



TİGİN

Analytical Social Sciences Journal

Analitik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi

ISSN 3023-5391 | 4 (2) | 2026

Research Article

Received: 26.07.2026

Accepted: 25.10.2026

Gülşah Özdemir*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8900-2560>

The Impact of Regional Conflicts and Security Issues on Governance Systems: State Capacity, Securitization, and Governance Transformation in the Middle East

Bölgesel Çatışmaların ve Güvenlik Sorunlarının Yönetişim Sistemleri Üzerindeki Etkisi: Orta Doğu'da Devlet Kapasitesi, Güvenlikleştirme ve Yönetişim Dönüşümü

Abstract

This study examines the transformative effects of regional conflicts and security challenges in the Middle East on governance systems from an international relations perspective. Its main objective is to identify how security pressures affect state capacity, public administration, economic governance, public service delivery, and digital security management. The research adopts a qualitative, conceptual design and employs Regional Security Complex Theory, state capacity, fragile-state, securitization, and governance approaches as its analytical framework. Academic literature and reports by international organizations such as the OECD, World Bank, and SIPRI are examined through document analysis, while comparative examples are drawn from Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Türkiye, Jordan, Israel, and the Gulf states. The findings indicate that conflicts do not affect governance systems uniformly. In states with limited institutional capacity, protracted conflicts erode public services and central authority; in states with stronger institutions, security pressures may encourage the development of crisis-management mechanisms, interagency coordination, and digital security capacity. The study concludes that the governance effects of security threats are determined not only by conflict intensity but also by institutional resilience, fiscal capacity, governance quality, and states' ability to adapt to a changing security environment.

Keywords: Middle East, regional security, state capacity, securitization, governance

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Department of International Trade, Burhaniye Faculty of Applied Sciences, Balıkesir University, Türkiye, gulsah.ozdemir@balikesir.edu.tr

Citation: Özdemir, G. (2026). The impact of regional conflicts and security issues on governance systems: State capacity, securitization, and governance transformation in the Middle East. *Tigin Analitik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2), 1-23.

Copyright, License and Responsibility Statement

© 2026 The Author(s). Copyright remains with the author(s), who grant TİGİN: Analytical Social Sciences Journal (*Analitik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*) the right of first publication. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0), permitting non-commercial use, sharing, and adaptation with appropriate attribution. The author(s) retain copyright and are solely responsible for the scientific, ethical, legal, and factual content of the article.



Öz

Bu çalışma, Orta Doğu'daki bölgesel çatışmaların ve güvenlik sorunlarının yönetim sistemleri üzerindeki dönüştürücü etkilerini uluslararası ilişkiler perspektifinden incelemektedir. Çalışmanın temel amacı, güvenlik baskılarının devlet kapasitesi, kamu yönetimi, ekonomik yönetim, kamu hizmetleri ve dijital güvenlik yönetimi üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya koymaktır. Araştırma, nitel ve kavramsal bir tasarıma dayanmakta; Bölgesel Güvenlik Kompleksi Teorisi, devlet kapasitesi, kırılğan devletler, güvenleleştirme ve yönetim yaklaşımlarını analitik çerçeve olarak kullanmaktadır. İlgili akademik literatür ile OECD, Dünya Bankası ve SIPRI gibi uluslararası kuruluşların raporları doküman incelemesi yoluyla değerlendirilmiş; Suriye, Yemen, Irak, Lübnan, Türkiye, Ürdün, İsrail ve Körfez ülkelerinden karşılaştırmalı örnekler kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, çatışmaların yönetim sistemleri üzerinde tek yönlü bir etki yaratmadığını göstermektedir. Kurumsal kapasitesi zayıf devletlerde uzun süreli çatışmalar kamu hizmetlerini ve merkezî otoriteyi aşındırırken, daha güçlü kurumsal yapılarda güvenlik baskıları kriz yönetimi, kurumlar arası koordinasyon ve dijital güvenlik kapasitesinin geliştirilmesini teşvik edebilmektedir. Çalışma, güvenlik tehditlerinin yönetim üzerindeki etkisini yalnızca çatışmanın yoğunluğunun değil, devletlerin kurumsal dayanıklılığı, mali kapasitesi, yönetim kalitesi ve değişen güvenlik ortamına uyum yeteneğinin belirlediği sonucuna ulaşmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Orta Doğu, bölgesel güvenlik, devlet kapasitesi, güvenleleştirme, yönetim

Introduction

The Middle East, as one of the most fragile security complexes in the international system, has for many years been characterized by a multilayered security environment in which interstate competition, civil wars, proxy conflicts, terrorism, sectarian polarization, and great power rivalry are intertwined. This security environment directly affects regional stability as well as states' governance systems, institutional structures, and approaches to public administration. Today, security issues are no longer merely phenomena assessed within the realm of foreign policy and military strategy; they have become one of the structural dynamics reshaping state capacity, decision-making mechanisms, the allocation of public resources, and governance models.

The transformation in the Middle East's security architecture after the Cold War has, above all, necessitated the restructuring of governance systems. As the region has gradually moved away from the U.S.-led unipolar security order, it has entered a new geopolitical environment characterized by a multipolar distribution of power. The United States' gradual reduction of its military engagement has not led to the emergence of a single hegemonic power in the region; instead, a competitive security order has emerged in which regional actors such as Iran, Türkiye, Saudi Arabia, and Israel have assumed more decisive roles in security policies. While this process has caused regional security dynamics to evolve into a more autonomous and complex structure, it has also necessitated that states develop more flexible and resilient governance systems capable of adapting to the changing security environment.

This transformation in regional power balances has also reshaped the strategies of global actors toward the Middle East. China's increased economic investments in the region under the Belt and Road Initiative have created new dependency relationships in the fields of energy, infrastructure, and trade, while paving the way for many states, particularly the Gulf countries, to pursue multifaceted *hedging* strategies: maintaining security partnerships with the U.S. while simultaneously developing economic ties with China. Middle Eastern states are therefore

developing more complex foreign policy and governance models aimed both at managing security threats and at balancing great power competition in line with their own national interests.

