

Shahedul Anam Khan

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

=====

Abstract

If national security means the fulfilment of certain enabling conditions for the state, and for the people within it to flourish, and develop then good governance is the tool by means of which that can be accomplished. These two phenomena are mutually responsive and complementary. The relationship has been further cemented with the redefinition of the term 'security' that has caused us to move away from state centric treatment of the issue to a more people oriented characterisation of the concept where people's security has assumed centrality in security discourse. Good governance remains a composite construct that demands the fulfilment of each of the constituent elements in order to qualify the state of governance in any country as 'good'. Governance predominates our existence today and it is a catchphrase for the development partners. For the developing countries in particular, everything that is donor driven has to fulfil the criterion of 'good governance'. In fact, the idea has reached such a phenomenal proportion that volumes have been written to define the term 'good governance'. The international financial institutions, the United Nations, and the European Union, have spent considerable effort and time to secure the assurances of the developing countries to understand their formulation and explication of the term 'good governance' as well as implementation of such measure as would ensure that those conditions are fulfilled to qualify for aid and that is crux of the issue – doing it well – which is a function of good governance. Thus, this paper endeavours to seek out the value complementarities of two very topical issues – governance and security in the comprehensive sense, and determine whether good governance merits consideration as a factor in formulating national security policy.

1. Introduction

“It is increasingly recognized that good governance is an essential building block for meeting the objectives of sustainable development, prosperity and peace. The situation of no two countries is precisely alike

Shahedul Anam Khan is Editor, Defence & Strategic Affairs, *The Daily Star* and Former Director General, Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies (BISS). His e-mail address is: shahedulanam@gmail.com

© Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies (BISS), 2010.

in this respect but, broadly speaking, and making due allowance for cultural differences, good governance comprises the rule of law, effective state institutions, transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs, respect for human rights, and the meaningful participation of all citizens in the political processes of their countries and in decisions affecting their lives.”¹

The above statement of the United Nations Secretary General (UNSG) very crisply sums up the essence of the subject under scrutiny - good governance. The UNSG’s remarks also bring out three basic ingredients of security - sustainable development, prosperity and peace. And justifiably, therefore, the United Nations (UN) had moved to provide extensive governance-related support to large number of developing countries and to countries in Eastern Europe, and the Commonwealth of Independent States in order that security of the people can be guaranteed. This paper attempts to seek out the value complementarities of two very topical issues – governance, and security in the comprehensive sense. However, in delving into any discussion on security and good governance, one must not fail to recognise the importance of the security sector governance, because ‘good governance’ is largely dependent on the good governance of other sectors including the security sector.

According to the UN, ‘governance’ is the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented), and it can be contextualised in several circumstances such as corporate governance, international governance, national governance and local governance.² It is also pertinent to remember that, “Government is one of the actors in governance. Other actors involved in governance vary depending on the level of government that is under discussion. In rural areas, for example, other actors may include influential land lords, associations of peasant farmers, cooperatives, NGOs, research institutes, religious leaders, finance institutions, political parties, the military etc. The situation in urban areas is much more complex. At the national level, in addition to the above actors, media, lobbyists, international donors, multi-national corporations, etc. may play a role in decision-making or in influencing the decision-making process”.³ Governance has been described as exercise of power and making decisions by a group which, in a democratic dispensation, happens to be the elected government. It is omnipresent in all the aspects of societal existence, and the welfare of a community depends on the choices made by people granted this authority. There are various actors who, by virtue of the position they hold, arrogate to themselves the power to govern. The

¹ UN Document - A/52/1, *Good governance, Human Rights and Democratization*, Annual Report of the UN Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization – 1997.

² “What is good governance”, available at <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp> accessed on 20 February 2010.

³ *Ibid.*

UN identifies the following as being part of the attributes of good governance:⁴ (i) Territorial and ethno-cultural representation, mechanisms for conflict resolution and for peaceful regime change and institutional renewal; (ii) Checks on executive power, effective and informed legislatures, clear lines of accountability from political leaders down through the bureaucracy; (iii) An open political system of law which encourages an active and vigilant civil society whose interests are represented within accountable government structures and which ensures that public offices are based on law and consent; (iv) An impartial system of law, criminal justice, and public order which upholds fundamental civil, and political rights, protects personal security' and provides a context of consistent, transparent rules for transactions that are necessary to modern economic and social development; (v) A professionally competent, capable, and honest public service which operates within an accountable, rule governed framework, and in which the principles of merit and the public interest are paramount; (vi) The capacity to undertake sound fiscal planning, expenditure, economic management, system of financial accountability, and evaluation of public sector activities; and (vii) Attention not only to central government institutions and processes but also to the attributes, and capacities of sub-national, and local government authorities; and to the issues of political devolution and administrative decentralisation.

