generic sense to the task of running a government, or any other appropriate entity for that matter. In this regard the general definition provided by Webster's Third New International Dictionary is of some assistance, indicating only that governance is a synonym for government, or "the act or process of governing, specifically authoritative direction and control"(Governance Barometer: Policy guidelines for good governance, 2023).

In the mid-1990s, international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development developed the concept of good governance to include new elements such as participation, transparency, and accountability. In addition, following the financial crises of the late 1990s, another element was added under the title of predictability, which in turn led to improvements in financial networks and corporate

governance. During the development of the concept in 2000 AD, a new component was added and it went beyond the emphasis on the government and government institutions which included the private sector and non-governmental organizations. (Karimi Mele, 2013).

The definitions of academics from the concept of good governance emphasize more on the element of political legitimacy as an independent variable. According to this element, Governance is "the conscious management of regime structures, with a view to enhancing the public realm". From this point of view, various aspects of democracy, such as elections, representation system, pluralism, citizens' participation in decision-making, political decentralization, enjoying civil liberties, legitimacy of the government, improving the level of civil society, and the like, are of particular importance.

"Governance", therefore, not only encompasses but transcends the collective meaning of related concepts like the state, government, regime and good government. Many of the elements and principles underlying "good government" have become an integral part of the meaning of "governance". John Healey and Mark Robinson define "good government"

as follows: "It implies a high level of organisational effectiveness in relation to policy-formulation and the policies actually pursued, especially in the conduct of economic policy and its contribution to growth, stability and popular welfare. Good government also implies accountability, transparency, participation, openness and the rule of law. It does not necessarily presuppose a value judgement, for example, a healthy respect for civil and political liberties, although good government tends to be a prerequisite for political legitimacy"(Governance Barometer: Policy guidelines for good governance, 2023).

We can apply our minds to the definition of governance provided by the World Bank in Governance: "Good governance is epitomized by predictable, open and enlightened policy-making, a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos acting in furtherance of the public good, the rule of law, transparent processes, and a strong civil society participating in public affairs. Poor governance (on the other hand) is characterized by arbitrary policy making, unaccountable bureaucracies, unenforced or unjust legal systems, the abuse of executive power, a civil society unengaged in public life, and widespread corruption. If the political climate is unfavorable, efforts to

develop capacities and an enabling environment will be in vain. Better governance ultimately necessitates political renewal. This entails a coordinated assault against corruption at every level, starting at the top. This can be achieved through leading by example, enhancing accountability, promoting open discourse, and fostering a free press. Additionally, it entails "supporting grassroots and non-governmental organizations like women's groups, co-ops, and farmers' associations. Goran Hyden elevates governance to an "umbrella concept to define an approach to comparative politics". Using a governance approach, he emphasizes "the creative potential of politics, especially with the ability of leaders to rise above the existing structure of the ordinary, to change the rules of the game and to inspire others to partake in efforts to move society forward in new and productive directions" (Bond, 1992).

These views boil down to the following:

Governance is a conceptual approach that, when fully elaborated, can frame a comparative analysis of macro-politics.

Governance concerns "big" questions of a "constitutional" nature that establish the rules of political conduct.

Governance involves creative intervention by political actors to

change structures that inhibit the expression of human potential.

Governance is a rational concept, emphasizing the nature of interactions between state and social actors, and among social actors themselves.

Governance refers to particular types of relationships among political actors: that is, those which are socially sanctioned rather than arbitrary.

It is clear that the concept of governance has over the years gained momentum and a wider meaning. Apart from being an instrument of public affairs management, or a gauge of political development, governance has become a useful mechanism to enhance the legitimacy of the public realm. It has also become an analytical framework or approach to comparative politics.

the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) expresses Citizens have confidence in a government that is able to deliver basic services. The degree to which a government is able to carry out its functions at any level can often determine a country's ability to sustain democratic reforms and provide for the well-being of its citizens. (USAID, 2023). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP), considers good governance as a way to achieve human development. UNDP defines governance as “the system of

values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interactions within and among the state, civil society and private sector (UNDP, 2023).