However, regional security dynamics are not limited to inter-state power competition. Crises such as the Syrian civil war, political instability in Iraq, the proxy war in Yemen, and the Gaza-centered conflicts have brought with them multidimensional security challenges, including the weakening of state authority, cross-border terrorism, irregular migration flows, and the rise of non-state armed actors. In particular, the growing influence of non-state actors such as Hezbollah, Hamas, ISIS, and the Houthis in the security equation renders the traditional state-centered approach to security inadequate, forcing governance systems to develop more comprehensive and adaptable security strategies.

Another key dimension of the security transformation in the Middle East is the increasingly decisive role played by technological advancements and dependencies on critical infrastructure. Despite the relative decline in the U.S. military presence in the region, ongoing technological dependencies in advanced weapons systems, software infrastructure, intelligence networks, and defense technologies show that security relationships are maintained beyond military bases or direct interventions, through mechanisms of *weaponized interdependence*. In addition, cybersecurity, the protection of critical infrastructure, artificial intelligence-supported security systems, and digital surveillance applications are leading to a more integrated structure between public administration and security policies.

Similarly, the fight against terrorism, irregular migration, and transnational organized crime has made border management one of the core governance areas for Middle Eastern states. In this context, integrated border management approaches necessitate the development of more coordinated and multi-stakeholder governance models among security agencies, customs authorities, law enforcement agencies, and international organizations. The view that security depends on institutional coordination and governance capacity as much as on military force is gaining ground.

These developments indicate that the conflicts in the Middle East produce more than short-term security crises; they create structural transformation processes that reshape state capacity, the functioning of public administration, institutional resilience, and governance models. Yet not all states in the region are affected by this transformation to the same extent. While countries with strong institutional capacity can address security pressures by adapting their governance systems, in fragile states, protracted conflicts can lead to institutional erosion, the weakening of public services, and the fragmentation of state authority.

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the effects of regional conflicts and security issues in the Middle East on governance systems from the perspective of international relations.

To this end, a conceptual framework grounded in the literature on security, state capacity, and governance will first be presented; subsequently, the region's evolving security architecture and great power competition will be examined, and the effects of conflicts on public administration, institutional capacity, and governance will be assessed through comparative country case studies. The study thereby seeks to show that security issues are structural mechanisms that transform governance systems, and not simply sources of instability.

Method

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and comparative research design. The analysis is based on document review of the academic literature on regional security, state capacity, fragile states, securitization, and governance, together with reports and datasets produced by international organizations including the OECD, World Bank, and SIPRI. Regional Security Complex Theory is used as the principal analytical framework, while state capacity, fragility, securitization, and governance serve as complementary concepts. The study does not involve surveys, interviews, experiments, or other forms of research with human or animal participants. Comparative country examples from Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Türkiye, Jordan, Israel, and the Gulf states are used to illustrate how similar security pressures may generate different governance outcomes depending on institutional capacity, fiscal resilience, and the quality of governance. The analysis is interpretive rather than causal and seeks to identify recurring mechanisms through which conflict and security pressures reshape governance systems.

Sources were selected according to their relevance to the research question, their scholarly or institutional standing, and their accessibility. Academic works were included when they addressed regional security in the Middle East, state capacity and fragility, securitization, or governance and had appeared as books, edited volumes, or peer-reviewed articles. Reports and datasets were drawn from international organizations that publish regularly on fragility, public finance, military expenditure, and public governance, and only their publicly available versions were used. Works that discussed the region without reference to governance, state capacity, or security were excluded. Classical works published before the post-Cold War period were retained where they provide the conceptual basis of the framework.

The countries examined were chosen to capture variation in both institutional capacity and the type of security pressure faced. Syria and Yemen represent cases in which protracted civil war has eroded central authority, whereas Iraq and Lebanon illustrate settings shaped by proxy competition and non-state armed actors. Türkiye and Jordan were included because of the governance pressures generated by mass migration and cross-border terrorism, while Israel and the Gulf states represent cases with comparatively strong institutional and fiscal capacity. This selection

makes it possible to observe how similar regional security dynamics lead to different governance outcomes under different institutional conditions.

The analysis followed a thematic and interpretive procedure. The literature and reports were first read to identify recurring mechanisms linking security pressures to governance. These mechanisms were then grouped under the five dimensions that structure the findings: state capacity, security-centered governance, economic governance, public services and local government, and digital security management. In the final step, the country examples were compared across these dimensions to determine whether a given security dynamic weakened institutions or prompted adaptation, and the results were summarized in Table 1.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Analyzing the effects of regional conflicts and security issues on governance systems requires moving beyond traditional approaches that address the concept of security solely in the context of military threats. Today, security is viewed as a multidimensional phenomenon that directly affects state capacity, institutional structures, public policies, and governance processes. Particularly in regions where conflicts have become chronic, such as the Middle East, security dynamics are transforming foreign policy preferences together with the administrative structures, decision-making mechanisms, and public administration paradigms of states. This study accordingly examines the effects of regional conflicts on governance systems within the framework of the Regional Security Complex Theory, state capacity, the fragile state approach, securitization theory, and the governance approach.

Regional Security Complex

The concept of regional security refers to the fact that security dynamics are shaped within the framework of the mutual interactions, threat perceptions, and common security challenges of states within a specific geographic area. This approach treats security not merely as a matter of military threats but as a multidimensional phenomenon requiring the joint assessment of political, economic, and social processes. Regional security thus possesses a dynamic structure influenced by both the relationships among intra-regional actors and developments within the international system (Hakim, 2024).

The Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT), one of the most important theoretical approaches in regional security studies, was developed by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver. According to the theory, security threats are largely concentrated among states located in the same geographic region, and states' security policies are shaped within a framework of mutual interdependence. Security therefore cannot be explained solely by the internal dynamics of individual states; neighboring countries' threat perceptions, historical rivalries, alliance relationships, and the

interventions of extra-regional actors collectively shape the regional security structure (Buzan & Wæver, 2003).

