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Abstract

The research exposed problems related to socio-economic, political and social factors that directly or indirectly affect the security of the population on the European continent and the world. The analysis of cause-and-effect relations of the large-scale military invasion of the Russian Federation allows developing algorithms for implementing democratic processes for Ukraine and for the countries of the European Union EU, and the whole civilized world. The main scientific-research works devoted to the formation of democratic societies were also analyzed, defining the specificities and main features and strategic vectors of development. The population's perception of democracy, human rights and civil liberties in various European nations was evaluated by using a sociological survey. As a result of the research conducted, a model for the formation of democratic values as a basis for the establishment of a democratic society was developed. It is concluded that, it is desirable to develop further recommendations on practical measures to protect freedom and democracy as the basis of value orientations in the fight against military aggression and, the formation of the foundations of the future security architecture in the world.
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Resumen

En la investigación se expusieron problemas relacionados con factores socioeconómicos, políticos y sociales que afectan, directa o indirectamente, la seguridad de la población en el continente europeo y el mundo. El análisis de las relaciones de causa y efecto de la invasión militar a gran escala de la Federación Rusa permite desarrollar algoritmos para implementar procesos democráticos para Ucrania y para los países de la Unión Europea UE, y todo el mundo civilizado. También se analizaron los principales trabajos científico-investigativos dedicados a la formación de sociedades democráticas, definiendo las específicidades y principales características y vectores estratégicos de desarrollo. La percepción de la población sobre la democracia, los derechos humanos y las libertades ciudadanas en varias naciones europeas se evaluó mediante el uso de una encuesta sociológica. Como resultado de la investigación realizada, se desarrolló un modelo de formación de valores democráticos como base para el establecimiento de una sociedad democrática. Se concluye que, es conveniente desarrollar más recomendaciones sobre medidas prácticas para proteger la libertad y la democracia como base de las orientaciones de valores en la lucha contra la agresión militar y, la formación de los fundamentos de la futura arquitectura de seguridad en el mundo.

Palabras clave: agresión militar a gran escala; desafíos socioeconómicos; arquitectura de seguridad; libertad de expresión; geopolítica en Europa del este.

Introduction

The security systems of Europe have experienced significant challenges with the beginning of the full-scale military invasion of the Russian Federation into Ukraine. For the first time since the Second World War, the European continent faced a full-scale threat caused by an authoritarian regime and the results of propaganda work.

The methods of forming public opinion in support of the war in the Russian Federation are based on elements of propaganda that have been known since the time of the Nazi regime. Unfair mass media, work with opinion leaders, criminal prosecution of political opponents, and formation of a negative attitude in society towards persons who have a viewpoint opposite to the position of power determined the destruction of the fundamentals of society’s democratic development.
This caused mass emigration of the able-bodied population, political persecution, and a lack of a negative attitude against aggression on the territory of the aggressor country. Challenges to military aggression have become challenges to human rights, freedom, democracy, and international law in the civilized world. Ukraine, as an independent and sovereign state that received security guarantees from the world’s leading countries, including the Russian Federation, as part of the Budapest Memorandum, was subjected to a military attack.

Accordingly, it should be understood that the existing security architecture, the postulates of security guarantees, in particular, within the framework of individual regulatory documents in the UN international security system, do not work. The absence of effective mechanisms of influence on the aggressor countries has also been determined. The flow of refugees who were forced to move to European countries, the USA, Canada and other countries have become a new challenge for social and economic security.

More than 8 million refugees were forced to leave Ukraine affected social-economic and social-political processes. Support for Ukraine’s democratic aspirations, and its desire to join the European community and become a member of the international security system have created new challenges and requirements for establishing a democratic society at the global level.

Therefore, it is expedient to consider certain aspects of the influence on the processes of establishing democracy in different countries of the world and to identify those shortcomings that must be overcome to ensure the normal functioning of countries within the framework of an effective system of democratic international law.

Therefore, the purpose of the academic paper is to determine the cause-and-effect relationships of developing democratic processes and establishing security architecture as a new paradigm of social development.

