

INNOVATION, WORK, SOCIETY

GOOD GOVERNANCE AS A CONCEPT OF (POST-)WAR ECONOMY
RECOVERY INFRASTRUCTURE

Glib Aleksin

Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Vadym Hetman Kyiv National Economic University, Ukraine
e-mail: aleksin.glib@kneu.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0003-2586-5986

Summary

This research explores the evolution of the concept of Good Governance as a fundamental requirement for effective recovery policy in the context of wartime and post-war economies. The core principles of Good Governance – responsibility, transparency, inclusivity, efficiency, public participation, and the rule of law – are investigated as tools for reestablishing stability and trust between citizens and the state in a crisis environment. A historical-comparative analysis of the implementation of Good Governance in post-war France, Korea, Bosnia, and Herzegovina is conducted to identify the essential components for successful institutional modernization and foreign support. The network-based approach to governance analysis used in this study highlights the interactions between prominent actors, including the government, business, media, civil society, and foreign partners, to offer effective governance during a crisis. The findings indicate that the efficiency of Good Governance is more influenced by the institutional capacity of the governance network and the level of coordination than by the structure of the political system. The relevance of foreign experiences in developing Ukraine's strategic recovery plans based on Good Governance is evaluated. Future research will focus on implementing the concept of Good Governance in post-war recovery efforts in Ukraine.

Key words: Good Governance, post-war recovery, institutional stability, transparency, international support, war in Ukraine.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/6912>

1. Introduction

Resilient and open governance has become essential for efficient management in the context of growing global insecurity and escalating hybrid threats. Originally created in peacetime as a normative framework for guaranteeing democratic legitimacy and institutional efficiency, the idea of Good Governance is progressively being redefined in wartime and post-war recovery contexts. Its application in (post-)war settings is not only normative but also functional: it becomes a structural necessity for recovering legitimacy, restoring public confidence, guaranteeing the rule of law, and organizing multi-level responses to difficult crises. Often resulting in the fragmentation of governmental power, compromised accountability mechanisms, and a decline in public service delivery, the challenges of war disturb institutional routines and exacerbate socioeconomic inequalities. Under such circumstances, the fundamental principles

of Good Governance – transparency, inclusivity, participation, accountability, effectiveness, and the rule of law – become increasingly important, providing a toolkit for institutional recovery and policy coherence in an unstable environment.

Using a historical-comparative perspective, this study investigates the development and applicability of Good Governance models in wartime and post-war recovery. Focusing on how institutional capacity, citizen participation, and international assistance are coordinated to recover state functions and stimulate long-term development, this research examines the governance models embraced in France following World War II, Korea after the Korean War, and Bosnia and Herzegovina following the 1990s Balkan war. Studies (UNDP, 2017) reveal that the quality of intersectoral coordination and the resilience of institutional networks define the efficacy of governance in post-war situations more than the official type of political system. Building on this insight, the paper adopts a network-based approach to governance analysis to map the interactions of major actors – government institutions, the private sector, citizens, international donors, and media – thereby reconstructing post-war architecture for a better social order.

This approach is particularly relevant in the current case of Ukraine, where the convergence of institutional fragmentation, war, massive migration, and an influx of foreign aid creates a notably complex governance environment. Understanding how effectively previous post-war settings function can aid in crafting Ukraine's recovery plan, emphasizing institutional stability and civic confidence through critical direction. This research contributes to the theoretical and empirical enhancement of governance models that are not only normatively sound but also empirically validated under the challenges of war and reconstruction by examining the achievements and limitations of foreign experiences.

2. Good Governance: retrospective analysis and contemporary lessons

Good Governance is a key tool for stabilizing and restoring the economy during war and in the post-war stage of development, creating a foundation for the effective functioning of institutions in crisis conditions (Yu, 2000). The basis of Good Governance consists of several fundamental principles: transparency, accountability, efficiency, participation, public activity, respect for the rule of law, and the management system's ability to respond quickly and effectively to new challenges. These principles are especially vital for post-war development, as they create conditions for restoring trust between citizens and the state, help overcome social divisions, and support reforms. Transparency and accountability serve as tools for preventing corruption and ensuring the effective use of resources, including international aid. The formation of social capital encourages citizen participation in decision-making processes and helps consolidate the efforts of various stakeholders in post-war recovery. Participation allows marginalized groups to influence the formation and implementation of policies, which is particularly important amid mass population displacement and the social transformations caused by war (Basheer, Elagib, 2024). Justice, along with the restoration of trust in the legal system and the prevention of violence, depends on the rule of law. Accordingly, in the (post-)war economy, the concept of Good Governance not only defines the strategic path of change but also creates the institutional foundation for its implementation. By ensuring a balance between security, economic, and social priorities, Good Governance is a crucial component of forming an adequate recovery policy (Boogaard et al., 2018).