If good governance is to do with delivery of the “goods” to the people, non-delivery of those would predictably foil the benefits those goods are supposed to provide both to the people individually and collectively. The essential concern here is not only of delivering the goods competently but also of being aware as to why governance suffers, and what all are the factors that militate against its efficient application. In talking about good governance, the natal link between governance and security becomes only too obvious, and to link the two, good governance and security - might perhaps convey an attempt to state the obvious. It should not be overlooked that every sector of the state and every institution that is served by these sectors, need to be well governed in their own ways in order to ensure good governance of the state, with the hope that it will thus accord the state, and the most important constituent of the state, the people – holistic security. It is just as well to keep in mind too that in trying to correlate good governance, and security one can easily fall into the trap of statist definition of security.

Against the preceding setting, the aim of this article is to highlight the essential elements of good governance, and security which has assumed a centrality in the discourse, and highlight the link between the two. The emphasis will be on the key issues of governance, on the challenges to delivery of services

⁴ UN, “Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Development: Goals in Conflict?”, *The United Nations Committee for Development Planning Report*, 1992.

by the state, and on whether good governance merits consideration as a factor in formulating national security policy. The paper will briefly dwell on good governance of the security sector, which, per se, has become a sine qua non for good governance as a whole.

2. Good Governance

The issue of governance pre-dominates the entire continuum of socio-political-economic dialogue today. It has become a catchphrase for our development partners. For the developing economies, anything and everything that is donor driven today has to fulfil the criterion of good governance. In fact, the idea has reached such a phenomenal proportion that tomes have been written to define the characteristics of good governance. The issue had even predominated the thoughts of the world leaders who, at the 2005 World Summit, in determining the millennium development goals, concluded that good governance is integral to economic growth, the eradication of poverty and hunger, and sustainable development, all of which ensure human security.⁵

In fact, the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the UN and the European Union (EU) have spent considerable effort, and time to secure the assurances of the developing countries to identify with their formulations, and explications of the term “good governance”, as well as implementation of such measure as would ensure that those conditions are fulfilled, to qualify for aid. This is quite understandable as those that provide money for various development programmes would want to know how well that is being utilised, and that is crux of the issue – doing it well, and doing it well is a function of good governance.

But leaving aside the developing countries, good governance is an enabling condition which claims universality in application irrespective of the level of development, and which enables governments to ensure a quality of life of the people that would rule out the possibility of unrest and violence. That in turn would ensure peace and security, at least in so far as its internal manifestation is concerned.

2.1. Concept

Although it will emerge subsequently, from definitions formulated by the international organisations, that the concept of good governance is predicated on power, there is every chance of going wrong if one were to be rooted on the premise that good governance is exclusively about wielding power. Neither, by the same token, is there a direct correlation between economic strength or indeed

⁵ UNGA, available at http://www.un.org/ga/59/hl60_plenarymeeting.html accessed 10 February 2010.

military strength, and security. There is no dearth of examples, in the past and in recent times, of big powers failing to ensure security in spite of having abundance of both.

The concept of good governance is as old as civilisation itself, concretised much later though when nation states emerged with a central authority to command and manage the affairs of the state. Empires have vanished, states have broken up and regimes have crumbled because of failure of states to govern properly. There are many examples in recent times where lack of good governance has resulted in deleterious consequences for the state. Of recent examples, one could cite the fate of the erstwhile Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti and Somalia. To quote Chris Patten, of the seven states, out of the top ten that appear in the list of states facing the greatest risk of failure, are in Africa and all have come to this state due entirely to the consequence of bad governance.⁶

That bad governance was the main reason for the fall of empires has been amply illustrated by historians. In this context it might perhaps be relevant to look at what Gibbon thought caused the downfall of one of the world's greatest empires. According to him, "The Roman Empire succumbed to barbarian invasions in large part due to the gradual loss of civic virtue among its citizens. They had become weak, outsourcing their duties to defend their Empire to barbarian mercenaries, who then became so numerous and ingrained that they were able to take over the Empire".⁷ Romans, he believed, had become effeminate, unwilling to live a tougher, "manly" military lifestyle. In addition, this is what might ring a very familiar tone, he blames the decline also on the degeneracy of the Roman army, and the Praetorian guards⁸.

