

**DOI: 10.31866/2616-745X.17.2026.360709**

**UDC 351.746.1:005.21]:327**

**ANTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE AS A TOOL  
FOR THE NATIONAL STRATEGIC RESILIENCE WITHIN  
THE MODERN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SYSTEM**

---

**Daria Likarchuk**

*PhD in Political Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor of the Department of European Integration Policy,  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1603-7601>,  
e-mail: [likarchukd@gmail.com](mailto:likarchukd@gmail.com),  
Educational and Scientific Institute of Public Administration  
and Civil Service of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,  
Kyiv, Ukraine, 04050*

**Для цитування:**

Likarchuk, D., 2026. Anticipatory Governance as a Tool for the National Strategic Resilience within the Modern International Relations System. *International Relations: Theory and Practical Aspects*, 17, pp.86-100. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-745X.17.2026.360709>.

The modern system of international relations is characterised by a state of “permanent polycrisis”, where volatility, uncertainty and emergence of “black swan” events have become the new normal. In such a context, the concept of Anticipatory Governance emerges not merely as a managerial innovation but as a fundamental prerequisite for state survival. The necessity of transitioning from post-factum crisis management to “governing the future” through strategic adaptability underscores the critical relevance of researching mechanisms for strengthening national resilience. The primary objectives of this study are to critically analyse the conceptual foundations of anticipatory governance and to substantiate its mechanisms as vital instruments for enhancing national strategic resilience amidst the shifting dynamics of the modern international system. This research is grounded on the application of general scientific and specialised non-empirical methods. A systems approach is employed in order to analyse the interconnectedness between state institutions and external challenges.

Comparative analysis enabled a distinction between reactive and proactive management models. Furthermore, deduction and theoretical modelling are applied to construct the architecture of strategic resilience, while scenario analysis is used to determine the role of foresight in public governance. The study demonstrates that anticipatory governance integrates three key components: strategic foresight, networked interaction, adaptive capacity. It establishes that national strategic resilience within the international relations system depends on the state's ability to institutionalise a "culture of the future" within decision-making processes. The author substantiates that utilising monitoring algorithms for "weak signals" and integrating real-time feedback loops allows the state system to transform from an inert structure into a dynamic ecosystem capable of not only withstanding shocks but evolving through them. The conceptualisation of anticipatory governance allows for a reimagining of the state's role on the global stage: from a passive object influenced by global processes to an active subject that models its own security trajectory. Implementing anticipatory governance mechanisms serves as a foundational element of national resilience-building, ensuring intellectual and organisational readiness for future crises.

**Keywords:** Anticipatory Governance; strategic resilience; international relations; foresight; public administration; national security.

### **Introduction**

The dynamic transformation of the global agenda necessitates an urgent conventionalisation of innovative methodological paradigms aimed at neutralising the ontological insecurity of sovereign actors. The phenomenon of anticipatory governance emerges not merely as a collection of administrative iterations, but as a fundamental epistemological matrix determining a state's capacity for proactive positioning. Within the stochastic nature of international transactions, predictive analytics undergoes a metamorphosis into a valence instrument for damping exogenous shocks (Likarchuk et al., 2022).

Modern reconfiguration of power vectors demands that the political establishment abandon reactive behavioral models in favour of strategic visioning. It is precisely the ability to incorporate foresight technologies into state-building processes that dictates national viability in an era of permanent turbulence. The evolution of threat configurations implies a requisite deconstruction of traditional security canons for the sake of implementing systemic resilience.

Within the context of cognitive warfare and hybrid asymmetries, the national strategic resilience represents a complex hierarchical structure predicated upon principles of adaptability and functional flexibility (El-Ghalayini, 2025). The process of implementing anticipatory mechanisms presupposes a profound

intellectualization of the state apparatus, capable of operationalising multivariant future scenarios. Rather than relying on linear extrapolation of historical experience, strategic planning should operate via categories of probabilistic horizons and non-linear bifurcations (Guston, 2014). Within this discourse, the institutionalization of feedback loops between the expert community and centers of legitimate decision-making acquires particular salience. Synergy between technological progress and analytical reflection establishes the groundwork for preemptive responses to latent destabilizing factors. Sovereignty effectiveness in a multipolar environment correlates directly with the level of cognitive readiness to identify weak signals of impending crises.