One of the fundamental assumptions of the RSCT is that security issues tend to cluster at the regional level due to geographical proximity. A political crisis, civil war, terrorist threat, or mass migration emerging in one country can quickly affect the security of neighboring states and give rise to new security issues on a regional scale. This phenomenon is defined in the literature as *security interdependence* and constitutes the defining characteristic of regional security complexes (Buzan & Wæver, 2003).

The Middle East is considered one of the most prominent areas of application for the Regional Security Complex Theory. The region's security architecture is shaped both by competition among regional powers such as Iran, Türkiye, Saudi Arabia, and Israel and by the interventions of global actors such as the United States, Russia, and, more recently, China. Furthermore, sectarian divisions, the activities of non-state armed actors, competition over energy resources, and chronic civil wars continuously reshape the region's security dynamics (Jarzābek, 2018). The Middle East thus exhibits the characteristics of a volatile and multilayered regional security complex marked by a high degree of security interdependence.

The nature of the Middle East's regional security complex does not stem solely from power competition among states. The region's possession of a significant portion of the world's oil and natural gas reserves, its location at the intersection of the European, Asian, and African continents, and its strategic position along international trade routes keep global powers' interest in the region constantly alive. As a result, regional security dynamics are shaped by global power competition as well as by actors within the region (Jarzābek, 2018).

Security interdependence in the Middle East is particularly evident in the Gulf region. While Iran's regional policies directly influence the security strategies of Gulf Cooperation Council members, developments in Yemen, Iraq, and Syria are altering the security perceptions not only of the countries directly involved but of the entire region. Such interdependence is intensifying states' search for alliances and making the security dilemma more apparent (Grabowski, 2020). Similarly, the mass migration flows that emerged following the Syrian civil war, the cross-border terrorist threat, and the activities of non-state armed actors have directly affected the security and public administration policies of neighboring countries such as Türkiye, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq.

The literature also emphasizes that regional security complexes are not effective solely within their own geographical boundaries. The military, economic, and political relations developing between the Middle East and the Horn of Africa show that interdependence can arise among different regional security complexes. The military and economic presence of Gulf countries in the Horn of Africa, along with developments related to migration, maritime security, and trade routes,

are cited as key examples of this (Cannon & Donelli, 2020; Gebru et al., 2023). These ties reveal that security issues have evolved into a more complex structure that transcends regional borders today.

For the purposes of this study, the Regional Security Complex Theory is utilized as an approach that explains security relations in the Middle East and, beyond that, as the main theoretical framework that enables an understanding of the effects of regional conflicts on governance systems. This is because the spread of security threats on a regional scale reaches beyond states' foreign policy and defense strategies into their public administration, border management, crisis management, allocation of public resources, and institutional structures. Therefore, taking into account the regional nature of security dynamics is essential for explaining the transformation of governance systems in the Middle East.

State Capacity and Fragile States

A central concept in explaining the impact of regional conflicts on governance systems is state capacity. State capacity is generally defined as a state's ability to maintain public order, ensure security, provide public services, manage its resources effectively, and implement its decisions (Evans, 1995; Fukuyama, 2013; Migdal, 1988). State capacity thus encompasses not only administrative effectiveness but also the state's ability to maintain its social legitimacy and develop institutional resilience in the face of crises.

In the literature on international relations and public administration, state capacity is recognized as one of the key factors in managing security threats. While countries with strong state capacity can manage security crises more effectively, in states with limited institutional capacity, conflicts can seriously undermine the functioning of public administration, economic stability, and social order. In particular, protracted civil wars and regional conflicts erode state capacity due to factors such as the diversion of public resources toward defense spending, the destruction of infrastructure, the deterioration of the investment climate, and disruptions to essential public services (Fukuyama, 2013).

The weakening of state capacity, in turn, often leads to the phenomenon of state fragility. According to Rotberg (2004), fragile states are those that are unable to ensure security, provide public services, and maintain their legitimate authority throughout the country. The OECD (2022), on the other hand, views fragility not merely as a lack of security but as a multidimensional process where political, economic, social, environmental, and institutional risks converge. Fragility therefore covers weakness in the state's military capacity alongside a decline in the quality of governance and the deterioration of institutional functioning.

The literature emphasizes that there is a strong relationship between state capacity and governance. According to Hout (2009), the European Union's policies toward fragile states, in

particular, focus largely on rebuilding institutional capacity but often fail to adequately address the root causes of fragility, such as state capture, identity-based political divisions, and structural inequalities. Similarly, Ikpe (2007) argues that the core problem of fragile states is not merely a lack of security; rather, it stems from the state's inability to manage social relations, generate political legitimacy, and control economic risks. These assessments suggest that state capacity is more than an administrative concept; it is one of the variables that determine the quality of governance.

The role of international aid in the reconstruction of fragile states is also a major topic of debate in the literature. Katoka and Kwon (2021) note that international aid programs often focus on short-term humanitarian aid mechanisms rather than strengthening public institutions, and that this can limit the development of state capacity in the long term. This pattern makes the institutionalization of public administration more difficult, particularly in countries experiencing protracted conflicts, and increases dependence on foreign aid.

Fiscal capacity is one of the key components of state capacity. According to Besley and Mueller (2021), an effective tax collection system, strong fiscal institutions, and sustainable public finance are among the fundamental indicators of state capacity. The weakening of fiscal capacity harms economic performance and also undermines the sustainability of public services and the social contract between the state and its citizens. For this reason, strengthening fiscal capacity, particularly during post-conflict reconstruction, is considered one of the prerequisites for enhancing institutional resilience.

However, recent studies indicate that fragility is not a problem that can be overcome solely by strengthening state institutions. In this view, multi-stakeholder governance models that rely on the participation of non-state actors, local communities, and international organizations can complement traditional state-building approaches. Particularly in post-conflict societies, strengthening social cohesion and involving local actors in governance processes play as large a role in enhancing institutional resilience as the restructuring of public institutions.