Paul Kennedy very convincingly argues that imperial overstretch, leading to loosening of the reins of the central authority, both in political and economic terms, had caused the collapse of many empires, of which the Mughal Empire is a classic example.⁹ Of recent times the USSR broke up because of overstretch, both economic as well as political, which it could not effectively manage. The strategic overstretch naturally stretched the bonding of good governance. There are indications at present that, the lone super power is faced with the possible consequences of overstretch, which is not only affecting its strategic designs, it is also affecting severely its economy, and thus the plans to cut the US defence expenditures by almost 80 billion dollars.

⁶ Chris Patten, *What Next? Surviving the Twenty-First Century*, London: Penguin, 2009.

⁷ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, London: Strahan & Cadell, 1776–1789.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, New York: Random House, 1987.

‘Governance’ has been characterised as exercise of power, and making decisions by a group which, in a democratic dispensation, happens to be the elected government. It is omnipresent in all the segments of the society where the welfare of a community depends on the choices made by people granted this authority.¹⁰ There are various actors who, by virtue of the position they hold, arrogate to themselves the power to govern. ‘Good governance’, on the other hand, is a relatively new term that is often used to describe the desired objective of a nation-state’s political development. The principles of good governance, however, are not new, and the major characteristics of good governance have been outlined by the UN.¹¹ The UN paper, “*What is Good Governance*” defines the term “governance” as “the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented)” In other words, governance involves the processes and systems by which a society or organisation operates.

Good governance is a form of governance that embodies eight specific characteristics application of all with a composite admixture that would make for an ideal state of governance. Good governance embodies processes that are “participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and adherence to the rule of law.¹² Thus, it is not difficult to see the close link also between good governance and respect for human rights. Though government is one of the main actors of governance, it is far from being the only one; depending on the specific entity under study, it can include other actors as mentioned earlier.

2.2. *Definition*¹³

It is interesting to note that definitions of “governance” by leading institutions and studies converge on the term as referring to a process by which power is exercised. However, it is not surprising, it being seen as a process, the accomplishment and completion of which would require the ability to implement policies.

1. **World Bank** defines governance as the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources. The World Bank has identified three distinct aspects of governance: (i) the form of political regime; (ii) the process by which authority is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development;

¹⁰ See, www.issues.tigweb.org accessed 15 February 2010.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Abdel M Adel Latif, “Good Governance and its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development”, paper presented at a workshop on *Democracy, Economic Development and Culture*, Seoul 20-31 May 2003.

and (iii) the capacity of governments to design, formulate, and implement policies, and discharge functions.¹⁴

2. **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** considers governance as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes, and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and mediate their differences.¹⁵
3. The **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)** looks at the concept of governance as denoting the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition encompasses the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which economic operators function, and in determining the distribution of benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.
4. **Department for International Development (DFID)** adopts the same approach to governance as that provided by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), which identifies four key elements in
 - Legitimacy of government (political systems)
 - Accountability of political and official elements of government (public administration and financial systems)
 - Competence of governments to formulate policies and deliver services (public administration, economic systems, and organisational strengthening)

One could paraphrase all these ideas as utilising the mechanisms at the disposal of the state to direct its resources for the purpose of development that would mitigate the risks to the well-being of the people.

2.3. *Characteristics*¹⁶

By and large, the following characteristics of governance find mention in various literatures on the subject:

1. Participation - All men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their interests. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association, and speech, as well as capacities to participate constructively.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ UNDP Report, *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*, 1997.

2. Rule of law - Legal frameworks should be fair, and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights.
3. Transparency - Transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions, and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is provided to understand and monitor them.
4. Responsiveness – Institutions, and processes try to serve all stakeholders.
5. Consensus orientation - Good governance mediates differing interests to reach broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group, and where possible on policies and procedures.
6. Equity - All men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being.
7. Effectiveness and efficiency - Processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.
8. Accountability - Decision-makers in government, the private sector, and civil society organisations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organisation and whether the decision is internal or external to an organisation.
9. Strategic vision - Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance, and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural, and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.

