SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH IDENTITY: META-PARADIGM OF HUMANITARIAN POLICY IN UKRAINE THROUGH THE PRISM OF SUBJECTIVE HUMAN RIGHTS

Iryna Ihnatchenko[1]
Yaroslava Ryabchenko[2]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-715-4-39

Abstract. This paper examines Ukraine's humanitarian policy as an object of administrative and legal analysis amid global transformations, wartime challenges, digitalization, and changes in the nature of interaction between the state and the individual. It substantiates the proposition that human life and health, culture, language, education, freedom of religion, and digital rights are becoming strategic factors of national security and societal sustainability. The authors propose an original concept of the "Sustainability through Identity" meta-paradigm, based on the premise that the resilience of the individual, society, and the state is linked to the ability to preserve, develop, and transform one's identity through the exercise and protection of subjective rights. In contrast to static resilience, sustainability is conceptualized as a dynamic four-stage continuum encompassing survival, recovery, qualitative renewal, and long-term sustainable development aligned with global UN benchmarks and national strategic priorities. The subject matter of the research comprises social relations in the field of humanitarian policy arising in the course of public administration and the provision of cultural, ethno-national, social, and digital human rights.

Purpose. The purpose of the research is to develop and provide a theoretical and legal justification for the "Sustainability through Identity" meta-paradigm as a conceptual model of the administrative and legal understanding of Ukraine's humanitarian policy; to systematize its five basic

[1] Candidate of Legal Sciences, Candidate of Art Studies,
Associate Professor of the Department of Administrative Law,
National University of Law named after Yaroslav the Wise, Ukraine
[2] Candidate of Legal Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department of Administrative Law,
National University of Law named after Yaroslav the Wise, Ukraine

© Iryna Ihnatchenko, Yaroslava Ryabchenko

paradigms (“Partnership and Security,” “United in Diversity,” “Care for Life,” “Traditions and Modernization,” and “Innovations for the Future”); and to reveal the administrative and delictual mechanism for ensuring their implementation.

Methodology. The research methodology comprises systemic, structural-functional, formal-legal, and comparative-legal methods, as well as the paradigmatic approach. The study analyzes constitutional principles, Ukrainian national legislation, international human rights protection standards (UNESCO, the Council of Europe, and the EU), and the competence of public administration bodies.

Results. The findings demonstrate that the subjective right serves as the legal form for recognizing and protecting the identity dimension of the individual, while public administration functions as a mechanism for creating the relevant legal, organizational, and resource conditions. Particular attention is paid to administrative procedure as a guarantee of the exercise of subjective human rights, as well as to legal, in particular administrative, liability as the delictual dimension of the meta-paradigm (Delict / Liability aspect of the Meta-paradigm). The study demonstrates that the five paradigms form an integrated system for ensuring identity resources, ranging from freedom of conscience and security to knowledge, technology, and the digital future. Furthermore, the article establishes that administrative regulation transforms from punitive control into a positive state obligation to ensure human-centric public services.

Practical implications. The practical significance of the research lies in the possibility of using the concept to systematize legislation, delineate the competences of public administration actors, improve administrative procedures, and develop indicators for the effectiveness of public administration under conditions of war and global transformation.

Value/originality. The scientific novelty and value of the research consist in developing a consistent legal construct: identity – subjective right – state obligation – public administration – administrative and legal and delictual mechanism – guarantee and protection of rights. It provides a novel systemic bridge between human self-determination, risk-based administrative governance, and state sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

Relevance of the Topic and Problem Statement. The contemporary stage of Ukraine's development requires a qualitative rethinking of the interaction between the state and the individual under conditions of military aggression, digitalization, implementation of artificial intelligence, and European integration. Humanitarian policy acquires particular relevance, reflecting the worldview, religious, linguistic, ethnic, cultural, social, and digital dimensions of human identity. The traditional sectoral approach operates through fragmented regulation, which necessitates a paradigm shift – a transition from state control to partnership, care, and the digital transformation of public administration.

The solution to this fragmentation lies in the elaboration of the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm. The category of *Sustainability* is defined as both a resource and a dynamic process encompassing a sequence of: 1) survival; 2) recovery; 3) renewal; 4) sustainable development. This framework aligns with the UN Sustainable Development Goals [45] and Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34], where sustainable development is linked to the constitutional rights of the individual and social cohesion.

