AN ANALYSIS ON SECURITY GOVERNANCE IN TURKEY

Ebru CAYMAZ *
Kadir Alpaslan DEMİR **
Fahri ERENEL ***

* Marmara University, Department of Organization and Management, Istanbul, Turkey
** Ph.D., Assistant Program Manager, Turkish Naval Research Center Command, Istanbul, Turkey
*** Asst. Prof., (R) Brig. Gen. TU A, Istanbul Kemerburgaz University, Department of International Logistics, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

The shift in global power has led not only to a diffusion of power, but also to a diffusion of ideas, concepts, principles, value and preferences in the last decades. A comprehensive approach called "security governance" has been introduced in order to cope with the problems caused by this conceptual change. Security governance, which presents an understanding of the concept of security beyond the issue of defense and encompasses the 'more diverse, less visible and less predictable', has become one of the most controversial issues both for academicians and defense experts. In this study, we aim to discuss the present condition of security governance both in Turkey and in the world in a comparative manner.

Keywords: *Defense, Defense Institutions, Security, Security Governance, Turkey.*

1.Introduction

Since the end of Cold War period, fundamental changes have transformed the transatlantic security architecture, posed a great challenge to the existing perception of security organizations and led to the emergence of a large number of new bilateral and multilateral organizations involved in security. Within the context of coherent and comprehensive global security management, NATO and the European Union revised their objectives and functions in order to face security threats more efficiently and also adapted new instruments to respond appropriately. The new primacy of security, which includes international terrorism and issues related to transnational crime, has thereby revolutionized the concept of governance and economic dimensions of international politics.

It has become a challenging necessity to design an enforceable system of global governance that can both serve and constrain sub-state, trans-state and traditional state actors. This new governance approach is also different in terms of breadth and variety of current concept of security because it also covers not only the matters of conflict and armaments but also the need to defend against terrorism, crime, diseases, natural disasters, environmental issues, socio-economic problems such as poverty, exclusion and overpopulation. Most papers on security governance would include a useful definition of security culture, but only a limited number of them pay attention to define how to establish a proper security culture.

AN ANALYSIS ON SECURITY GOVERNANCE IN TURKEY

In the light of these developments, our study aim to discuss to current governance condition of Turkey, analyze the existing approach and address to the question of "how can we develop proper security governance for our defense institutions?".

2. The Concept of Security and Security Governance

Increasing visibility of emerging powers at the international arena is currently perceived as a challenge to more traditional powers [1], [2]. The reshuffling of economic and political strength between the great powers of the previous period and the challengers holds the potential to alter the global landscape.

The basic functions and definitions of security and governance, both between states and societies, have been dramatically evolving. This evolvement has provided a basis for better understanding of the 'interconnectedness', and sometimes interdependencies, between security and governance. The notions of security and governance are now an important part of both the academic and policy discourses. On the other hand, the notion of security governance still remains unclear and it is accepted as a concept at its formative stage [3]. In order to conceptualize security governance, it is necessary to specify the component terms of it: security and governance.

The term security, which is briefly defined as to be untroubled by danger or fear, is a core of human life [4]. As it has been already pointed out by Thomas Hobbes, without security "there is no place for industry…no arts, no letters, no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty and short" [5].

Security of the state stands for a state's ability to protect itself from external threats; such as intervention, invasion, occupation, or some other harmful interference by a hostile foreign power or terrorist group. And thus, the main aim of the state security is to deter, prevent or defeat possible attack against the state and its citizens [6].

During the Cold War period, the notion of security was considered in terms of national security, which was largely defined in militarized terms. On the one hand, it was also noted that security might be threatened by more than military threats alone and this understanding has led to the inclusion of political, economic, societal and environmental aspects [7].

The term of governance is a recent concept in literature which has been used within the context of globalization. As an evolving concept, it reflects the fragmentation of political authority among public and private actors on multiple levels of governance; namely national, sub-national and international. It refers to the structures and processes whereby a social organization manages itself, whether it applies centralized control or self-regulation [8]. In other words, we can describe governance simply as "the capacity to get things done" [9].