2.4. Challenges¹⁷

The following can militate against good governance, if not addressed properly:

1. Rule of law
2. Lack of democratic practice
3. Weak state institutions
4. Effective parliament
5. Corruption
6. Accountability

¹⁷ These emerged as consensus points at an International Seminar on *Democracy, Governance and SSR*, held in Dhaka in August 2007.

7. Transparency
8. Devolution of power/ effective local government
9. Separation of power

The challenges, as will be eminently clear from a cursory glance of the list, have natal association with, and complement each other; but for which good governance as a prerequisite to development and growth, and consequently the security of the people would remain unaccomplished.

The weak states in particular, or those that have emerged after a long freedom struggle, have been hard put to ensure unbridled function of these essential composites of good governance, both as individual elements or as a collective entity. This fact had been recognised by the UN, which states in the UNSG Report that, “Post-conflict situations entail particular needs. It is our view that measures to strengthen capacity for governance must permeate national, and international responses to emergency situations, and should begin as early as possible. Successful recovery from the dislocations produced by conflict is aided by moving rapidly towards meeting broad development challenges as well as creating adequate legal frameworks, judiciaries, law enforcement systems, stable social and political environments, and economic opportunities.”¹⁸

For the government to deliver it must not only ensure accountability of its actions by making the relevant oversight bodies powerful, but also there has to be transparency in its handling of various issues, both national and international. Currently, a debate is raging in Bangladesh, which has involved the Judiciary and the Parliament, regarding who is accountable to whom, if at all. There has been an effort in Bangladesh to stamp the predominance of the Parliament over the Judiciary, basing on the principle of sovereignty of the Parliament. This has met with the disapproval of the apex court who feels that neither is beholden to the other, that each should compliment the other in fulfilling the objectives of the state. If anybody, it is the people that the two organs of the state are accountable. This brings into perspective the entire gamut of separation of powers, and independence of the judiciary.

For an ordinary person, one is not so much concerned with the issue of independence, and accountability, given that every organ of the state is accountable to the constitution, the only “thing” that happens to be invested with immutable sovereignty. There is nobody or institution that can claim to be beyond the purview of the constitution’s oversight. What, however, is important is the concept of separation of power, and being able to act within its own laid down ambit of work without interference. Nevertheless, each of the organs of the state is accountable for its action, the manner of which may vary.

¹⁸ *op. cit.*, n 2.

This issue engages the very fundamental principle of good governance i.e. separation of power. Scholars suggest that, “The doctrine of the separation of powers is therefore, relevant in the establishment of whether or not a country has a political system that is responsive to good governance. The doctrine of the separation of powers is based on the acceptance that there are three main categories of government functions: legislative, executive, and judicial. Corresponding to these are the three main organs of government in a state – the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary. The doctrine insists that these three powers and functions of government in a free democracy must be kept separate, and exercised by separate organs of the state. Today, the doctrine should be taken to mean checks and balances based on a constitutional scheme. What is important today is not the separation of powers *strictu sensu*, but checks and balances.”¹⁹

Be that as it may, the important point that emerges from the current discourse is that without harmony between the organs of the state, the institutions will stand to lose their efficacy, and ultimately become a hindrance rather than a facilitator of good governance.

In most countries, weak state institution is the cause of poor rule of law as much as it is due to lack of democratic practice which in turn encumbers proper functioning of democratic institutions. Corruption has become the most serious impediment to good governance. Regrettably, it affects every institution of the state that is obligated to ensure the welfare and security of the people. Corruption is an issue that engages the effort of all governments, rich or poor, since no one is completely free of it.

Devolution of power or the lack of it, and dysfunctional local government stymies good governance. Democracy and democratic institutions at the grassroots level suffer since much of the services that good governance has to provide needs to be complemented by bottom up planning which a powerless local government cannot do. However, if there is distortion of political power where public servants are made to face serious challenges, as we have seen happen in Bangladesh, then good governance will certainly meet with serious impediments.