When assessed within the context of the Middle East, the relationship between state capacity and fragility becomes even more pronounced. While protracted conflicts in countries such as Syria, Yemen, and Libya have led to a marked erosion of state capacity, disruptions in public services, and a weakening of central authority, countries with relatively strong institutional capacity, such as Israel, the Gulf monarchies, and, to a certain extent, Türkiye, have been able to manage security pressures more effectively and adapt their governance systems to new security conditions. The contrast shows that regional conflicts do not affect all states to the same extent; rather, the outcomes of security crises are largely determined by the level of state capacity and institutional resilience.

Securitization and Governance

One of the key mechanisms transforming governance systems in regional conflicts is the process of securitization. Buzan et al. (1998) define securitization as the process by which a particular issue is removed from the realm of political debate and presented as an existential security threat. In this process, security discourse can legitimize the adoption of extraordinary measures in place of routine governance practices.

Securitization processes lead, particularly in conflict zones, to the centralization of decision-making mechanisms, an increase in the influence of security institutions within the political system, and the reallocation of public resources in line with security priorities. The framing of issues such as counterterrorism, border security, irregular migration, or civil war as matters of national security can bring about deep changes in the functioning of public administration (Buzan et al., 1998).

The concept of governance is also directly affected. While Rhodes (1997) defines governance as a process of mutual interaction between the state, the private sector, civil society, and other actors, Pierre (2000) emphasizes that governance strengthens multi-stakeholder decision-making mechanisms in public administration. However, in regions under intense security pressure, governance often takes on a security-centered character; the influence of the central government, the security bureaucracy, and intelligence agencies in decision-making processes increases.

In the case of the Middle East, security governance requires a multidimensional approach to management that extends beyond the coordination of state institutions to border management, migration policies, disaster management, counterterrorism, and international cooperation mechanisms. Regional security issues are consequently reshaping security policies as well as the organizational structure of public administration, inter-agency coordination, and governance capacity.

This study adopts the Regional Security Complex Theory as its primary analytical framework to explain the effects of regional conflicts on governance systems. State capacity, fragile states, securitization, and governance approaches are used as complementary conceptual tools to explain the effects of security dynamics on public administration. This combination makes it possible to show that conflicts transform the state's institutional structure and governance systems along with its security policies.

The Regional Security Environment and Conflict Dynamics in the Middle East

The Middle East is regarded in the literature of international relations as one of the regions where security issues are observed in the most intense and multilayered manner. The region's security structure is shaped by interstate competition and, equally, by historical conflicts, sectarian divisions, proxy wars, non-state armed actors, energy resources, and interventions by great powers. As a result, the Middle Eastern security system exhibits a complex structure that extends beyond

classical military threats to encompass political, economic, social, and geopolitical dimensions (Buzan & Wæver, 2003; Fawcett, 2023; Hinnebusch, 2015).

The continuity of historical conflicts is a key determinant of the Middle East security system. The Arab–Israeli conflict has been one of the most significant issues shaping the region’s security agenda for many years. The 1948 Arab–Israeli War, the 1967 Six-Day War, the 1973 War, the Palestinian issue, and the Gaza-centered crises have affected not only Israeli–Palestinian relations but also the foreign policy preferences, alliance relationships, and security perceptions of Arab states (Cleveland & Bunton, 2019; Fawcett, 2023).

In addition, the Iran–Saudi Arabia rivalry has become one of the most defining elements of the Middle East’s security architecture in recent years. This rivalry cannot be explained solely by sectarian differences; regional leadership, energy policies, regime security, and the struggle for geopolitical influence are also key elements of this rivalry (Gause, 2014; Hinnebusch, 2015). Iran’s influence in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen directly shapes the security policies of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, thereby deepening the regional security dilemma.

Proxy Wars and Non-State Actors

Much of the conflict in the Middle East is waged not through direct interstate wars but through proxy wars. The examples of Syria, Yemen, Iraq, and Lebanon demonstrate that regional and global actors are waging a struggle for influence through local armed groups, militias, and political movements (Lynch, 2016; Phillips, 2016).

The role of non-state actors in this process has been steadily increasing. Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis, ISIS, and various militia groups are not merely actors posing a security threat; they have also evolved into entities that share public authority in some countries, provide social services, control border regions, and influence political decision-making processes. Their expanding role has serious implications for state sovereignty and public administration (Fawcett, 2023; Hinnebusch, 2015).

The rise of non-state actors is leading to the erosion of central authority, particularly in countries with weak state capacity. As seen in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq, the fragmentation of the security domain directly affects the delivery of public services, border management, and local administrative structures. Proxy wars, in other words, do not merely generate military conflicts; they also transform governance systems into fragmented, hybrid, and multi-actor structures.

Identity, Sectarianism, and Securitization

Another important dimension of the Middle Eastern security system is identity- and sectarian-based divisions. Sunni–Shia rivalry, ethnic differences, tribal ties, and regime identities can serve as both causes and instruments of regional conflicts. Still, sectarianism is not an

explanatory factor in and of itself; it is often politically instrumentalized in line with the strategic interests of regional powers (Hashemi & Postel, 2017; Hinnebusch, 2015).

Sectarian and identity-based tensions, in turn, reinforce securitization processes. States can legitimize extraordinary security policies by defining internal and external threats through identity-based rhetoric. Thus, security concerns lead to the strengthening of centralized decision-making mechanisms, the expansion of the security bureaucracy, and a more security-centered public administration (Buzan et al., 1998).

Energy Security and Geoeconomic Competition

One of the key factors shaping the security architecture of the Middle East is energy resources. The region holds a strategic position in terms of global energy security because it possesses a significant portion of the world's oil and natural gas reserves. Chokepoints such as the Strait of Hormuz, the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb, the Suez Canal, and the Eastern Mediterranean are of critical importance for energy supply security and maritime trade (Fawcett, 2023; Yergin, 2020).

For the region's states, energy resources serve as a tool of foreign policy and security strategy in addition to being a source of economic revenue. While oil and natural gas revenues strengthen the state capacity, public spending, and tools of regional influence for Gulf countries, crises along energy transit routes can directly impact global markets. Energy security is thus one of the most important areas linking governance systems to international security in the Middle East.

