Nová bezpečnostná architektúra sveta v kontexte vojny na Ukrajine

New Security Architecture in the World considering the War in Ukraine

Vasyl Zaplatynskyi – Inga Uriadnikova

Abstrakt: *Tento článok poskytuje komplexnú analýzu transformácie globálnej bezpečnostnej architektúry pod vplyvom rozsiahlej vojny Ruska proti Ukrajine. Skúma sa zraniteľnosť existujúcich medzinárodných bezpečnostných mechanizmov a obmedzený vplyv medzinárodného práva na agresora, pričom sa zdôrazňuje naliehavá potreba nového systému kolektívnej obrany. Osobitná pozornosť sa venuje úlohe Ukrajiny ako kľúčového prvku európskej bezpečnosti, jej skúsenostiam s odporom a dôležitosti integrácie do medzinárodných obranných štruktúr. Analyzujú sa aktivity hlavných vojenských aliancií (NATO, EÚ, ŠOS atď.), ich účinnosť a vnútorné rozpory. Článok zdôvodňuje potrebu prechodu od pasívneho odstrašovania k aktívnej prevencii agresie, rozvíjania flexibilných aliancií, posilňovania kybernetickej a informačnej bezpečnosti a zapojenia občianskej spoločnosti do formovania novej bezpečnostnej paradigmy.*

Kľúčové slová: *globálna bezpečnosť, vojna na Ukrajine, nová architektúra, medzinárodné aliancie, kolektívna obrana, hybridné hrozby, medzinárodné právo.*

Abstract: *This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the transformation of the global security architecture under the impact of Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine. The vulnerability of existing international security mechanisms and the limited influence of international law on the aggressor are examined, highlighting the urgent need for a new system of collective defence. Special attention is paid to Ukraine's role as a key element of European security, its experience in resistance, and the importance of integration into international defence structures. The activities of major military alliances (NATO, EU, SCO, etc.), their effectiveness and internal contradictions are analysed. The article substantiates the necessity of shifting from passive deterrence to active prevention of aggression, developing flexible alliances, strengthening cyber and information security, and engaging civil society in shaping a new security paradigm.*

Keywords: *global security, war in Ukraine, new architecture, international alliances, collective defence, hybrid threats, international law.*

Introduction

The war waged by the Russian Federation against Ukraine has become one of the key factors driving the transformation of the modern international security system. The events of recent years have demonstrated the limited effectiveness of traditional mechanisms for deterring aggression, including the activities of international organizations and the implementation of multilateral agreements. The existing security architecture, shaped in the aftermath of the Cold War, has proven incapable of ensuring an adequate level of protection for the sovereignty of states confronted with external aggression.

Under conditions of global instability, Ukraine has emerged not only as the target of an armed assault but also as a central actor in the formation of new approaches to collective security. Ukraine's experience in countering hybrid, cyber, and full-scale warfare is of particular significance for rethinking the foundational concepts of international stability. This experience creates the groundwork for developing a new model of security architecture that integrates military, political, legal, and technological instruments to provide an adequate response to contemporary threats.

The purpose of this article is to analyse the transformation of the global security architecture under the impact of Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine, to identify key vulnerabilities and shortcomings of the existing international security mechanisms, to outline the emerging requirements for a renewed system of collective defence, and to substantiate the principles and instruments necessary for building an effective, adaptive, and value-oriented security architecture in the contemporary world—one that accounts for current military, political, economic, cyber, and environmental challenges.

The scientific novelty of this article lies in a comprehensive analysis of the transformation of the global security architecture under the impact of Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine and in the substantiation of fundamentally new approaches to building an effective international security system. Unlike previous studies, this research:

- ✓ systematically examines the Ukrainian experience of resistance as a model for developing modern mechanisms of collective defence that address hybrid, cyber, and informational threats;
- ✓ analyses the limitations and low effectiveness of existing international institutions (such as the UN and OSCE) and guarantees (such as the Budapest Memorandum) in the context of contemporary warfare;
- ✓ proposes a concept of a new security architecture that integrates military, energy, economic, informational, and environmental protection dimensions, emphasizing Ukraine's role as an active subject of global security;
- ✓ substantiates the need to shift from passive deterrence to proactive prevention of aggression, including the creation of flexible regional alliances, rapid-response mechanisms, and legally binding security guarantees;
- ✓ highlights the importance of integrating civil society, volunteer initiatives, modern technologies, and international justice into the emerging security system.

