

INSTITUTIONAL STABILITY OF THE STATE DURING THE WAR POLITICAL FACTORS OF ECONOMIC SECURITY OF UKRAINE

Vladyslav Pustovar¹, Kostyantyn Zakharenko², Yehor Minenko³

Abstract. The *subject* of the study is the institutional resilience of the state during wartime, with a particular emphasis on the political factors that ensure Ukraine's economic security. The research focuses on the interaction of political institutions, mechanisms of societal mobilization, international alliances, and anti-corruption bodies in preserving state capacity under conditions of armed conflict. *Methodology.* The methodological framework of the study is based on general scientific and special legal methods, including dialectical, comparative political-legal, formal legal, and systemic analysis. These tools made it possible to examine the nature and criteria of institutional resilience, to explore its relationship with economic security, and to evaluate both national and international mechanisms that contribute to strengthening Ukraine's resilience. The *aim* of the work is to define the essence of institutional resilience as a political-legal phenomenon, analyse the role of political stability, democratic institutions, and public authorities in ensuring economic security, and identify strategies for reinforcing Ukraine's resilience in the post-war period. Special attention is given to the role of international integration, sanctions policy, and digital transformation as drivers of institutional modernization. The *results* of the study have shown that institutional resilience is a multidimensional category that combines political stability, the effectiveness of governance, the protection of democratic legitimacy, and international support. Political factors, such as consolidation of power, trust in democratic institutions, and societal mobilization, are decisive for maintaining economic stability under martial law. At the same time, the international dimension – alliances, aid, and sanctions – acts as a force multiplier for domestic institutions. *Conclusion.* Institutional resilience in contemporary wartime conditions is not limited to ensuring the continuity of governance. It also encompasses mechanisms for balancing centralized authority with democratic legitimacy, integrating digital innovations into governance, and aligning national reforms with international standards. Public authorities, security institutions, and anti-corruption bodies are guarantors of resilience, while international alliances provide external legitimacy and resources. The future of Ukraine depends on the ability of its institutions to sustain flexibility and legitimacy simultaneously, ensuring both short-term survival and long-term modernization.

Keywords: institutional resilience, economic security, political stability, democratic institutions, wartime governance, international alliances, sanctions policy, digital transformation, anti-corruption, Ukraine.

JEL Classification: F52, D72, G34, D73

1. Introduction

War is one of the most destructive events capable of undermining not only the economy but also the institutional framework of any state. In the case of Ukraine, Russia's full-scale invasion in 2022 exposed vulnerabilities in the functioning of public authorities

while simultaneously accelerating long-needed reforms. During wartime, parameters such as the ability to mobilize resources, ensure continuity of governance, maintain legal flexibility, and preserve public trust in institutions acquire particular importance. If these parameters weaken, the state risks losing economic

¹ Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine, Ukraine
E-mail: vpustovar7@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9790-0210>

² Educational and Analytical Centre "Oleksandr Yaremenko Institute for Social, Legal and Political Studies", Ukraine

E-mail: kzakharenko@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0980-7313>

³ Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine, Ukraine (*corresponding author*)

E-mail: egor.minenko1044@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7169-3252>



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms
of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0

stability, strategic autonomy, and even sovereignty (Kuzio, 2023).

Institutional resilience in wartime is understood as the capacity of political, legal, and economic institutions to adapt to extreme challenges while retaining legitimacy and effectiveness. It is a multidimensional phenomenon combining political, administrative, social, and cultural factors. For Ukraine, it has vital practical meaning: resilient institutions form the foundation of defense capability, guarantee the transparent use of international assistance, reduce corruption risks, and provide the basis for economic recovery.

Political factors play a special role in this context: political consolidation around strategic goals, effective communication between government and society, preservation of democratic practices even under extraordinary conditions, as well as external political legitimization through partnership with international alliances. Thus, institutional resilience and economic security are closely interlinked: strong institutions safeguard the economy, while a stable economy strengthens state institutions.