Review of Scientific Research and Publications. The theoretical and legal foundation for researching the general principles of public administration, the rule of law, and mechanisms for ensuring subjective human rights is formed by the works of V. Averianov, Yu. Bytyak, I. Boiko, V. Harashchuk, Yu. Heorhiievskyi, V. Zui, I. Ihnatchenko, T. Kolomoiets, Ya. Riabchenko, T. Slinko, O. Soloviova, V. Somina, and O. Cherviakova [1; 30; 69].

– Research into the five core directions relies on the scholarly contributions of:

– *Partnership and Security* (public-private partnership, social communications, freedom of conscience): O. Buchma, V. Vasylenko, I. Verkhovod, Yu. Heorhiievskyi, Yu. Yenakaiev, A. Kolodnyi, I. Kostenko, A. Marchyshak, I. Maslova, Yu. Mekh, M. Nesterova, S. Odak, R. Oleksenko, O. Ratsul, V. Tytarenko, V. Turenko, L. Fylypovych, Ya. Yuvsechko, and others;

– *United in Diversity* (ethnopolitics, language policy): V. Kotyhoroshko, I. Kresina, O. Maiboroda, and others;

– *Care for Life* (healthcare, medical law, social protection): A. Berlach, O. Zyma, M. Mendzhul, V. Pashkov, I. Senyuta, S. Stetsenko, and others;

– *Traditions and Modernization* (cultural policy, heritage): V. Akulenko, O. Hrytsenko, I. Ihnatchenko, and others;

– *Innovations for the Future* (digital transformation, artificial intelligence, digital rights): M. Babik, M. Bielova, O. Vinnik, V. Dobrovolskyi, T. Yehorova-Lutsenko, Yu. Zhornokui, O. Zozulia, A. Krakovska, V. Machuskyi, D. Orziantseva, V. Piddubna, O. Punda, O. Ruban, D. Sadovska, V. Titova, V. Tkachenko, B. Shcherbyna, Shch. Yavor, O. Yavorska, O. Yatsenko, and others.

At the same time, a comprehensive integration of all five directions within a single meta-paradigm remains insufficiently developed.

Conceptual Foundations and Legal Logic. The meta-paradigm is grounded in a legal transformation chain: a) self-awareness; b) self-identification; c) identity; d) legal recognition; e) subjective right; f) the state's obligation to ensure it.

The key model is expressed by the construct: identity (content) – subjective right (form) – public administration (mechanism) – sustainability (result).

The research model encompasses five interconnected paradigms of humanitarian policy: *Partnership and Security*, *United in Diversity*, *Care for Life*, *Traditions and Modernization*, and *Innovations for the Future*, each revealing a specific dimension of human identity.

The objective of the study is the theoretical and legal substantiation of the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm as a conceptual model for an administrative-legal understanding of Ukraine's humanitarian policy through the prism of subjective human rights and the mechanisms of their public administration provision.

Research tasks:

– to reveal the essence of the paradigm shift in public administration and the correlation between identity and subjective rights;

– to define the normative basis of the meta-paradigm in the context of the UN Sustainable Development Goals [45] and Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34];

– to characterize the content of the five humanitarian policy paradigms and rethink the "state–individual" balance toward partner interaction;

– to analyze institutional, procedural, and delictual mechanisms for the realization of subjective rights in the humanitarian sphere;

– to determine the role of digitalization and artificial intelligence as a factor in the transformation of public administration.

Object of the study: social relations in the sphere of formation and implementation of Ukraine's humanitarian policy.

Subject of the study: the administrative-legal meta-paradigm *Sustainability through Identity*, its five core paradigms, legal norms, administrative procedures, legal (administrative) liability, and mechanisms for ensuring subjective human rights.

The methodological framework of the research relies on specialized legal and general scientific methods. The paradigmatic method was used to substantiate the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm and delineate its five core paradigms. The systemic-structural method enabled the analysis of humanitarian policy as an integrated system uniting institutional, procedural, and delictual elements. The axiological and human-centered methods provided the basis for rethinking the "state–individual" balance and framing human identity as a core value. The comparative-legal method was applied to align national legislation with UN and EU standards, while the formal-legal method served to analyze legal norms, administrative procedures, and legal constructs.

Scientific Novelty and Practical Significance of the Results. The scientific novelty lies in the development of an integrated legal construct connecting the provision of human identity with the category of sustainability (*Sustainability*) through the toolkit of subjective rights and public administration procedures. The practical significance consists in the potential application of the results for systematizing Ukrainian legislation, optimizing the competence of public administration entities, and harmonizing domestic law with EU standards.

