The State Wellness Framework: A Multidimensional Governance Model for National Resilience

Written by Megan Bogle

September 8, 2025

Abstract

The State Wellness concept has been created in a symmetric response to the Rainhard Gelan sabotage warfare to provide tools targeting specifically the implemented weapon: psychops, which acts through deindividuation, dehumanization, creation of an enemy's face, generalization of responsibility, and adherence to group thinking/acting. Behind the crowd, individuals easily commit crimes and stay unpunished, while the victims do not feel protected and do not understand how to fight against the "system." The "system" has one feature that protects it from legal punishment: anonymization of crowds of individuals. These are the core success factors for all military conflicts and genocide operations since the early 19th century.

Governance failures under conditions of hybrid warfare, systemic corruption, and institutional fragility have revealed critical gaps in traditional frameworks such as the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance and the COSO Enterprise Risk Management model. While both provide valuable guidance for integrity, transparency, and risk-informed decision-making, they do not adequately capture the holistic, psychosocial, and cultural dimensions of state resilience. In terms of sabotage hybrid warfare where is psyops actions counterfeit as a crucial infrastructural dominance, the concept of state resilience has no chance to be considered through the singular prism of past performance and habitual management. This paper introduces the new paradigm of wealth of nation's management: State Wellness Framework (SWF). SWF is a multidimensional model inspired by Jane Ogden's (2012) theory of wellness in health psychology, Howard Gardner's (1983,

2006) multiple intelligences framework, and institutional approach to governance, risk and control that were introduced during the past decades by the OECD and COSO frameworks. The SWF conceptualises governance as an ecosystem of interdependent dimensions — structural, functional, ethical, relational, strategic, and cultural — that together enable resilience, citizen trust, and sustainability.

The framework builds upon established governance literature while addressing overlooked areas such as identity preservation, cultural heritage, and individuation. Like personal wellness, state wellness requires balance across multiple domains. A "Governance Wheel" operationalises this concept through accentuating the mission critical state functions, mapping wellness dimensions to state policies and creating a diagnostic and prescriptive tool for policymakers. Guiding principles — including tone at the top, segregation of duties, accountability chains, risk-based oversight, and citizen-centric governance — anchor the framework in both theory and practice.
Implementation pathways are proposed across immediate, mid-term, and long-term horizons, with specific applications to high-risk functions such as public health, infrastructure, transport, safety, and digital registers. By integrating insights from psychology, political science, control basics, and risk management, the State Wellness Framework advances a new paradigm for governance: governance as wellness.

Keywords: governance, wellness, resilience, COSO, OECD, hybrid warfare, multidimensional wellness, multiple intelligences

1. Introduction

1.1 Context and Problem Statement

In the twenty-first century, states face profound governance challenges shaped by hybrid warfare, cyber sabotage, corruption, and systemic risk accumulation (Kaldor, 2012; Heupel & Zürn, 2017). These findings were presented in the earlier published investigative reports devoted to the study of genocidal polices of the mid-20s century and their further roll-out in the form of Rainhard Gelan hybrid warfare. Traditional governance systems often operate on the assumption that structural and legal mechanisms alone can guarantee resilience. Yet, recurrent crises — from financial collapses to global pandemics — demonstrate that governance failures frequently emerge not only from institutional design flaws but also from deeper psychosocial and cultural vulnerabilities (Fukuyama, 2014; Rodrik, 2020).

Frameworks such as the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance (OECD, 2015) and the COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework (COSO, 2017) provide robust guidelines for transparency, accountability, and control. However, these standards tend to emphasize mechanistic and procedural aspects of governance, underplaying the multidimensional, holistic, and identity-based nature of resilience in modern societies.

Hybrid warfare strategies — including disinformation campaigns, manipulation of state registers, and corrosion of public trust — exploit precisely these blind spots (Makhortykh, 2020). In such conditions, governance cannot be sustained through technical controls alone; it requires a model of wellness that integrates structural, functional, ethical, relational, strategic, and cultural dimensions.