Furthermore, the Ukrainian case demonstrates that resilience cannot be reduced merely to institutional design or the formal presence of democratic procedures. It also depends on the ability of institutions to foster social trust, build inclusive decision-making, and channel civic energy into constructive participation. The war has shown that informal networks, volunteer movements, and civic initiatives can significantly reinforce the formal capacity of state institutions, creating a hybrid model of resilience where top-down governance is complemented by bottom-up societal agency. This synergy between state and society represents a unique feature of Ukraine's institutional response to wartime challenges.

2. Institutional Resilience of the State: Essence and Criteria

Recent scholarship increasingly regards state resilience under conditions of war as a key category in political science and security studies. Researchers emphasize that economic security during war cannot be considered in isolation – it directly depends on the functional capacity of institutions. I. Rohatiuk et al. (2024) demonstrate that Ukraine's economic security derives from legal and political mechanisms regulating the financial, energy, and industrial spheres. They argue that in wartime, institutional transparency and efficiency prevent systemic collapse.

D. North and colleagues (2009) underline the structural nature of economic security, consisting of interconnected components – economic, political, and legal. They emphasize political stability and anti-corruption measures as decisive factors of resilience.

Thus, economic security is not merely an outcome of economic policy but also a fundamentally political function.

Another branch of scholarship explores the local and social dimensions of resilience. I. Melnykovska (2025) analyses the local and regional levels, showing that communities often serve as the first institutional "buffers" during crises. They provide essential services, support internally displaced persons, and build solidarity networks. The study concludes that effective communication between central authorities and local institutions is crucial for state resilience.

From the international perspective, Y. Kurnyshova (2023) examines Ukraine as a case of "normative agency", demonstrating how resilience practices enabled the country to assert its voice in international relations. This suggests that institutional resilience matters not only for domestic survival but also for external political subjectivity.

Psychological aspects of resilience also deserve attention. As shown by H. Hale (2021) societal resilience during crises emerges from the intersection of individual and institutional factors. High levels of trust in government, effective communication, and social solidarity strengthen the adaptability of institutions. Conversely, even highly formalized institutions may lose functionality if public trust is undermined.

Taken together, these studies indicate that institutional resilience in wartime is not solely a legal or administrative category. It is a comprehensive property of the political system that encompasses democratic procedures, interaction with civil society, international partnerships, and social solidarity. For Ukraine, these aspects are of primary importance, as they determine not only the success of defense but also the country's future capacity for recovery and development.

Institutional resilience of the state is a category that integrates the political, legal, economic, and social dimensions of governance in times of crisis. It can be defined as the ability of state institutions to maintain legitimacy, functionality, and decision-making capacity under extraordinary threats (Hale, 2021). In peacetime, institutional resilience is expressed through the stability of the political system and the predictability of administrative decisions, whereas in wartime it becomes a factor of state survival.

Scholars emphasize that institutional resilience is not synonymous with "stability" or "rigidity." On the contrary, it implies adaptability and flexibility that allow the system to preserve its core functions even amid radical change (Brassett, Croft, & Vaughan-Williams, 2021). In Ukraine, this has been manifested in the ability of the parliament, government, judiciary, and local self-government bodies to continue

operating despite active hostilities and the occupation of certain territories.

Institutional resilience and economic security are mutually dependent categories. On the one hand, strong and effective institutions ensure the stability of economic policy, predictability of the regulatory environment, and protection of property rights, which are fundamental prerequisites for economic security (North, Wallis, & Weingast, 2009). On the other hand, a high level of economic security reinforces institutional resilience, since financial stability and resource capacity enable the state to fund the armed forces, social services, and the restoration of critical infrastructure.

During wartime, this interdependence becomes even more visible: resource shortages or corrupt practices undermine trust in institutions, while institutional weakness may lead to loss of control over economic processes. As Rohatiuk et al. (2024) argue, the institutional capacity of the state largely determines the effectiveness of managing international financial aid and humanitarian resources.