From the point of view of The United Nations Office of High Commissionaire of Human Rights (UNOHCHR), Governance refers to all processes of governing, the institutions, processes and practices through which issues of common concern are decided upon and regulated. Good governance adds a normative or evaluative attribute to the process of governing. From a human rights perspective it refers primarily to the process whereby public institutions conduct public affairs, manage public resources and guarantee the realization of human rights. While there is no internationally agreed definition of 'good governance', it may span the following topics: full respect of human rights, the rule of law, effective participation, multi-actor partnerships, political pluralism, transparent and accountable processes and institutions, an efficient and effective public sector, legitimacy, access to knowledge, information and education, political empowerment of people, equity, sustainability, and attitudes and values that foster responsibility, solidarity and tolerance. In summary, good governance relates to the political and

institutional processes and outcomes that are necessary to achieve the goals of development. The true test of 'good' governance is the degree to which it delivers on the promise of human rights: civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. The key question is: are the institutions of governance effectively guaranteeing the right to health, adequate housing, sufficient food, quality education, fair justice and personal security? (United Nations Office of High Commissioner of Human Rights (UNOHCHR, 2023).

The following principles can be derived from different definitions of good governance:

Legitimacy: the term legitimacy denotes a system of government—wherein government denotes "sphere of influence". A government is considered legitimate if people under its authority recognize it as rightful (Bilinski, 2022).

Participation: Participation in the concept of good governance here is an opportunity for everyone to voice their opinions through institutions or representations. In addition, everyone, without exception, has the right to freedom of association and expression.

Rule of law: To implement good governance, the legal framework in the country must be enforced impartially,

especially concerning human rights law.

Transparency: Transparency means that every policy taken and implemented by the government must be carried out under existing regulations. In addition, there must be a guarantee that any information related to the policy can be accessed by everyone, especially those who are directly affected by the policy.

Responsiveness: Good governance needs institutions and processes to attempt to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable time.

Consensus oriented: This fifth principle is related to the decision-making process. When the decision-making process cannot accommodate everyone's wishes, then at a minimum, the decision must be a decision that can be accepted by everyone and does not harm anyone.

Equity and inclusiveness: Good governance ensures justice for the community. Everyone has the same opportunity to maintain and improve their welfare.

Effectiveness and efficiency: Every decision-making process and its institutions must be able to produce decisions that meet every community need. Community resources must also be utilized optimally by the government.

Accountability: All institutions involved in good governance have full responsibility to the public for the sake of improving the quality of society. What is good governance? United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). Also, the World Bank, as one of the important and reference international organizations, defined good governance based on the index. based on these indicators, the state of good governance was evaluated every two years in the period of 1996-2002 and annually from 2002 onwards in different countries. These indicators include:

Voice and Accountability: Voice and accountability captures perceptions of the extent to which a country's citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and free media. In general, this means that the people can question the government regarding its views and actions and everything that the government affects the destiny and life of the people.

Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism: Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism measures perceptions of the likelihood of political instability and/or politically motivated violence, including terrorism. This index looks

at the level of stability and stability of the political regime and the probability of its continued life, the level of reliability of the regime's strategies and policies in the event of the death or change of the current leaders, as well as the occurrence of events such as social unrest, assassinations, and political executions, the frequency of coups, and urban riots. , ethnic tensions and internal conflicts, the way of transferring power at the high levels of political elites, as well as the occurrence of wars and crises in countries, which itself is a function of international and regional conditions.

Government Effectiveness: Government effectiveness captures perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service, and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.

Regulatory Quality: Regulatory quality captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development. Turning attention to the policies themselves, this index refers to issues such as hostile or inconsistent policies of the government towards the market, lack

of effective supervision of the banking system, the level of government intervention in the economy, control of prices and wages, and the imposition of cumbersome regulations.

Rule of Law: Rule of law captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence. In fact, it means the level of commitment of all, including citizens and officials, to conform their behavior to the binding regulations and the practical respect of the statesmen and citizens of the country for the institutions that have been established to establish, implement, and resolve disputes. In addition, the people's trust in the laws, the predictability of the judicial system's behavior, the level of organized crime, and the probability of success in a complaint against the government, are among the components of the rule of law index.

Control of Corruption: Control of Corruption captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as "capture" of the state by elites and private interests. Corruption is the abuse of control of

public power for the benefit of private interests, such as paying bribes to government officials, extortion in public procurement, or embezzlement of public property. This index measures concepts such as corruption among official officials, the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures, its effect on attracting foreign capital, additional payment, or bribery to obtain economic permits. According to this definition, the more positive features such as the rule of law, accountability, and effectiveness of the government in the society, and the less corruption, additional regulations, political instability, and violence, the more appropriate it is to rule in that society to achieve development. Here, while accepting the logical intervention of the government, its facilitating role is emphasized, and with the approach of political development and democracy, the important role of the government in laying the foundation for the strengthening of civil institutions and social freedoms is emphasized (Kaufmann & Kraay, 2023).