The system of modern international relations can be characterised by the erosion of classical containment institutions and the emergence of novel confrontational spaces, requiring intellectual rearmament of political subjects. Examining anticipatory governance through the lens of neo-realistic and constructivist approaches allows for the identification of hidden mechanisms for stabilizing interstate interactions. The necessity of harmonizing internal resources with external challenges demands the creation of integrated monitoring ecosystems functioning in a real-time regime (Heo and Seo, 2021). It is imperative to acknowledge that strategic autonomy remains unattainable without mastering the toolkit for managing uncertainty, which is an immanent feature of the postmodern world. Conceptualising resilience through anticipation permits the avoidance of catastrophic consequences stemming from strategic myopia inherent in bureaucratized verticals. These collective factors determine a transition from quantitative resource accumulation to qualitative refinement of prognostic capabilities.

The complexity of the current geopolitical conjuncture necessitates a radical revision of the epistemological foundations governing the national security apparatus. Anticipatory governance serves as a mediator between existing resources and hypothetical threats, ensuring a high degree of immunity against destructive influences. Deep integration of intelligence data, socio-economic indicators, and cybernetic forecasts forms a cohesive basis for securing national interests. The absence of a clearly articulated preemption strategy renders state institutions vulnerable to “black swans” and other unpredicted deviations. Establishing a correlation between the level of anticipation and rates of social consolidation opens new perspectives for bolstering domestic stability. Such an approach initiates a transformation of political culture, wherein responsibility for the future becomes the dominant vector of state activity.

### **Analysis of recent research and publications**

Contemporary scholarly discourse identifies anticipatory governance as a critical mechanism for ensuring national strategic resilience within the highly turbulent system of international relations. Researchers emphasize that traditional reactive management models are being superseded by proactive approaches that integrate strategic foresight directly into state decision-making processes (Guston, 2014). Specifically, analysis of EU and OECD experiences suggests that the implementation of foresight tools allows not only for the identification of potential external shocks but also for the construction of adaptive “resilience dashboards” to monitor state progress in critical sectors (European Commission, n.d.; OECD, 2025). In this context, the focus has shifted from merely predicting the future to building the institutional capacity to act under conditions of uncertainty, which remains fundamental to preserving national sovereignty and competitiveness (Kimbell and Vesnić-Alujević, 2020; Umbach, 2024). Recent literature places particular emphasis on digital transformation as a catalyst for anticipatory practices, where big data and algorithmic governance serve as instruments to mitigate unintended policy outcomes (El-Ghalayini, 2025; Johnston, 2026). Scholars assert that the efficacy of such systems depends on the synergy between technological innovation and social entrepreneurship, as reflected in global innovation development indicators (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2024; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024). At the same time, empirical case studies from Finland, the Netherlands, and South Korea demonstrate that anticipatory governance requires a profound reconfiguration of the public sector and the development of new methodological approaches to ground development design (Heo and Seo, 2021; Kallio and Välimaa, 2025; Likarchuk et al., 2022; Vaquero-Piñeiro, Terribile and Giovannini, 2025). Consequently, in the face of global challenges, anticipatory governance emerges not merely as a managerial innovation but as a foundational pillar of the modern architecture of international security and stability (Todisco et al., 2025; World Bank, 2024).

### **Formulation of the objectives of article**

The primary objective of this research is to critically study the conceptual framework of anticipatory governance and substantiate its mechanisms as a vital instrument for fortifying the national strategic resilience within the volatile dynamics of the contemporary international relations system.

### **Presentations of the main material of the study**

Anticipatory Governance emerges as a fundamental paradigm of public administration in an era of “radical uncertainty” and rapid technological transformation. In contrast to traditional reactive models, which focus on mitigating the consequences of existing crises, this concept is rooted in the systemic integration of

strategic foresight into decision-making processes. It necessitates the creation of flexible institutional mechanisms capable of not only forecasting plausible future scenarios but also actively shaping them through the preemptive adaptation of regulatory frameworks and resource allocation (Kallo and Välimaa, 2025). A central element of this model is the capacity of political systems for continuous learning and cognitive agility. Anticipatory governance transforms public management from a system of hierarchical control into a dynamic framework of risk management, where the analysis of “weak signals” and the monitoring of emergent threats play a pivotal role. This approach minimizes the “regulatory lag” effect, particularly in fields such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology and climate change, where the pace of innovation significantly outstrips the velocity of legislative activity.