Thus, the article articulates a holistic vision of a new philosophy of security grounded in solidarity, responsibility, and the primacy of values over political or economic interests, and offers practical tools for its implementation in the post-crisis world.

The study employs an interdisciplinary approach that integrates political analysis, international law, and security studies. The primary research methods include system analysis, which enables a comprehensive examination of transformations within the global security architecture under the influence of the war in Ukraine; comparative analysis to assess the effectiveness of international security mechanisms (UN, NATO, EU, SCO); and a case study of Ukraine's experience as an example of transforming approaches to collective defence.

Content analysis of international treaties, official documents, analytical reports, and statistics on armed conflicts was conducted to ensure an evidence-based perspective. The

research is grounded in the principles of objectivity, critical evaluation, and multidimensional consideration of modern security challenges, thereby forming an integrated vision of a new, adaptive architecture of global security.

1 Research results

The full-scale war of Russia against Ukraine has become a catalyst for profound transformations in the field of global and regional security. It has revealed the vulnerability of existing international security mechanisms, demonstrated the limited influence of international law on the aggressor, and highlighted the urgent need to establish a new security architecture capable of responding to modern threats and challenges (Jurčák, Ivančík, 2023). As noted by Zhelezov (2025), the use of international law as an instrument of power in the digital age increases the risks to the stability of the international order (Zhelezov, 2025). The events in Ukraine have become not only a local conflict but also a global-scale shift that has transformed the perception of security in Europe and the world at large.

One of the key elements of the new security architecture must be the understanding that a threat to the sovereignty of one state inevitably affects the stability of the entire region, and consequently, the global system. An important step in this regard has been the strengthening of NATO's eastern flank, the enhancement of the defence capabilities of the Baltic states, Poland, Romania, and other countries that directly feel the threat posed by aggressive Russia. At the same time, Ukraine's experience of resistance has demonstrated that effective defence is possible only through close intergovernmental cooperation, intelligence sharing, rapid logistical support, and flexible decision-making mechanisms that go beyond the bureaucratic constraints of previous systems.

Equally important is the revision of energy policy and the recognition that dependence on authoritarian regimes in the energy sector can have catastrophic consequences. Therefore, the new security architecture also includes energy diversification, the development of critical infrastructure, resilience to hybrid threats, and cybersecurity. Moreover, the significance of Ukraine as a key element of European security has become undeniable, necessitating its integration into the system of collective defence. The war has shown that peace and stability on the continent cannot be guaranteed without Ukraine.

Another crucial element of the new security architecture is the concept of shared responsibility for maintaining the international legal order, whereby every state must not only declare its values but also be prepared to defend them with resources, political will, and military commitment. Given the limited influence and low efficiency of existing international institutions (the UN, OSCE), new formats of regional alliances and flexible coalitions must be sought — a tendency reflected in the EU's implementation of the Security Strategy (Angheal & Damen, 2025). This refers to regional defence alliances, flexible coalitions of support, and mechanisms for rapid response to emerging threats.

Currently, there exists a significant number of interstate organizations based on political, military, economic, social, and environmental interests. The most well-known military alliances include NATO, the European Union (EU), the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), FINABEL, the African Union (peacekeeping forces), and

the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), among others (Samoilenko, Sardak, 2021). However, within these military organizations, differences in opinion often arise, weakening their potential to solve security issues. For example, within the European Union, Hungary blocked approximately 41% of EU resolutions regarding Ukraine (Prasad, 2024).

The war in Ukraine has become a turning point for forming a new vision of the global order, where security cannot be ensured by individual states or organizations alone but requires close interaction, solidarity, adaptability to threats, and the prioritization of values over interests (Jurčák, Ivančík, 2023). In such an architecture, it is important to maintain a balance between national sovereignty and collective responsibility, between law and power, between defence and prevention. Ukraine, as the outpost of the democratic world's defence, must become a full-fledged participant in this new order — not only as a victim of aggression but as an active architect of new security in Europe and globally.