Great Power Rivalry and External Interventions

Historically, the Middle East security system has not developed independently of great power competition. While competition between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War shaped regional alliances, the United States' military and political presence has been decisive in the region's security architecture in the post-Cold War era. However, in recent years, the relative shift in the U.S.'s role in the region, Russia's growing influence through Syria, and China's economic investments have given rise to a multi-actor structure of foreign intervention in the Middle East (Fawcett, 2023; Walt, 2018).

Russia has become an influential actor in the regional security equation, particularly by leveraging its military and diplomatic capabilities during the Syrian civil war. China, on the other hand, is deepening its relations with the region primarily through energy, infrastructure, trade, and the Belt and Road Initiative (Fulton, 2019; Hinnebusch, 2015). These developments are leading Middle Eastern states to diversify their foreign policy preferences and seek a balance among the great powers.

Great power competition also indirectly influences governance systems in the region. Military aid, arms transfers, economic investments, sanctions, and diplomatic support mechanisms shape states' security policies and institutional priorities. Therefore, understanding governance systems in

the Middle East requires attention to regional and global power relations as well as to internal political structures.

The Middle East security system is a multilayered structure in which historical conflicts, regional power competition, proxy wars, identity-based divisions, energy geopolitics, and interventions by major powers are intertwined. This structure makes clear that security issues are not limited to the military sphere alone; they also directly affect public administration, state capacity, border security, crisis management, and governance processes.

Therefore, it is essential to take the region's security dynamics into account when explaining the transformation of governance systems in the Middle East. Security crises centralize states' decision-making processes, increase the influence of the security bureaucracy, alter the distribution of public resources, and lead to the erosion of state capacity in some countries. Within this framework, the next section will examine the concrete effects of regional conflicts on governance systems through the lenses of state capacity, public services, economic management, border management, and securitization processes.

Findings: The Transformative Effects of Regional Conflicts on Governance Systems

In the Middle East, security issues shape more than states' foreign policy and defense strategies; they are dynamics that redefine the institutional structure, functioning, and priorities of governance systems. Prolonged civil wars, proxy conflicts, terrorism, forced migration, and great power competition affect public administration's security policies and, beyond them, state capacity, economic management, the delivery of public services, and governance mechanisms. For this reason, regional conflicts should be viewed not merely as crises that generate political instability, but as structural processes that transform the institutional functioning of the state (Buzan et al., 1998; Fawcett, 2023).

The persistence of security threats leads to the reallocation of public resources, the centralization of decision-making processes, an increase in the institutional weight of the security bureaucracy, and public policies being shaped increasingly around security concerns. However, this transformation does not occur in the same direction in all states. In countries with limited institutional capacity, conflicts lead to the weakening of state authority, disruptions in public services, and the deepening of governance crises; whereas in states with strong institutional capacity, security pressures can encourage the development of crisis management mechanisms, the strengthening of institutional coordination, and the widespread adoption of digital security measures (Fukuyama, 2013; OECD, 2022; World Bank, 2022).

Within this framework, the impact of regional conflicts on governance systems cannot be explained as a one-dimensional process of weakening. On the contrary, conflicts represent a multilayered transformation process that reshapes states' institutional capacity, transforms

governance models, and restructures the priorities of public administration around a security-centered axis. In this section, this transformation is examined through five key dimensions: state capacity, a security-centered governance approach, economic management, public services, and digital security management.

The Transformation of State Capacity

One of the most pronounced effects of regional conflicts on governance systems is the transformation of state capacity. State capacity is generally defined as the state's ability to maintain public order, ensure security, collect taxes, provide public services, and effectively implement its policy decisions nationwide (Evans, 1995; Fukuyama, 2013). In contemporary security literature, however, state capacity has evolved from being merely a technical concept denoting administrative efficiency into a multidimensional concept that also encompasses the ability to adapt to crises, maintain institutional resilience, and develop governance mechanisms suited to a changing security environment (OECD, 2022; World Bank, 2022).

Prolonged conflicts in the Middle East are among the main structural factors affecting state capacity. Civil wars, proxy conflicts, terrorism, and cross-border security threats are diverting states' financial resources, hindering the functioning of public institutions, and negatively impacting the sustainability of public services. Conflicts spanning many years in Syria, Yemen, and Libya have led to the weakening of central authority, the erosion of bureaucratic capacity, and a sharp decline in the ability of public institutions to deliver services nationwide (OECD, 2022; Rotberg, 2004). During this process, investments in education, health, and infrastructure have been sidelined, while a significant portion of public budgets has been allocated to security and defense expenditures.

However, the impact of security pressures on state capacity does not manifest in the same way across all countries. In states with stronger institutional structures, conflicts can serve as a catalyst for the restructuring of public administration and the development of crisis management capacity. Israel's integrated crisis management system developed in response to security threats, its cybersecurity capabilities, and technology-supported public administration practices, along with the institutional reforms undertaken by Gulf countries to protect critical infrastructure, are among the notable examples of this transformation (Fawcett, 2023; Fukuyama, 2013). These examples show that security threats can pave the way for processes of adaptation and innovation in public administration, and not only for institutional erosion.

The transformation of state capacity is not limited to institutional functioning. During periods of heightened security threats, states' fiscal capacity, human resource management, and policy priorities are also being reshaped. Increases in defense budgets, the redirection of public investments toward security-related areas, and rising expenditures on the protection of critical infrastructure are reshaping the allocation of public resources. While this may strengthen security

capacity in the short term, it can place pressure on economic development, social welfare, and the financing of public services in the long term (SIPRI, 2024; World Bank, 2022).

On the other hand, explaining state capacity solely through the strengthening of security institutions is insufficient. Hout (2009) emphasizes that the reconstruction of institutional capacity in fragile states cannot be achieved through technical reforms alone; elements such as the quality of governance, the rule of law, political legitimacy, and social inclusivity are also integral components of state capacity. Similarly, the OECD (2022) notes that fragility stems not only from a lack of security but also from the convergence of political, economic, and social risks. The success of security policies is therefore directly linked to the institutional resilience and governance capacity of public administration.