The first two indicators present the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced, the third and the fourth discover the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies, and the final two indicators show the respect of citizens

and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them. The analysis of those six indicators is the most significant task for the research of the institutional dimension in the concept of sustainable development (Juknevičienė & Kareivaitė 2012).

Facilitating role of the government

Domarkas believes that “Good governance is considered as synonymous for democratic governance, which stresses the interaction of governmental, private sector’s and civil society’s organizations in economic, political and administrative management areas (Domarkas, 2011).

In good governance, there is a close relationship between the three main pillars of the government, civil society, and the private sector, and their partnership leads to more correct and optimal use of public affairs. The correct relationship between these three pillars makes it possible to achieve good driving judgment in different dimensions. In good governance, there is a continuous partnership between the three main pillars of the government, civil society, and the private sector in carrying out development activities. the interactive

activity of these three parts plays the role of leading and facilitating governance and provides the necessary platform for the realization of good governance. In this way, good governance includes the government and how it operates and goes beyond it by involving the private sector and civil society because it is believed that the interactive participation of these three sectors is necessary for sustainable human development. In this regard, the government is responsible for providing an efficient political and legal environment, the private sector is responsible for generating employment and income, and the civil society facilitates the political and social interaction of active groups to participate in economic, social, and political activities.

Good governance is the product of revision in the experience of several decades of cultural, administrative, economic, social and political relations in the West. because good governance requires the participation of the three spheres of the government, the private sector and civil institutions, which as a result of the unresponsiveness of the market economy and the rule of economic rationality in it, the welfare state has been designed by spending a very high amount and emphasizing the quantitative influence of the government and its interventions and

the role of civil society without relation to the government and the market. Good governance refers to indicators that were paid less attention to in the Western society of the 20th century, and the society sees the way out of today's economic, political, social, and cultural problems by applying the model of good governance and applying its indicators. Therefore, good governance has emerged at the beginning of the new millennium to respond to new global needs, which are caused by factors such as the growth of societies, the development of human resources, the political development of societies, especially the growth of democracy and the new role of the government. and the new relations between the state and the nation (Qolipour, 2008).

Today, it is believed that comprehensive and sustainable development of societies is not possible without effective, efficient, and powerful government. Therefore, the government must accept a new role, because the existence of an efficient and effective government is essential to achieve the goal of economic and social development which performs its duty more as a partner and provider of facilities than as a manager. Following the new role of the government, the relations between the government and the

nation have also changed, and a new pattern is emerging in the relations between the government and the nation, in which the governments and the nations engage in public activities together. In such an environment, a model of good governance was formed in order to institutionalize new relations between the state and the nation, so that in its form, all existing sectors in the society, including the governmental, private, and civil, feel responsible for the social and public issues of the society (Ibid).

Therefore, it can be said that the emergence of the idea of good governance is due to the structural changes in the world arena that have occurred following globalization and the evolution of the concept and functions of the nation-state. In parallel with the diminishing importance of the role and the deformation of the special functions of the state-nation, we have witnessed the importance of the role of citizens and the increasing emphasis on their rights and demands towards governments and the acceptance of more responsibility by governments to take care of their rights and set regulations regarding the behavior of their citizens inside and outside the borders and protecting their rights, so that we can say that we have faced the emergence of a new culture of human rights regime.

The emergence of a new approach to national security

Today, the concept of national security is expanding and deepening in terms of its framework and dimensions, and threat perceptions evolve and take on an asymmetric and uncertain nature. In this regard, it may be said that the multidimensional, pluralistic, and interdisciplinary nature of national security conceptualizations makes them more complicated. Therefore, a multifaceted and comprehensive understanding that balances military and non-military tactics, takes into account cyber and asymmetric threats and envisions comprehensive approaches is necessary to address today's national security concerns.

In terms of decision-making mechanisms, the new security approach illustrates an understanding that can result in various forms of action. This means that it does not reject social reality, but rather adapts to dynamics and change, strikes a balance between capacity and intent, and is likely to foster both domestic and international collaboration. New security parameters are added to the security paradigm with each experience, and the way that the subject, scope, actor, and sovereign authorities are perceived as part of the security phenomena evolves. These days, the idea of security is becoming

more factual and anthropological. Strategies that prioritize the state are dropped in favor of strategies that take into account social texture, culture, and economic welfare (Waeber & Flockhart, 2014).