The new security architecture emerging as a result of the war in Ukraine must involve a change in the philosophy of deterrence — from passive reaction to active prevention. The world can no longer afford blind faith in diplomatic protocols and formal guarantees that lack real mechanisms of enforcement or accountability. The Ukrainian experience clearly demonstrates that even internationally recognized borders and security assurances, such as the Budapest Memorandum (1994), have no real power without the willingness of the international community to defend these principles.

The Budapest Memorandum, signed on December 5, 1994, between Ukraine, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States, guaranteed Ukraine's security in exchange for its renunciation of nuclear weapons and accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of nuclear weapons (NPT). This memorandum was violated by one of its guarantors, the Russian Federation, in 2014 during the annexation of Crimea and the beginning of the war in eastern Ukraine, and later, during Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. There are indeed several questions about the text of the memorandum and its legal guarantees. However, the violation of an international document by a guarantor state demonstrates the impunity of such behaviour.

Since the beginning of its aggression in 2014, Russia has violated approximately 400 international documents, including the UN Charter, the Statute of the Council of Europe, and numerous conventions regulating the laws and customs of war (Sobenko, 2022). In general, the violation of international and bilateral agreements is characteristic of dictatorial regimes and states that initiate wars. For instance, before the outbreak of the Second World War, Germany systematically violated treaties such as the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and the Munich Agreement (1938); similarly, the Soviet Union acted in this way (Satskyi, 2004).

According to analysts, Russia (historically the Muscovite state, Russian Empire, USSR, and Russian Federation) has initiated 53 wars over the past 350 years, expanding its territory from 3 million km² in 1547 to 21.8 million km² by 1914. Since 1991, the Russian Federation has launched 12 wars, including those in Georgia, Tajikistan, Chechnya, Syria, and Ukraine (Antipov, 2016; List of wars involving Russia, 2025; Russia's wars for the last 30 years and their consequences, 2022; Armed conflicts involving Russia from 1991 to the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, 2022).

The impunity of great powers remains an unresolved issue for the world. Clearly, the UN in its current format is unable to resolve most conflicts. The efforts of a single state —

even one as powerful as the United States under Donald Trump — may influence the resolution of certain armed conflicts but cannot address the problem fundamentally. Therefore, the architecture of new security must rely on real deterrence instruments: military presence, collective mobile rapid response forces, cyber units, and integrated air and missile defence systems deployed in potentially vulnerable regions.

Information security deserves special attention as one of the modern fronts of warfare — a battle fought not only on the battlefield but also in human consciousness, computer networks, and resource flows. Manipulations, propaganda, hybrid campaigns, and disinformation are forms of warfare that require no tanks yet can destabilize societies from within. Hence, the security system must include constant efforts to maintain information hygiene, the development of data verification standards, and the strengthening of platform accountability for the spread of false narratives.

In the new security model, it is critical to consider the interconnection between democratic values and defence capability. Democracies must be not only politically strong but also resilient to external challenges — particularly those from authoritarian regimes exploiting the weaknesses of democratic institutions. In this context, the war in Ukraine highlights the need for resilience against external influences, independent media, a strong civil society, and transparent governance.

An additional challenge is the growing role of China and its ambition for geopolitical dominance amid global instability. China's neutral stance in Russia's war against Ukraine demonstrates that the new security architecture must also consider the role of Asian actors capable of shifting the global balance of power.

Economic security has also become a crucial factor. The war has shown that economic shocks caused by military actions affect global markets, pricing policies, energy supply, and food logistics, which, in turn, can provoke social instability in countries far from the war zone. Therefore, the security system must include an economic component: stability of logistics, energy independence, protection of food supply chains, and crisis management preparedness. Economic leverage remains one of the key instruments for influencing potential or actual aggressors.

New security alliances should be built not merely on geographic principles but on shared threats and collective responsibility. The model of "the strong help the strong" must be replaced with the principle of "all for one and one for all," where even smaller states have the right to protection and participation in strategic decision-making. Ukraine, having withstood the assault of a much larger army, has proven that determination, partner support, and the will to resist are as vital as military numbers. Thus, the new system must incorporate adaptive models of assistance that enable each participating country to receive support aligned with its capabilities and challenges.

In the geostrategic dimension, Ukraine is transforming into a key ally of the democratic world — a nation that pushes Western security policy out of its comfort zone, urging decisive action, responsibility, and strategic foresight. At the same time, Ukraine requires guarantees that are not declarative but legally binding, accompanied by real defence commitments from partners. This could take the form of a new security treaty analogous to NATO's Article 5 or a temporary functional equivalent.