The example of the Middle East indicates that the impact of conflicts on state capacity is not linear. While the same security pressures can lead to the erosion of state authority and the deepening of governance crises in countries with weak institutional capacity, in countries with strong institutional capacity, they can encourage the modernization of security institutions, the development of crisis management mechanisms, and the widespread adoption of digital public administration practices. Therefore, when explaining the impact of regional conflicts on governance systems, the decisive factor is not merely the intensity of the conflict, but rather the states' institutional capacity, the quality of governance, and their ability to adapt to a changing security environment (Fawcett, 2023; Fukuyama, 2013; World Bank, 2017).

The Strengthening of a Security-Centered Approach to Governance

A major effect of the long-standing conflicts in the Middle East on governance systems is the gradual strengthening of a security-centered approach to governance. States operating under constant security threats are redefining the priorities of public administration and placing security concerns at the center of political decision-making processes. This transformation is changing defense policies and, with them, the organizational structure of public administration, institutional frameworks, and governance paradigms.

Securitization theory offers one way of explaining this process. According to Buzan et al. (1998), when states define certain issues as existential security threats, they can legitimize extraordinary policy tools that fall outside the scope of ordinary political processes. Consequently, issues such as terrorism, irregular migration, border security, cyber threats, or energy supply security are no longer treated merely as matters of public policy but are addressed as national security concerns. This process expands the scope of action for executive branches while also increasing the influence of security institutions in decision-making mechanisms.

The most visible outcome of securitization is stronger centralization in public administration. In conflict and crisis environments, decision-making processes are carried out by a more limited

group of actors, the powers of executive branches expand, and the security bureaucracy becomes one of the key determinants of public administration. In particular, intelligence agencies, internal security agencies, and the defense bureaucracy are assuming more active roles in the implementation of security policies and in areas such as border management, migration policies, the protection of critical infrastructure, and crisis management (Huysmans, 2006).

The Middle East offers clear examples of this shift. The Syrian civil war, the ISIS threat, the conflicts in Yemen, and security crises centered on Gaza have increased the influence of security institutions within the administrative structure in many countries. Similarly, transnational terrorism, irregular migration flows, and hybrid security threats have made it imperative to develop security-centered coordination mechanisms within public administration (Fawcett, 2023). As cooperation between security agencies and the civilian bureaucracy has strengthened, crisis management and emergency planning have become core functions of public administration.

The rise of a security-centered governance approach is altering not only institutional structures but also the priorities for the use of public resources. Increased defense spending, the prioritization of critical infrastructure investments, the acceleration of technological investments in border security, and the strengthening of the institutional capacity of security agencies are leading to a reshaping of public budgets. The OECD (2022) emphasizes that the rise in security risks in fragile states directly affects the allocation of public resources and places additional pressures on governance capacity.

In recent years, the security-centered approach to governance has taken on a new dimension with the advancement of digital technologies. Artificial intelligence-powered analysis systems, biometric authentication applications, big data analytics, and smart border management solutions are becoming integral components of security management. While the OECD (2024) notes that the use of artificial intelligence in public administration can accelerate decision-making processes and enhance the effectiveness of public services, it also highlights the need to develop new governance mechanisms regarding algorithmic transparency, accountability, data security, and the protection of fundamental rights.

However, the spread of a security-centered governance approach also brings with it certain governance challenges. The increasing prioritization of security has led to criticism regarding the weakening of democratic oversight mechanisms, the centralization of decision-making processes, and the restriction of individual rights and freedoms on security grounds (Huysmans, 2006). A sustainable balance between security and democratic governance is therefore vital, particularly for public administration to maintain its legitimacy in protracted conflict environments.

Taken together, the strengthening of a security-centered governance approach in the Middle East should not be viewed merely as a short-term response to conflicts. Rather, this process has

become one of the main dynamics shaping the long-term transformation of governance systems, alongside the restructuring of state capacity, shifts in the priorities of public administration, the growing institutional influence of the security bureaucracy, and the widespread adoption of digital security measures.

The Transformation of Economic Governance

Regional conflicts are reshaping the approach to economic governance and the priorities of public finance, alongside security policies. During periods of heightened security risks, states shift from development-oriented to security-oriented policies in the allocation of public resources; budgets allocated to defense spending, border security, the protection of critical infrastructure, and crisis management increase significantly. This process alters the basic priorities of economic management, giving rise to a new model of resource allocation in public finances (SIPRI, 2024; World Bank, 2022).

Conflict also negatively impacts the investment climate, reduces production capacity, and increases economic uncertainty. While prolonged security crises lead to a slowdown in private-sector investment, a weakening of capital flows, and rising costs of external financing, the diversion of a significant portion of public resources toward security expenditures can limit investments in social development, education, and infrastructure (World Bank, 2022). Economic management is thus shifting from a classical fiscal approach that prioritizes growth and prosperity to a more cautious and resilience-based framework focused on managing security risks.

Yet the impact of security pressures on economic management is not the same across all countries. While Gulf countries with high fiscal capacity can use resources derived from energy revenues to support defense industry investments, critical infrastructure security, and economic diversification programs, in countries directly affected by conflicts, such as Syria, Yemen, and Libya, economic management has become largely dependent on humanitarian aid, reconstruction, and external financial support. This divergence shows that the transformation of economic management is closely linked to the intensity of the conflict as well as to states' fiscal capacity, institutional resilience, and level of economic diversification (World Bank, 2022; Yergin, 2020).

The Transformation of Public Services and Local Governments

One of the most visible effects of regional conflicts on governance systems is evident in the way public services are delivered. Prolonged conflicts not only disrupt health, education, and social services but also alter which institutions provide these services and under which governance model. Particularly in countries where central authority has weakened, public services are increasingly delivered with the support of international organizations, local governments, and civil society organizations.

Damage to health infrastructure, the loss of functionality of educational institutions, forced migration, and the loss of financial resources by local governments severely limit the continuity of public services. This situation not only reduces the quality of services but also exacerbates social inequalities, leading to a weakening of the state's legitimacy and its relationship with citizens. The sustainability of public services has accordingly become one of the most important indicators of state capacity in conflict environments.