To achieve the purpose of the research, the following aims were fulfilled, namely:

- a retrospective analysis of the cause-and-effect relationships of the largest military conflicts in the world and military aggression on the territory of the USSR and the countries of the former post-Soviet space was conducted;
- the interrelationships of the factors of developing democracy and ensuring peace in the territory of the countries of the former post-Soviet space and the countries of Europe were determined;
- a sociological survey of the relationship to democratic processes in Ukraine, European countries and the Russian Federation was conducted;
• factors affecting the population’s attitude to the development of democratic processes were determined;
• a model of the architecture of society’s democratic development as a future paradigm of social development was constructed.

1. Literature Review

Tolerance development is the cornerstone of a democratic society. Intercultural dialogue is the basis of global democratic development. Determining the mechanisms of forming a tolerant attitude of people toward each other in the conditions of global social-economic and social-political challenges is a significant task of scientific and applied studies.

Several scholars define the function of educational processes as a component of the core principles of democracy. The democratic values include the right to freedom of expression, freedom of thinking, participation in public life, and tolerance, i.e., freedom for all people without interfering with the rights of others (Roij, 2022).

The analysis of democratic challenges of a global nature made it possible to group the issues of democracy development: formation of authoritarian regimes and their spread, activation of terrorist organizations, fundamentalism, and organized crime. The reasons for this situation are imperfect mechanisms for implementing democratic rights and freedoms. International law is rather of a recommendatory nature.

After all, there are no effective mechanisms of influence on the implementation of normative approaches to the formation of democratic principles. Democracy formation is rather a task of civil society, which can only be done through developing public activity, education, the formation of tolerance and the development of intercultural ties, social security (Silander, 2022).

The concepts of social security and social development are significant elements of a democratic society. These concepts have a dynamic character, presenting national and regional differences of states and peoples. The formation of public and social features takes place under the influence of various historical processes, political, national, traditional, cultural, economic, geographical, climatic, and household differences.

Several authors analyze the processes of public and social security of the world’s largest democracy – the United States of America. The American nation has a unique character because its creation is based on multicultural and multinational features. The main value of society is freedom and democracy. Neoliberal concepts of development consist in establishing
social priorities and economic paradigms in their interrelationship (Dahms, 2022).

The global challenges of democratic societies, identified in the studies of numerous scientists, can be grouped into the following elements (Silander and Simunkombwe, 2022):

- freedom of choice, electability and accessibility to electoral bodies;
- freedom of speech, freedom of mass media, lack of restrictions on information in social networks;
- the priority of a people-centered approach when making social-economic and social-political decisions;
- protection of private property and a person’s economic interests;
- ensuring security;
- ensuring self-development, education, access to social services;
- equality and tolerance;
- freedom of political opinion, opportunities to express one’s opinion through public actions.

Negative tendencies in developing anti-democratic processes in poor countries are one of the global challenges. Only global transformations can ensure global development. The analysis of democratic transformations in African countries made it possible to identify the following issues (Silander and Malmgren, 2022):

- authoritarian regimes;
- lack of the population’s rights and freedoms;
- development of corruption;
- civil conflicts, terrorist threats;
- lack of protection of life and health, private property;
- lack of equitable regulatory and legal frameworks without divisions between private and public spheres of influence.

Military conflicts destroying the principles of freedom and democracy are a great challenge for the democratic, civilized world. Conducting a critical review of the impact of military actions on democratic processes made it possible to determine their influence on social-economic processes. Military conflicts have a negative impact on economic development, reducing the level of social security.
Concurrently, it is important to bear in mind that in the conditions of conflict, violent actions, physical injuries, and an important process during the conflict and after its end is social security, in particular, psychological and physiological rehabilitation, treatment, restoration of housing and life support infrastructure, etc. Therefore, in the conditions of social security requirements, the processes of democratic development take a back seat in the post-war reconstruction (Owens, 2022).