In the context of the new security architecture, reforming international organizations is equally important. The global community has long shown tolerance toward gross violations of international law, which only encouraged the aggressor's escalation. This underscores the urgent need for a paradigm shift — from a formal to a real security system, where every violation entails inevitable responsibility and tangible consequences. Zhelezov (2025) emphasizes that the modern international system must adapt to new forms of legal influence to mitigate risks of geopolitical instability. Reforming the UN, limiting the influence of law-violating states, and revising veto powers are essential steps required by the times.

The war in Ukraine has become a catalyst for global rethinking of the concepts of security, responsibility, and solidarity. The preservation of peace can no longer rely on agreements with aggressors or on deterrence "at any cost." The world needs a system that encourages compliance with law, ensures rapid responses to threats, and prevents the spread of aggression. Within this system, Ukraine must become an equal participant — a state that not only receives support but also contributes to global security through its experience, technology, partnerships, and active foreign policy.

The new security architecture is not merely a reconstruction of existing structures but the creation of a new philosophy of international relations, where the value of human life, freedom, sovereignty, and law prevails over temporary comfort, economic benefit, or political complacency. It is a choice the world must make today to avoid a new global conflict tomorrow.

The further development of this new security architecture must involve not only the revision of structures and strategies but also a deep transformation of global thinking regarding war, peace, sovereignty, and international responsibility. The war in Ukraine has revealed a critical issue: prolonged peace was based not on real security but on the illusion of it — sustained by compromises with aggressors, limited responses to previous conflicts, and fear of escalation. For years, the world ignored earlier warnings — the aggression in Georgia, the occupation of Crimea, the destabilization of eastern Ukraine — and now faces the necessity of acting swiftly, decisively, and strategically.

Thus, the future security system must be grounded in principles of early warning, deterrence of potential aggressors, and systematic risk analysis. Global and regional centres for conflict forecasting must be established, analytical structures strengthened, and real-time monitoring of social, military, economic, and informational trends ensured to prevent escalation.

Security in the digital dimension — including cyber threats, attacks on critical infrastructure, government resources, and elections — has become especially relevant. This domain is an inseparable component of the new security system and requires coordination among military institutions, private companies, scientists, engineers, and analysts. Modern cybersecurity implies the use of advanced technologies and innovative models based on the zero-trust concept (Birru, 2025). Cyber defence must be collective — with shared information, response algorithms, and joint threat monitoring platforms.

At the same time, the formation of new security is impossible without rethinking the concept of neutrality. Traditional neutrality, once perceived as a guarantee of peace, can in the era of hybrid global threats become a cover for passivity or complicity through silent approval or economic cooperation with aggressors. Therefore, the key marker of a state in the

new security paradigm will not be its formal status but its real actions, stance, sanctions policy, support for victims of aggression, and readiness to defend international law.

New security challenges also include the environmental dimension. The war in Ukraine has shown the massive scale of environmental damage: destruction of hydrological structures, pollution of rivers, fires, and the devastation of forests and soils. Hence, environmental protection becomes part of defence strategy. Modern armies must integrate ecological security into military planning. Postwar recovery should encompass not only physical infrastructure but also ecosystem restoration, mitigation of technogenic threats, and transition to green technologies in both military and civilian spheres.

In the new security architecture, it is crucial to involve civil society, volunteer movements, and local communities in decision-making processes. Ukraine's experience has proven that civic mobilization, volunteer initiatives, and horizontal support networks are as important as formal state institutions. Thus, the world must create tools that allow for the rapid integration of civic initiatives into national and international security systems.

Additionally, the principles of military-technical cooperation must be revised — shifting from complex, time-consuming arms transfer procedures to rapid, flexible, and politically motivated decisions. The same applies to humanitarian assistance, medical evacuation, and the provision of civil protection resources.

At the heart of the new security paradigm lies the protection of human rights. War is invariably accompanied by massive violations — forced deportations, torture, killings, rape, destruction of infrastructure, and attacks on civilian objects — creating an acute humanitarian crisis and a threat to human life and dignity. This underscores the urgent need to transform the paradigm of international justice: to ensure effective investigation of war crimes, inevitable accountability for perpetrators, and the establishment of special tribunals to guarantee justice and the inevitability of punishment. Without this, any security system will remain merely declarative.