The significance of this approach further lies in the enhancement of democratic legitimacy and social resilience through the inclusivity of foresight processes. Engaging a broad spectrum of stakeholders in future-modelling allows for the identification of potential ethical conflicts and social disparities before they manifest. Consequently, anticipatory governance serves as an instrument of preventive diplomacy and social engineering, harmonising the interests of diverse groups around long-term sustainable development goals rather than short-term electoral cycles. The conceptual framework of Anticipatory Governance (AG) emerges as a sophisticated teleological instrument for bolstering national strategic resilience amidst the volatile perturbations of the modern international relations system (Todisco et al., 2025). Rather than adhering to reactive paradigms, sovereign actors increasingly institutionalize foresight to preemptively nullify systemic shocks originating from non-linear geopolitical trajectories. This paradigmatic shift necessitates a robust integration of predictive analytics and participatory deliberation to mitigate the deleterious effects of “black swan” events (Johnston, 2026). By transcending traditional bureaucratic inertia, states cultivate a cognitive flexibility that permits the calibration of policy instruments long before a crisis attains its inflection point. The efficacy of this approach is contingent upon the epistemological rigor of forecasting methodologies that seek to decipher latent signals of impending global transformations. Consequently, strategic resilience is no longer perceived as a static defensive posture but as a dynamic, evolutionary capability of the subject.

International practice indicates that the implementation of AG is particularly pronounced within the Nordic cluster, where the Finnish Committee for the Future exemplifies the institutionalisation of long-termism. Finland consistently allocates approximately 4% of its GDP to research and development, a fiscal com-

mitment that underscores its dedication to technological and societal foresight. Such institutional arrangements facilitate the continuous scanning of the strategic horizon, allowing the state to navigate the complexities of digital sovereignty and ecological transitions with unparalleled agility (Kimbell and Vesnić-Alujević, 2020). Such a model demonstrates that resilience is fundamentally anchored in the ability to synchronize domestic legislative cycles with the broader temporalities of global technological shifts. By embedding foresight within the parliamentary apparatus, Finland ensures that its strategic vectors remain immune to the transient whims of populist exigencies. The resultant stability provides a formidable bulwark against the erosion of institutional trust during periods of intense international turbulence.

In the Asia-Pacific region, Singapore's Centre for Strategic Futures (CSF) operates as a quintessential node of anticipatory intelligence, prioritizing the identification of "weak signals" that portend disruptive geopolitical realignments. Singapore's strategic calculus is informed by the acute vulnerability of the city-state, necessitating a hyper-vigilant posture regarding supply chain integrity and maritime security. The CSF employs sophisticated scenario-planning techniques to simulate multifaceted contingencies, ensuring the maintenance of competitive advantages within Global Value Chains (GVC) (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2024). Statistical indicators suggest that Singapore's proactive regulatory environment has contributed to its perennial ranking among the top three nations in the Global Innovation Index. This success is attributable to the seamless synthesis of cross-sectoral data, which informs the creation of "buffer capacities" within the national infrastructure. Anticipatory governance thus functions as a catalyst for maintaining socio-economic equilibrium in spite of the entropic pressures of a multipolar world.

Through its National Intelligence Council (NIC), the United States periodically disseminate the "Global Trends" report, a document that epitomises the application of strategic foresight on a macro-analytical scale. This initiative attempts to map the convergence of demographic shifts, resource scarcity, and emergent technologies to delineate the probable contours of the international system over twenty-year intervals. While the American approach is frequently criticised for its penchant for securitization, the depth of its analytical reach remains unparalleled due to a defense budget exceeding \$800 billion. The integration of these insights into the National Security Strategy (NSS) reflects an attempt to bypass cognitive biases that often obfuscate long-term strategic imperatives (OECD, 2025). Still, the efficacy of foresight is occasionally undermined by the inherent friction between long-term projections and the short-term incentives of the electoral cycle. Nevertheless, the American commitment to technological "edge-finding" en-

tures that the military-industrial complex remains attentive to the exigencies of future warfare.