The Cold War is one of the examples of social needs in conditions of political instability. The development of countries with democratic fundamentals determined the provision of the population’s high life quality. At the same time, authoritarian societies lead to humanitarian and social problems, the solutions of which are related to openness to global processes, and not to ensuring development by extensive methods. This significantly limits the implementation of the potential of the country and its population (Prabhakar, 2022).

The Cold War affected various regions the countries of Africa, which were divided by geopolitical influence into capitalist and communist ones. The development of these countries depended only on external influences, and not through the formation of stable state entities, which are possible only in conditions of democratic development (Jean-Baptiste, 2022; Silander, 2022b).

The creation of a balance between democratic procedures and global challenges is a crucial issue in the context of the security architecture formation in the world. Security architecture is related to understanding the rules of the global world order and their acceptance by all players of the international geopolitical space (van Riet, 2022).

The Russian Federation’s full-scale military aggression against Ukraine posed new threats to global democracy and the security system that emerged after World War II. The aggressive policy of the aggressor country was provoked by the lack of effective mechanisms for containing military conflicts in the conditions of modern law and order in the global sense.

The formation of sustainable development priorities as a system of international world perception in the conditions of military aggression is determined by a system that requires significant transformations. Mechanisms of international positioning, developed and implemented by the UN, show their inefficiency, forasmuch as they cannot stop the bloody conflict (Bin-Nashwan et al., 2022; Lopatovska et al., 2022). Therefore, it is expedient to consider issues related to establishing a model of security architecture’s new processes in the conditions of new global challenges, in particular, the full-scale military aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine.
2. Methodology

The academic paper analyzes scientific studies of the processes of democracy development in various countries of the world, including those where military or civil conflicts took place. Based on the analysis, the cause-and-effect relationships of the processes of ensuring the country’s security and democratic changes were determined.

A comparative analysis of the cause-and-effect relationships of influencing factors and the consequences of development processes and oppression of democracy in different countries of the world made it possible to determine the prerequisites for the formation of military conflicts.

A sociological survey of the population of Ukraine and European countries (in 2022) and the population of the Russian Federation (in 2021 due to the lack of the possibility of performing a survey in 2022) was conducted concerning the issue of developing democracy in the country, national values, development priorities.

The research hypotheses were confirmed by correlation-regression analysis of sociological survey data and the relationships between democratic and human development indicators. A model of the architecture of the democratic advancement of society as a prospective paradigm of social development has been created using modeling techniques.

3. Results

As a result of studying literary sources representing the scientific and research works of several authors devoted to the issues of democracy’s role in the processes of social development and the construction of security architecture, the directions of social development that exert a significant influence on the formation of conditions for peace, security and global cooperation were determined, in particular, as follows:

- development of open good-neighborly relations based on mutual respect, tolerance, and recognition of the role of each nation and each state in the processes of global human development;
- determination of opportunities for open competition formation, fair access to international markets, formation of transparent mechanisms for the organization of the international trade system and fair distribution of income;
- creation of effective mechanisms for control of arms buildup systems and determination of effective mechanisms for deterring military aggression;
• development of international legal documents that would regulate foreign policy processes based on the supremacy of international law;

• formation of tolerance and tolerant attitude of people towards each other;

• creation of conditions for self-identification, development of national self-awareness without creating conditions for separatism development;

• freedom of speech, freedom of movement, freedom of public association, the impartiality of mass media and the possibility of free expression of will, struggle against political persecution and oppression on religious, political, ethnic and other grounds.

Analyzing the cause-and-effect relationships of military conflicts of recent years, world wars and political instability in the countries of the post-Soviet space and Europe, Table 1 was drawn up.