1. Meta-Paradigm "Sustainability Through Identity"

Contemporary security challenges, full-scale military aggression, digitalization processes, and Ukraine's European integration commitments require a qualitatively new understanding of public administration in the humanitarian sphere. The traditional sectoral regulatory model proves to be fragmented, as it treats individual spheres of social life (culture, education,

language, religion, healthcare) as isolated objects of authority's influence. A systemic response to these challenges is the author's *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm, which unites various directions of humanitarian policy around ensuring subjective human rights and preserving human multidimensional identity.

The proposed meta-paradigm is grounded in a fundamental theoretical and legal construct: Identity (content) – Subjective right (form) – Public administration (implementation mechanism) – Sustainability (result).

Within the framework of this concept, the category of *Sustainability* is considered not as a static state, but as a dynamic system of resources of society and the state, encompassing four interconnected dimensions:

– survival resource – ensuring basic security, preserving life, physical and mental health of the individual;

– recovery resource – restoring violated rights, social rehabilitation, overcoming the consequences of crisis, and infrastructure reconstruction;

– renewal and transformation resource – qualitative re-evaluation of institutions, modernization of legislation, adaptation to digital challenges and artificial intelligence;

– sustainable development resource – long-term societal progress based on human potential, aligned with the UN Sustainable Development Goals [45].

In this context, a fundamental distinction is built between the concepts of *Resilience* and *Sustainability*. While *Resilience* defines the system's capacity to withstand an external shock and return to its initial state, *Sustainability* is a broader category that encompasses the capabilities to survive, recover, qualitatively renew, and ensure continuous sustainable development by maintaining the internal resource – human identity.

1.1. Concept and Foundations of Meta-Paradigm

In this study, humanitarian policy is defined as the purposeful activity of public administration entities aimed at creating legal, organizational, institutional, and resource conditions for the implementation and protection of subjective human rights related to an individual's personal, linguistic, religious, cultural, physical, social, and digital development. Humanitarian policy loses its purely sectoral character and acquires a human-centered

orientation: its unifying object is the individual as the bearer of subjective rights and the subject of their own identity.

An administrative-legal paradigm is a conceptual model for understanding and organizing public administration, which determines the nature of interaction between the state and the individual, the goals and functions of public authority, the system of entities and their powers, principles of legal regulation, administrative procedures, and means of legal liability within a specific sphere of social relations. In the humanitarian sphere, the administrative-legal paradigm additionally defines the model of recognition, provision, and protection of subjective human rights associated with various dimensions of individual identity.

The systemic structure of the administrative-legal paradigm encompasses the following constituent elements:

– normative-value element (goals and principles): rule of law, proportionality, transparency, non-discrimination, human dignity;

– institutional element (entities and bodies): executive authorities, local self-government bodies, civil society institutions;

– regulatory element (legislation): international standards, constitutional norms, laws, and bylaws;

– procedural element (administrative procedures): algorithms for implementing and protecting individual rights, providing public services, appealing decisions;

– delictual element (legal liability): a mechanism for protecting and stabilizing the entire legal system, which reacts to breaches of balance in "Individual–State" legal relations.

The introduction of the meta-paradigm entails a *paradigm shift*–the transition from the traditional command-and-control model of public governance to a partner-based and human-centered one. The state ceases to act exclusively as a subject of authoritative coercion or the source of rights, transforming into a favorable institutional environment and a partner that guarantees conditions for personal self-realization.

The operationalization of the proposed meta-paradigm is achieved through five core paradigms, each defining a specific sustainability resource (*Sustainability*) and a corresponding legal dimension of identity:

– *Partnership and Security*: oriented toward religious and worldview identity, a resource of security and trust;

– *United in Diversity*: encompasses linguistic and ethnic identity, a resource of social cohesion;

– *Care for Life*: directed toward physical and psychological identity, a resource of health and rehabilitation;

– *Traditions and Modernization*: relies on cultural identity, a resource of historical memory and heritage;

– *Innovations for the Future*: reflects digital and technological identity, a resource of knowledge, artificial intelligence, and development.

The regulatory legal foundation of the meta-paradigm is grounded in the principles of international law and national legislation. The international legal level is formed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [42], the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights [44], the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights [35], the Convention on the Rights of the Child [43], the European Convention on Human Rights [3], the European Charter of Local Self-Government [4], the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities [6], the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages [5], the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict [38], UNESCO Conventions of 1972, 2003, and 2005 [39; 40; 41], as well as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights [13] and the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU [14].

