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Abstract This research aims to explore how public administration contributes to safeguarding national security through policy formulation and implementation. It seeks to construct theoretical frameworks and provide actionable suggestions for addressing emerging risks, threats, and vulnerabilities to national security. It is particularly relevant in contemporary events such as the Russia-Ukraine conflict, instability, and external pressures. The research uses a variety of methodologies, including economic analysis, systems analysis, specialised professional methods, scientific abstraction, comparison, synthesis, and statistical techniques such as correlation and regression analysis, as well as multivariate cluster analysis and the K-means method. Additionally, it employs various techniques for organising, presenting, and generalising data, such as tabular and graphical representation. Russian actions have worsened security challenges in Europe and emerging markets, hindering public administrations’ ability to maintain national security. The Fragile State Index for Ukraine hit a critical juncture in 2023, highlighting the imperative to confront these threats promptly. The evolving landscape of national security, marked by heightened instability and external pressures, demands a thorough reconsideration concerning functioning public administration safeguarding national interests. Empirical data underscores the pressing necessity to confront these challenges through deliberate strategic planning and efficient operational frameworks. It underscores the significance of collaborative efforts and coordinated responses among nations confronting analogous threats to safeguard national sovereignty and territorial integrity amidst a dynamically shifting geopolitical milieu.
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1. Introduction

The effectiveness of state operations is greatly hindered by the contemporary challenges and risks that threaten state security amidst global unpredictability. Consequently, there has been a noticeable decline in the effectiveness of public administration systems and a reduction in state security. Urgent measures are needed to address this situation by identifying strategic directions for institutional changes in the public administration system, considering the challenges posed by Russia’s aggression against Ukraine and the occupation of significant Ukrainian territories. The shifting geopolitical landscape in Europe has led to substantial disruptions in the international legal order, further complicating protecting the state’s national interests amidst dangerous challenges and threats.

Consequently, introducing a new model is becoming increasingly urgent to create a robust and efficient public administration system. It involves enhancing principles, tools, methods, and management structures while bolstering the safeguarding of national interests against risks and threats to sovereignty, territorial integrity, and overall state security, both in the present and long term.

The problems of public administration in the context of national security are actively studied by a number of modern scientists. Separate publications by scientists are devoted to the analysis of the specifics of the functioning of innovative public management mechanisms (Borschchevskyi et al., 2022; Zagurska-Antoniuk, 2020). Some researchers consider the concept of public management in the field of national security policy from the position of an integrated approach (Blahuta et al., 2022). Moseyko & Negodchenko (2021), considering the essence of the phenomenon of public management in the security concept, differentiate its certain functional directions.

In general, researchers see the unfolding of the potential of public administration in the aspect of ensuring national security in the aspect of harmonizing the main socio-economic and political factors (Page et al., 2023). The works of Gavrilenko (2022), Reznikova (2022), which represent the concept of innovative strategies of public management of national security in the concept of digitalization, are fairly thorough publications. Gavkalova et al. (2023) considered individual issues of optimizing the organizational, legal and institutional foundations of public administration.

However, many questions in the investigated problem remain unresolved, which determines the relevance of the subject of the current study.
2. Theoretical reference framework

For a considerable period, scholars have extensively examined the complexities of defining the role of public administration in safeguarding state security. These discussions have been prominent in scientific and practical conferences. Nonetheless, achieving optimal levels of state security remains an unresolved challenge. Persistent destabilising influences from external and internal factors negatively affect state security. Furthermore, a well-defined framework outlining the administrative aspects of state security within the public administration system is needed.

In the contemporary context, Gavrilenko (2022) contends that current methods of ensuring state security emphasise a systematic approach to analysing political and legal phenomena and state institutions. He particularly underscores these elements’ interconnectedness and mutual influence, viewing state security as an open public administration system. This system operates based on defined criteria, an autonomous regulatory mechanism, and precise control measures. Gavrilenko concludes that state security represents a unique subject within public administration science, possessing distinct characteristics of both general management systems and tools for stabilising the identification of legal issues within a country’s legislation.

The Strategy for Ensuring State Security, ratified by the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine on December 30, 2021, defines this scientific and practical category as establishing the necessary conditions to safeguard Ukraine’s state sovereignty, territorial integrity, democratic constitutional order, and other essential national interests from existing and potential threats.

Dobra (2021) highlights the crucial importance of public administration in the context of national security. According to the scholar, public administration’s effectiveness is pivotal in establishing a resilient state, particularly in contexts marked by armed conflict or post-war reconstruction.