1.2 Towards a Wellness Paradigm of Governance

The concept of state wellness draws inspiration from health psychology and educational theory. In health psychology, Jane Ogden (2012) argues that wellness is multidimensional, encompassing structural integrity, functional capacity, emotional balance, and identity preservation. Analogously, governance systems can be conceptualized as "living organisms" that require holistic care, not mere compliance mechanisms.

Similarly, Howard Gardner's (1983, 2006) theory of multiple intelligences demonstrates that human potential cannot be reduced to a single cognitive dimension. States, like individuals, must cultivate multiple forms of intelligence: strategic foresight, ethical reasoning, relational engagement, cultural narrative, and adaptive resilience. This analogy provides a valuable heuristic for rethinking governance as multidimensional wellness, targeting not only lives of humans, but preserving all kind of living nature, including animals.

1.3 Objectives of the Paper

This paper develops the State Wellness Framework (SWF) as a new academic and policy model for governance. Its objectives are threefold:

- To define the concept of state wellness and anchor it in multidisciplinary theory (psychology, governance, risk management).

- To present the Governance Wheel — a diagnostic and prescriptive tool mapping wellness dimensions to governance functions.

- To establish guiding principles, implementation pathways, and monitoring mechanisms that enable systemic turnaround and resilience.

The SWF builds upon, but also extends, COSO and OECD frameworks by integrating wellness, identity, and cultural vitality into governance reform. In doing so, it seeks to provide both academics and policymakers with a comprehensive, life saving centered, and resilient paradigm for governance in an era of uncertainty.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Multidimensional Wellness in Health Psychology

The concept of wellness has traditionally been framed in the context of individual health. In health psychology, Jane Ogden (2012) describes wellness as a multidimensional state that extends beyond the absence of illness to include physical integrity, functional balance, emotional well-being, and

identity preservation. This contrasts with reductionist models of health that prioritize pathology and disease. Wellness, in Ogden's formulation, emphasizes holistic integration across multiple domains — biological, psychological, social, and cultural.

Translating this to governance, states can be viewed as "organisms" whose survival depends on multidimensional integrity. Just as individual wellness requires balance among diet, exercise, relationships, and emotional regulation (Seligman, 2011), state wellness requires equilibrium between structural institutions, ethical norms, citizen engagement, and cultural identity. The erosion of any one dimension destabilizes the system as a whole.

Scholars have increasingly recognized the value of wellness-based metaphors for collective systems. For instance, Kickbusch (2007) argues that public health frameworks can inform societal governance through concepts of resilience, prevention, and systemic balance. The State Wellness Framework (SWF) builds on this foundation, asserting that governance reform must be approached not only as a technical exercise in risk control but also as a psychosocial project of collective wellness in respond to the psyops method as a primarily applied instrument of the hybrid warfare. In response to the psychological violence as the main way to conduct military activity, the follow up measures cannot operate without this domain.

2.2 Multiple Intelligences as a Proxy for State Capabilities

Howard Gardner's (1983, 2006) theory of multiple intelligences provides another useful lens for conceptualizing state wellness. Gardner challenged the dominance of IQ-based measures of human ability, instead proposing multiple intelligences — linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic. Recognizing that human flourishing is pluralistic and requires diverse forms of capability is the strength of this model. Underestimation of the importance of living nature and preserving our animals is based on the underdevelopment of one of the intelligences, the ability to communicate with and understand the language of other species, except humans. At the same time, animals are the first to demonstrate the

signs of something going wrong, as our research with Rainhard Gelan showed. Thus, saving animals and understanding their behavior becomes not a luxury but a vital skill for survival, becoming crucial.

Another factor is the capability not only to understand the language of animals, but also to understand the language of other people, including highly contextualized patterns of messaging. Thus, multiple intelligence is first and foremost about having a deep understanding of everyday life events and the ability to communicate with spices beyond the usual circle, which can change our attitude towards them from consumption to protection.

