

Dariia Kotenok
Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor
Kyiv National Economic University
named after Vadym Hetman
Kyiv, Ukraine

GEOPOLITICAL CRISES AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC ORDER: RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS, CHANNELS OF INFLUENCE AND SCENARIO MODELLING

Geopolitical crises constitute a specific type of socio-economic disruption arising at the intersection of political, military, economic and institutional confrontation between states or blocs of states. Methodologically, their conceptualisation is based on a combination of geopolitical, geoeconomic and security studies approaches [1; 2]. Accordingly, a geopolitical crisis may be understood as a systemic escalation of international confrontation that affects the world order through military-political, trade, financial, energy and institutional channels.

A retrospective analysis of crises in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries shows that their causes are most often associated with competition for resources, markets, technological leadership, institutional dominance and control over the security architecture. The First World War destroyed the pre-war model of globalisation and generated debt problems, inflation and the strengthening of the role of the United States in the world economy [3]. The Second World War ended the crisis of the interwar order and laid the foundations for the Bretton Woods monetary and financial architecture. The Great Depression of 1929-1933 acquired geopolitical significance through unemployment, protectionism and political radicalisation [4]. The Cold War produced a bloc-based division of the world economy, an arms race and technological rivalry [5]. The oil crises of the 1970s demonstrated that energy resources could be used as an instrument of geopolitical pressure, while the 2008 crisis reinforced the role of the state and central banks in economic stabilisation [6].

The Russian-Ukrainian war is a contemporary geopolitical crisis because it goes beyond a bilateral military conflict and affects international law, European security, energy independence, food stability, sanctions policy and the future architecture of the world order. Its consequences include the disruption of logistics routes, the reorientation of trade flows, inflationary pressure, rising defence expenditure, the growing role of international financial assistance and a rethinking of economic security [7; 8].

The generalisation of the experience of geopolitical crises makes it possible to distinguish five key channels through which they influence the world economy: trade, financial, energy, institutional and structural. The trade channel is reflected in changes in export and import directions, the destruction or restructuring of supply chains, sanctions and protectionism. The financial channel is associated with capital movements, currency instability, debt risks and the role of international financial institutions. The energy channel affects resource prices, inflation and energy security.

The institutional channel changes the rules of international interaction and mechanisms of global governance. The structural channel is manifested in shifts in centres of power, technological priorities and strategies of economic resilience [9].

To model the consequences of the war in Ukraine as a geopolitical crisis, it is appropriate to use the tools of game theory, in particular the logic of the prisoner's dilemma. This approach allows the conflict to be represented as a strategic interaction between two players: Ukraine and the democratic coalition (Block 1), and the Russian Federation / the revisionist bloc (Block 2). Each player chooses between cooperation and defection. Such an approach makes it possible to identify dominant strategies, a Nash equilibrium and the scenario in which coercion to peace changes the aggressor's payoff structure [10; 11].

	Block 2: cooperation	Block 2: defection
Block 1: diplomatic-legal strategy	1. Legal stabilisation. Restoration of the international order, gradual economic stabilisation and reduction of global uncertainty.	2. Unilateral concession. Prolongation of the crisis, increased risks for Ukraine and erosion of trust in international guarantees.
Block 1: strategic coercion to peace	3. Coercion to a stable peace and Ukraine's victory. Restoration of Ukraine's sovereignty, accountability of the aggressor and renewal of the world order on the basis of security and law.	4. Managed long-term confrontation. Deterrence of the aggressor, a high cost of stabilisation, but the creation of preconditions for Ukraine's future victory.

Figure 1 — Matrix of strategic scenarios of the Russian-Ukrainian war as a geopolitical crisis in the logic of the prisoner's dilemma

According to the matrix, for Block 2 in the short-term logic the dominant strategy is defection, as it allows the continuation of military, energy and trade pressure. For Block 1, the rationally preferable strategy is coercion to peace, since it minimises losses, raises the cost of aggression and changes the incentive structure for the Russian Federation. Therefore, the short-term Nash equilibrium is Scenario 4, namely managed long-term confrontation. At the same time, the desired target equilibrium of the repeated game is a transition to Scenario 3, when coercion by the democratic coalition forces the Russian Federation to cooperate.

The outcomes of Scenarios 3 and 4 differ significantly across transmission channels. Under Scenario 3, the trade channel implies the restoration of Ukrainian exports and secure logistics; the financial channel implies the mobilisation of resources for reconstruction and lower investment risks; the energy channel implies reduced dependence on Russian resources; the institutional channel implies strengthened accountability of the aggressor and a greater role for international security mechanisms; and the structural channel implies Ukraine's modernisation, weakening of the resource-based model of Russian influence and consolidation of democratic coalitions. Under Scenario 4, these channels are manifested in the long-term

reorientation of trade, prolonged sanctions, Europe's energy autonomisation, a stronger role of the state in security policy and the division of the world economy into security-compatible blocs.

To summarise, contemporary geopolitical crises not only disrupt short-term economic equilibrium but also transform the long-term trajectory of global development. Their consequences are reflected in the restructuring of trade, finance, energy, international institutions and centres of economic power. The Russian-Ukrainian war is a full-scale geopolitical crisis because it affects global security, energy markets, food stability, sanctions regimes, international finance and the logic of global governance. The application of game-theoretic tools to the strategic analysis of geopolitical crises shows that unilateral concessions do not remove the aggressor's incentives for defection. The most rational strategy for Ukraine and the democratic coalition is strategic coercion to peace. Systematising the consequences of Ukraine's victory through the identified transmission mechanisms indicates that such a victory is not only the restoration of justice for the victim state, but also a factor in renewing the world order on the basis of international law, security, economic resilience and accountability for rule violations.

References

1. Geopolitics // Encyclopaedia Britannica: website. 2026. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/geopolitics> (accessed: 03.06.2026).
2. Blackwill R. D., Harris J. M. War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016. 384 p.
3. Eichengreen B. Globalizing Capital: A History of the International Monetary System. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019. 320 p.
4. Kindleberger C. P. The World in Depression, 1929-1939. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986. 355 p.
5. Gaddis J. L. The Cold War: A New History. New York: Penguin Press, 2005. 333 p.
6. Tooze A. Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World. New York: Viking, 2018. 720 p.
7. Policy Responses on the Impacts of the War in Ukraine // OECD: website. 2022-2025. URL: <https://www.oecd.org/ukraine-hub/policy-responses/> (accessed: 03.06.2026).
8. World Economic Outlook. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, 2025-2026. URL: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO> (accessed: 03.06.2026).
9. Fan T., Wo M., Xiang W. Geopolitical Barriers to Globalization. 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.12084> (accessed: 03.06.2026).
10. Nash J. F. Equilibrium Points in N-Person Games // Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 1950. Vol. 36, No. 1. P. 48-49.
11. Axelrod R. The Evolution of Cooperation. New York: Basic Books, 1984. 241 p.