Adaptation of institutions in times of crisis takes place through both formal and informal mechanisms. Formal mechanisms include legislative changes, simplification of administrative procedures, digitalization of public services, and the establishment of new security and recovery institutions (Melnykovska, 2025). Informal mechanisms involve community self-organization, volunteer movements, and state-business partnerships.

For example, the Ukrainian government quickly adopted wartime budgetary decisions and coordinated the centralized management of international aid, which was made possible through flexible parliamentary and governmental procedures. At the same time, civil society, through volunteer networks and grassroots initiatives, assumed part of the functions of supplying the army and supporting internally displaced persons, thereby reinforcing the institutional resilience of the state.

International studies also suggest that “hybrid models of resilience” are particularly effective under wartime conditions, where state and non-state institutions operate in synergy (Kurnyshova, 2023). This approach enables the state not only to survive but also to lay the groundwork for post-war recovery and modernization.

3. Political Factors of Ukraine's Economic Security during Wartime

Political stability is traditionally viewed as one of the fundamental conditions for state development, but during wartime its importance multiplies. A stable political system enables rapid decisions on resource mobilization, the introduction of wartime taxes, and the conclusion of international agreements on financial and military support. After the onset

of Russia's full-scale invasion, Ukraine created a unique model of power consolidation, with the parliament, government, and president acting in close coordination, abandoning political infighting that had been common in the past (Åslund, 2022).

This consolidation of power helped to avoid governance paralysis in the first months of the war, which was particularly crucial under the constant threat of missile strikes and the temporary occupation of territories. The effectiveness of such an approach is supported by comparative experiences: post-war reconstruction in Croatia and Bosnia shows that political unity at critical moments allowed rapid economic recovery and the attraction of international resources (Mujanović, 2018).

At the same time, political stability does not imply the absence of political competition. In democracies, it means that even opposition forces act within a framework of “patriotic consensus,” avoiding challenges to the legitimacy of core state institutions during crises. This not only strengthens citizens' trust in the state but also signals to international partners that Ukraine remains a reliable recipient of financial and military assistance (World Bank, 2023).

Preserving democratic institutions during wartime is one of the most important factors of economic security. Democracy guarantees transparency in decision-making, parliamentary oversight, and publicity in budgetary processes. L. Diamond (2022) argues that democracies are more likely to ensure long-term resilience under crisis conditions because they rest on societal support rather than coercion.

Ukraine has demonstrated that democratic mechanisms can function even under war conditions. The Verkhovna Rada continued legislative activity, adopting key acts through remote and shortened procedures, while local self-government bodies became essential actors in supporting citizens in occupied and frontline areas. This shows the flexibility of Ukrainian democratic institutions and their ability to adapt in extreme circumstances.

Political culture also plays a crucial role. Research suggests that societies with a high level of political culture are more capable of mobilizing resources and avoiding destabilizing conflicts (Kuzio, 2023). Ukrainian society, shaped by the Orange Revolution of 2004 and the Euromaidan of 2013-2014, has developed a strong civic identity and culture of solidarity. This culture acts as an “invisible institution” that sustains the legitimacy of power and supports economic security even when formal institutions face enormous strain.

Importantly, preserving democratic values during wartime also has strategic foreign policy implications. Ukraine's democratic character makes it a natural ally of the West, facilitating large-scale financial, military, and technical assistance (Freedom House, 2023).

Thus, democracy functions not only as a normative choice but also as an instrument of economic security.

Political mobilization of society is a key prerequisite for state survival in wartime. It encompasses not only military mobilization but also economic, social, and informational activity. In Ukraine, the volunteer movement, widespread charitable initiatives, the development of territorial defense, and numerous grassroots projects became examples of synergy between state and civic energy (Onuch & Sasse, 2022).

This phenomenon can be explained through the concept of “bottom-up resilience”, in which citizens assume functions that the state is temporarily unable to provide. Volunteer organizations funded drones, vehicles, and medical equipment, directly affecting the country’s defense capability. Such civic engagement not only enhances military effectiveness but also reduces pressure on the state budget, thereby strengthening economic security.