Analogously, states cannot be assessed solely on economic performance or military strength. National resilience depends on multiple forms of "state intelligence":

• Strategic Intelligence: the ability to anticipate and adapt to crises (akin to logical-mathematical).

• Ethical Intelligence: upholding integrity, justice, and transparency (akin to intrapersonal).

• Relational Intelligence: fostering trust, civic participation, and cohesion (akin to interpersonal).

• Cultural Intelligence: preserving identity, heritage, and symbolic values (akin to musical/spatial).

• Adaptive Intelligence: embedding resilience into infrastructure and governance systems (akin to naturalistic).

These intelligences collectively map onto the dimensions of state wellness. A state that excels in economic metrics but neglects cultural heritage or relational trust is, in Gardner's terms, "imbalanced" — strong in one intelligence but deficient in others. The SWF thus proposes that holistic governance requires cultivating diverse intelligences across governance systems, ensuring that resilience is not one-dimensional.

2.3 Governance Frameworks: COSO and OECD Principles

While Ogden and Gardner provide psychological and educational foundations, governance studies contribute procedural and normative anchors. Two frameworks are particularly relevant:

COSO Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Framework:

- Originally developed for corporate governance, COSO ERM emphasizes risk identification, control activities, monitoring, and information flows (COSO, 2017). Its strength lies in its structured approach to uncertainty and accountability. However, COSO is rooted in enterprise-level logic and does not fully address citizen-centric or cultural dimensions of governance.

OECD Principles of Corporate Governance:

- These principles, most recently revised in 2015, stress integrity, transparency, accountability, and inclusive decision-making (OECD, 2015). They provide a global standard for ethical leadership. Yet, like COSO, they primarily target corporate and financial governance, not the holistic psychosocial dimensions of state resilience.

Both frameworks offer valuable scaffolding for institutional integrity but remain insufficient for the multidimensional demands of governance in hybrid warfare contexts. The State Wellness Framework extends COSO's procedural rigor and OECD's normative commitments by embedding them within a wellness-based paradigm.

2.4 State Wellness: Bridging Wellness, Intelligence, and Governance

Bringing these strands together, state wellness can be defined as:

The multidimensional health of a nation, reflected in the effective functioning of governance systems, the protection and empowerment of its citizens, and the sustainable management of its life, which includes resources, identity, and environment.

This definition integrates:

- Wellness theory (Ogden, 2012): emphasizing multidimensional balance.

- Multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983, 2006): emphasizing pluralistic capabilities.

- Governance frameworks (COSO, 2017; OECD, 2015): emphasizing control, transparency, and accountability.

The Governance Wheel operationalizes this definition by mapping six dimensions of wellness (structural, functional, ethical, relational, strategic, cultural) to state functions. Like a medical model

of wellness, it provides both a diagnostic lens (assessing deficiencies) and a prescriptive framework (guiding reforms).

2.5 Conceptual Gaps in Existing Models

Despite decades of governance reform, three gaps remain insufficiently addressed in global standards:

- Identity and Memory: Current models underplay the preservation of identity, history, and cultural narratives, even though these are vital for legitimacy and cohesion (Nora, 1989; Anderson, 2006).

- Psychosocial Dimensions: Governance is treated as mechanical rather than as a living system with emotions, narratives, and collective psychology (Mann, 2012).

- Resilience Under Hybrid Threats: COSO and OECD focus on integrity and efficiency but lack explicit tools for countering disinformation, sabotage, or psychological warfare (Rid, 2020).

The State Wellness Framework directly addresses these gaps by embedding psychology, cultural theory, and resilience studies into governance design.

3. The State Wellness Framework

3.1 Conceptual Overview

The State Wellness Framework (SWF) positions governance as a multidimensional system of interdependent functions, analogous to the biopsychosocial model of health (Engel, 1977). Just as personal wellness depends on equilibrium between body, mind, and environment (Ogden, 2012), state wellness requires balance across governance domains.