The historical analysis of implementation examples for Good Governance in post-war economies of the 20th century allows us to identify effective ways to implement the principles of appropriate governance in Ukraine. After World War II, France introduced an economic

planning strategy known as the Monnet Plan (Rossiter, Quirk, 2017). This plan combined the democratic involvement of citizens in the formation of the institutions of the Fifth Republic with centralized resource management. This period was also marked by significant external support through the Marshall Plan, which facilitated the integration of external resources into national recovery policy. In Korea, despite the local peculiarities of the social structure in the first decades after the war, five-year economic development plans were successfully implemented, laying the foundation for the rapid development of the national economy in the 2000-2020s and reforming the education system (Xing, 2024). In combination with US assistance, this contributed to the formation of an effective mechanism for long-term development. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, after the war of the 1990s (Vukojević, 2023), a federal governance model was established with dominant international control through the Office of the High Representative (OHR), anti-corruption mechanisms, and an infrastructure of oversight by the EU, NATO, and the UN. However, the efforts did not yield the desired results, and the country remained ethnopolitically divided and dependent on external actors.

A comparative analysis of the selected cases indicates that, despite the different forms of political systems – from parliamentary democracy in France to a federal structure with international influence in Bosnia and Herzegovina – the effectiveness of Good Governance largely depends on the level of interaction between the main participants in the process: institutions, citizens, the private sector, the media and international partners. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.

Comparative analysis of cases of implementation of Good Governance principles in post-war France, Korea, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Criterion	France	Korea	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Type of political system	Parliamentary democracy	A developing country with elements of authoritarianism	A federal system with international influence
Transparency	Parliamentary oversight, reports	Centralized planning	External oversight through donor structures
Accountability	Constitutional mechanisms	Administrative bureaucracy	Donor accountability
Management efficiency	Monet Plan, nationalization	Five-year plans, industrialization	Dependent on external players
Citizen participation	Elections, referendums	Educational and community initiatives	Limited due to ethnic polarization
International support	Marshall Plan	US support	EU, NATO, UN

In this context, the network approach allows us to consider the architecture of Good Governance during times of crisis. The state is responsible for the strategic planning and implementation of reforms, serving as the central link in the network of Good Governance. Citizens contribute to public oversight and the promotion of community interests. The private sector aids in restoring the economy, primarily by ensuring adequate levels of investment and employment. The population, which is the beneficiary of the policy, is engaged through feedback channels such as local self-government and public hearings. The key to this network is the availability of reliable transparency tools, which the media cannot claim in Ukraine due to their own discredit (KIIS, 2025).

The results of the analysis point to several conclusions. First, good governance during and after war depends on strategic vision, coordinated interaction between sectors, and genuine citizen participation in the decision-making process. Second, network analysis serves as a guide for further modernization of institutions and a tool for identifying weaknesses in the system of good governance. Third, the experiences of countries such as France, Korea, and Bosnia and Herzegovina illustrate that good governance can take different forms but has a single essence; the effectiveness of good governance relies on the quality of interaction among actors in the established management network, rather than on the formal political system.

3. Good Governance in (post-)war economy model

The development of a functional and adaptive governance framework in wartime and post-war environments requires the creation of an integrated model that connects ethical principles, institutional design, stakeholder coordination, and context-specific responses. Based on a comparative investigation of France, Korea, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, a Good Governance in (post-)war economy model is proposed that aligns normative governance ideas with the actual mechanisms of post-war reconstruction. This concept is grounded both in theoretical foundations and in the practical dynamics observed in countries managing institutional recovery during significant crises.