Emphasis is placed on democratic principles, accountability, transparency, and adherence to the rule of law in carrying out public administration tasks, as these factors are deemed essential for safeguarding a nation’s security.

Kivalov (2023) presents a perspective on national security, framing it within the broader scope of a nation’s security landscape. He argues that safeguarding national security necessitates developing a fresh approach to public administration specifically tailored to security concerns. This approach entails addressing critical areas of reform in managing societal dynamics within national security. Additionally, Kivalov stresses the importance of delineating between security and defence domains.

Expanding on Kivalov’s (2023) findings, Zagurska-Antoniuk (2020) proposes that national security should be integrated into the state’s public administration framework. She contends that establishing a robust public administration system for national security is crucial in the current era, requiring well-defined legal parameters, and should be a top priority for strategic national development. Moreover, she asserts that public administration mechanisms for national security must align with international standards and be adept at executing domestic and foreign policies centred on safety and democratic progress.

Moreover, Safi (2020) posits that public administration is pivotal in effectively implementing state policies and ensuring national security. Safi suggests examining national, regional, and local governance structures to enhance security measures. This approach enables the incorporation of regional development nuances, promotes intergovernmental cooperation, and expedites the achievement of desired objectives. Gavkalova et al. (2023) echo these views, arguing that in addition to these efforts, public administration entities should embrace modern innovative tools and strategies, including innovative digitalisation approaches, to enhance the provision of state security.

However, according to Holzer (2022), the state’s public administration system is significantly susceptible to internal political and societal shifts. The decline in public trust towards authorities has reduced operational efficacy and compromised national security. Similarly, Inakefe and Godwin (2022) share this perspective, highlighting a direct correlation between the efficiency of the public administration system and the nation’s level of security. They argue that the methods and instruments employed in public administration align with those necessary for safeguarding national security across various levels, from local to national.

Page et al. (2023) assert that many academics perceive public administration as the crucial process of executing government policies, encompassing planning, organising, executing, and controlling governmental actions. They emphasise the necessity for well-considered and balanced mechanisms and strategies for implementation, considering both external and internal environments. The authors highlight the integral role of effective public administration and strategic implementation in ensuring national security. However, Liu et al. (2022) contend that the parameters for ensuring national security in countries worldwide are only partially reliant on the efficacy of their public administration. They argue that contemporary global challenges exert significant pressure on national public administration systems, intensifying destabilising factors and diminishing national security levels.

Borschchevskyi et al. (2022) argue that during martial law times, a noticeable impact leads to significant institutional changes and the transformation of informal institutions. Concurrently, scholars emphasise that heightened instability in the country disrupts established mechanisms of state governance and exacerbates security issues across all levels of public administration. Hence, they advocate for a transition towards innovative approaches in shaping state and regional
development, emphasising the necessity for collaborative efforts among various elements of the public administration framework, including governmental authorities, local administrations, and civil society organisations. Establishing and executing financial, social, and market mechanisms for institutional transformation becomes paramount in such circumstances.

According to Akimova (2018), public administration occupies a central role in ensuring state security owing to its responsibility to carry out regulatory and informational functions crucial for state security. The author defines the mechanism of public administration as a structured assembly of government bodies aimed at attaining managerial objectives in alignment with their legal mandates and functional goals.

Bahmani (2016) and Blahuta et al. (2022) argue that ensuring state security requires coordinated efforts between public administration and society. They argue that such cooperation enables swift adaptation to evolving external and internal challenges, ensuring effective responses to present dangers. Research exemplified by Blahuta et al. (2022) highlights vital hurdles hindering public administration’s efficacy, consequently impacting state security. In Ukraine, for instance, inadequate engagement between public administration and the populace leads to disregarding public opinion and low transparency and democratic standards in administrative processes. Notably, corruption emerges as a significant threat to state security, drawing attention from scholars like David-Barrett (2023). He emphasises corruption’s perilous implications, compromising state security, undermining national sovereignty, and eroding public trust in administrative institutions.

Yusufzada et al. (2019) and Reznikova (2022) highlight additional challenges and threats confronting public administration entities in safeguarding state security. These include the absence of a robust rule of law, deficient institutional strategic planning, and the need for more professionalism among public administration personnel. Moseyko and Negodchenko (2021) further support this assertion, illustrating the inefficacy of Ukraine’s public administration system concerning state security. They argue that this ineffectiveness stems from systemic flaws exacerbated by severe financial, economic, social, and political crises. These crises have led to the depletion of state finances, widespread corruption, democratic distortions, and a decline in living standards among the populace.