The new world order must form a clear link between violation — responsibility — punishment. Equally important is the creation of conditions for sustainable peace after the end of wars. Security architecture must not end with victory in war; it must include long-term reintegration of affected regions, reconstruction, economic support, psychological rehabilitation, and the preservation of identity and memory. This requires international action plans — long-term, collectively supported, and strategically oriented.

The war in Ukraine is not only a catastrophe but also an opportunity — a chance to rethink the fundamental principles of the world we wish to live in. Whether it becomes a world of strong laws and responsibility, or one of brute force and impunity, depends not only on politicians but on every country, citizen, and organization capable of influence. Therefore, the formation of a new security architecture is not a one-time act but a continuous process — a process in which Ukraine is no longer a passive observer but an active subject transforming the world, proving that freedom and dignity are not slogans but a force capable of shaping the future.

The construction of a modern security system will inevitably involve the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) at all levels — from intelligence and early warning to automated command and control systems, cybersecurity, and logistical support. AI has the potential to radically enhance the speed and precision of threat detection (through big data analytics and

escalation forecasting), provide adaptive air and missile defence systems, and improve coordination among international rapid response missions. However, as researchers warn, the widespread introduction of AI in military and security spheres introduces new risks — intensifying the arms race, creating challenges of system alignment with human goals, and generating the potential for unpredictable escalation through autonomous decision-making (Russell et al., 2015). Analytical studies indicate that the integration of AI into international security requires regulatory policies, transparent safety standards for algorithms, and international control mechanisms to avoid the pragmatic and ethical traps of emerging technologies (Horowitz et al., 2018). AI may even be employed in global decision-making systems, at the level of the UN, NATO, or other organizations. Artificial intelligence must become not only a technical component of the new security architecture but also a subject of active political, legal, and international coordination.

Conclusion

The analysis of Russia's war against Ukraine and its impact on the global security system has demonstrated the urgent necessity for a fundamental rethinking of existing international approaches to deterrence and the maintenance of peace. The events of recent years have exposed the limited effectiveness of traditional institutions (such as the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) and certain international agreements (in particular, the Budapest Memorandum) in ensuring real protection of state sovereignty. This highlights the pressing need to establish a new, comprehensive security architecture. The conducted research has made it possible to formulate a number of key conclusions:

- ✓ Existing security mechanisms have proven insufficiently effective under modern threats. Traditional instruments—diplomatic agreements, memoranda, and resolutions of international organizations—have failed to prevent aggression in a timely manner. This confirms the necessity of developing a new model of security guarantees that includes real enforcement and accountability mechanisms.
- ✓ Ukraine has become a central element of European and global security. Its experience in resisting hybrid, cyber, and full-scale aggression should be integrated into future models of collective defence, as it illustrates new forms of modern warfare and effective methods of counteraction.
- ✓ The role of civil society and international justice has gained significant importance. Ukraine's experience has demonstrated that public mobilization, volunteer networks, and the effective application of legal mechanisms to address war crimes are vital components of the resilience of democratic societies.
- ✓ International law and formal guarantees, without practical mechanisms of enforcement and accountability, function with limited effectiveness. Any modern security system must be based on a comprehensive set of practical instruments—from military alliances and rapid response forces to cyber defence and information security measures.
- ✓ The transition from passive deterrence to active prevention of aggression must become a defining feature of the future security architecture. This requires the

creation of more flexible alliances, legally binding guarantees, and the integration of advanced technologies—including artificial intelligence—into both national and international security systems.

- ✓ The United Nations and other international organizations require profound structural reforms, including the revision of veto powers and the establishment of legally binding mechanisms of accountability for acts of aggression.

The new security architecture must integrate military, energy, economic, environmental, and informational dimensions, thereby forming the systemic resilience of democratic societies to complex and multidimensional threats. This architecture of the future must account for the dynamics of international processes, remain adaptable to emerging challenges, and ensure operational capability. It should rest on clear and universal principles: the inevitability of punishment for aggression, the primacy of human rights, solidarity, democratic resilience, and respect for sovereignty.

Such a system will create the necessary foundations for guaranteeing the protection of individual states, ensuring long-term stability, and enhancing the predictability of development within the entire international community.