Mechanisms of societal mobilization are actively supported by political institutions through communication campaigns, the use of national symbols, and the integration of civic initiatives into state programs. As Y. Kurnyshova (2023) emphasizes, the synergy between state and civil society creates a “hybrid model of resilience” where formal and informal institutions operate jointly. This model ensures short-term wartime efficiency while laying the foundation for long-term modernization and recovery.

Moreover, Ukraine’s mobilization of society has a significant external dimension. The engagement of the Ukrainian diaspora, international volunteer organizations, and NGOs in supporting Ukraine demonstrates the transnational character of political mobilization, reinforcing the country’s diplomatic position and opening additional channels for economic aid.

4. Institutions of Public Authority as Guarantors of Economic Security

Parliament and government are the institutional backbone of a state’s political system, and in wartime they perform the dual function of political leadership and economic coordination. Their ability to interact effectively and rapidly is decisive for sustaining state capacity. In Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada demonstrated remarkable adaptability after February 2022 by moving to a special wartime regime: laws were adopted through shortened procedures, often under conditions of emergency and remote participation. This ensured the legal framework for martial law, regulated mobilization, and created a foundation for wartime fiscal policy (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2022).

The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine assumed the responsibility for executing these decisions, centralizing budgetary management, supervising procurement

for defense needs, and coordinating humanitarian and financial assistance from abroad. The joint action of parliament and government was instrumental in averting financial collapse in the first months of the invasion, when GDP fell by nearly one-third. Through this synergy, Ukraine negotiated with the IMF for a new Extended Fund Facility and secured multiple EU macro-financial packages (IMF, 2023).

Comparative experience confirms the importance of such institutional coherence. Israel, for instance, has institutionalized a “wartime coalition” model, in which parliament and government work in tandem across political divides to ensure uninterrupted governance under existential threats (Ben-Bassat & Dahan, 2008). Similarly, during World War II, the United Kingdom established a national unity government that bridged party differences to maintain both war efforts and economic stability (Tooze, 2007). Ukraine’s experience thus underscores a broader principle: the unity of executive and legislative institutions in wartime not only guarantees immediate decision-making but also reassures international donors and investors that state policies remain predictable and coordinated.

Security institutions such as the Armed Forces, intelligence agencies, and law enforcement bodies play a central role in preserving the foundations of economic life. Their direct contribution lies in protecting critical infrastructure – energy systems, transportation corridors, ports, and information networks – without which economic activity cannot function. During 2022-2023, Ukraine’s energy sector became a primary target of Russian missile attacks. The ability of security institutions to coordinate rapid repairs, secure logistical routes, and protect energy facilities prevented total systemic breakdown (Ministry of Defense of Ukraine, 2023).

At the same time, the presence of functioning security structures reassures both citizens and businesses, reducing panic and limiting capital flight. Studies indicate that in states with strong security institutions, wartime capital flight is significantly lower (Collier, 2020; World Bank, 2023). In Ukraine, the Armed Forces not only defended territory but also maintained conditions for grain exports through the Black Sea corridor – an achievement that safeguarded critical foreign currency revenues and stabilized the exchange rate.

Furthermore, the defense sector itself has become a source of economic resilience. The rapid expansion of Ukraine’s defense industry, including domestic production of drones, armored vehicles, and munitions, illustrates the economic multiplier effect of security spending. This mirrors patterns in Poland and Lithuania, where sustained investment in defense has spurred technological innovation and industrial growth (Sakwa, 2023). Thus, security institutions should not be viewed solely as budgetary “consumers”

but as engines of industrial modernization and long-term economic resilience.

Anti-corruption institutions are crucial guarantors of economic security, especially when massive inflows of international aid are at stake. Ukraine's establishment of specialized agencies – the National Anti-Corruption Bureau (NABU), the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (SAPO), and the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC) – has created a layered system of accountability. These institutions have gained heightened importance during wartime, as they ensure that aid flows and procurement are not siphoned off through corrupt practices. Transparency International (2023) noted that Ukraine, despite the ongoing war, maintained modest but positive progress in its Corruption Perceptions Index, largely due to the continued activity of these institutions.