Table 1. Grouping of cause-and-effect relationships of military conflicts and social development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military conflict</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Social prerequisites</th>
<th>Implications for democracy development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World War I</td>
<td>Redistribution of geopolitical interests.</td>
<td>The significant branching of society into pluralistic and authoritarian monarchical ones. Technological backwardness, the need for social transformations in the territories that were under the power of the authoritarian monarchy, which significantly slowed down the processes of their development.</td>
<td>The spread of the processes of social development, the introduction of technologies, the cooperation of production processes, as a result, the improvement of the population’s standard of living and the formation of social values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>Redistribution of geopolitical interests, the consequences of territories’ distribution after the World War I, the struggle of totalitarian regimes.</td>
<td>The formation of totalitarian regimes aimed at military aggression's goals and expanding the territories of influence, the acquisition of territories with additional resources, the ideology of the superiority of some nations over others.</td>
<td>Destruction of nationalist ideology, transition to a new world order, formation of openness, freedom of Western democracies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War in North and South Korea</td>
<td>The struggle of a totalitarian communist regime against a democratic society.</td>
<td>The formation of two polar state formations – totalitarian communist and democratic, which promoted freedom and pluralism.</td>
<td>Global isolation of the totalitarian regime and the development of science, technology and economy in conditions of freedom as a form of motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War in Iraq</td>
<td>The fight against the totalitarian regime of Saddam Hussein, the distribution of spheres of influence in the Middle East.</td>
<td>Threats to democratic societies on the part of a totalitarian state, threats of international terrorism.</td>
<td>The development of democratic processes in the country; a negative aspect is social-economic instability and the lack of effective state institutions and security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War in Afghanistan</td>
<td>The geopolitical conflict that has been going on since the 1980s over the distribution of spheres of influence in Central Asia, the fight against terrorist groups and fundamentalism.</td>
<td>The presence of a clan system of power organization, geopolitical instability.</td>
<td>The destruction of the democratic society’s fundamentals that emerged in the country, the rise to power of Islamic fundamentalists with restrictions on the rights and freedoms of the population, poverty and lack of development in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-Chechen war</td>
<td>The struggle of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria for independence and withdrawal from the Russian Federation.</td>
<td>Activation of national resistance on the territory of the Russian Federation after the collapse of the USSR with demands for greater powers and/or independence.</td>
<td>Limitation of rights and freedoms, lack of practical implementation of legislative mechanisms that should operate on the territory of Chechnya, usurpation of power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-Georgian war</td>
<td>Struggle for influence on territories that were the cause of armed conflicts after the collapse of the Soviet Union.</td>
<td>Efforts to solve the problems of the frozen conflict related to territorial claims as a result of the collapse of the USSR and uncertainty in the issues of belonging to a number of territories (South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Transnistria, Nagorno-Karabakh).</td>
<td>The presence of unrecognized republics as territories that cannot fully develop due to an uncertain status, the formation of corrupt puppet authorities dependent on the Russian government in these territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War in Yugoslavia</td>
<td>The struggle against authoritarian regimes and genocide on national grounds.</td>
<td>Genocide organized by the ruling party, which represented the interests of the Serbs, an authoritarian regime that did not allow solving issues of a national nature through public discussion and establishing mutually beneficial conditions.</td>
<td>Disintegration of the country into territories based on national divisions, the development of freedom and democracy in new territories, unification with the European space, in particular, membership in the EU with the corresponding introduction of norms and standards specific to the EU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing the social causes and consequences of military conflicts, their role in the formation of democratic principles, and general laws was determined, which are presented in the form of the following hypotheses:

- authoritarian regimes maintain power on the basis of the formation of an internal or external enemy; the support of power in conditions of restriction of freedoms and democracy is connected with the unification of the population around the fight against a potential threat – democratic and free societies;

- military conflicts can lead to two starting points for the state: the first is negative – the destruction of the fundamentals of statehood, democratic institutions, the formation of totalitarian or authoritarian, sometimes religious fundamentalist regimes or military juntas with subsequent usurpation of power; the second is positive – the transition of the state from an authoritarian to a democratic society,

- democratic societies are characterized by pluralistic social phenomena, which are a form of people’s motivation for entrepreneurial activity, technological development, investment activity, obtaining a competitive education and improving qualifications. Pluralistic societies have significant advantages in development over authoritarian and totalitarian regimes in conditions of free competition and freedom of choice. Therefore, the struggle of democratic values with authoritarian restrictions is an element of society’s progress and development at the global level.