In spite of elected governments running the affairs of the state, there may still be a deficit of democratic norms manifested in the attitude of the government towards its political opponents. In countries where democratic practices are not grounded in the universal democratic practices, and where democratic institutions have not fully acquired the sturdiness to resist political pressure, democracy has failed to acquire its true meaning with its predictable negative ramifications. In spite of an elected parliament in place it may prove utterly dysfunctional, as we

¹⁹ Palamagamba John Kabudi, *Good Governance: Definition and Implications* available at www.fes-tanzania.org/doc/good-governance.pdf, accessed on 15 February 2010.

have experienced in Bangladesh. It is a pity that those who have been entrusted by the people to represent their interest have found it fit to betray their trust by abdicating their responsibility. What we have had in Bangladesh, since the emergence of democracy, is a moribund version of it with the Parliament remaining largely ineffective due to the absence of the opposition in the house. It is regrettable that the elected representatives fail to see the singular role it can play in delivering good governance.²⁰

3. Security

Security in its comprehensive sense is premised on three factors: one being traditional security emerging from statist discourse, but also security of the people that can come from economic progress, and good governance and rule of law; these three things, working together, is really what determines security.

Happily, there has been a paradigmatic shift in the approach of the international strategic community, scholars, and governments as a whole to the issue of security where the human dimension is receiving the highest priority. The focus is increasingly on the essentiality of keeping the people secure by ensuring their basic needs. It is the function of good governance to implement the basic needs approach of any government. Even the lone super power, the USA, has been constrained to acknowledge the predominant role of good governance in conflict resolution when the United States national security advisor admitted very recently that the solution of the Afghan crisis lay not in military victories but in delivering to the people their basic needs through a regime of good governance.²¹ But here too the predominance of the state becomes inevitability. Although security of the people in its comprehensive manifestation requires both the state and the non-government agencies to harmonise their efforts, the role of the state assumes predominance because of the very nature of the service that only the state can provide. Even in the contest of non-traditional security the self-empowerment of the non-state actors has severely, constrained, if not restricted, the capability of the state to provide adequate physical security to the people. This has in turn severely affected the quality of governance of the state.

3.1. National Security

‘Security’ and ‘threat’ are cognate words and there is a propensity to use these two in a fungible manner. Any discourse on security must of necessity take into consideration the entire threat scenario and the consequent strategic footprint

²⁰ For example see, Md. Awal Hossain Mollah, *Good Governance in Bangladesh: Role of Parliament* available at www.goodgovernancebd.org/link/concept./Lecturer20rajsahi.pdf, accessed on 15 February 2010.

²¹ US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates, commenting on the situation in Afghanistan, February, 2009.

that the planners need to study. Threat, or security, is a complex issue. In spite of the reconceptualisation of the term, there still remains the propensity to consider it in the conventional form where threats are predicated largely on statist perception of the matter, the military being the major means of combating it. However, the post modernists see otherwise. To them, and rightly so, people's security assumes centrality in the discourse of security issues, and where the means to combat these are other than only military. The eclectic nature of the term is well encapsulated in the comment that, "National security threats must be assessed from the totality of factors affecting the survival, protection, safety, well-being, and contentment of the people."²² Thus anything or anybody that subverts these objectives must be considered as THREAT.

The changing nature of threat must also be understood clearly since not always are nation states major sources of threat to one another. This has been nowhere more definitively expressed than in Huntington's "Clash of Civilization" which propounded the notion that not only a country but also an ideology can pose threat to another country or a group with common interests. Threats, or in other words sources of insecurity, may originate from any source, and one is considered secure if one can exist in an environment free of coercive influence – endogenous or externally induced. Even when one indulges in the traditional security discourse, the inevitable question that follows is, what are the generic sources of threat that we might face in the years ahead? One eminent scholar enumerates several interesting threat scenarios. He states that, loss of state monopoly over information – technological revolution in electronic media, failure of the state to protect its people, failure to achieve economic prosperity, loss of state's monopoly over justice in view of growing role of international organisation, lending institution, foreign governments, human rights groups, and self-appointed spokesmen for democracy, failure to provide justice – role of international organisation and threat from within, are likely to induce negative impact on the security environment of the state and the region.²³

To that one could add the role of the multi-national companies (MNC), and deprivation from common resources or inability of a country to make legitimate and optimum use of common natural endowments could also pose threats to a country's security. Sources of threat straddling international borders have been recognised by the UN. To quote the UNSG, "The same means of communication and personal mobility that make it possible for civil society actors to function globally also enable "uncivil society" actors to do so. In this world of increasingly porous borders new threats have emerged to national security, economic development, democracy and sovereignty in the form of transnational networks of crime, drug trafficking, money-laundering and terrorism."²⁴ There is

²² Patricia Dovi Sampson, *National Security Issues-New Trends and Threats*, 2005.