International partners consider anti-corruption reform a key precondition for assistance. The European Commission (2023) explicitly linked Ukraine's EU accession prospects and financial support to further progress in judicial reform and anti-corruption enforcement. Similarly, the IMF's financial packages contain governance benchmarks that require transparency in budgetary spending (IMF, 2023). Thus, anti-corruption institutions serve as "gatekeepers" of international trust, without which economic security would be impossible.

Domestically, anti-corruption institutions also shape investor confidence. Research shows that investors prefer countries with predictable institutional environments, even if they are in conflict zones (Mungiu-Pippidi, 2015). Ukraine's adoption of the ProZorro e-procurement system has significantly reduced risks of misuse, improving public finance efficiency and attracting private contractors even during wartime.

Finally, the symbolic dimension of anti-corruption institutions cannot be underestimated. High-profile prosecutions of senior officials send strong signals both internally and externally about the state's commitment to the rule of law. This bolsters social trust, strengthens the legitimacy of state institutions, and creates the normative foundations for post-war recovery.

5. The International-Political Dimension of Institutional Resilience, Strategies for Strengthening Institutional Resilience and Economic Security

Geopolitical alliances are among the key factors shaping a state's institutional resilience during wartime. For Ukraine after 2022, strategic integration with the European Union and NATO became not only a political orientation but also a determinant of economic security. Obtaining EU candidate status in

June 2022 symbolized the irreversibility of reforms and strengthened both public and investor confidence in Ukrainian institutions (European Council, 2022).

Equally important is the deepening of defense cooperation with NATO. Although Ukraine is not yet a member of the Alliance, it participates in joint exercises, adopts NATO standards, and increasingly integrates into common defense planning. This strengthens defense capacity and provides access to technologies and financial support (NATO, 2023). In this sense, institutional resilience is not merely an internal quality; it is reinforced by integration into international alliances.

The experience of Central and Eastern European states demonstrates that integration processes promote institutional stability, foster the rule of law, and create favorable conditions for economic growth (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2020). For Ukraine, integration with the EU represents not only a geopolitical choice but also a systemic process of Europeanization, which enhances the adaptive capacity of its institutions in the midst of war.

International assistance plays a fundamental role in preserving Ukraine's institutional and economic resilience. According to the World Bank, in 2022–2023 Ukraine received more than \$40 billion in external support, including grants, loans, and humanitarian aid (World Bank, 2023). This financing sustained health care, education, and social payments – critical elements of state legitimacy in the eyes of citizens.

Yet, such assistance is conditional. It comes with requirements to reform institutions, strengthen anti-corruption mechanisms, and increase fiscal transparency. For instance, the European Commission (2023) explicitly tied the disbursement of macro-financial assistance to Ukraine's progress in rule-of-law reforms. In this way, foreign support stimulates not only short-term stabilization but also long-term institutional transformation.

Sanctions against Russia are another vital instrument of support. The EU, the United States, and other partners have introduced more than 12 sanction packages targeting Russia's energy exports, access to global financial markets, and high-tech imports (European Commission, 2023). Analytical reports show that sanctions significantly reduced Russian state revenues and undermined its capacity to finance the war. For Ukraine, this creates a "window of opportunity" to strengthen its economy and institutions, as the weakening of the aggressor indirectly boosts Ukraine's international credibility.

Sanctions also carry a symbolic dimension: they demonstrate that the international community recognizes Ukraine's legitimacy as a victim of aggression and is committed to long-term support. This external legitimization further strengthens the resilience of domestic institutions.

Ukraine is not merely a recipient of aid but also an active contributor to international stability, demonstrating institutional capacity to respond to global challenges. A prime example is the "Black Sea Grain Initiative" of 2022-2023, mediated by the UN and Turkey. This agreement enabled Ukraine to export grain through the Black Sea, preventing a global food crisis (UN, 2023). It showed that Ukraine can protect its own economic interests while simultaneously contributing to global market stability.