The framework is operationalized through the Governance Wheel, a conceptual model in which six dimensions — structural, functional, ethical, relational, strategic, and cultural — form interconnected spokes. Each dimension supports the others, and a deficiency in one weakens the whole. For instance, without cultural integrity, structural reforms may fail to inspire trust; without ethical integrity, functional efficiency may collapse into corruption.

The Governance Wheel thus acts as both a diagnostic tool (assessing systemic vulnerabilities) and a prescriptive guide (designing reforms) focusing on mission critical functions, vital for survival. Its multidimensionality distinguishes it from COSO ERM (COSO, 2017), which emphasizes procedural controls, and the OECD Principles (OECD, 2015), which emphasize ethical norms, by embedding psychosocial and cultural layers of resilience.

3.2 Dimension I: Structural Wellness

Structural wellness refers to the institutional backbone of governance — the architecture of ministries, registers, infrastructure, and public services. Like the skeletal system in human health, it provides form, stability, and continuity.

Key elements include:

• Public infrastructure (transport, utilities, digital networks)

• State registers (property, identity, civil records)

• Institutional integrity (separation of powers, independence of oversight bodies)

Scholars emphasize that institutional structures are necessary but not sufficient for governance resilience (North, 1990; Fukuyama, 2014). Without well-maintained registers, for example, citizens lose legal identity and property rights, creating systemic instability (De Soto, 2000). Structural wellness thus anchors the other dimensions of state wellness.

3.3 Dimension II: Functional Wellness

Functional wellness corresponds to the operational efficiency, monitoring, and adaptability of governance systems. It aligns with COSO's emphasis on control environments, risk assessment, and monitoring (COSO, 2017).

Core attributes include:

• Transparency of processes

• Monitoring & evaluation systems

• Crisis preparedness

- Operational resilience in service delivery

In public administration research, functional performance has often been measured through efficiency indicators, but scholars argue for broader conceptions that include adaptability and resilience (Talbot, 2010; OECD, 2021). A state may have robust institutions (structural wellness) but fail functionally if it cannot adapt to pandemics, cyberattacks, or economic shocks (Ansell et al., 2021).

3.4 Dimension III: Ethical Wellness

Ethical wellness is the moral compass of governance, encompassing integrity, justice, transparency, and accountability. It parallels Ogden's (2012) emphasis on psychological integrity and Gardner's (1983) intrapersonal intelligence — the ability to self-reflect and act responsibly.

Core elements include:

- Rule of law and justice systems

- Anti-corruption safeguards

- Tone at the top (ethical leadership)

- Accountability chains (traceable decisions and actions)

Ethical wellness is foundational for legitimacy. Without it, citizens perceive governance as exploitative, leading to systemic distrust (Rothstein & Teorell, 2008). Studies demonstrate that high-trust societies exhibit greater resilience to crises, as citizens are more willing to comply with regulations and collective actions (Putnam, 2000).

3.5 Dimension IV: Relational Wellness

Relational wellness represents the quality of engagement between citizens, institutions, and communities. It parallels Gardner's interpersonal intelligence and draws on theories of social capital (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000).

Key features include:

- Citizen participation in governance

- Civic engagement and deliberative democracy

- Social cohesion and community networks

- Protection of rights and freedoms

Relational wellness mitigates alienation and creates shared ownership of governance outcomes. Scholars highlight that states with strong civic participation demonstrate higher resilience against populism, disinformation, and authoritarian regression (Norris & Inglehart, 2019). Thus, relational wellness is a countermeasure against hybrid warfare strategies that exploit societal divisions.

3.6 Dimension V: Strategic Wellness

Strategic wellness emphasizes the adaptive, forward-looking capacities of governance systems. It parallels Gardner's logical-mathematical intelligence and resilience theory in organizational studies (Hamel & Välikangas, 2003).