The national legal foundation of the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm is rooted in the Constitution of Ukraine [50] as the foundational act establishing fundamental guarantees of the rule of law, human rights, and sovereign identity. Its operational level encompasses specialized sector-specific Ukrainian legislation spanning the entire spectrum of its thematic dimensions: public security and legal partnership, language policy harmonization and the protection of national community rights, humanitarian protection, healthcare, and social welfare, alongside cultural heritage preservation, freedom of conscience, institutional governance renewal, digitalization, and administrative procedure modernization. The overarching strategic vector for aligning this domestic legal framework with international standards is established by Presidential Decree No. 722/2019 [34] in synergy with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [45].

The administrative-legal mechanism for implementing the meta-paradigm through the Law of Ukraine "On Administrative Procedure" [60] ensures the translation of declarative subjective rights into clear, transparent, and legally protected algorithms of interaction between citizens and public authorities, guaranteeing the stability of the state through the preservation and development of each individual's identity.

1.2. Identity and Subjective Public Rights

Rethinking identity in the context of public law regulation requires moving beyond a narrow dogmatic understanding of law and addressing its primary human-centered source. The formation of the legal dimension of identity is a sequential process that unfolds from the individual's primary self-awareness to self-identification, awareness of belonging, formation of a socially significant identity, its legal recognition, and, ultimately, normative consolidation in the form of a subjective right. At the initial stage, an individual becomes aware of their own "Self," defines subjective values, orientation, and their belonging to linguistic, cultural, religious, social, or professional communities. However, not every characteristic of personal self-determination constitutes a legal category. Identity acquires legal significance when the state recognizes the corresponding sphere of human self-determination, consolidates it in the form of a subjective right, creates procedural mechanisms for its implementation, provides legal protection, and defines the boundaries of permissible public interference.

In this regard, identity within the context of the administrative-legal paradigm is defined as an individual's conscious perception and determination of their belonging to specific personal, cultural, linguistic, religious, physical, psychological, social, digital, and other communities and characteristics that shape their self-perception and require legal recognition, respect, provision, and protection by public administration entities. Identity is not reduced exclusively to formal documentary attributes (name, citizenship, or entries in state registers); it is a dynamic, multidimensional phenomenon.

Identity acts not as a separate sectoral paradigm, but as a cross-cutting fundamental element of the entire meta-paradigmatic construct. It encompasses various dimensions of an individual's existence: worldview and religious, linguistic and ethnic, physical and psychological

(the dimension of bodily integrity and health), cultural and artistic, as well as digital and technological. Each of the five core paradigms answers the question of what specific public-law and social resource is necessary for the individual and society to preserve, restore, develop, or transform the corresponding dimension of their identity. Specifically, the *Partnership and Security* paradigm is oriented toward providing a resource of trust for religious identity; *United in Diversity* – a resource of cohesion for linguistic and ethnic identity; *Care for Life* – a resource of health and rehabilitation for physical and mental identity; *Traditions and Modernization* – a resource of historical memory for cultural identity; *Innovations for the Future* – a resource of knowledge and artificial intelligence for digital identity.

The transition from substantive content (identity) to its legal expression is accomplished through the institution of subjective rights. Subjective human rights within the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm are considered as legally recognized and normatively guaranteed possibilities for an individual to preserve, realize, develop, and transform various dimensions of their identity, as well as to demand that the state create appropriate legal, organizational, procedural, and resource conditions for their exercise and protection. In this system, the subjective right serves as a connecting link between an individual's internal self-identification and the external public legal order. It transforms natural human needs and interests into legally binding requirements addressed to public administration entities.

Within the proposed approach, the differentiation of the roles of the individual and the state is critically important: the state does not authoritatively determine or impose identity upon the individual, which would correspond to a paternalistic model, but rather creates a favorable institutional environment. The operational scheme of this mechanism unfolds as a sequential system of interconnected stages: from the human personality and self-awareness–to the formation of identity and its legally significant manifestations, which take the form of a subjective right, entail a legal duty of the state, and set in motion the mechanism of public administration (where the legal norm defines powers, is implemented through an administrative procedure, and materializes in a public service or decision), guaranteed by means of judicial and administrative protection, secured by legal liability, and yielding the ultimate result in the form of

sustainability (*Sustainability*) of the individual, society, and the state. Thus, the administrative-legal dimension of a subjective right encompasses not only the measure of an individual's permissible conduct, but also the imperative obligation of public administration regarding the fulfillment of both negative obligations (refraining from unlawful interference) and positive actions (creating infrastructure, procedures, and providing public services).