In the digital domain, Ukraine has advanced as a case of resilience by integrating into the EU and NATO cyber defense frameworks. Cooperation with the European Union Agency for Cybersecurity and the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence has helped repel numerous cyberattacks on critical infrastructure (NATO CCDCOE, 2022). This illustrates that institutional resilience in the modern era encompasses both physical and digital dimensions.

Another important area is Ukraine's engagement in global climate and energy governance. Despite the war, Ukraine has maintained its commitments under the Paris Climate Agreement and has aligned itself with the European Green Deal. This indicates that institutional resilience is not confined to war or economics but also involves strategic planning for sustainable post-war development (IEA, 2023).

Ukraine has also advocated for the establishment of a special international tribunal to prosecute the crime of aggression. This initiative is not only a legal mechanism for accountability but also a signal of Ukraine's capacity to influence the creation of new international norms and standards (Council of Europe, 2023). Such activism demonstrates that Ukraine is transitioning from the role of a "recipient of support" to that of a normative actor capable of generating global institutional initiatives.

After the end of the war, Ukraine will face the dual task of economic reconstruction and the modernization of political institutions. The experience of post-war reconstruction in Europe demonstrates that the quality of political institutions determines not only economic recovery but also the level of societal trust in the state (Fukuyama, 2014).

For Ukraine, the following areas of reform will be critical:

1. Parliamentary oversight and balance of powers. During wartime, the expansion of executive authority may be justified; however, post-war development will require restoring a system of checks and balances. This will help prevent over-concentration of power and ensure democratic legitimacy.

2. Judicial reform. The independence of the judiciary is a key factor for investment attractiveness and trust. According to the World Bank (2023),

states with effective courts recover more quickly after conflicts, as they provide property rights protection.

3. Anti-corruption infrastructure. The work of NABU, SAPO, and HACC must be further institutionalized, with their independence constitutionally guaranteed. This will strengthen donor confidence and attract investment for reconstruction.

4. Decentralization. The pre-war reform of local governance must continue. Strong municipalities are capable of restoring social services and economic infrastructure more quickly at the local level (Council of Europe, 2023).

A central element of reform will be the implementation of the *acquis Communautaire* in the context of EU accession. This will involve legislative harmonization, strengthening the independence of institutions, and enhancing citizen protections. Thus, European integration serves not only as a foreign policy priority but also as an instrument of internal institutional resilience.

Digitalization has already proven effective during the war. The "Diia" platform ensured access to administrative services, registries, and social support, even under missile strikes and mass power outages (Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine, 2022). This showed that digital infrastructure strengthens institutional resilience.

In the post-war period, digitalization must become a core element of reform:

1. E-governance. Expanding "Diia", introducing e-voting, and digitizing budgetary processes could drastically reduce corruption and increase transparency.

2. Artificial intelligence and data analytics. The use of AI in justice, healthcare, and financial management could optimize processes, reduce bureaucracy, and provide fairer outcomes (OECD, 2021).

3. Blockchain technologies. Applying blockchain in procurement and state asset management would maximize transparency and minimize abuse.

4. International experience confirms this trajectory. Estonia, which built a digital state after regaining independence, has become a global benchmark for institutional efficiency and citizen trust (Margetts & Naumann, 2017). For Ukraine, digitalization is not only a technological tool but also a symbol of modernization and a new social contract between the state and its citizens.

Ukraine's institutional resilience will depend on reform trajectories, international support, and the security environment. Several scenarios can be outlined:

1. Optimistic scenario. Rapid EU and NATO integration, large-scale investments in reconstruction, and successful implementation of European standards. In this case, Ukraine's economy could achieve sustained growth of 6–7% annually, while political institutions would evolve into efficient, democratic structures comparable to those of Poland or Lithuania.

2. Baseline scenario. Gradual reforms with continued support from international partners. Economic growth would be slower (3–4% annually), with Ukraine remaining partially dependent on aid. Political balance would be preserved, but risks of instability and corruption would persist.

3. Pessimistic scenario. Reforms stall due to internal political struggles, corruption increases, and security risks remain high. This would undermine investor trust, slow reconstruction, and accelerate human capital outflow.