Research on the various scientific approaches to defining the role of public administration in guaranteeing state security during the formulation and execution of strategies and mechanisms reveals a range of diverse and complex scholarly advancements in this domain. It underscores the necessity for further comprehensive investigation into this matter. This research aims to lay the theoretical groundwork and provide practical advice on evaluating public administration’s role in safeguarding state security, especially in formulating and implementing strategies and mechanisms for its enforcement.

3. Materials and methods

The article utilises both general scientific methods and specialised techniques of economic analysis, fundamental research, and scientific comprehension, encompassing a range of approaches to scholarly investigation.

− Use systematic analysis, scientific abstraction and comprehensive methods to define the core of public administration and clarify its functions in safeguarding national security;
− The applied research relies on comparative methods, analogy, and statistical analysis;
− Utilising multifactorial cluster analysis based on the k-means method, categorise countries worldwide according to indicators reflecting their public administration parameters;
− Utilising tabular and graphical methods to visually depict research findings and employ systematic organisation and generalisation techniques to conclude from the results.

The study concentrated on the following nations: Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Moldova, and Slovakia.

The study’s background information draws upon the scholarly works of national and international researchers and data reported by international organisations spanning 2019 to 2023.

− Fragile States Index Annual Report;
− According to Democracy Index, Democracy Index 2019-2021 and Democracies 2022;
− According to the Corruption Perception Index, Corruption Perception Index 2019-2022.

4. Results

Research on public administration issues related to ensuring state security has been ongoing for a significant duration, which is evident in both academic exploration and practical implementation by governmental and public entities. It is evident that this matter encompasses both theoretical and practical dimensions, as achieving desired outcomes necessitates specific actions:

− amend and improve existing national legislation;
− develop strategy documents;
determine the principles and instructions for timely detection, prevention and elimination of threats to national security by public administration bodies.

The Strategy for Ensuring State Security, adopted on December 30, 2021, by the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine, organises a systematic list of threats, as depicted in Figure 1.

The present security landscape is marked by considerable instability both on a global scale and within individual nations. The instability has been exacerbated by the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, resulting in heightened risks to national security not only for the directly affected countries but also for neighbouring nations. As a result, the array of threats to national security, detailed in Figure 1, includes:

1. The inefficiency of government agencies, coupled with inconsistent and incomplete attempts to reform security components, is evident;
2. Inadequacies in mechanisms for providing organisational, legal, personnel, financial, and material-technical support for enhancing and developing national security are apparent;
3. Limitations on state fiscal resources.
4. Oligarchic clans’ dominance over vital sectors of the economy and enterprises.

![Figure 1 Primary Threats to State Security. Source: National Security Strategy (2022)](https://www.malque.pub/ojs/index.php/mr)
Instability Index for each country, which aids in evaluating the state and trajectory of governmental operations and their fulfilling responsibilities.

The methodological components of the Fragile State Index encompass evaluating the efficiency of public administration entities, their susceptibility to contemporary threats and challenges, existing conflicts, and their capacity to assess the risks of state collapse. Global country dynamics do not exhibit favourable stability, particularly exacerbated by ongoing conflicts. Consequently, the calculation of the Fragile State Index holds significant importance, as it enables the assessment of potential outcomes such as:

- Loss of national sovereignty;
- national security and safety environment parameters;
- the role of public authorities in their protection;
- the legitimacy of public institutions and their ability to provide quality services;
- the state protects human and civil rights and implements law rules. An escalation in the Fragile State Index signifies a decline in the state security level and a rise in crises within the state and society. Consequently, countries become more susceptible to conflicts, threats, and hazards.

The Fragile State Index studies conducted in European nations such as Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Moldova, and Slovakia between 2019 and 2023 indicate that within the EU, countries generally exhibit lower FSI values compared to those experiencing armed conflicts, such as Ukraine (FSI: 68.6–95.9) and Russia (FSI: 72.5–80.7). Belarus, an implicit ally of Russia in the conflict with Ukraine, demonstrates an FSI range of 67.8–69.9. Moldova, sharing a border with Ukraine, has an FSI range of 64.5–67.4 (Figure 2).

![Figure 2](https://www.malque.pub/ojs/index.php/mr)

**Figure 2** Current status and dynamics of the Fragile State Index in selected European countries between 2019 and 2023.

*Source:* The calculations relied on the Fragile State Index Annual Reports (2019 to 2023)

The trends observed in the Fragile State Index for the selected countries highlight notable disparities in the capacity of public administration bodies to maintain optimal levels of state security. European Union nations demonstrate higher efficiency in their administrative functions, resulting in better protection of state sovereignty than transitional countries, especially those affected by conflict.