The constitutional matrix for ensuring identity through subjective rights is formed by the principles of the inalienability and inviolability of human rights (Art. 21 of the Constitution of Ukraine), the non-exhaustive nature of their list and the prohibition of reducing the content and scope of existing rights (Art. 22), as well as the right of everyone to the free development of their personality (Art. 23). The detailing of identity dimensions relies on a system of constitutional guarantees: rights to life and dignity (Arts. 27, 28), privacy and personal data protection (Art. 32), freedom of thought, speech, and information (Art. 34), freedom of worldview and religion (Art. 35), freedom of association (Art. 36), healthcare (Art. 49), education (Art. 53), as well as freedom of artistic, scientific, and technical creation and access to cultural heritage (Art. 54) [50].

The international legal dimension confirms the positive nature of state obligations regarding the support of identity. The UN Human Rights Committee, in General Comment No. 23 to Art. 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, emphasizes that the effective protection of identity requires the state to take positive legal and administrative measures [60]. Furthermore, the European Court of Human Rights, in its case law concerning Art. 9 and Art. 8 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, consistently distinguishes between the sphere of internal self-determination (*forum internum*), which is not subject to any limitations, and the sphere of external manifestation of identity (*forum externum*), where limitations are possible exclusively on the basis of law in clearly defined public interests [12; 10].

On this basis, the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm can be formulated as a conceptual model of the administrative-legal understanding of humanitarian policy, in which the sustainability (*Sustainability*) of the individual, society, and the state is achieved by ensuring the legal possibility to preserve, develop, and transform an individual's multidimensional

identity through the institutions of subjective rights, positive duties of public administration, and effective administrative procedures.

1.3. State–Individual Balance: Administrative Paradigm Shift

The fundamental basis of the author's meta-paradigm is the rethinking of the "state–individual" correlation in the public law domain. The traditional state-centered model of public administration viewed the personality primarily as an object of authoritative influence, imperative regulation, and administrative control. In contrast, modern humanitarian policy is based on a human-centered balance, in which the individual acts as the primary bearer of inalienable subjective rights, while the state serves as their institutional guarantor, facilitator, and equal partner. This balance requires renouncing the unconditional dominance of public interest in favor of harmonizing public interest with the provision of conditions for the free development of personality, human dignity, and self-determination.

The key theoretical mechanism of such a transformation is the *paradigm shift*, defined as a change in the conceptual model of understanding the interaction between public authority and the individual, which entails a restructuring of the goals, functions, legal means, and procedural mechanisms of public administration. A paradigm shift is not identical to a routine alteration of legislative norms: it signifies a profound transformation of the normative logic itself–an answer to the question of for whom the state functions, what tasks it resolves, and what instruments it operates. In the humanitarian sphere, this shift marks the transition from a command-and-control system of authoritative coercion to partner-based and service-oriented models of public governance.

The internal architecture of the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm encompasses five systemic paradigm shifts. Each of them expresses a transition from an outdated model to a modern one, relies on a specific sustainability resource (*Sustainability*), establishes a subjective formula for the individual's relationship with the surrounding world, and is characterized by its own system of core semantic accents:

– In the *Partnership and Security* paradigm, a shift occurs from administrative control of the religious and worldview spheres to partnership and security. The specific resource source here is trust, the subjective formula is "I and my convictions," and the key semantic accent is the protection of

freedom of conscience and the provision of a secure environment for the realization of worldview identity.

– In the *United in Diversity* paradigm, a shift is carried out from linguistic-ethnic and cultural unification to the recognition and legal protection of diversity. Its resource lies in social cohesion, the subjective formula is expressed as "I and my belonging," and the semantic accent becomes anti-discrimination provision and balancing the interests of different communities.

– In the *Care for Life* paradigm, a shift unfolds from purely normative-bureaucratic regulation of the health sphere to human-centered care and recovery. It relies on the resource of physical and mental health, is embodied in the formula "I and my body and spirit," and its semantic accent is comprehensive medical-social rehabilitation and respect for human dignity.

– In the *Traditions and Modernization* paradigm, a shift takes place from preserving cultural heritage as an end in itself to combining the continuity of tradition with its modern transformation. This model mobilizes the resource of cultural memory, is expressed in the formula "I and my memory," and its semantic accent is digitalization and the innovative development of cultural heritage.

– In the *Innovations for the Future* paradigm, a shift is realized from utilizing technologies as an auxiliary tool to the digital transformation of the public governance system itself. It relies on the resource of knowledge and artificial intelligence, functions according to the formula "I and my future," and its semantic accent is ensuring human digital rights and ethical control over algorithmic decisions.

Thus, the final balance between the state and the individual in the meta-paradigm is achieved not through neutralizing differences or paternalistic pressure, but through the functioning of public administration as an institutional guarantor that, through subjective rights, creates conditions for realizing all dimensions of human identity.