The baseline scenario appears most probable, but with political will and sustained partner support, Ukraine could move toward the optimistic path. This requires clear reform "roadmaps", coordination with international financial institutions, and private investment mobilization.

Thus, Ukraine's strategy for strengthening institutional resilience must combine political reforms, digital transformation, and long-term planning. This approach is not only a precondition for economic security but also a guarantee that Ukraine will become part of Europe's architecture of security and prosperity.

6. Conclusion

The full-scale war against Ukraine has underscored the critical importance of institutional resilience as both a political and economic category. Resilience in this context is not limited to the simple survival of state structures but involves their capacity to adapt, retain legitimacy, and ensure effective governance in conditions of extreme stress. The Ukrainian case illustrates that institutional resilience functions as the decisive bridge between political stability, social trust, and economic security.

First, political stability and the consolidation of power around a unified strategic leadership have been indispensable for preventing administrative paralysis and sustaining macroeconomic functionality. At the same time, the preservation of democratic institutions, parliamentary oversight, and political pluralism has safeguarded the legitimacy of decision-making. This delicate balance between centralized authority and democratic practices has helped Ukraine to mobilize resources effectively while maintaining public trust, which is indispensable for long-term resilience.

Second, institutions of public authority have acted as the operational backbone of resilience.

The parliament and government coordinated legal and fiscal adjustments; security institutions ensured territorial integrity and protected critical infrastructure; and anti-corruption bodies strengthened accountability and reinforced both domestic and international trust. Together, these institutions demonstrated that institutional resilience is a systemic phenomenon dependent on the complementarity of multiple actors, rather than the strength of any single branch of power.

Third, the international-political dimension has significantly amplified Ukraine's internal resilience. Integration into the EU and NATO processes has provided both an external anchor and a framework for domestic reforms. International assistance has preserved fiscal stability and social welfare, while sanctions against Russia weakened the aggressor's economic capacity. Importantly, Ukraine has transitioned from being a passive recipient of aid to an active normative actor-contributing to global food security through the Black Sea Grain Initiative, enhancing collective cyber defense, and promoting international legal accountability through calls for a special tribunal.

Fourth, strategies for strengthening institutional resilience in the post-war period must be forward-looking. Political reforms should reinforce checks and balances, judicial independence, decentralization, and the durability of anti-corruption agencies. Simultaneously, digital transformation and the integration of innovative governance mechanisms – such as AI, blockchain, and advanced e-governance – will provide transparency, efficiency, and citizen trust. Scenarios for Ukraine's future suggest that sustained political will, coupled with international support, could move the country from a baseline recovery path toward an optimistic trajectory of rapid integration into the Euro-Atlantic community.

In conclusion, institutional resilience is not merely the capacity to withstand wartime shocks but the essential foundation for Ukraine's recovery, modernization, and integration into Europe's security and prosperity architecture. The war has demonstrated that resilience is multidimensional: it combines flexibility with legitimacy, efficiency with accountability, and national capacity with international solidarity. The way Ukraine continues to strengthen its institutions will define not only the success of its reconstruction but also its long-term role as a democratic and secure state within the regional and global order.

References:

- Åslund, A. (2022). *Ukraine: What went right, what went wrong and how to rebuild*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- Ben-Bassat, A., & Dahan, M. (2008). The political economy of military spending in Israel. *Defence and Peace Economics*, 19(4), 291–310. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10242690802164814>