According to a more complicated definition, governance 'denotes the structures and processes which enable a set of public and private actors to coordinate their independent needs and interests through the making and implementation of binding policy decisions in the absence of a central political authority' [1]. This definition includes new notions such as the introduction of self-government at the local or state level, the outsourcing of governmental functions to the private sectors, privatizing security in newly established

democracies, the term of failed states, cooperation between governments, international institutions and private actors as well as post-conflict reconstruction of states [10].

At the international level, if there is an absence of a world government, governance takes a different form which includes rule-based cooperation between multiple governments, international institutions as well as transnational actors such as corporate business and non-government organizations. Therefore, it also refers to the "security architectures" on the global and regional levels.

Thus, governance can be more demanding than government; it provides a solid foundation for governments to deal with the reality of the contemporary world in which governments are still the central actors in domestic and international affairs although they are increasingly obliged to share authority with non-state actors at all levels of interaction.

2.1 New Actors of Security Governance

The shift from government to governance in security affairs, which has been applied to established democracies as well as to 'failed states', necessitates a broader consideration of security sector as it includes non-statutory security forces such as guerrilla armies and private security companies.

The United Nations (UN) has also perceived that consideration requirement and a new definition was put forward by the Human Development Report 2002 [11] and published by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Therefore, five categories of actors are defined within the security sector:

1. "*Organizations authorized to use force*: This subgroup includes armed forces, police, gendarmeries, intelligence services (military and civilian), coast guards, customs authorities, reserve and local security units (civil defense forces, national guards, presidential guards, militias);

2. *Civil management and oversight bodies*: This subgroup includes the president and prime minister, national security advisory bodies, legislature and legislative select committees, ministries of defense, internal affairs and foreign affairs, customary and traditional authorities, financial management bodies (finance ministries, budget offices, financial audit and planning units), civil society organizations (civilian review boards, public complaints commissions);

3. *Justice and law enforcement institutions*: This subgroup includes judiciary, justice ministries, prisons, criminal investigation and prosecution services, human rights commissions and ombudspersons, correctional services, customary and traditional justice systems;

4. *Non-statutory security forces*: This subgroup includes liberation armies, guerrilla armies, private bodyguard units, private security companies, political party militias; and,

5. *Non-statutory civil society groups*: This subgroup includes professional groups, the media, research organizations, advocacy organizations, religious organizations, non-governmental organizations, community groups" [11], [10].

The level of involvement by the actors given in these five categories varies from country to country because of their political systems.

2.2. The Current Situation in Turkey

AN ANALYSIS ON SECURITY GOVERNANCE IN TURKEY

The Turkish security discourse has also affected by different regional security dynamics in the aftermath of the Cold War. As an enthusiastic partner in NATO for maintenance of collective peace and security, Turkey has redefined security risk and threats and tried hard to promote and protect universal values which were defended by this normative union.

The longitudinal political and social "weight" of the Turkish Armed Forces has been considered among the most significant and complex issues in Turkish history. Recently, the need for further alignment of the Turkish Civilian-Military Relations (CMR) with the democratic standards was emphasized at the European Commission's (EC) successive Annual Progress Reports on Turkey. This issue, without no doubt, has become one of the most significant issues in Turkey's accession to the European Commission.

In order to establish a more harmonized civilian-military relations with the democratic standards, the significance of healthy cooperation between the government, parliament and security sector institutions (the armed forces, the police department, the gendermerie and other actors) was underlined at a conference titled as "Security Sector Governance: Turkey and Europe" [12], [13].

Apart from being an active member of alliances, Turkey has also started to conduct meetings and conferences; invited experts from different security sector institutions and provided a basis for these experts to exchange ideas to improve cooperation. The civil society has become an actor of this process and demands stemming from civil society are taken into consideration as well.

In addition to the issue of alignment of the Turkish CMR with the EU standards, implementation of "a substantive Security Sector and Bureaucracy Reform (SSBR)" has been emphasized at different academic events in Turkey. It is envisioned that SSBR would cover both CMR-related subjects and the establishment of democratic control and oversight mechanisms on all domestic security institutions by adopting a citizen-oriented approach. Therefore, it is considered that good governance among all actors of security sector would be achieved.

3. Conclusion

Over the past decade, Turkish politics have been dealt with two conflicting developments which also affected the security sector in Turkey. First of all, the Turkish military structure has placed a great emphasis on its self-appointed role as a guardian of the basic principles of the Turkish state. This emphasis has been supported by the Constitution of the Turkish Republic as the Constitution does not point out a difference between the concepts of both internal and external security. Moreover, the notion of subordination of all forces which contribute to internal security and the exact role definitions of civilian authorities is not asserted in current Constitution.