Fundamentally, the approach is organized around five interdependent domains: (1) normative principles of governance; (2) strategic institutional architecture; (3) participatory engagement mechanisms; (4) network coordination and responsiveness; and (5) adaptive integration of international support. Each domain acts as a cornerstone of governance and a dynamic mechanism allowing system-wide resilience.

First, as guiding principles that shape every level of decision-making, the *normative principles of the governance* domain support the ethical foundations of Good Governance, namely transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, and efficiency. Particularly in crisis situations, when the loss of confidence and legitimacy aggravates societal disintegration, these ideas shift from abstract concepts to practical guidelines. While inclusivity and involvement help legitimize state activities among communities, transparency and legal clarity serve as counterpoints to corruption and elite capture.

Second, the approach emphasizes *strategic institutional architecture* as a means of operationalizing these normative values. Institutions in a post-war context must be quickly rebuilt or re-legitimized to meet immediate requirements and create the foundation for long-term development. For instance, France's post-war Monnet Plan demonstrates how centralized planning can be reconciled with democratic accountability. In contrast, the experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina highlights the danger of institutional incoherence and overreliance on outside players, thereby compromising local ownership and long-term viability.

Third, because public confidence cannot be rebuilt without active citizen participation, *participatory engagement mechanisms* are a critical component of the concept. Participation goes beyond voting; it also includes local meetings, public hearings, decentralized government, and ways for underprivileged populations to influence reconstruction goals. This participatory infrastructure is particularly important in situations of mass relocation, where reconnection between people and the state must be actively established, serving as the link between state strategy and social legitimacy.

Fourth, using a network governance perspective to understand how various actors – governmental agencies, citizen groups, media, private businesses, international institutions – interact

to achieve successful governance, the model encompasses a *network coordination and responsibilities* domain. It indicates that the level of coordination among actors not only influences the state's capacity but also affects institutional efficiency in (post-)war contexts. As the examples of Korea and France illustrate, robust governance systems characterized by mutual trust, shared knowledge, and coordinated resource allocation are more likely to yield positive recovery outcomes. Conversely, fractured or externally imposed networks – such as those observed in Bosnia and Herzegovina – face the risk of cultivating dependency and dysfunction.

Fifth, the field of *adaptive integration of international support* addresses how national interests could be reconciled with outside aid – whether financial, technical, or political – without compromising sovereignty. International assistance for post-war governance has a bipolar effect: it might inspire changes or strengthen outside reliance. The model suggests that effective situations control this integration through strategic alignment, local absorptive capacity, and co-designed frameworks, thus transforming help into a vehicle for sustainable development rather than temporary stabilization.

A feedback loop of monitoring, learning, and recalibration connects these five dimensions. Designed to be flexible, the model recognizes that political dynamics, security issues, and societal expectations all influence governance in (post-)war environments in a nonlinear manner. The system's ability to learn from its own mistakes, absorb external knowledge, and modify processes determines institutional resilience.

The suggested model advances the knowledge of Good Governance not just as a normative benchmark but also as a system of interrelated activities that respond to the political, economic, and social upheavals of war by combining historical lessons with modern problems. It is especially relevant to Ukraine's recovery, as institutional integrity, civic inclusion, and the smart use of foreign funding will define the course of post-war reconstruction. Thus, the model serves as a roadmap for operationalizing governance improvements in transitional and weak economies, as well as a diagnostic framework. The proposed model is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Good Governance in (post-)war economy model

Governance domain	Policy objective	Key policy instruments	Risks if ignored	Metrics for evaluation
Normative-principled governance	Ensure ethical consistency and restore public trust	Legal frameworks, transparency mechanisms, anti-corruption laws	Legitimacy crisis, corruption, civic disengagement	Trust index, transparency ratings, legal compliance scores
Strategic institutional architecture	Rebuild functional and legitimate institutions	Central planning bodies, civil service reform	Institutional fragmentation, administrative collapse	Institutional performance audits, policy execution rates
Participatory engagement mechanisms	Promote inclusive and democratic participation	Public consultations, decentralized governance, local forums	Social exclusion, civic unrest, policy failure	Participation rate, inclusion indicators, satisfaction surveys