The examples of Syria and Yemen reveal that protracted conflicts have significantly eroded the institutional capacity of local governments as well as that of central governments. In contrast, in countries facing intense migration pressures, such as Türkiye and Jordan, new service delivery models have emerged thanks to coordination mechanisms developed among municipalities, central governments, international organizations, and humanitarian aid organizations. This process indicates that public services are evolving from a traditional state-centered structure toward a multi-stakeholder governance model (World Bank, 2017).

Overall, regional conflicts reduce public services in quantitative terms and also transform the organizational structure of public administration. The strengthening of inter-agency coordination in service delivery, the growing role of local governments in crisis management, and the increased visibility of international organizations as key actors demonstrate that public administration has developed a more flexible and multi-stakeholder governance model during periods of conflict. However, the success of this transformation varies widely among countries, depending on the level of state capacity, institutional coordination, and fiscal sustainability.

Digital Surveillance and Security Management

As the nature of regional conflicts changes, security management is evolving beyond traditional military approaches toward a new governance model integrated with digital technologies. Artificial intelligence-supported decision-making systems, big data analytics, biometric authentication applications, unmanned aerial vehicles, and smart border technologies have become core components of security policies in Middle Eastern countries today. This transformation is shifting security management from merely a technical process that enables faster and more effective decision-making to a strategic element that reshapes the organizational structure and institutional functioning of public administration (Zuboff, 2019).

In particular, the rise of terrorism, irregular migration, transnational organized crime, and hybrid security threats has prompted security agencies to invest more heavily in digital technologies. Biometric registration systems, facial recognition technologies, AI-powered risk analyses, and real-time data-sharing systems are widely used in border management, immigration control, and crisis management processes. While these applications enhance the institutional capacity of security

agencies, they also strengthen interagency coordination and promote data-driven decision-making processes in public administration (OECD, 2024).

However, the proliferation of digital security applications also brings new governance challenges. The expansion of digital surveillance systems has sparked wide debate regarding the protection of personal data, algorithmic transparency, accountability, and the safeguarding of fundamental rights. Therefore, establishing the legal and institutional framework that regulates these technologies is as much a responsibility of modern public administration as the effective use of security technologies themselves (OECD, 2024; Zuboff, 2019).

Consequently, digitalization is transforming not only the tools of security management in the Middle East but also the very concept of governance. As security policies increasingly evolve toward a data-driven, technology-supported, and inter-agency coordination-based structure, the success of governance systems depends on technological capacity and, just as much, on the use of these technologies in accordance with democratic governance principles. Digital security management can thus be regarded as one of the most current and dynamic dimensions of the transformation that regional conflicts are bringing about in governance systems.

Regional conflicts and security issues exert varying levels of influence on the governance systems of Middle Eastern countries through different mechanisms. These effects are not limited to the strengthening of security institutions; they also lead to the restructuring of state capacity, economic management, public services, and governance processes. That said, the nature of this transformation varies depending on the type and duration of the conflict, as well as on states' institutional capacity, the quality of governance, and their ability to adapt to crises. Table 1 provides a comparative summary of the primary structural effects of prominent security dynamics in the Middle East on governance systems and how these effects are reflected in examples from different countries.

Table 1. Effects of Regional Conflict Dynamics on Governance Systems in the Middle East

Security Dynamic	Impact on the Governance System	Example Countries
Civil war	Weakening of state capacity	Syria, Yemen
Proxy wars	Strengthening of the security bureaucracy	Lebanon, Iraq
Terrorism	Centralization and extraordinary security measures	Türkiye, Israel
Forced migration	Pressure on local governments and public services	Jordan, Lebanon
Energy competition	Redistribution of public investments based on security priorities	Gulf countries
Great power competition	Strengthening defense capabilities and foreign policy institutions	Qatar, UAE

Source: Compiled by the author using sources from Bužan and Weaver (2003), Fukuyama (2013), Rotberg (2004), Fawcett (2023), and the OECD (2022).

Discussion

An examination of Table 1 reveals that security challenges in the Middle East do not have a unidirectional impact on governance systems. While the same security threat may lead to a

weakening of state capacity and increased institutional fragility in some countries, in states with stronger institutional capacity, it can encourage the modernization of security institutions, the development of crisis management mechanisms, and the restructuring of decision-making processes. This variation indicates that the effects of conflicts on governance systems depend not only on the intensity of the security threat but also on state capacity, the quality of governance, and the level of institutional resilience. Therefore, in the case of the Middle East, the relationship between security and governance should be assessed as a multidimensional and dynamic transformation process that varies from country to country, rather than as a linear cause-and-effect relationship.

In the Middle East, regional conflicts are transforming governance systems through security policies and also through state capacity, economic management, public services, and governance processes. However, this transformation does not yield the same outcome in all countries. While states with strong institutional capacity can address security pressures by adapting their governance systems, in fragile states, protracted conflicts lead to the weakening of public administration and the erosion of state authority. The impact of security threats on governance systems is thus determined not so much by the intensity of the conflict as by the institutional capacity and quality of governance of the states involved (Fukuyama, 2013; OECD, 2022; Rotberg, 2004).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Middle East continues to be one of the regions where security issues are most acute within the international system. Regional power competition, the growing influence of non-state actors, proxy wars, energy geopolitics, and interventions by global powers are constantly reshaping the region's security architecture. This security environment does not merely affect the fields of foreign policy and defense; it also has direct, transformative effects on all components of public administration, from state capacity to public services and from economic management to governance models.

The conceptual framework and regional examples examined in this study demonstrate that the relationship between security and governance systems is not linear. The same security threat may contribute to the restructuring of public administration, the development of crisis management capacity, and the modernization of security institutions in states with strong institutional capacity; in states with limited institutional capacity, it can lead to the weakening of public services, the erosion of administrative capacity, and the deepening of governance crises. Therefore, the key factor determining the impact of conflicts on governance systems is not merely the intensity of the security threat, but also the institutional resilience and governance capacity of states.