Strategic wellness encompasses:

- Foresight and anticipatory governance

- Risk-based oversight and decision-making

- Innovation and technological adaptability

- Resilience planning and redundancy

This dimension bridges COSO's risk management principles with resilience scholarship (Linkov & Trump, 2019). States lacking strategic foresight may respond reactively rather than proactively, leaving them vulnerable to cascading crises. Strategic wellness thus ensures governance is future-proof rather than merely present-focused.

3.7 Dimension VI: Cultural Wellness

Cultural wellness refers to the preservation of identity, heritage, and symbolic vitality within governance. It parallels Gardner's spatial, musical, and naturalistic intelligences — which emphasize narrative, aesthetics, and holistic understanding.

Core aspects include:

• Heritage and memory preservation (archives, libraries, monuments)

• Cultural identity and storytelling

• Collective rituals, values, and traditions

• Symbolic legitimacy of governance institutions

While often overlooked in governance frameworks, cultural wellness is critical for long-term legitimacy and cohesion. Anderson (2006) argues that nations are "imagined communities" sustained through shared narratives. Hybrid warfare exploits cultural fractures by eroding memory and identity (Makhortykh, 2020). Cultural wellness therefore acts as a shield for collective continuity.

3.8 Interdependence of the Dimensions

The six dimensions of the Governance Wheel are mutually reinforcing:

• Without structural integrity, functional processes collapse.

• Without ethical leadership, relational trust erodes.

• Without cultural vitality, strategic reforms lack legitimacy.

This interdependence mirrors Ogden's wellness model, where imbalance in one domain (e.g., emotional health) undermines overall wellness. Similarly, in Gardner's framework, individuals thrive only when multiple intelligences are nurtured.

Thus, state wellness is not a linear checklist but a systemic balance. Policymakers must treat the Governance Wheel as an integrated ecosystem, where deficiencies in one spoke weaken the entire wheel.

4. Guiding Principles of the State Wellness Framework

The State Wellness Framework (SWF) rests on a set of guiding principles designed to operationalize wellness in governance. These principles provide normative anchors, practical directives, and evaluative benchmarks, ensuring that governance functions not only comply with

technical standards but also foster resilience, legitimacy, and citizen well-being. Like COSO's (2017) "components" and the OECD's (2015) "principles," the SWF's guiding principles are universal yet adaptable across political, cultural, and institutional contexts.

4.1 Principle 1: Tone at the Top

The foundation of governance wellness lies in ethical leadership. Tone at the top refers to the example set by leaders in embodying integrity, transparency, and accountability. Research consistently shows that leadership behavior influences institutional culture and ethical outcomes (Kaptein, 2011; Treviño et al., 2000).

For states, tone at the top requires:

• Leaders visibly prioritizing ethical norms over short-term gains.

• Clear articulation of values such as justice, fairness, and inclusivity.

• Institutional mechanisms that hold leadership accountable for misconduct.

Without ethical leadership, reforms risk becoming performative rather than transformative. Tone at the top thus anchors all other principles.

4.2 Principle 2: Segregation of Duties

Concentration of power erodes resilience. The principle of segregation of duties (SoD) mandates the separation of critical functions across independent bodies to prevent conflicts of interest and systemic abuse. Originally a cornerstone of financial auditing (COSO, 2017), SoD is equally vital in governance, not just for the business.

Applications include:

• Separating regulatory, supervisory, and operational functions across ministries.

• Ensuring independence of judicial, legislative, and executive powers.

• Limiting private proxies' influence over critical public registers and infrastructure.

Empirical studies confirm that states with strong SoD mechanisms experience lower corruption and higher public trust (Rose-Ackerman & Palifka, 2016).

4.3 Principle 3: Accountability Chain

Every decision, transaction, and policy must be traceable, documented, and reviewable. The accountability chain ensures continuity of responsibility from top-level leadership to operational execution.

Key practices include:

• Digital and physical audit trails for public decisions.