An analysis of the Fragile State Index dynamics in selected European nations reveals notable fluctuations in the indicator during periods of crisis within each country. Notably, adverse trends were particularly pronounced in 2022, coinciding with the global instability caused by Russia’s conflict with Ukraine. Throughout this timeframe, the Fragile State Index showed an upward trend in most countries, except for Hungary and Slovakia, which experienced stability. It is worth highlighting that Ukraine reached a critical point in 2023, registering a score of 95.9 on the Fragile State Index.

In 2023, the geopolitical landscape in Europe underwent a notable deterioration, primarily due to Russia’s aggression and unprovoked war against Ukraine. The ongoing conflict has intensified political instability throughout the region, notably in Ukraine, where active combat and occupation have disrupted the functioning of the public administration system.
Simultaneously, in 2022, the Fragile State Index decreased its value. Short-term crisis events can unite public administration bodies and society in pursuing several shared objectives, such as:

- safeguarding democratic principles, the sovereignty of states, and maintaining territorial integrity;
- enhancing the elements of national security.

These imbalances result in notable adverse effects in the medium and long run. To thoroughly examine the examined matters, the authors suggest delineating common and unique aspects of public administration in the chosen countries. To achieve this, they propose categorising the countries according to the Fragile State Index from 2019 to 2023. The categorisations should be conducted using multivariate cluster analysis, employing the k-means technique and Statistica 8.0 software. The outcomes are organised in Table 1.

The research findings highlight notable differences between the two clusters of European countries regarding their public administration effectiveness and strategies for ensuring state security. Over the analysed period, the first group comprised European Union members such as Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia, while the second group consisted of transitional countries with less stable public administration systems, including Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and Moldova. These latter countries exhibited notably lower levels of state security than the former group.

It is essential to note the correlation between a country’s Fragile State Index value and its level of democracy. When examining each nation through the lens of the Democracy Index, we can discern a clear inverse correlation between these metrics. Specifically, nations marked by high state instability, such as Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and Moldova, exhibit lower levels of democratic development. Moreover, indicators within these nations imply that public administration entities face challenges in effectively upholding the core tenets of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Classification of Selected European Countries according to the Fragile States Index from 2019 to 2023.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fragile State Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Cluster number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fragile States Index Annual Reports (2019-2023)

According to Figure 3, the Democracy Index data from 2019 to 2022 illustrates the state and trends in selected European countries. Analysis of this index suggests that European Union member states can be classified as having imperfect democracies, as their Democracy Index values fall within the range of 6.01 to 8.00 points. In contrast, transitional countries like Ukraine and Moldova exhibit hybrid regime democracies, with Democracy Index values ranging from 4.01 to 6.00 points. Meanwhile, Russia and Belarus demonstrate authoritarian regimes, with Democracy Index values below 4.00 points.

This study aims to investigate the impact of democracy and corruption levels on state instability parameters across various European countries. To achieve this objective, correlation and regression analyses were conducted using Statistica 8.0 software. The primary data required for these analyses are structured in Table 3, and the results are presented in Table 2.

Empirical research into the interplay among the degree of democracy, levels of corruption, and state instability in selected countries from 2019 to 2022 unveiled a strong correlation among these variables. The approximation coefficient and the statistical significance of the model demonstrated this, with Fisher’s F-test values ranging from $R^2 = 0.958$-$0.967$ throughout the study period.

Furthermore, the decline in the Democracy Index and the Corruption Perceptions Index correlates with an escalation in the Fragile State Index value. The regression coefficients corresponding to these relationships are as follows: in 2019, $r = -0.49$ for the Democracy Index and $r = -0.65$ for the Corruption Perceptions Index; in 2020, $r = -0.56$ for the Democracy Index and $r = -0.59$ for the Corruption Perceptions Index; in 2021, $r = -0.31$ for the Democracy Index and $r = -0.75$ for the Corruption Perceptions Index; and in 2022, $r = -0.32$ for the Democracy Index and $r = -0.72$ for the Corruption Perceptions Index.

The research on the practical aspects of safeguarding state security by governmental authorities suggests that nations involved in warfare experience diminished levels of security compared to European Union countries. Furthermore, the performance metrics of governmental bodies in these nations tend to be lower.
Figure 3 The current status and dynamics of changes in the Democracy Index of selected European countries from 2019 to 2022.