Governance domain	Policy objective	Key policy instruments	Risks if ignored	Metrics for evaluation
Network coordination and responsiveness	Enable multi-stakeholder coordination and responsiveness	Inter-agency taskforces, digital platforms, feedback channels	Policy incoherence, duplication, ineffective delivery	Coordination efficiency index, multi-actor collaboration scores
Adaptive integration of international support	Align external aid with national priorities	Donor coordination units, absorptive capacity programs, joint implementation plans	Donor dependency, misalignment, ineffective recovery	Aid absorption rate, donor harmonization score, impact assessments

This governance model provides an integrated, evaluative framework for leading state and non-state actors through post-war reconstruction by emphasizing ethical governance, institutional capacity, civic involvement, policy coordination, and international collaboration.

4. Conclusions

This study concludes that the concept of Good Governance holds significant functional relevance in both war and post-war settings. A comparative historical analysis of France, Korea, and Bosnia and Herzegovina illustrates that applying Good Governance values, i.e. transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, and efficiency, is not only normative but also essential for rebuilding trust, stabilizing institutional functions, and aligning national priorities with international support mechanisms.

The analysis shows that the degree of network coordination among important actors – state institutions, citizen groups, the business sector, media, and international donors – shapes the effectiveness of post-war governance more than it does the formal type of political regime. Strong, flexible, and participative institutional architectures (the case of post-war France) indicate more viable recovery paths than those where outside control replaced local legitimacy, as seen in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Good governance in (post-)war economic models operationalizes governance through five interconnected domains: normative-principles governance, strategic institutional architecture, participatory engagement mechanisms, network coordination, and responsiveness and adaptive integration of international support. This model not only outlines the roles and hazards associated with each domain but also proposes quantifiable metrics for evaluating the resilience and efficiency of political systems under crisis conditions.

By strengthening institutional integrity, guaranteeing inclusive policymaking, and effectively directing international assistance, this model provides a strategic roadmap for Ukraine's post-war recovery. Tailored to the complex dynamics of Ukraine's recovery landscape, marked by institutional disintegration, mass displacement, and heightened geopolitical instability, the model's network-based and evaluative structure facilitates a flexible yet coherent approach.

Future studies should focus on the effective implementation of this model in Ukraine by using empirical case studies and governance diagnostics to monitor the adoption of Good Governance concepts. Transforming normative frameworks into real-world recovery results also depends critically on developing policy tools to enhance coordination, increase local absorptive capacity, and ensure civic inclusion. Thus, good governance becomes not only a conceptual foundation but also a useful tool for sustainable post-war development.

References

1. UNDP. (2017). *Institutional and coordination mechanisms*. Retrieved from: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2478Institutional_Coordination_Mechanisms_GuidanceNote.pdf
2. Yu, T. F. (2000). *A new perspective on the role of the government in economic development*. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27(7/8/9/10), 994–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068290010337279>
3. Basheer, M., & Elagib, N. A. (2024). *Armed conflict as a catalyst for increasing flood risk*. *Environmental Research Letters*, 19(10), 104034. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad6fb6>
4. Van Den Boogaard, V., Prichard, W., Benson, M. S., & Milicic, N. (2018). *Tax revenue mobilization in conflict-affected developing countries*. *Journal of International Development*, 30(2), 345–364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3352>
5. Rossiter, C., & Quirk, W. J. (2017). *Constitutional dictatorship*. In Routledge eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315080536>
6. Xing, J. (2024). *The impact of U.S. foreign aids on the Post-War development of South Korea*. *Transactions on Social Science Education and Humanities Research*, 5, 246–251. <https://doi.org/10.62051/gt6kqm39>
7. Vukojević, S. (2023). *Government Formation in Multi-level Settings: Evidence from Post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina*. *Društvene I Humanističke Studije*, 8(1(22)), 173–196. <https://doi.org/10.51558/2490-3647.2023.8.1.173>
8. KIIS. (2025). *Dynamics of trust in social institutions in 2021-2024*. Retrieved from: https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=1467&page=1&fbclid=IwZXh0bgNhZW0CMTAAAR0UNT6lYBZK40x1A76We2K6Syg4LSxARi3NZ1oz_0ZVGbQkwlykmZh8sp4_aem_NXO_O1mwV55VizFYgRLYKw