2. Administrative-Legal Constructs of Humanitarian Policy Paradigms

This section carries out the practical operationalization of the *Sustainability through Identity* meta-paradigm through a sequential analysis of its five core paradigms. Each of them is examined as an independent administrative-legal construct grounded in a single legal matrix: from

defining an individual's subjective right through the corresponding relationship formula ("I and...") and mobilizing the sustainability resource – to normative-legal consolidation, the competence of public entities, the regulation of administrative procedures, and the application of cutting-edge digital tools. A systemic study of specific paradigm shifts in each sphere reveals the transformation of public governance from a command-and-control model to service- and partner-oriented provision of various dimensions of human identity.

2.1. Paradigm "Partnership and Security" Legal Mechanism

The *Partnership and Security* paradigm (subjective formula: *"I and my freedom of conscience"*) is a public-law model for ensuring an individual's religious and worldview identity under conditions of military threats and societal crises. In this system, the paradigm shift consists of a transition from passive formal non-interference or isolation of the religious sphere to its active public-law provision, where security acts not as a basic limitation on freedom, but as an indispensable condition for its actual realization.

The key semantic accent of this paradigm is the concept of *sacral citizenship* and the vector *from the temple – to the trench and the shelter*, expressed as a conscious combination of religious identity with active civic responsibility, wherein religious values become the ethical foundation for serving the people, and the fulfillment of civic duty (defense of the state, volunteering) acquires the features of a sacred act [20, p. 2302]. The state does not ensure the religiosity of an individual per se, but creates legal guarantees for preserving their identity in places where civic duty is fulfilled, medical treatment is received, or evacuation occurs, where faith transforms into a resource for social sustainability, volunteering, and national resistance.

Normative Legal Matrix and the Legality of Limitations

The correlation between freedom of conscience and public security relies on a clear distinction between two levels of legal protection:

– *Forum internum* (internal freedom): the right to hold, adopt, or change religion or belief (Art. 18 of the ICCPR [35], Art. 9 of the ECHR [3], Arts. 35, 64 of the Constitution of Ukraine [50]). It is absolute in nature and not subject to limitations even during martial law.

– *Forum externum* (external manifestation): worship, rites, and activities of religious organizations. Emerging legal conflicts and countering the instrumentalization of the religious sphere (specifically the ideology of the "Russian world") are resolved through the concept of a *neutral yet cooperative state* and the application of the ECtHR three-part test: assessment of measures according to the criteria of legality, legitimacy of aim (protection of public order and national security), and necessity in a democratic society [20].

According to the European Commission Report of November 4, 2025, and the OSCE/ODIHR Guidelines, countering external influence must not lead to arbitrary restrictions on rights, particularly regarding alternative (non-military) service or the legal personality of communities [9; 33].

Subjects and Administrative Procedures

The administrative-legal mechanism for implementing the paradigm encompasses the activities of specialized public administration entities and clearly regulated procedures:

– Composition of subjects: Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, State Service of Ukraine for Ethnopolitics and Freedom of Conscience (DESS), Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, military command bodies, healthcare institutions, and penal institutions.

– Administrative procedures: registration procedures for acquiring legal personality; procedures for changing affiliation; accreditation and appointment of military and civilian chaplains (pursuant to the Law of Ukraine "On the Military Chaplaincy Service" [59]); procedures for verifying affiliation with foreign religious centers of the aggressor state (according to the Law of Ukraine No. 3894-IX of August 20, 2024) [65]; mechanisms for administrative appeal of public authority decisions.

Such an approach transforms freedom of conscience from an abstract constitutional declaration into a genuinely protected subjective right, which is realized in a safe public environment [23].

Thus, the implementation of the *Partnership and Security* paradigm establishes a normative link between freedom of conscience, public-private partnership, and administrative-delictual protection. This direction directly implements UN Sustainable Development Goals 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) and 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) [45], while simultaneously operationalizing sub-points 16 and 17 of Point 1 of Decree

of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34]. These provisions mandate the creation of accountable, transparent, and inclusive public institutions and foster multi-stakeholder partnerships as key guarantees of national security and societal sustainability.

2.2. Paradigm "United in Diversity" Legal Framework

The *United in Diversity* paradigm (European benchmark: *United in Diversity*; subjective formula: *"I and my belonging"*) serves as a conceptual model of public administration aimed at ensuring an individual's ethnic, linguistic, and cultural identity while simultaneously preserving the integrity of a unified constitutional domain. The paradigm shift in this sphere consists of a decisive transition from forced assimilation and societal unification to integration based on the recognition of diversity, where language and ethnic affiliation are perceived not as a problem or threat, but as a resource for social cohesion and national sustainability.