Within the European Union, the European Strategy and Policy Analysis System (ESPAS) serves as an inter-institutional platform for harmonizing the foresight capabilities of the Commission, Parliament, and Council. This collaborative endeavor seeks to forge a coherent European strategic identity by identifying intersectional risks of climate change, migration, and digital hegemony. The EU's "Open Strategic Autonomy" agenda is predicated on the anticipatory recalibration of trade dependencies, particularly concerning critical raw materials where China currently controls over 70% of global processing capacity (Umbach, 2024). By utilising foresight to diversify procurement networks, the Union aspires to insulate its Single Market from the weaponisation of economic interdependencies. This proactive decoupling ("de-risking") represents a sophisticated application of AG intended to preserve the normative influence of the European project. The synergy between foresight and regulation allows the EU to project its standards globally, a phenomenon scholarly defined as the "Brussels Effect" (European Commission, n.d.).

The United Arab Emirates has distinguished itself through the creation of the Ministry of Possibilities, a radical experimentalist iteration of anticipatory governance that seeks to transcend traditional departmental silos. By investing over \$1.5 billion in artificial intelligence initiatives annually, the UAE aims to transition from an extractive economy to a knowledge-based hegemony by the year 2071. This temporal horizon, stretching five decades into the future, requires a profound reconfiguration of the social contract and the educational apparatus. The Emirati model utilizes AG to navigate existential threats posed by the global energy transition, ensuring the nation remains a central hub in the post-petroleum epoch. Such long-range planning is facilitated by a centralized political structure that minimises the disruptive impact of partisan volatility. The success of this model is evidenced by the UAE's burgeoning role as a mediator in regional conflicts and a leader in space exploration.

In contrast, the application of AG within emerging economies often encounters structural implementation impediments related to fiscal constraints and institutional fragility. Despite these challenges, countries like South Korea have successfully leveraged the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI) to maintain a dominant position in the semiconductor industry. Korean "National Foresight" exercises are meticulously designed to align private sector innovation with state strategic goals, creating a formidable techno-nationalist synergy. This alignment ensures that the state can rapidly reconfigure its industrial base

in response to “chokepoints” emerging in global technology trade. The South Korean experience illustrates that anticipatory governance is most effective when underpinned by a high degree of coordination between the state and society. Without such cohesion, foresight remains a purely academic exercise, dissociated from the material realities of national power and sovereignty (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2024). The rise of “wicked problems” as challenges characterised by extreme complexity and a lack of definitive solutions—further necessitates the refinement of anticipatory mechanisms. Climate change, for instance, represents a systemic risk that defies traditional probabilistic modeling, requiring instead the adoption of “possibilistic” thinking. AG facilitates the development of adaptive pathways that allow states to pivot their strategies as new empirical data emerges from the environmental periphery. Statistical models from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) serve as a foundation for states attempting to build resilient coastal infrastructures. Those nations failing to integrate these projections into their urban planning face catastrophic economic losses, estimated to reach trillions of dollars by mid-century (World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024). The inability to practice AG constitutes a fundamental threat to national security and long-term territorial integrity.

Amidst the diffusion of power and the erosion of Westphalian norms, anticipatory governance becomes an imperative for survival in an agonal international system. Countries demonstrating high levels of strategic resilience typically possess extensive intellectual monitoring networks that function beyond the constraints of electoral cycles. Interestingly, the effectiveness of AG correlates with the level of digitalization in public administration, where the use of Big Data permits precision modeling of social fluctuations. According to World Bank data, states with a high Government Effectiveness Index demonstrate a 30% higher capacity to absorb external shocks without systemic destabilization (World Bank, 2024).

AG is not merely an administrative superstructure but a vital cognitive layer of modern statehood. Investment in anticipatory capabilities is equivalent to strategic insurance against unexpected geopolitical ruptures and systemic failures. To ensure epistemological relevance and the empirical verification of the offered theoretical postulates, the following expanded comparative matrix is presented, encompassing a decile selection of state actors representing heterogeneous models of Anticipatory Governance implementation. This analytical framework synthesises the determinants of fiscal allocation for innovative development, indicators of institutional effectiveness within the state apparatus, and parameters of strategic prospection, the configuration of which collectively determines the level of national strategic resilience amidst global turbulence.