The integrity of security, reversing conventional security methodologies, and creating all-encompassing, interdisciplinary approaches to problem-solving have become central to the complexity of contemporary security perceptions. Today, security approaches, diversity, richness, and conceptualization of security in terms of subject, scope, dimension, and unit of analysis have resulted in a "paradigm shift" as expressed by Thomas Kuhn (1982). This deepening and expansion in the concept of security bring out a new security paradigm. It outlines a dynamic and practical approach to security that takes into account all of the earlier theories in the meta-analysis, does not completely disregard them, and gives them varying weights and priority. Today, security approaches focus on debates on identity and security, on the one hand, and liberal security and confidence-building measures such as military information exchange, military visits and inspections, verification and increasing transparency, as well as the elimination of military threats in the classical sense, have an identity. On

the one hand, these aim at limiting the military forces of the states and consequently reducing the welfare of societies by reducing military funding, while on the other hand advances in combat weapon vehicle technologies become more lethal and shatter relative combat forces.

Experiences from the twenty-first century, including the 9/11 attacks, the interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, colorful revolutions, and the Arab Spring, point to a multifaceted security paradigm. These advancements have demonstrated that unilateral security measures are by no means the answer to the world's present challenges and conflicts (Ryakhovskaya, 2014). As a result, security parameters have changed from an interstate strategy to a hybrid one that incorporates military and semi-military tactics that take into account both state and non-state elements, as well as diplomacy and measures aimed at fostering confidence. Therefore, a larger spectrum of threats are now perceived as threats, and military threats that were previously thought to originate from hostile governments have developed an ambiguous, asymmetric, destructive, and border-blurring nature. Examples of these threats include transnational organized crime, socioeconomic disparity, and ethnic and sectarian conflicts. Because of this, the concept of security considers

all facets of national authority simultaneously and necessitates collaboration (Bails, 2008). It is not only interested in the military dimension of security, adopts multidimensional approaches, uses rapid methods with decision-making and enforcement methods, and can use conventional as well as non-conventional capabilities simultaneously while matching to operate soft security and hard security approaches in harmony. Thus, there is a significant growth in the interplay between the military aspect of security and the aspects of human rights, the economy, and the environment.

Regional, ethnic, and religious battles continue, even though there are no direct hot conflicts between superpowers, which could be devastating in their consequences and last for generations due to the extent of the devastation they cause. Rebellion and terrorism as instruments of proxy war, civilian and paramilitary mercenaries, as well as the hybrid states of advanced states, combined with perceptual operations to control the minds of the masses, show almost all states as an asymmetrical threat in settled areas rather than in rural areas and even in regions which are considered safe zones (Kober, 2016). National security today requires an international unity of understanding of its regional and worldwide dynamics

while also increasing the number of national power aspects in a two-way eclectic connection. The ability of military units to seize control of democratic systems has led to a significant increase in the influence of politics in security practices. However, civilian administrators have also been able to use troops for political purposes because of their unlimited power. Nowadays, security is a broad topic that should be addressed in conjunction with the components of national power rather than solely by military means. A robust economy, a strong state, and a powerful army are therefore mutually beneficial. Education and economic development, innovation, and the production of high-value-added are integral to each other. As a force multiplier in terms of difference and superiority, self-development is the main focus of the countries from design to production and strategy development to all decision-making systems (Ibrahim, 2020). It is acknowledged that issues like human rights, the environment, and economic sensitivity should not be limited to a state's domestic policies due to the use of security by civil administrations as a tool both domestically and internationally. Serious discussions about the necessity of determining the boundaries of state and public power in order to identify security policies as a means of

providing security services to individuals and citizens alike are still ongoing. Thus, there is currently a heated discussion overdrawing the limits of state and public power (Weber, 2016).

In the context of shaping the war and security environment, security in the present time has become a part of the security of energy and water resources and supplies, the control of refugees within the scope of transboundary threats, the fight against disasters and infectious diseases, the unregistered export and import of all kinds of small and light weapons, the storage of conventional weapons and ammunition. The struggle against maladministration in the context of inadequacies, uncontrolled proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the threat of global security in the socio-cultural and educational context has been indisputably included in the concept of security. Therefore, all aspects of security have to be handled holistically.