• Whistleblower protection frameworks.

• Independent oversight committees.

Accountability strengthens trust by demonstrating that governance is not arbitrary but subject to checks, balances, and review (Bovens, 2007). In the SWF, accountability is not punitive but preventive, reducing opportunities for misconduct and reinforcing systemic integrity.

4.4 Principle 4: Risk-Based Oversight

Wellness requires anticipating and mitigating risks before they escalate into systemic crises. The risk-based oversight principle, adapted from COSO ERM (2017), directs resources toward high-vulnerability areas.

This includes:

• Identifying critical risk domains (e.g., public health, digital registers, infrastructure).

• Prioritizing preventive action over reactive intervention.

• Integrating foresight and scenario planning into policymaking.

Studies on organizational resilience confirm that proactive risk management significantly reduces the severity of crises (Linkov & Trump, 2019). In governance, risk-based oversight transforms crisis management into resilience-building.

4.5 Principle 5: Citizen-Centric Governance

Governance wellness cannot be achieved without centering citizens as the primary stakeholders. Citizen-centric governance emphasizes participation, empowerment, and protection of rights.

Practical measures include:

• Mechanisms for participatory budgeting and policy co-design.

• Platforms for civic dialogue and deliberation.

• Constitutional guarantees of civil liberties and protections against state abuse.

Citizen-centricity enhances legitimacy and creates relational wellness by fostering trust, belonging, and shared responsibility (Norris & Inglehart, 2019). States that neglect citizen perspectives risk alienation and social fragmentation.

4.6 Principle 6: Transparency and Integrity

Transparency is the visibility of governance processes; integrity is the consistency of these processes with ethical norms. Together, they create predictability and trustworthiness in governance.

Measures include:

• Open access to government data and budgets.

• Mandatory disclosure of conflicts of interest.

• Public reporting of decision-making rationales.

Research shows that transparency reduces corruption, but only when combined with integrity mechanisms that enforce consequences (Fox, 2007). Transparency without integrity risks becoming a façade; integrity without transparency risks opacity. The SWF requires both.

4.7 Principle 7: Sustainability and Resilience

Wellness cannot be temporary; it must endure across generations. This principle emphasizes environmental stewardship, resource sustainability, and long-term resilience.

Applications include:

• Embedding climate governance into policy (Ostrom, 2009).

• Building redundancy into infrastructure to withstand shocks.

• Safeguarding natural and digital ecosystems for future generations.

Sustainability research underscores that resilience is not merely the capacity to "bounce back" but to adapt and transform (Folke, 2016). For states, this means designing governance systems capable of evolving under dynamic threats.

4.8 Principle 8: Preservation of Identity and Memory

Governance wellness requires preserving cultural heritage, collective memory, and societal identity. This principle recognizes that legitimacy depends not only on efficiency but also on symbolic continuity.

Key practices include:

• Safeguarding archives, libraries, and historical registers.

• Protecting minority identities within pluralistic frameworks.

• Narrating national identity through inclusive cultural policies.

Theories of collective memory (Nora, 1989; Assmann, 2011) demonstrate that societies with preserved memory exhibit stronger cohesion and resilience. Hybrid warfare often targets cultural symbols and archives precisely because identity preservation is foundational to national resilience (Rid, 2020).

4.9 Principle 9: Inclusivity and Equity

Finally, governance wellness requires inclusive participation and equitable treatment across gender, ethnicity, class, and other identities. Equity ensures that wellness is distributed fairly, preventing systemic exclusion.

This entails:

• Mainstreaming gender and diversity considerations in policymaking.

• Equitable access to public services.

• Targeted interventions for marginalized groups.

Inclusive governance enhances both ethical and relational wellness by reducing inequality and strengthening civic trust (Sen, 1999; Fraser, 2009). Without inclusivity, wellness becomes fragmented, privileging elites while undermining systemic legitimacy.