The concept of security in the Middle East is also undergoing a deep transformation. Today, security is no longer limited to military threats; irregular migration, energy supply security, cyberattacks, the protection of critical infrastructure, risks posed by climate change, and artificial intelligence-based security applications have become integral parts of the regional security agenda. This situation necessitates a shift toward a new approach to public administration, one that is not limited to traditional security institutions but rather utilizes digital technologies, strengthens interagency coordination, and embraces multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms.

The direction that great-power competition takes will weigh heavily on the region's future. The transformation of the U.S.'s role in the region, the growing economic influence of China, and Russia's continued presence in the security sphere are driving Middle Eastern states to develop more flexible and multifaceted foreign policy strategies. Security policies therefore need to rest on economic resilience, technological competence, and institutional governance capacity as well as on military capabilities.

Digitalization and artificial intelligence applications are expected to be used more widely in public administration in the coming period. AI-powered decision-making systems, biometric authentication technologies, smart border management, big data analytics, and cybersecurity applications will become standard tools of security management. However, the widespread adoption of these technologies will also give rise to new governance debates regarding the protection of personal data, algorithmic transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights. Future security management is therefore likely to be more sustainable for those states that can develop a balanced approach between technological capacity and the principles of democratic governance.

The impact of climate change, water scarcity, energy transition, mass migration, and other non-traditional security threats on the Middle East's governance systems is likely to keep growing. These developments render the exclusive responsibility of defense institutions for security policies insufficient; they necessitate governance models based on stronger cooperation among public administration, local governments, international organizations, and civil society.

Consequently, security issues in the Middle East should not be viewed merely as crises that weaken governance systems. They must also be addressed as structural dynamics that reshape state capacity, transform governance models, alter the priorities of public administration, and foster new institutional structures. In this context, the region's future depends on the end of conflicts and also on establishing a sustainable balance among security, governance, and institutional resilience. Supporting security policies with an inclusive approach to governance, strong public institutions, regional cooperation, and technological transformation can be considered a prerequisite for establishing more stable and resilient governance systems in the Middle East. By addressing

regional conflicts not merely as a security issue but as a transformative process that reshapes public administration, this study aims to contribute to the interdisciplinary literature on the relationship between security and governance in the Middle East.

Author Contributions

Gülşah Özdemir conceived and designed the study, conducted the literature review, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the findings, and drafted and revised the manuscript. The author read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no financial, institutional, professional, or personal conflicts of interest that could have influenced the research, analysis, or publication of this study.

References

- Besley, T., & Mueller, H. (2021). *Fiscal Capacity and State Fragility* (pp. 235–270). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OSO/9780198853091.003.0009>
- Buzan, B., & Wæver, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Cannon, B. J., & Donelli, F. (2020). Asymmetric alliances and high polarity: evaluating regional security complexes in the Middle East and Horn of Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 41(3), 505–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2019.1693255>
- Cleveland, W. L., & Bunton, M. (2019). *A history of the modern Middle East* (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7t0sr>
- Fawcett, L. (Ed.). (2023). *International Relations of the Middle East* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance*, 26(3), 347–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12035>
- Fulton, J. (2019). *China's Changing Role in the Middle East*. Atlantic Council.
- Gause, F. G. (2014). *Beyond Sectarianism: The New Middle East Cold War*. Brookings Institution.
- Gebru, M. K., Zeru, G., & Tekalign, Y. (2023). The Impact of the Middle East and Gulf States' Involvement on the Horn of Africa's Peace and Security: Applying Regional Security Complex Theory. *Digest of Middle East Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dome.12301>
- Grabowski, W. (2020). Application of the Regional Security Complex Theory for security analysis in the Persian Gulf. *Athenaeum. Polskie Studia Politologiczne*, 68(4), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.15804/athena.2020.68.02>

- Hakim, H. (2024). *Regional Security: A Conceptual Approach*. <https://doi.org/10.60842/rass-pgpa.5.vol.4.n5.2024>
- Hashemi, N., & Postel, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Sectarianization: Mapping the New Politics of the Middle East*. Oxford University Press.
- Hinnebusch, R. (2015). *The International Politics of the Middle East* (2nd ed.). Manchester University Press.
- Hout, W. (2009). *Between development and security: The European Union, governance and fragile states* (Asia Research Centre Working Paper No. 153). Murdoch University. <https://repub.eur.nl/pub/17881>
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration, and Asylum in the EU* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203008690>
- Ikpe, E. (2007). Challenging the discourse on fragile states. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 7(1), 85–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678800601176543>
- Jarżabek, J. (2018). The theory of regional security complexes in the Middle Eastern dimension. *Wschodnioznawstwo*, 12, 155–170. http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-04b92a93-42fd-439d-b10b-4f04b1c4ebe6/c/Wschodnioznawstwo_2018_2_do_druku-155-170.pdf
- Katoka, B., & Kwon, H. (2021). A Paradox of the New Deal and Foreign Aid for Fragile States in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Global Policy*, 12(5), 639–652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13012>
- Lynch, M. (2016). *The New Arab Wars: Uprisings and Anarchy in the Middle East*. PublicAffairs.
- Migdal, J. S. (1988). *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvzsmdzz>
- OECD. (2022). *States of Fragility 2022*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/states-of-fragility-2022_c7fedf5e-en.html
- OECD. (2024). *Governing with Artificial Intelligence: Are Governments Ready?* OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/governing-with-artificial-intelligence_795de142-en.html
- Phillips, C. (2016). *The Battle for Syria: International Rivalry in the New Middle East*. Yale University Press.
- Pierre, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability*. Open University Press.
- Rotberg, R. I. (Ed.). (2004). *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7scrg>
- SIPRI. (2024). *Military Expenditure Database*. <https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>

Walt, S. M. (2018). *The Hell of Good Intentions: America's Foreign Policy Elite and the Decline of U.S. Primacy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

World Bank. (2017). *World development report 2017: Governance and the law*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0950-7>

World Bank. (2022). *A new state of mind: Greater transparency and accountability in the Middle East and North Africa* (MENA Economic Update, October 2022). World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/099061523112537158>

Yergin, D. (2020). *The new map: Energy, climate, and the clash of nations*. Penguin Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.