The international relations paradigm of the Cold War period tried to explain the international security system through ideologies in general and based its perception of security on a simple, realistic, anarchic environment that expresses the state's inability to dominate other states and puts the state

and military power at the center. In summary, the realist theory, excluding idealistic optimism, has centered on real political and national interests developed by the concepts of a hierarchical balance of power based on the interstate power balance and super-powers and conceptualized the perception of security from the window of existence and living in confidence (Fearon, 1995).

The two frameworks used to define Cold War security approaches are power balance and common security. During this period, the understanding of security focused on balancing the power struggle of states with other states that they thought threatened their national security, and if this was not possible, by creating alliances, the relative power of the respondent state was reduced. In this respect, Cold War-era international relations theories are a summary of power balance and power struggles. However, during the bipolar world order of the Cold War period, with the Détente period, steps were taken on the disarmament between the two superpowers and the restriction of nuclear weapons, and with the effect of liberalism, in addition to military methods, an approach that refers to the soft power elements of international struggle has been subjected to a romantic tendency to be maintained (Nye, 2004).

Besides adding social structures, identities, and universal values and norms to state-based security approaches, the post-Cold War security paradigm outlines an approach that makes reference to the dynamic structure of the international security system. Instead, national security from the standpoint of interdependence is the main focus of the post-Cold War security paradigm. This paradigm addresses non-traditional threats such population movements, smuggling, transboundary terrorism, environmental issues, control over energy and energy corridors, use of space and sea, and radicalism in religion and ideology. In this sense, the issue should be valued not just for a state's national security but also for the security of its neighboring nations and the area as a whole. The security paradigms that emerged during the Cold War hold that interests are not constant or stable. International standards fluctuate as a result of the dynamic structure of the international security system, and this fluctuation creates an interaction between centers. Both sociocultural ties and economic interdependence foster interstate collaboration and reduce conflict. Particularly after the end of the Cold War, soft balancing measures against superpowers have been implemented, casting doubt on the idea of a

sovereign hierarchical balance of power. Regrettably, in this process, terrorism has also proven a useful tool for balancing soft power. Once more, during this time, questions were raised about the value and significance of international institutions to maintaining peace, and there was a greater push for bilateral military and security cooperation. The division between well-governed and non-democratic states, as well as other states, characterized this era.

In short, it can be said that the rise of the new approach to national security is due to the epistemological shortcomings of the traditional approach. The traditional approach had some important shortcomings as follows:

One of the topics of the traditional approach that has been seriously criticized by some security researchers in recent decades is the neglect of ecological security or the security of the human environment. According to the critics, security theories and approaches, policies and development plans are only human-centered and only consider his interests and have sacrificed all types and forms of life of other creatures for human life. It is natural that such a perception prevents the understanding of global security. In the new understanding, security is achieved when human activities and

actions do not harm the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biological community. Otherwise, the activity of humans is considered to be an unsafe action for the earth and its creatures, including humans themselves.

One of the other objections to the traditional and limited approach to security is its elitism, which means that security is ultimately defined based on the values, norms, interests and needs of elites and not according to the basic needs of ordinary people. While the new point of view based on human needs believes that elitism in its security approach causes increasing insecurity. And it often causes ordinary people to face the government and elites and they are alienated from the concept and process that is of fundamental importance for their survival. The expanded view believes that what has ensured people's security and is considered the most important manifestation of it, is in the basic processes of society and the needs of individuals and social groups. In other words, not only political elites but also cultural values, socialization processes, harmony, and social cooperation are the most basic factors in creating and maintaining real security. In this way, the criticism of the limited perception and the negation of the elitist approach of the classical approach led to the emergence of an

approach that focuses more on the needs and interests of the masses.

Another drawback of the traditional view of security is that security theories are often designed based on the needs, interests, and social, political, and economic conditions of developed Western countries and are neglected in relation to the conditions of developing countries. According to critics, the development conditions of the north were designed and implemented in such a way that the structural insecurity of the people of the south followed. As a result, the way to overcome the underdevelopment of the south is to fundamentally change the conditions and relations between these two types of governments and rethink the classic concept of security and replace it with a new concept that includes meeting the needs of the people of the south. Achieving this goal requires the restructuring of the world order in a way that respects the identity, tradition and benefit of the people of the southern communities. In addition, it is necessary to redistribute of productive and constructive capacities so that the people of the south can achieve self-reliance through it (Chomsky,1985).