In order to confirm the proposed three hypotheses (authoritarian regimes are based on creating an image of the enemy and fighting against it; military conflicts can be the result of the decline of state institutions or the development of the democracy’s fundamentals; democratic societies
are more motivated in the aspect of ensuring development), it is proposed to conduct a retrospective analysis of the historical heritage and carry out a sociological survey, the form of which was developed and proposed in the research (it was described in the section on research methods).

To provide mathematical evidence for the relevance of the put-forward theories of cause-and-effect relationships in the development of democracy, available sociological data were analyzed and a sociological survey was conducted. The results of the sociological survey are represented in Fig. 1.

Table 2. A retrospective of historical events confirming the developed hypotheses of the interrelationship between democratic processes and military conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Historical events confirming it</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian regimes are based on creating an image of the enemy and fighting against it</td>
<td>The Nazi regime and the struggle with the Jews for the purity of Aryan blood; the communist regime and the struggle with capitalist countries; the totalitarian regime of North Korea and the struggle with the capitalist south. The Khmer Rouge regime in Cambodia that triggered the war with Vietnam. The authoritarian regimes of Iraq and Iran, which fought on religious grounds.</td>
<td>The overthrow of totalitarian regimes with the transition to democratic freedoms, the country's complete international isolation, the scaling of totalitarian terror due to the deterioration of the social-economic situation and the need to preserve power through repression due to the population's growing dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>Conducting a well-thought-out information policy aimed at preventing the formation of totalitarian regimes, implementing international programs for the development of civil society to form a system of resistance to such regimes, spreading the principles of democracy, the values of freedom and pluralism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military conflicts can be the result of the decline of state institutions or the development of the democracy's fundamentals</td>
<td>The decline of state institutions after the change of colonial regimes and the transfer of power to local elites; civil wars and social-economic instability of countries in Africa and Latin America (for example, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Myanmar, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan). Social-political instability due to the intervention of other states: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria.</td>
<td>The loss of powers by state institutions leads to the destruction of other institutions – social-economic ones. Such a system leads to a rapid increase in poverty, the impossibility of establishing effective economic processes, and a decrease in the level of the population's social security.</td>
<td>Formation of the conditions for developing democratic processes, primarily, in the formation of power systems, by adapting the world's leading experience and cooperation with international organizations in the field of peace and security.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Democratic societies are more motivated in the aspect of ensuring development.

Countries with a high level of economy development, social security, engineering and technology are democratic, open to global cooperation, tolerant and have priorities in ensuring the rights and freedoms of the population: the USA, Germany, France, Japan, South Korea, and South Africa.

Democratic processes create competitive conditions in the economy, entrepreneurship, and technology development. Self-regulation promotes the spread of social and economic development best practices. Accordingly, in the absence of restrictions, a person has motivation for development and self-fulfillment as a competitive advantage in the labor market, in business, social security, etc.

Implementation of deregulation processes, especially in economic systems, with the aim of providing the population with freedom of development, which is the basis of the state's development as a synergistic effect of developing individual subjects of economic activity, government, particular individuals, etc.

Source: prepared by the authors.

Analysis of the attitude towards democratic processes shows that democracy is a basic priority of state development for EU countries. More than 98% of respondents define it as a basic value; this indicator (99%) has been consistently high since 2021.

Analyzing indicators of the attitude to democracy in Ukraine, it is expedient to determine that this indicator is consistently high and has a steady upward trend. In 2022, this indicator reached its maximum of 95%. The development of the trend line’s projection, represented in Fig. 2, shows that by 2025, the indicator of the attitude towards democracy as a basic value of society in Ukraine will be similar to the indicators of the survey of respondents in the EU countries.
It is interesting that in 1995-1996, the indicator of the attitude to democracy in the Russian Federation was only 45% (almost half less than in the same period in Ukraine), and it increased in 2006. However, after developing a projection of the research results, it was determined that the indicator of democracy perception as a basic social value in Russia has a downward trend and may reach minimum values by 2025.