4.10 Integration of Principles

The nine principles function collectively, not individually. Like Ogden's (2012) multidimensional wellness, they require balance: transparency without accountability breeds cynicism; sustainability without citizen-centricity risks technocracy; inclusivity without cultural preservation risks homogenization.

The SWF thus insists on systemic integration: wellness emerges not from piecemeal reforms but from coherent, interdependent governance principles.

5. Implementation Roadmap

5.1 Immediate Horizon (0–12 months): Emergency Safeguards

The first stage of implementation prioritizes stabilization — repairing the most fragile elements of governance wellness to prevent systemic collapse. Like triage in medicine, this phase emphasizes urgent interventions.

Key actions:

• Independent audits of high-risk ministries (tax, transport, justice).

• Emergency safeguards for state registers and archives to prevent manipulation.

• Whistleblower protection systems to expose corruption.

• Establishing a strategic firewall against hybrid warfare targeting public health, infrastructure, and surveillance systems.

Research demonstrates that rapid, visible safeguards restore a baseline of trust and reduce panic during crises (Boin et al., 2016).

5.2 Medium-Term Horizon (1–3 years): Structural Transformation

The second stage shifts from crisis management to systemic restructuring. Structural transformation aligns with COSO ERM principles by embedding internal controls and risk-informed governance (COSO, 2017).

Measures include:

• Reallocation of functions: ministries focus on core regulatory roles, while digital infrastructure is centralized under a specialized agency.

• Segregation of duties: operational tasks separated from oversight roles.

• Decoupling from proxies: eliminating private actors' control over public data registers.

• Citizen participation mechanisms: deliberative assemblies and participatory budgeting introduced to strengthen relational wellness.

Medium-term reforms aim to reduce systemic vulnerabilities while embedding accountability and transparency.

5.3 Long-Term Horizon (3–7 years): Cultural Integration and Resilience

The third stage seeks to entrench governance wellness into political culture. This requires cultivating resilience not as a technical safeguard but as a way of governance life.

Long-term strategies:

• Institutionalization of foresight practices in policymaking.

• Resilience education in civic and public administration curricula.

• Cultural preservation initiatives safeguarding archives, libraries, and heritage institutions.

• Cross-sector partnerships between government, academia, and civil society to co-create governance innovation.

Long-term integration ensures that governance wellness is self-sustaining, capable of evolving with future challenges.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation

6.1 Indicators of State Wellness

Measuring state wellness requires multidimensional indicators comparable to health diagnostics.

Suggested indicators include:

• Structural: integrity of public registers, infrastructure audits.

• Functional: service delivery efficiency, crisis response times.

• Ethical: corruption perception indices, judicial independence metrics.

• Relational: citizen trust surveys, participation rates.

• Strategic: risk preparedness indices, innovation adoption rates.

Cultural: heritage preservation measures, inclusivity indices.

6.2 Balanced Scorecard for State Wellness

Adapting Kaplan and Norton's (1996) balanced scorecard, governance performance can be evaluated across four perspectives:

• Citizen perspective: trust, satisfaction, inclusivity.

• Internal processes: transparency, accountability, resilience.

• Innovation/learning: foresight, adaptability, digital integration.

• Institutional sustainability: resource stewardship, intergenerational equity.

6.3 Risk and Control Matrix

Similar to enterprise controls, a risk-control matrix ensures that each governance function has mapped risks and mitigation strategies. For instance:

• Public health → Risk: bioterrorism → Control: biosecurity systems.

• Digital registers → Risk: data manipulation → Control: blockchain-based verification.

• Infrastructure → Risk: sabotage → Control: redundancy and monitoring.

This systematic approach translates the wellness paradigm into actionable safeguards.

7. Discussion

7.1 Academic Implications

The SWF contributes to governance scholarship by integrating psychology, educational theory, and resilience studies into statecraft. Unlike OECD and COSO, which focus primarily on institutional mechanics, SWF acknowledges that governance is also a psychosocial and cultural process. It advances the literature on holistic governance (Ansell & Torfing, 2021) by proposing wellness as an organizing metaphor.