Another shortcoming of the traditional approach is that this attitude does not pay attention to the basic identity needs of minorities, because for

identity groups, security means providing their needs, including identity, justice, participation, self-control, and freedom from any kind of domineering constraints. In other words, security means recognizing them as independent, distinctive, and intellectual identities, recognizing the right to self-governance (control) and economic self-reliance, and meaningful and effective participation in decisions that affect their lives. Such a view on the security of immigrants, original natives of mother lands, and other identity groups has been neglected in drawing and determining policies and designing traditional security strategies.

Also, some of the late security theorists make propositions by challenging the patriarchal foundations ruling security research and paying attention to structural violence against women and, as a result, structural insecurities in the world. In order to achieve comprehensive security based on the needs of half of the world's population, away from gender bias. Therefore, it seems necessary to implement security policies and adopt an approach that is appropriate to the conditions of developing countries and to take measures in the way of governance to increase internal security-generating capacities.

In this way, the development of the horizontal and vertical concept of security and its inclusion of multifaceted elements and components and the expansion of security agencies show the social, cultural, and objective conditions that have caused the transformation of governance methods and the emergence of a good governance model based on sustainable human development, in a similar way, it has caused the conceptual transformation of national security from a traditional approach to modern and sustainable security and it has made these two ideas connected to each other in a very symmetrical concept and in practical terms.

In this part of the paper, in order to make this connection more obvious, some of the consequences of good governance for national security are mentioned.

Security consequences of implementing good governance

Among the propositions that claim the relationship between good governance and national security are the positive security consequences that arise from the implementation of good governance, because it is believed that the application of good governance teachings has many consequences, some of the most important of which are: 1 - Creating sustainable human development.

The concept of sustainable development expanded its ambit from environmental protection to harmonization of economic activities and social development. Human development is very broad encompassing human security, individual freedom, and rights to enable people to lead a better life. Sustainable human development relies upon ethics and cooperation between government and citizens to resolve persistent problems, particularly relating to poverty and human insecurity. It provides a framework to receive development assistance as well as initiates global endeavors to ensure a decent standard of life to everyone in the present and the future. Sustainable human development requires the active participation of civil society to ensure government accountability in the public interest. Civil society can provide conditions and a roadmap for the State and the market (egyankosh.ac.in, 2023).

2-Strengthening and improving social, human, political, physical and material capitals, 3- Development of democracy and promotion of partnerships and the rule of the people, 4- Developing pluralism, increasing respect for human rights and strengthening social cohesion, 5- Reduction of corruption, opposition to lawlessness and norm-breaking.

In relation to security as a product of good governance, it is worth mentioning that security is an important factor in the sustainable development of society, which in the new interpretation and definition is equivalent to security. Security includes both physical and spiritual security and is the opposite of threat.

The development will not be possible as long as there are threats such as disease, repression, sudden riots, political, social, and cultural limitations, and threats in the society. In the meantime, welfare and livelihood security are the first priority, but it is necessary to pay attention to two dimensions of security at the same time, and the implementation of the governance model will play an important role in ensuring security. Good governance can establish a structure in which, while providing material and physical security, spiritual security is also emphasized. The element of corruption and its place in good governance and its destabilizing effect can also confirm the relationship between good governance and security. Corruption is a sign of the government's weakness and causes the weakening of the people's belief and trust in the government's ability and political will, cutting off the people's hope for the future, questioning the legitimacy, and reducing the general acceptability of

the government and people's despair. With the existence and spread of corruption, the government's popularity among the people decreases, the threshold of people's tolerance decreases, public protests increase, and finally, the realm of the rule of law declines, and in short, the intensity and frequency of economic, moral, administrative, political, social and cultural insecurity is doubled. On the other hand, the fight against corruption, which good governance claims to pursue, strengthens authority and strengthens national security, because it increases the government's responsiveness and persuasion to public opinion, people's trust in the government and their satisfaction, and increases hope for the future. It also causes the implementation of government policies, strengthening the relationship between the people and the government, reducing the gaps and exclusions, establishing an efficient system, and finally, strengthening the popular base of the government and mutual trust between the people and the government, and the potential to deal with threats and national standing in times of danger and crisis.