²³ Prof Stephen Cohen, talk at the RCSS, Colombo, 1999.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, n.2.

something that we often overlook when we look at security which is that at times the state can itself be a cause of its insecurity.

3.2. *Good governance and Security - The link*

The inherent link has been acknowledged by scholars. For example, Heiner Hanggi of the Geneva Center for Democratic control of the Armed Forces suggests, “ Though the issue of ‘security’ and ‘governance’ can be distinguished for analytical reasons, and are very often distinguished for political reasons, too, they are both closely intertwined - increasingly so”.²⁵

The International Crisis Group (ICG) identifies several aspects of security as follows:²⁶

1. **National security** – or freedom from the fear of military conflict;
2. **Community security** – or freedom from the fear of violence: with law and order, and a decent justice system;
3. **Personal security** – freedom from the fear of want: with income and employment, housing, health and educational opportunity;
4. **Environmental security** - freedom to enjoy decent physical conditions in which to live and work and play; and
5. **Personal liberty** – freedom to move, and speak, and assemble, to live in dignity and without discrimination, and to participate in the political process, at least of selecting those who make the decisions that affect our lives;

The capacity and will to deliver these things is good governance.

Security is inseparable from good governance, since good governance helps prevent conflict and ensure peace. The link had been spelled out more than 200 years ago by Kant when he said, “People who feel secure and free, governed by the rule of law and not of men, are much less likely to go to war with each other - either within or across borders - than those who don’t”.²⁷

It needs little emphasis that if governance relates to directing the proper utilisation of resources, and the state institutions for the benefit of the people, anything that weakens the process of governance will lead to instability and flux

²⁵ Heiner Hanggi, *Good Governance and the Security Sector: Its Relevance for Confidence Building*, Democratic control of the Armed Forces (DCAF) Conference paper, 16 October 2002.

²⁶ Evans, Gareth, “Peace, Security and Good Governance” address to EU-UNU Tokyo Global Forum, *Governance Across Borders – National, Regional and Global*, United Nations University, Tokyo.

²⁷ Immanuel Kant, “Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch”, 1795, quoted in *Peace, Security and Good Governance, Ibid.*

which would consequently affect national security. Experts opine that improvements in good governance are closely linked with security and stability. If the goals of good government are the consolidation of political structures, and the establishment of legitimate democratic institutions such as the promotion of constitutionality, power-sharing and human rights, a clear legal instrument which enables development of the private economic sector, and the fight against corruption, attaining this particular level of governance would engender peace. This is how the OECD sees the link. It says, "Security is important for improved governance. Inappropriate security structures, and mechanisms can contribute to weak governance, and to instability and violent conflict, which impact negatively on poverty reduction".²⁸ As the UN Secretary General notes in his September 2003 report on the Millennium Declaration, "We must make even greater efforts to prevent the outbreak of violence well before tensions and conflicts have eroded polities and economies to the point of collapse." It therefore follows that, insecurity or lack of peace is the result of violence stemming from social or political stability. If there is a causal link between instability and violence which adversely affect good governance, then perhaps one could also suggest that, there is a reverse causality, in that, lack of good governance engenders violence, and thereby instability and insecurity. Therefore, suffice it to say that good governance = good government = stability and security, and the reverse is true too.

4. Governance of the Security Sector

This is a sensitive issue seldom delved into with seriousness. As with other sectors that become dysfunctional, the security sector too will fail to deliver if there is lack of good governance of the sector itself. With the paradigmatic shift in addressing the issue of security, and with national security being accorded an entirely new definition, the linkage between governance and security has become only too apparent. Experts aver that, a well managed security sector helps development process of the country.