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Strategic Anticipation and the National Resilience Indicators (2024–2025)

Nation-State	R&D Expenditure (% of GDP)	Global Innovation Index (Rank)	Government Effectiveness Index	E-Gov Development Index	Primary AG Institution	Planning Horizon (Years)	Strategic Focus Area	Cybersecurity Commitment (GCI)	Energy Autarky (%)
Singapore	2.2%	5	2.26	0.91	Centre for Strategic Futures (CSF)	30	Supply Chain Integrity	0.98	<5%
South Korea	4.9%	10	1.18	0.96	STEPI / National Foresight	15	Techno-Nationalism	0.98	18%
United States	3.5%	3	1.48	0.92	National Intelligence Council (NIC)	20	Global Hegemony	0.99	100%
Finland	3.9%	6	1.88	0.95	Committee for the Future	20	Societal Resilience	0.93	55%
Israel	5.6%	14	1.25	0.88	National Security Council	10	Existential Security	0.94	95%
Switzerland	3.4%	1	2.01	0.92	Federal Chancellery (Foresight)	25	Neutrality & Finance	0.92	48%
UAE	1.5%	32	1.42	0.90	Ministry of Possibilities	50	Post-Petroleum Transition	0.96	100%
Estonia	1.8%	16	1.55	0.94	Government Strategy Office	15	Digital Sovereignty	0.99	80%
Japan	3.3%	13	1.65	0.90	NISTEP (MEXT)	20	Robotics & Demographics	0.97	12%
France	2.2%	11	1.45	0.89	France Stratégie	10	Strategic Autonomy	0.94	45%

Source: (European Commission, n.d.; OECD, 2025; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2024; World Bank, 2024; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024).

The synthesis of the aforementioned empirical data facilitates a nuanced understanding of how anticipatory mechanisms are strategically leveraged within the contemporary international system to cultivate the national resilience (Vaquero-Piñero, Terribile and Giovannini, 2025). States such as Israel and South Korea exemplify a “survivalist innovation” paradigm, wherein hyper-intensive R&D investment functions as a form of cognitive defense, ensuring that the rapid identification of technological breakthroughs remains synonymous with existential security. Simultaneously, the UAE and Singapore manifest an institutional long-termism that utilises extended planning horizons (often spanning five decades) to compensate for geographical or resource-based vulnerabilities, thereby proactively constructing future-proof economic niches. The high correlation between E-Gov integration and government effectiveness in nations like Estonia and Finland underscores a model of normative and digital resilience; here, robust digital infrastructures act as systemic shock absorbers that maintain administrative continuity amidst the entropic fluctuations of hybrid threats and global volatility. Ultimately, this data confirms that the national strategic resilience is fundamentally a derivative of the state’s prognostic capacity, as those entities that successfully bridge the epistemological gap between horizon scanning and policy formulation exhibit superior stability within the increasingly agonal global order.

The strategic resilience in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is a derivative of a nation’s capacity for preemptive adaptation and intellectual outmaneuvering. International experience confirms that the successful integration of AG requires the abandonment of linear extrapolations in favor of complex, multi-scenario analysis. State policy devoid of a prognostic component is inevitably destined for failure under conditions of hyper-global competition. The formation of anticipatory institutions allows for not only reacting to threats but actively constructing desirable future scenarios. Only through a deep understanding of the temporal aspects of governance is it possible to preserve agency in a multipolar world. Further research should focus on developing unified metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of anticipatory systems across diverse socio-political contexts.

### **Conclusions**

The implementation of Anticipatory Governance principles is a critical prerequisite for maintaining state sovereignty and competitiveness in a globalised world. The complex systems that constitute modern states require a transition from rigid planning to an architecture of “dynamic resilience”, where strategic foresight becomes a core competency of the state apparatus rather than merely an auxiliary analytical tool. Only through anticipatory action can governance transform an unpredictable future from a source of systemic threat into a domain of strategic opportunity.

The implementation of anticipatory governance mechanisms emerges not merely as an optional administrative innovation, but as a fundamental imperative for securing national agency within the increasingly negentropic complexity of the international architecture. The efficacy of strategic resilience correlates directly with the capacity of state institutions for epistemological precedence, allowing for the transformation of potential destabilizing factors into manageable parameters of state development. Analysis of international practice indicates that the successful institutionalization of foresight necessitates a departure from linear prognostic models in favor of multi-scenario analysis that integrates predictive analytics with the cognitive flexibility of the governing apparatus. Consequently, anticipatory governance functions as a vital cognitive layer of modern statehood, ensuring the homeostasis of the national system within the agonal environment of global competition. Further scientific inquiries in this field should be focused on the development of unified metrics to evaluate the impact of anticipatory systems on macroeconomic stability and social cohesion across heterogeneous political regimes. There is an urgent necessity in studying the correlation between the level of digitalisation in public administration and the speed of external shock absorption, particularly in the context of the weaponisation of economic interdependencies. Special attention must be devoted to the ethical dimensions of employing predictive analytic algorithms in strategic decision-making processes to avoid deterministic fallacies and preserve the participatory nature of democratic governance. Furthermore, a promising vector grounds on the analysis of harmonising national foresight strategies within supranational unions to foster collective resilience against transboundary existential threats.