Johnston discusses nine major challenges that should be anticipated and must be avoided in order to increase the quality of good governance and to reduce corruption. A summary of his discussion is

presented below: Avoid excessive legislation and regulation. Remember that politics is a part of good governance, build broad-based support for reform and pay close attention to problems and controversies, pay close attention to incentives, Public opinion matters, strengthen checks and balances, never underestimate opposition to reform, do not focus only on nation states, Stay focused on the long term (Johnston, 2002).

In addition, good governance practices increase the level of social trust, which in turn has an undeniable security effect, because social order depends on people's satisfaction, which itself causes the formation of social networks as a sign of social capital. Social capital is a sign of political trust and legitimacy and causes the increase of citizens' support for practical policies and acting on them according to the law. Social capital strengthens the foundations of national unity, facilitates the formation of civil society, strengthens political-social participation, and improves the responsiveness of the political system, all of which lead to smoother responsiveness of the government, which is one of the prominent indicators of good governance.

Social trust is closely related to social cohesion, which is a necessary condition for sustainable security.

Because it implies a struggle with various forms of ostracism or social exclusion and ensures that the marginalized and vulnerable groups are included in the civil society. In the new definition of social cohesion, this concept includes values and principles whose purpose is to ensure that all citizens have equal access to basic economic and social rights without any discrimination. From this point of view, it is obvious that social cohesion is weakened by economic-political changes and policies that lead to more poverty. In other words, some aspects of symbolic violence that good governance aims to eliminate from citizens' lives include widespread and chronic unemployment, relationships resulting from unfair competition for access to resources due to the wave of immigration, stigmatization of people in daily life and in public discourse. Social solidarity is also weakened by violence from below, which manifests itself in ethnic-racial riots.

The lack of good governance indicators leads to the emergence of failed states, the most important characteristics of which are underdevelopment, poverty, and low income of the country, applying negative discrimination and exclusion of some groups or peoples, delegitimization of the government, low legitimacy, political instability, inability to exercise authority and

provide services. From this point of view, it should be said that the implementation of good governance prevents the formation of a failed and weak government, which is full of signs of an insecure government. On the other hand, the precision in the definitions of human security shows the extent of its overlap with the definitions of good governance. The Human Development Report of the United Nations has defined the categories of human security including economic, food, health, environmental, personal, social, and political security. and the United Nations Human Development Program has defined it as a synonym for freedom from fear and need and freedom of expression (UNDP, 1994). From this definition, we can infer threats such as underdevelopment that reduces human happiness, conflicts, and threats caused by fear and natural disasters that threaten the security of human habitat, which are considered both a sign of lack of good governance and a violation of sustainable security. Therefore, the realization of security is possible only when we organize our political, economic and cultural institutions and behavior based on the principle of providing for human needs. Second, achieving the overall goal of human security, that is, human independence and the possibility of meaningful presence and participation

in the institutions and processes that shape our political, economic, and cultural life, and this is possible with the realization of good governance. In particular, we should pay attention to the economic indicators of human security, such as the attractiveness of communities for investment, non-interference of the government in economic affairs, guarantee of private ownership, transparent administrative and financial system, low administrative corruption and suitable infrastructures to provide services to economic actors.

Conclusion

Good governance and a new approach to national security intersect. First, from the point of view of the social, political, and cultural contexts in which they appeared and expanded, as well as from the point of view of time, the emergence and development of both concepts goes back to the last decades of the 20th century, which on the one hand is the growing of civil society and the increasing role of Citizens were realized in social and political life, and on the other hand, structural changes led to the emergence of supranational actors, negation of the state-oriented paradigm of national security, increasing attention to the internal roots of security threats, and the emergence of the idea of human

security, social security, and sustainable security. Both views have been reflected in the humanitarian development program of the United Nations. In addition, from the perspective of having common constituent elements and components, all eight elements of good governance are reflected under the coordinates of multidimensional and expanded security, especially political, economic, and social dimensions. Also, from the point of view of the consequences of the actions of good governance, which can establish conditions that result in the provision of stable security. Hence, these two concepts can be considered mutually dependent, and it was concluded that good governance actions lead to the provision of extensive and stable security. The rethinking of the traditional definition of security and its inclusion of new elements has been paralleled by the evolution of governance methods, the strengthening of the government's policy-making ability, and the transformation of the concept of government into good governance. In this way, the development of the horizontal and vertical concept of security and the expansion of its references show that the contexts and objective conditions that lead to the transformation of governance methods and the emergence of a good

governance model based on human development are similar to the transformation of the concept of national security from a traditional approach to modern and sustainable security and has made these two ideas very symmetrical from a conceptual point of view and necessary for each other from a practical point of view.