List of references and sources:

ANGHEAL, S. – DAMEN, M. 2025. The future European security architecture. In *European Parliamentary Research Service*, 2025 Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2025/765785/EPRS_STU(2025)765785_EN.pdf>

ANTIPOV, Z. 2016. Russia has started 53 wars. In *Gazeta.ua*, 2016. Available at: <https://gazeta.ua/articles/history/_rosiya-rozpochala-53-vijni-perelik/697222#comments>

Armed conflicts involving Russia from 1991 to the full-scale invasion of Ukraine. 2022. In *Centre for Countering Disinformation*, 2022. Available at: <https://cpd.gov.ua/articles/czpd_analizuye-6/>

BIRRU, N. K., 2025. Zero trust at scale: Security architecture for distributed enterprises. In *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 2025, pp. 3027-3036. University of Southern California, USA.

HOROWITZ, M. C. – SCHARRE, P. – ALLEN, G. C. – FREDERICK, K. – CHO, A. – SARAVALLE, E. 2018. Artificial intelligence and international security. In *Center for a New American Security*. Available at: <https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/artificial-intelligence-and-international-security>

JURČÁK, V. – IVANČÍK, R. 2023. The conflict in Ukraine – A Turning Point for Security and Defence of the EU? In *Security Dimensions*, 2023, vol. 44, no. 44, pp. 84-101. ISSN 2353-7000. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0054.1744>

List of wars involving Russia. 2025. In *Wikipedia*, 2025. Available at: <https://surl.lu/eiurte>

Memorandum on Security Guarantees in Connection with Ukraine's Accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. (Budapest Memorandum). 1994. Adopted

on 05.12.1994 by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. Available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/ laws/show/998_158#Text>

PRASAD, A. 2024. Hungary continues to block military aid to Ukraine and will not vote for sanctions against Russia. The EU reacted. In *Forbes Ukraine*, 2024. Available at: <https://forbes.ua/news/ugorshchina-prodovzhue-blokuvati-viyskovu-dopomogu-ukraini-i-ne-golosuvatime-za-sanktsii-proti-rf-v-es-vidreaguvali-27052024-21394>

RUSSELL, S. – DEWEY, D. – TEGMARK, M. 2015. Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence. In *AI Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 105-114. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v36i4.2577>

Russia's wars for the last 30 years and their consequences. 2022. In *ukrainer.net*, 2022. Available at: <https://www.ukrainer.net/en/russian-wars/>

SAMOILENKO, A. O. – SARDAK, S. E. 2021. Military potential of regional associations. In Economic space, 2021, pp. 27-32. Available at: <http://biblio.umsf.dp.ua/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4461/1/3%20%D0%A1%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%B4%D0%B0%D0%BA%20%D0%A1.%20%D0%95.pdf>

SATSKIY, P. V. 2004. Soviet-German agreements of August-September 1939 and Ukrainian lands. In Collection of scientific works of the National Research Institute, vol. III., pp. 302-309. Kyiv, 2004. Available at: <https://ir.kneu.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/0c30b296-b41b-403f-9a8c-84f3c67cf322/content>

SOBENKO, N. 2022. Russia has violated about 400 international treaties to which Ukraine is a party — Zelensky. In *Social News*, 2022. Available at: <https://suspilne.media/248787-rosia-porusila-blizko-400-miznarodnih-dogovoriv-ucasniceu-akih-e-ukraina-zelenskij/>

ZHELEZOV, Z. 2025. Implications of International Lawfare for the Global Security Architecture. In *Environment, Technology, Resources – Proceedings of the 16th International Scientific and Practical Conference*, 2025, Vol. 5, pp. 363-370. Available at: <https://journals.rta.lv/index.php/ETR/article/view/8463/6910>.

Hon. prof., Assoc. Prof. Vasyl ZAPLATYNSKYI, CSc.,
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0119-7135
Kyiv Metropolitan University, Bulvarno-Kudriavska St. 18/2, 040 53 Kyiv, Ukraine,
e-mail: vasyl.zaplatynskyi@gmail.com

Hon. prof., Assoc. Prof. Inga URIADNIKOVA, CSc.,
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3750-876X
Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture, Povitrianykh Syl Ave 31, 030 37 Kyiv, Ukraine,
e-mail: ingavictory@gmail.com