7.2 Policy Implications

For policymakers, SWF offers a roadmap to counter hybrid threats and systemic vulnerabilities. By embedding wellness dimensions into governance, states can resist manipulation, preserve citizen trust, and ensure resilience. Particularly in fragile or transitional states, wellness provides a more comprehensive framework than compliance-based models.

7.3 Future Research

The SWF opens pathways for interdisciplinary inquiry:

• Digital governance: how AI and blockchain can secure registers and enhance transparency.

• Resilience metrics: developing standardized indicators for state wellness.

• Comparative studies: applying SWF across different governance contexts.

Future research should empirically validate SWF, testing its applicability across regions and crisis scenarios.

8. Conclusion

Governance in the twenty-first century requires more than procedural controls. In the face of hybrid warfare, disinformation, and systemic crises, states must cultivate wellness as a holistic condition. The State Wellness Framework (SWF) reconceptualizes governance through six dimensions — structural, functional, ethical, relational, strategic, and cultural — operationalized by nine guiding

principles. Like Ogden's wellness model and Gardner's multiple intelligences, SWF emphasizes balance, multidimensionality, and resilience.

By integrating COSO's procedural rigor and OECD's ethical standards with wellness-based insights, SWF offers a comprehensive governance paradigm for resilience. Its phased implementation, monitoring mechanisms, and cultural integration ensure both short-term stability and long-term legitimacy.

The central message is clear: governance comes first, everything else follows. Without wellness at its core, states risk systemic collapse; with it, they gain resilience, legitimacy, and sustainability.

References

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.

Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2021). *Public governance as co-creation: A strategy for revitalizing the public sector and rebuilding trust in government.* Cambridge University Press.

Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge University Press.

Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2016). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement), S95–S120.

COSO. (2017). *Enterprise risk management: Integrating with strategy and performance.* Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission.

De Soto, H. (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. Basic Books.

Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. *Science*, 196(4286), 129–136.

Folke, C. (2016). Resilience (republished). *Ecology and Society*, 21(4), 44.

Fox, J. (2007). The uncertain relationship between transparency and accountability. *Development in Practice*, 17(4–5), 663–671.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world.* Columbia University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons.* Basic Books.

Hamel, G., & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. Harvard Business Review, 81(9), 52–63.

Heupel, M., & Zürn, M. (2017). *Protecting the individual from international harm: The role of the United Nations*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action.* Harvard Business School Press.

Kaptein, M. (2011). From inaction to external whistleblowing: The influence of the ethical culture of organizations on employee responses to observed wrongdoing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(3), 513–530.

Kickbusch, I. (2007). *Health governance: The health society.* In M. McKee, L. MacLehose, & E. Nolte (Eds.), *Health systems, health, wealth and societal well-being* (pp. 189–203). Open University Press.

Linkov, I., & Trump, B. D. (2019). *The science and practice of resilience*. Springer.

Makhortykh, M. (2020). Hybrid war digital propaganda: Case study of Russia's disinformation campaigns in Ukraine. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 36(4), 281–297.

Mann, M. (2012). *The sources of social power: Volume 4, Globalizations*, 1945–2011. Cambridge University Press.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7–24.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2015). *G20/OECD principles of corporate governance*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2021). *Government at a glance 2021*. OECD Publishing.

Ogden, J. (2012). *Health psychology: A textbook* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 325(5939), 419–422.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Rid, T. (2020). *Active measures: The secret history of disinformation and political warfare*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Rodrik, D. (2020). Why does globalization fuel populism? Economics, culture, and the rise of right-wing populism. *Annual Review of Economics*, 13, 133–170.

Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. J. (2016). *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165–190.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Talbot, C. (2010). *Theories of performance: Organizational and service improvement in the public domain*. Oxford University Press.

Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2000). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 951–990.