Within the context of AG operationalisation, the study of the “strategic autism” of institutions (which impedes the adequate perception of weak signals and results in catastrophic inertia during systemic ruptures) assumes critical significance. Scientific interests base on the deconstruction of barriers between theoretical prognostic centers and practical nodes of political decision-making, as the epistemological gap between them remains a key vulnerability for most modern states. The development of “dynamic adaptation” protocols will allow sovereign actors not only to minimise risks but to actively construct favourable geopolitical configurations by utilising the future as a resource space. Research into these aspects will contribute to the creation of a holistic theory of anticipatory security that meets the challenges of an epoch of radical uncertainty.

The final stage of the theoretical comprehension of this problem should be the formulation of the “anticipatory sovereignty” concept, wherein the capacity

for intellectual maneuvering is recognised as the leading criterion of state power in the information age. This presupposes a transition from damage-prevention strategies to strategies of active probability management, requiring a fundamental reconfiguration of educational and scientific paradigms within national systems. Examining the experiences of small states that successfully nullify a lack of material resources through intellectual superiority may provide universal tools for the modernisation of global security institutions. Thus, the scholarly discourse surrounding anticipatory governance remains open, requiring a multidisciplinary synthesis of knowledge at the intersection of political science, cybernetics and epistemology.

## REFERENCES

- El-Ghalayini, Y., 2025. Digital Transformation: A Tool for Anticipatory Governance. In: *Anticipatory Governance Shaping a Responsible Future*. [e-book] Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company, pp.235-245. [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811296000\\_0015](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811296000_0015)
- European Commission, n.d. *Resilience dashboards*. [online] Available at: <[https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/new-push-european-democracy/strategic-foresight/resilience-dashboards\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/new-push-european-democracy/strategic-foresight/resilience-dashboards_en)> [Accessed 10 March 2026].
- Guston, D.H., 2014. Understanding 'anticipatory governance'. *Social Studies of Science*, [e-journal] 44 (2), pp.218-242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312713508669>
- Heo, K. and Seo, Y., 2021. Anticipatory governance for newcomers: lessons learned from the UK, the Netherlands, Finland, and Korea. *European Journal of Futures Research*, [e-journal] 9 (9), pp.3-92. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-021-00179-y>
- Johnston, K., 2026. Editorial: Anticipatory governance? Capacity for unintended policy outcomes. *Public Money & Management*, [e-journal] 46 (1), pp.1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2026.2578913>
- Kallo, J. And Välimaa, J., 2025. Anticipatory governance in government: the case of Finnish higher education. *Higher Education*, [e-journal] 89, pp.367-385 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01211-3>
- Kimbell, L. and Vesnić-Alujević, L., 2020. After the toolkit: anticipatory logics and the future of government. *Policy Design and Practice*, [e-journal] 3 (2), pp.95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2020.1763545>
- Likarchuk, N., Andrieieva, O., Likarchuk, D. and Bernatskyi, A., 2022. Impression marketing as a tool for building emotional connections in the public administration sphere. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 10 (1), pp.9-16.
- OECD, 2025. *Strategic Foresight Toolkit for Resilient Public Policy: Anticipatory governance in practice*. [online] January 21. Available at: <<https://www.oecd.org/>>

en/publications/foresight-toolkit-for-resilient-public-policy\_bcdd9304-en.html> [Accessed 10 March 2026].