In order to understand such a rapid growth of attitudes towards democratic values in the conditions of an authoritarian power regime, it is expedient to determine the concepts included in the context of the democracy definition in the analyzed countries. The results of the sociological survey are represented in Fig. 2.
The results of the sociological survey determine that the indicator of the relationship to democratic processes of Ukraine and EU countries has smaller deviations than the indicators of the Russian Federation and European countries, where the deviations are significant. The greatest deviations are observed when it comes to specific human actions aimed at the formation of democratic values, for example, participation in strikes, boycotts, signing petitions, participation in elections, especially local ones. All these elements, in fact, are a manifestation of citizens’ participation in the formation of a democratic society. The indicators of such participation are minimal for the Russian Federation.

Considering the aggravation of the situation with manifesting freedom of speech and expressing will in 2022 in connection with full-scale military aggression and political persecution of persons who disagree with the
authorities’ standpoint, such public activity has only decreased in 2022. With low public activity of the population, there is a high level of support for the state government and the leader.

More than half of the respondents prioritize the need to obey the political will of the state leader, without questioning his decisions, whatever they may be (regarding restrictions on freedom of speech, political persecution, the formation of a corrupt system, bringing one’s friends and relatives to power, the hereditary transfer of power, changes to the constitution, starting a war, mobilization, etc.).

A strong military is the priority for the population, while the economy is the priority for democratic societies. Given that a third of the population defines the army as the basic purpose of the country; the level of trust in the army is lower than in democratic societies. Despite the high priority of law enforcement agencies as a system of supporting law and order and the existing state order, the majority of respondents define a higher level of danger than in democratic societies. Only a third of those surveyed define freedom of speech as a priority of a democratic society.

Therefore, it is expedient to note that according to the results of the conducted sociological survey, it was determined that authoritarian societies replace the democracy concept, defining it only as the stability of social-political processes.

The majority of respondents do not associate themselves with society as full-fledged members of this society; they do not define themselves as a person of the world, which determines distrust and limited contacts with representatives of other countries. This significantly limits the outlook and format of thinking of the population of authoritarian regimes, building an idea of the advantages of the existing political regime and determining its uniqueness.

It is proposed to analyze the results of assessing several indices: the democracy index, the human development index to confirm the hypothesis proposed in the research, that democratic societies are more motivated in the aspect of ensuring development. It was already partially confirmed by the results of a sociological survey, where it was revealed that respondents from Ukraine and EU countries identified their personal role in social-political and social-economic processes, as well as determined the priority of economic development.
Table 3. Correlation interrelationships of the democracy index, the human development index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place in the rating</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Democracy index</th>
<th>Human development index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>9,81</td>
<td>9,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>9,37</td>
<td>0,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9,26</td>
<td>9,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9,25</td>
<td>0,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9,24</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>9,20</td>
<td>0,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>9,15</td>
<td>9,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>8,83</td>
<td>9,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/74</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>5,81</td>
<td>0,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124/52</td>
<td>The Russian Federation</td>
<td>3,31</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164/151</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1,43</td>
<td>0,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165/188</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>0,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166/149</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>1,13</td>
<td>0,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source [Human Development Report, 2021; Democracy Index, 2021].

The indicator of the democracy index is calculated by determining such indicators as the electoral process and pluralism, the government’s functioning, participation in country’s political life, and the development of political culture and civil rights. That is, these indicators confirm the statement about the role of pluralism as an element of a democratic society. The indicator of the human development index is calculated as a set of indicators for determining the level of poverty, literacy, education, life expectancy, health care, social indicators, the level of environmental safety, GDP, the level of freedom of speech and other indicators.

Analyzing interrelationship’s indicators between the democracy index and the human development index, a high correlation dependence of the indicators was determined, namely 0,62. The confirmation of the developed hypothesis is also a place in the ranking of the democracy index and human development index calculation: the countries that are in the TOP-10 countries according to the democracy index are also found in the TOP-20 countries with the highest index of human development. Accordingly, the countries with the worst indicators of democratic development have the lowest indicators of the human development index, which statistically confirms the hypotheses developed in the research.
Based on the developed hypotheses, an architecture’s model of society’s democratic development as a future paradigm of social development was formed – Fig. 3.