Contrary to common perception, security sector is more eclectic than we are disposed to credit it with. It not only includes the security forces, i.e. groups with the authority, and the legal instruments to apply force in order to ensure security, the law enforcing and security agencies but all those institutions that exercise oversight on the forces, namely, institutions that are entrusted to monitor and manage the former, like the human rights commission, anti-corruption commission and parliamentary committees. The last, but by no means the least, are the other state organs and institutions, which are entrusted to ensuring that the rule of law is not circumvented, the judiciary being the foremost.

²⁸ OECD, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, *Security System Reform and Governance*, 1995.

It needs no explanation that, the need for good governance of the security sector is compelled both by internal as well as external demands. Internally, good governance of the security sector fulfils the development needs of the country. Guaranteeing allocational efficiency in expenditure on security, and other so-called non-productive sectors is a function of good governance which is often overlooked, particularly in a developing country where there is a strong pull from all sides for a larger portion of the pie. Asserting the harmony between security and development needs by rational apportioning of the budget ensures that the soft sectors of the economy are addressed with equal importance. The geo-strategic developments, particularly after 9/11, and in particular the redefinition of the term 'security' modulates internal dynamics governing the security sector particular in defining its task, role and structure.

Externally, there is constant pressure from development partners to reform the sector, and the need to fit the international system, given that nations like Bangladesh have become more involved in the regime of international peace keeping which has necessitated restructuring the sector. The two major issues - democracy and governance - predicate the functioning as well as the reform of the security sector. Security Sector Reform (SSR) is increasingly seen as part of the array of activities that contribute to alleviation of poverty and development. UNDP, the World Bank, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and the DFID have become major actors in forging this connection.

There are several objectives that reform of the security sector looks to attain. Firstly, SSR seeks to create a secure environment that would generate opportunities conducive to development which in turn will help mitigate the national vulnerabilities and thereby reduce the threats. Secondly, by having such mechanism in place as would make the system function with transparency, and be accountable for its actions. That in turn, one hopes, will help set the benchmark for socio-political-economic-foreign-security policies. Thirdly, through all these, gain trust and credibility.

Reform of the security sector is an issue that all governments should be seized with constantly. And that involves:²⁹ (i) Developing a clear institutional framework for the provision of security that integrates security and development policy and includes all relevant actors; (ii) Strengthening the governance of the security institutions; and (iii) Building capable and professional security forces that are accountable to civil authorities. In our context, there is much to be desired in so far as good governance of the security sector is concerned.

5. Conclusion

Looking at the matter in a more down-to-earth manner, it would not be remiss to suggest that good governance is in fact good management and at the

²⁹ OECD *op. cit.*

national level that essentially remains a function of good leadership. The concept of governance denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control of the management of its resources for social and economic development which encompasses the role of public authorities in establishing an environment that allows economic operators to freely function, and determine the distribution of benefits, as well as the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled. If politics is the means not to power but to fulfil the development needs of the people, then harmonisation of efforts and resources, ensuring allocational efficiency, achieving consensus and directing policies form an integral part of the overall strategy. In other words, good government makes for good governance and vice versa although they are not quite the same thing. "Good governance gives the state an opportunity to focus on four critical elements of sustainability and human development: eliminating poverty, creating jobs and sustaining livelihoods, protecting and regenerating the environment, and promoting the advancement of women. Developing the capacities for good governance underpins all these objectives and create enabling environment for peace and sustainable development."³⁰

Security, stabilisation, democratisation and constitutionality are the basic conditions needed for individual well-being, peaceful coexistence and social, political, and economic development. Appropriate measures should promote mechanisms providing peaceful solutions to conflicts and reconciliation, and contribute to the protection and integration of minorities and underprivileged groups. And these are what guarantee security of the people.³¹

Some are of the opinion that, it was well nigh impossible to attain an ideal state of good governance and as such we should be satisfied with the second best option, that is 'good enough governance' rather than trying to attain the ideal state. The fact that there is an inextricable link between security and good governance, since 'bad governance' or failure to govern properly will inevitably adversely impact the well-being of the people, and in turn the security of the state, it will be risky to accept anything less than good governance. Good governance means a lot of things, but most of all it involves utilising the mechanisms at the disposal of the state to direct its resources for the purpose of development that would reduce the risk to the well-being of the people. Failure to deliver good governance is courting insecurity for the people. And if people are insecure so is the state.

³⁰ Louis O Dorvilier, *Governance, Peace and Stability in LDCs*, Brussels, Belgium, 2001.