Source: Democracies (2022)

Table 2 Correlation and regression analysis outcomes depicting the factors affecting the Fragile State Index of chosen European nations from 2019 to 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Linear expression</th>
<th>Approximation factor</th>
<th>Statistical significance of the model indicated by Fisher’s F-test value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$Y = 122,57 - 0.49x_1 - 0.65x_2$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.958$</td>
<td>$F(4,58)=27.87$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$Y = 123,29 - 0.56x_1 - 0.59x_2$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.959$</td>
<td>$F(4,79)=29.18$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$Y = 116,70 - 0.31x_1 - 0.75x_2$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.966$</td>
<td>$F(4,09)=35.60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$Y = 114,72 - 0.32x_1 - 0.72x_2$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.967$</td>
<td>$F(4,01)=36.10$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Democracy Index (2019-2021); Democracies (2022); Corruption Perception Index (2019-2022)

Table 3 The preliminary data for the calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Index of Fragile States</th>
<th>Index of Democracy</th>
<th>Index of Corruption Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

The research findings on the role of public administration in safeguarding state security, especially concerning the development and execution of strategies and mechanisms, indicate a considerable vulnerability of the security landscape across nations worldwide. Both external and internal environments pose significant challenges, dangers, and threats. The analysis reveals that military factors exert the most detrimental influence on state security, significantly affecting the functioning of public administration entities within Ukraine’s security framework and spilling over into neighbouring countries.

In 2023, political unrest escalated significantly in numerous European nations under study, particularly in Ukraine, which has a critically high Fragile State Index value of 95.9. This figure signifies a heightened vulnerability to the erosion of state sovereignty and territorial integrity and an elevated risk of state collapse.

Empirical analysis reveals that European Union member states such as Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia exhibit higher socio-political development and are better equipped to maintain optimal state security.

However, transitioning countries like Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and Moldova face higher vulnerability to conflicts and crises, demanding substantial resources and efforts for resolution.
The obstacles observed in safeguarding state security through public administration entities emphasise the need for comprehensive measures to alleviate risks and threats while strengthening state security. Essential measures encompass:

1) halt military operations on Ukrainian territory and resolve the armed conflict between the Russian Federation and Ukraine;
2) the imperative to diminish conflict levels within public administration activities and elevate the quality of their execution of essential tasks and functions;
3) improving communication between government entities and the public while increasing the openness of this communication.

The suggested actions should be incorporated into sector-specific and regional plans to safeguard state security, which will be executed within the State Security Strategy. This method will facilitate attaining the intended goals and safeguard the nation’s interests against disruptive external and internal risks, threats, and hazards.

Scientists are convinced that one of the most effective means for optimizing the national security system today is the active use of public management processes. The publications of Moseyko & Negodchenko (2021) and Reznikova (2022) emphasize the need to develop a specific toolkit within the framework of the public management paradigm to maximize the potential of interaction between society and the state in the sector of national security. According to some scientists (Safi, 2020; Kivalov, 2023), such a strategy should level the phenomenon of imbalance in the researched field.

A number of scientific publications analyze the possibility of digitalization of a significant share of management processes in the security sphere (Inakefe & Godwin, 2022; Holzer, 2022). According to Gavkalova, Syromolot & Lukashev (2023), the main goal of the process of digital transformation of public administration in the field of national security is the accumulation, protection and optimal use of data sets.

The actualization of the issue of national security, according to Dobra (2021), is due to the fact that public administration in the conditions of unstable realities of social progress has proven the effectiveness of the implementation of innovative technological solutions and the possibilities of digital optimization of the studied area. In the field of information security, researchers (Dávid-Barrett, 2023; Zagurska-Antoniuk, 2020) consider it necessary to implement comprehensive measures to protect the national information space, integrate it into the global information space, and prevent information expansion.

6. Conclusion

The research on the role of public administration in ensuring state security has highlighted vital factors that destabilise the functioning of public administration bodies in this sphere. These factors include:

1) The Russian Federation has launched a large-scale invasion into Ukrainian territory, engaging in intense combat operations;
2) A significant restructuring of the public administration system resulting from Russia’s annexation of large portions of Ukrainian territory and subsequent loss of control over them;
3) The expansion of conflict-related risks into neighbouring countries of Ukraine causes instability in their security landscape.

Research suggests that the Russian-Ukrainian conflict has increased state instability in several European Union nations, including Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia, as well as transitional countries such as Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and Moldova. As a result, their state security levels have declined. In 2023, Ukraine’s Fragile State Index reached a critical level of 95.9, indicating increased risks associated with the erosion of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the potential for disintegration.
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