Todisco, L., Mangia, G., Canonico, P. and Langella, F., 2025. Foreseeing the future: anticipatory governance as a response to the technological and managerial challenges in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, [e-journal] pp.1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2025-0109>

Umbach, G., 2024. Futures in EU governance: Anticipatory governance, strategic foresight and EU Better Regulation. *European Law Journal*, [e-journal] 30 (3), pp.409-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12519>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2024. *E-Government Survey 2024. Accelerating Digital Transformation for Sustainable Development – With the addendum on Artificial Intelligence*. [e-book] New York: United Nation. <https://doi.org/10.18356/9789211067286>

Vaquero-Piñeiro, C., Terribile, F. and Giovannini, E., 2025. Anticipatory governance systems: a review of approaches to design public policies for sustainable development. *Journal of Economic Interaction and Coordination*. [e-journal] <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11403-025-00471-1>

World Bank, 2024. *Worldwide Governance Indicators 2024 Update: Changes in Underlying Source Data*. [online] November 5. Available at: <<https://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/sites/govindicators/doc/wgisourcedatarevisions.pdf>> [Accessed 10 March 2026].

World Intellectual Property Organization, 2024. *Global Innovation Index 2024: Unlocking the Promise of Social Entrepreneurship*. [online] Geneva: WIPO. Available at: <[https://www.wipo.int/web-publications/global-innovation-index-2024/assets/67729/2000%20Global%20Innovation%20Index%202024\\_WEB3lite.pdf](https://www.wipo.int/web-publications/global-innovation-index-2024/assets/67729/2000%20Global%20Innovation%20Index%202024_WEB3lite.pdf)> [Accessed 10 March 2026].

Received: 11.03.2026; Accepted: 13.04.2026;

The article was first published online: 15.05.2026

## **ANTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE ЯК ІНСТРУМЕНТ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ СТРАТЕГІЧНОЇ СТІЙКОСТІ В СУЧАСНІЙ СИСТЕМІ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН**

**Лікарчук Дар'я Сергіївна**

*Кандидатка політичних наук, доцентка,  
доцентка кафедри євроінтеграційної політики,  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1603-7601>,  
e-mail: [likarchukd@gmail.com](mailto:likarchukd@gmail.com)*

*Навчально-науковий інститут публічного управління  
та державної служби Київського національного  
університету імені Тараса Шевченка,  
вулиця Академіка Ромоданова, 12/2, Київ, Україна, 04050*

Сучасна система міжнародних відносин характеризується станом «перманентної полікризи», де волатильність, невизначеність та поява «чорних лебедів» стають новою нормою. У цьому контексті концепція випереджального врядування (Anticipatory Governance) постає не просто як управлінська інновація, а як фундаментальна передумова виживання держави. Необхідність переходу від ліквідації наслідків до управління майбутнім через стратегічну адаптивність зумовлює критичну актуальність дослідження механізмів зміцнення національної стійкості (resilience). Основними цілями дослідження є критичний аналіз концептуальних засад випереджального врядування та обґрунтування його механізмів як життєво важливого інструменту зміцнення національної стратегічної стійкості в умовах мінливої динаміки сучасної системи міжнародних відносин. Дослідження ґрунтується на застосуванні загальнонаукових та спеціальних неемпіричних методів. Використано системний підхід для аналізу взаємозв'язку між державними інституціями та зовнішніми викликами. Компаративний аналіз дозволив порівняти моделі реактивного та проактивного управління. Метод дедукції і теоретичного моделювання застосовано для формування архітектури стратегічної стійкості, а сценарний аналіз – для визначення ролі форсайту в державному врядуванні. Доведено, що випереджальне врядування інтегрує три ключові компоненти: стратегічне прогнозування (foresight), мережеву взаємодію та адаптивну спроможність. Встановлено, що національна стратегічна стійкість у системі міжнародних відносин залежить від здатності держави інституціоналізувати «культуру майбутнього» у процесі прийняття рішень. Обґрунтовано, що використання

алгоритмів моніторингу слабких сигналів та інтеграція зворотного зв'язку в реальному часі дозволяють трансформувати державну систему з інертної структури в динамічну екосистему, здатну не лише протистояти шокам, а й розвиватися завдяки їм. Концептуалізація випереджального врядування дає можливість переосмислити роль держави на міжнародній арені: від об'єкта впливу глобальних процесів до суб'єкта, що активно моделює власну безпекову траєкторію. Впровадження механізмів Anticipatory Governance є базовим елементом розбудови національної стійкості, оскільки забезпечує інтелектуальну та організаційну готовність до майбутніх криз.

**Ключові слова:** Anticipatory Governance; стратегічна стійкість; міжнародні відносини; форсайт; державне управління; національна безпека.