Secondly, the EU has stipulated a package of political preconditions that are supposed to be filled to gain successful entry into the European fold. While the military's overseer role remains as the pre-eminent source of authority in Turkey, the EU's entry criteria prescribes a model that places the military structure in a subordinate position to democratic control.

AN ANALYSIS ON SECURITY GOVERNANCE IN TURKEY

On the other hand, there are also substantial changes in Turkey within the last two decades. Its GDP almost reached 1.4 trillion $ with a more steady and sustainable economic growth rate. In the recent years, Turkey follows a proactive foreign policy both globally and regionally, try to be an active member of international institutions such as the United Nations and G20 and it has been pointed out as an emerging power in many researches. Besides, Turkey's presence in NATO operations has increased their legitimacy and dissolved resistance in the Muslim world which also enables Turkey to be acknowledged to have a distinctive position in terms of the sensitivities of Islamic societies and Western military intervention [14].

Apart from these developments, International Conference on Security Sector Governance: Turkey and Europe, which was held in 2005, could be accepted as a turning point together with the EU's prescription. Now, different events are organized under the title of security governance and increasing number of academic researches has been conducted. Besides, Turkey's first private military firm, Sancak Akademi, was established in 2014. Consequently, it could be concluded that Turkey attaches greater importance to security governance and has made a certain progress in that process but there are still certain parts that require improvement.

In order to achieve good governance, first of all the notion of accountability of all administration and forces (including the internal security forces) to the citizens and their representatives should be added to the constitution. Also the definition of subordination to civilian authority for police, gendarme and coast guards should be clear. Last but not least, the strengthening of democratic control over security institutions by the state and civil society as well as the professionalization of the security forces would make a major contribution to this process

Acknowledgements and Disclaimers:

References: (Times New Roman 14 Bold)

[1]Kirchner, E.; Dominguez, R., ”*Security Governance in A Comparative Regional Perspective*”, UNU-CRIS Working Papers, W-2013/8.

[2]Fontaine, R.; Kliman, M. D., *”International Order and Global Swing States”,* the Washington Quarterly, Vol.36, No.1, 2013, pp.93-109.

[3]Krahmann, E., ”*Conceptualizing Security Governance*”, Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2003, pp. 5-26.

[4]The Concise Oxford Dictionary, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 8th Edition, 1990.

[5]Hobbes, T., *Leviathan*, Edited by Michael Oakeshott, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

[6]Preece, J. J., ”*Security in International Relations*”, The University of London International Programmes Publications Office, 2011.

[7]Buzan, B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era*, 2nd Edition, Harvester / Wheatsheaf, 1991, London.

[8]Rosenau, J. N*.,”Governance in a Globalizing World”,* Held, D., and McGrew, A. (eds.)The Global Transformations Reader, 2000, Cambridge University Press, pp.181-190.

[9]Czempiel, E. O*.,”Governance and Democratization”,* Rosenau, J. N. (ed.), Governance without Government, Order and Change in World Politics, 1992, Cambridge University Press, pp. 250-271.

[10]Hanggi, H., *Making Sense of Security Sector Governance*, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), 2003; http://www.dcaf.ch/Chapter-Section/Making-Sense-of-Security-Sector-Governance (last access on 10th October, 2015).
[11]UNDP, Human Development Report: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World, 2002, Oxford University Press, New York.
[12]DCAF-TESEV, *Security Sector Governance*: Turkey and Europe, http://www.tesev.org.tr/assets/publications/file/Guvenlik%20Sektoru%20Yonetisimi%20Turkiye%20ve%20Avrupa.pdf (last access on 10th October, 2015)
[13]International Conference on Security Sector Governance, http://www.tesev.org.tr/uluslararasi-konferans--guvenlik-sektorunde-demokratik-acilimlar--turkiye-ve-avrupa-guvenlik-sektoru-yonetisimi/Icerik/965.html (last acces on 10th October, 2015).
[14]Tangör, B., *Security Governance Approach and European Security and Defence Policy (Güvenlik Yönetişimi Yaklaşımı ve Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Sistemi Politikası)*, Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadir ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 6/3, 2004, pp. 252-268.