References

- Bails, J. (2008). The concept of security in international relations. *International Relations*.
- Bilinski, Adam. (2022). Study what legitimacy is in government. Examine the philosophy of legitimacy, and discover rational-legal, charismatic, and traditional legitimacy examples. Updated: 03/27/2022). Available at: <https://study.com/academy/lesson/types-of-legitimacy-in-government.html>
- Bond, G. (1992). Governance, State and Society [Review of Governance and Politics in Africa, by G. Hyden & M. Bratton]. *Journal of International Affairs*, 46(1), Pp. 227–233. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24384126> , Accessed on 01.09.2013.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1985). *Turning the Tide; U.S. Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace*, Pluto Press
- Domarkas, V. (2011). “Reflections on the Public Administration Paradigm Change in the Last Decade’s Publications.” *Public Policy and Administration* 1 (10).
- Egyankosh.ac.in. “Sustainable Human Development”, Available at:

<https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/67137/1/Unit-11>, Accessed on 10/10/2023.

Fearon, J. (1995). Rationalist explanations for war. International Organization.

Governance Barometer: "Policy guidelines for good governance". Available at: Website of South Africa's National Party).<https://www.gdrc.org/u-gov/governance-understand.html>. Accessed on 01.10.2023.

Ibrahim, T. (2020). Opinion -non-military threats and the limits of national security. E-International Relations.

Jarosz, Adam. (2014). Good Governance and Civil Society: Selected Issues on the Relations between State, Economy and Society. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Johnston, Michael. (2002). "Good Governance: Rule of Law, Transparency, and Accountability". Department of Political Science, Colgate University. Available at: <https://etico.iiep.unesco.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/unpan010193.pdf>

Juknevičienė, V., & Kareivaitė, R. (2012). Good governance as the instrument for the implementation of the sustainable development's conception. Available at: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54776605>

Karimi Mele, Ali. (2013). "A theoretical reflection on the relationship between good governance and national security". Strategic Studies Quarterly. Pp. 43-80.

Kaufmann, Daniel & Kraay, Aart. (2023). Worldwide Governance Indicators, 2023 Update. Available at: (www.govindicators.org), Accessed on 10/21/2023.

Keping, Y. (2011). Good Governance and Legitimacy. In: Zhenglai, D., Guo, S. (eds)

China's Search for Good Governance. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230337589_2

Kober, S. (2016). The changing nature of war: is a philosophy of doubt the better counsel in deciding to go to war? The Globalist. <http://www.TheChangingNatureofWar-TheGlobalist>.

Kuhn, S. T. (1982). The structure of scientific revolutions. Alan Publishing.

Mandel, Robert. (1994). The Changing Face of National Security: A Conceptual Analysis (Contributions in Military Studies). Praeger Publisher.

Nye, J. (2004). Soft power: the means to success in world politics. Public Affairs Ltd.

Qolipour, Rahmatullah. (2008). Good governance and a suitable model of government. Tehran: Strategic Research Center and Islamic Azad University.

Ryakhovskaya, A. (2014). Transformation of crisis management in crisis. Management Business.Jour, 2, 102.

UNDP. (United Nations Development Program). (1994). Available at: <https://www.undp.org/eurasia/ourfocus/governance#:~:text=UNDP%20defines%20governance%20as%20%E2%80%9Cthe,civil%20society%20and%20private%20sector>.

UNESCAP. (2009). Available at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>. Accessed on 27.09.2023.

UNOHCHR. (United Nations Office of High Commissionaire of Human Rights). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/goodgovernance/aboutgoodgovernance#:~:text=Governance%20refers%20to%20all%20processes,to%20the%20process%20of%20governing>.

USAID. (United States Agency for International Development). Available at: <https://www.usaid.gov/democracy/promoting-good-governance>

Ved P. Nanda. (2006). "The Good Governance Concept Revisited". The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. 603, Law, Society, and Democracy: Comparative Perspectives. pp. 269-283 (15 pages). Sage Publications, Inc.

Waever, O. & Flockhart, T. (2014). Cooperative security: a new concept? DIIS report. Danish Institute for International Studies.

Weber, C. (2016). Queer international relations. Oxford University Press.