**Fig. 3. Model of the architecture of society’s democratic development. Source: prepared by the authors.**

The developed model is represented as a system’s elements: input-output information that is transformed by implementing the proposed mechanisms.

### 4. Discussion

As a result of the research, hypotheses were put forward regarding the role of democratic transformations in social development and political processes. In particular, the influence of the cause-and-effect relationships of military aggression to the level of democracy in society was considered. One of the hypotheses determines that authoritarian regimes use military conflicts by forming the idea of external enemies as a tool to preserve the regime in conditions of social-economic development’s low indicators.

The absence of democratic processes is closely linked to inadequate measures of socio-economic progress, which was proven by analyzing
the role of pluralistic processes in motivating the population to engage in entrepreneurial and investment activity. The developed hypotheses are of a debatable nature. However, they were confirmed by the results of sociological surveys, their analytical studies and the determination of correlations between the democracy index and the human development index of the world’s countries.

In subsequent studies, it is planned to determine the transformations that took place with the beginning of full-scale military aggression regarding the main issues of Ukraine’s social development. Based on the conducted analysis, it is advisable to develop recommendations on practical measures to protect freedom and democracy as the basis of value orientations in the fight against military aggression and the formation of the fundamentals of the future security architecture in the world.

**Conclusion**

Through the comprehensive research conducted, specifically focusing on a retrospective examination of cause-and-effect dynamics within major global military conflicts and military aggression, a deeper understanding of the interplay between democracy development and peacekeeping factors has been achieved. The hypotheses formulated based on this analysis have been substantiated through a sociological survey that gauged public attitudes towards democratic processes in Ukraine, various European nations, and the Russian Federation.

Consequently, the culmination of this research effort has resulted in the formulation of a comprehensive model outlining the architectural framework for the future development of democratic societies, thus presenting a paradigm shift in social and political progress.

This model serves as a blueprint for shaping the trajectory of society, ensuring the realization of democratic ideals and fostering sustainable growth. By incorporating the findings and insights from this study, policymakers and stakeholders can effectively implement strategies and policies that facilitate democratic development, leading to enhanced stability and prosperity on both national and global scales.

The conducted research has yielded significant insights, not only in terms of retrospective analysis of cause-and-effect relationships within major military conflicts worldwide but also in understanding the complexities surrounding military aggression in the territory of the post-Soviet countries. By examining these historical events, it became evident that the development of democracy and the maintenance of peace are deeply intertwined factors.
Building upon this understanding, hypotheses were formulated and subsequently confirmed through a comprehensive sociological survey. The findings of this survey provided invaluable data to support the research outcomes and shed light on public perceptions of democracy in different regions.

Based on the accumulated knowledge and insights, a groundbreaking model for the architecture of society’s democratic development emerged. This model stands as a guiding framework, offering a vision for the future paradigm of social and political progress. It recognizes the fundamental importance of democratic principles in shaping the trajectory of societies and outlines strategies for their implementation.

By adopting this model, policymakers and stakeholders can effectively navigate the challenges of the ever-changing global landscape. It presents a blueprint for fostering democratic ideals, ensuring that societies are built on principles of freedom, equality, and justice. Moreover, it serves as a foundation for sustainable growth, as societies that embrace democratic values are more likely to experience stability and prosperity.

In practical terms, the implications of this research extend beyond theoretical discussions. The model’s recommendations can be translated into actionable measures aimed at protecting and promoting freedom and democracy in the face of military aggression. By prioritizing democratic values and integrating them into the fabric of society, nations can establish resilient security architectures that safeguard the well-being and aspirations of their citizens.

In conclusion, the conducted research has contributed to our understanding of the complex relationship between democracy, peace, and social-economic development. The developed model for society’s democratic development provides a forward-thinking approach to shape the future trajectory of nations, emphasizing the importance of democratic values as the bedrock of a prosperous and secure world.
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