- Brassett, J., Croft, S., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2021). *Resilience in politics and international relations: Critical and global perspectives*. Routledge.
- Collier, P. (2020). *Wars, guns, and votes: Democracy in dangerous places*. Vintage.
- Council of Europe. (2023). *Support for the establishment of a special tribunal for the crime of aggression against Ukraine*. Strasbourg: CoE. Available at: <https://www.coe.int>
- Diamond, L. (2022). Democracy versus autocracy: The resilience of democratic institutions in times of crisis. *Journal of Democracy*, 33(2), 5–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2022.0021>
- European Council. (2022). *European Council conclusions on Ukraine, 23 June 2022*. Brussels: European Council. Available at: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu>
- European Commission. (2023). *Ukraine Facility: EU support for recovery, reconstruction and modernization*. Brussels: European Commission. Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu>
- European Commission. (2023). *EU sanctions against Russia explained*. Brussels: European Commission. Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu>
- Freedom House. (2023). *Nations in Transit 2023: Ukraine country report*. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org>
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Hale, H. E. (2021). *Patronal politics: Eurasian regime dynamics in comparative perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). *Ukraine: First review under the Extended Fund Facility arrangement*. Washington, DC: IMF. Available at: <https://www.imf.org>
- International Energy Agency (IEA). (2023). *Ukraine energy security review*. Paris: IEA. Available at: <https://www.iea.org>
- Kurnyshova, Y. (2023). Ukraine at war: Resilience and normative agency. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 17(4), 6–29. Available at: <https://www.cejiss.org/ukraine-at-war-resilience-and-normative-agency>
- Kuzio, T. (2023). *Russian imperialism and Ukrainian resistance: Nation, identity and war*. Routledge.
- Margetts, H., & Naumann, A. (2017). Government as a platform: What can Estonia show the world? *Government Information Quarterly*, 34(4), 784–793. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.09.002>
- Melnykovska, I. (2025). The local and regional dimension of Ukraine's resilience during Russia's full-scale invasion. *Journal of Peace, Conflict & Development*, 31(1), 1–20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1060586X.2025.2545626>
- Ministry of Defense of Ukraine. (2023). *Annual report on defense and security sector activities 2022–2023*. Kyiv: MoD. Available at: <https://www.mil.gov.ua>
- Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine. (2022). *Diia: Digital state services during the war*. Kyiv: MDTU. Available at: <https://thedigital.gov.ua>
- Mujanović, J. (2018). *Hunger and fury: The crisis of democracy in the Balkans*. Oxford University Press.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2015). *The quest for good governance: How societies develop control of corruption*. Cambridge University Press.
- NATO. (2023). *NATO support for Ukraine: Factsheet*. Brussels: NATO. Available at: <https://www.nato.int>
- NATO CCDCOE. (2022). *Ukraine and international cooperation in cyber defence*. Tallinn: NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. Available at: <https://ccdcoe.org>
- Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2020). *The Europeanization of Eastern Europe*. Cornell University Press.
- North, D. C., Wallis, J. J., & Weingast, B. R. (2009). *Violence and social orders: A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2021). *The state of AI in public administration*. Paris: OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org>
- Onuch, O., & Sasse, G. (2022). *The Maidan and beyond: Civil activism and political change in Ukraine*. Oxford University Press.
- Rohatiuk, I., Ivchenko, B.-Y., Kanfui, I., Solovyov, E., Yermenchuk, O., & Denysenko, O. (2024). Economic security of Ukraine in wartime: Challenges and prospects. *SocioEconomic Challenges*, 8(3), 123–134. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385935293_Economic_security_of_Ukraine_in_wartime_challenges_and_prospects
- Sakwa, R. (2023). *War and order: Reflections on Russia, Ukraine and the future of Europe*. Routledge.
- Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2020). *The Europeanization of Eastern Europe*. Cornell University Press.
- Tooze, A. (2007). *The wages of destruction: The making and breaking of the Nazi economy*. Penguin.
- Transparency International. (2023). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2023: Ukraine country profile*. Berlin: Transparency International. Available at: <https://www.transparency.org>
- United Nations (UN). (2023). *Black Sea Grain Initiative Joint Coordination Centre report*. New York: UN. Available at: <https://www.un.org>

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2022). *Legislative activity during martial law: Analytical report*. Kyiv: VRU. Available at: <https://www.rada.gov.ua>

World Bank. (2023). *Ukraine economic update, spring 2023*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/ukraine/publication/ukraine-economic-update-spring-2023>

Received on: 20th of July, 2025

Accepted on: 18th of September, 2025

Published on: 09th of October, 2025