The semantic accent and *signature legal concept* of the paradigm is the metaphor of "little diamonds" combined with the concept of "The Ukrainian language is the queen in the round dance of languages." The term *minority* (from the English *minority* – smaller), elaborated in the decisions of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine (No. 10-rp/99, No. 1-r/21 [28; 29]), defines the numerical minority of a language group rather than inferiority or "smallness" of people. Minority languages are not "small people" (minorities), but rare "little diamonds" that require revitalization and state protection. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian language, as the state language, creates an overarching communication framework around which the diversity of other languages freely functions and [21].

Normative Legal Matrix and the Legality of Limitations

The provision of linguistic and cultural rights is grounded in Articles 10, 11, 24, and 53 of the Constitution of Ukraine [50], Articles 19 and 27 of the ICCPR [35], and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities [6]:

– Harmonization of the state language and community rights: Establishing the mandatory status of the Ukrainian language in the public domain (Law of Ukraine of April 25, 2019 No. 2704-VIII [57]) pursues a legitimate aim, complies with the principle of proportionality, and does not constitute discrimination, as confirmed by the CCU. It safeguards

state sovereignty without infringing upon individuals' rights in the private sphere, while guaranteeing the protection of indigenous peoples and minority communities (Law of Ukraine of December 13, 2022 No. 2827-IX [61]).

– Updating of the Charter and the security safeguard: The Law of Ukraine of December 3, 2025 No. 4699-IX updated the official translation of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, marking a transition from the "protection of groups of people" to the "protection and preservation of endangered languages." The Russian language was officially removed from the list of protected languages in Ukraine, as its instrumentalization by the aggressor state threatens the constitutional order and national security [67]. State protection extends to 18 minority languages.

Subjects and Administrative Procedures

The institutional system of public administration within this paradigm comprises the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the State Service of Ukraine for Ethnopolitics and Freedom of Conscience (DESS), the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, the Secretariat of the Commissioner for the Protection of the State Language, and local self-government bodies.

The administrative-legal mechanism operates through the following procedures:

– Procedures for providing public services in the languages of indigenous peoples and minority communities in areas of their compact settlement within the limits defined by law;

– Administrative procedures in the education system (ensuring the study of the native language alongside proper mastery of the state language);

– Control and monitoring procedures of DESS regarding compliance with the right to non-discrimination;

– Mechanisms for reviewing complaints and administrative appeals of public authority decisions by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights and the Commissioner for the Protection of the State Language;

– Digital procedures for storing, cataloging, and promoting minority languages via digital registries and educational platforms.

Through this, the *United in Diversity* paradigm ensures a legal balance between the functioning of the Ukrainian language as a consolidating factor

of the state and the protection of an individual's subjective right to preserve their ethno-cultural identity [23; 24].

Furthermore, the functioning of this outlined mechanism serves as an important condition for ensuring the sustainable development of the state. The implementation of the *United in Diversity* paradigm aligns with the strategic benchmarks defined by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019. Specifically, the proper protection of ethno-national and linguistic rights makes a direct contribution to achieving Goal 10 ("Reduced Inequalities") and Goal 16 ("Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions"), laying the groundwork for an inclusive society, interethnic harmony, and long-term legal sustainability of the state [34; 45].

2.3. Paradigm "Care for Life" Implementation Mechanism

The *Care for Life* paradigm (English benchmark: *Care for Life*; subjective formula: *"I and my right to health"*) defines a conceptual model of public administration aimed not only at preserving human biological existence, but also at restoring an individual's capacity for full, independent, and socially active life activity. The paradigm shift consists of a decisive transition from a repressive-supervisory or purely curative model to a service-oriented state of continuous care (*care*): from the initial preservation of life – to systemic rehabilitation, adaptation, and reintegration of the individual into society.

The signature legal concept and legal accent of the paradigm is the concept of the "Right to return to life" ("Right to restore oneself"), embodying the principle "From survival – to life." Under conditions of war and post-war recovery, an individual who has suffered trauma, lost limbs, or lost work capacity has the right not merely to receive a medical service, but to restore their own human subjectivity. Health and the capacity for recovery are viewed as a fundamental resource for preserving personal identity.

Normative Legal Matrix and International Standards

The construct of the paradigm relies on the harmonization of constitutional guarantees and international legal standards:

– *International and constitutional dimension*: Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Art. 25) [42], ICESCR (Art. 12–the right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and Art. 11 – an adequate

standard of living) [44], Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Art. 25) [36], and the case law of the ECtHR (in particular, the case *Yakovenko v. Ukraine* regarding inadequate medical care as a violation of Arts. 2 and 3 of the ECHR [3; 11]), combined with Articles 3, 27, 28, 46, 48, 49, and 50 of the Constitution of Ukraine [50], form an integrated legal framework.

Specialized and wartime legislation: The core principles are operationalized through the Fundamentals of Health Care Legislation of Ukraine [47], the Laws of Ukraine "On the Public Health System" [62], "On Mental Health" [66], among others. Of strategic significance are the Law of Ukraine "On Rehabilitation in Healthcare" (No. 1053-IX, as amended on January 1, 2026) [58] and the Law of Ukraine of August 19, 2026 No. 4954-IX [68], which strengthened guarantees for military personnel, veterans, and released prisoners of war for free prosthetics, functional restoration, and receipt of assistive rehabilitation technologies.

Digitalization and telemedicine: Pursuant to the Law of Ukraine of August 9, 2023 No. 3301-IX, telemedicine and telerehabilitation (via the eHealth and Helsi systems) transformed from a technological convenience into an administrative-legal mechanism for ensuring the accessibility of the subjective right to medical care under martial law and destroyed infrastructure [63].

Subjects and Administrative Procedures

Public administration in this sphere is provided by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Ministry of Health of Ukraine (MoH), the National Health Service of Ukraine (NHSU), the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine, the Coordination Center for Mental Health, military medical structures, and local self-government bodies.

The administrative-legal mechanism is implemented through the following procedures:

– Procedures for providing free rehabilitation and medical services under the state guarantees program;

– Procedures for multidisciplinary assessment and patient routing (from the operating table to social and professional adaptation);

– Administrative procedures for providing prosthetics, technical, and assistive rehabilitation means;

– Telemedical procedures and the application of artificial intelligence in diagnostics, rehabilitation forecasting, and patient status monitoring, subject to personal data protection;

– Procedures for administrative appeal against inadequate provision of care or refusal to provide rehabilitation means.

Thus, the *Care for Life* paradigm transforms rehabilitation from an auxiliary medical procedure into a strategic legal instrument for preserving human capital and restoring individual subjectivity [22].

Furthermore, the functioning of the outlined administrative-legal mechanism serves as a fundamental guarantee for ensuring the sustainable development of the state under martial law and post-war reconstruction. The implementation of the *Care for Life* paradigm directly aligns with the strategic benchmarks defined by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34]. The full provision of an individual's subjective right to healthcare, medical assistance, rehabilitation, and mental well-being makes a direct contribution to achieving Goal 3 ("Good Health and Well-Being") and Goal 16 ("Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions"), affirming the supreme social value of human life and laying the foundation for long-term legal sustainability and inclusiveness of Ukrainian society [45].

2.4. Paradigm "Traditions and Modernization" -Cultural-Legal Framework

The *Traditions and Modernization* paradigm (subjective formula: *"I and my cultural right"*) defines a model of public administration aimed at ensuring the continuity of national memory and equal access to cultural heritage while simultaneously creating conditions for modern creative self-expression and the development of creative industries. The paradigm shift in this sphere consists of overcoming the perception of culture as the preservation of the past or a secondary expenditure item in the budget: moving from static museum protection to understanding culture as a public resource, a guarantee of human development, and a living foundation of collective identity. The cultural right is not "secondary," as a culturally deprived individual loses value benchmarks, which reduces their social, educational, labor, and economic activity [18; 17; 16].

The signature legal concept and legal accent of the paradigm is the concept of *"Living tradition as the right to continuation"*: "Without

tradition, modernization turns into faceless borrowing or plagiarism; relying on tradition, it becomes authentic development." Tradition is viewed not as a formal museum exhibit, but as a substantive source for creating a new cultural product.

Three-Dimensional Sphere of Implementation and Normative Legal Matrix

The implementation of the paradigm encompasses three key interconnected spheres:

I. Classical art and professional creativity: Ensuring freedom of artistic, literary, and musical self-expression, supporting arts education, and protecting copyright (Art. 54 of the Constitution of Ukraine) [50].

II. Culture as a public service and infrastructure: The functioning of the basic network of cultural institutions (museums, libraries, theaters, archives, cultural services centers in communities) as a guarantee of territorial, physical, and economic accessibility of cultural goods.

III. Business domain and creative industries: The development of cultural entrepreneurship, digital art, publishing, the film industry, public-private partnerships, and cultural tourism.

The legal core of the paradigm is formed by Articles 23, 34, 53, and 54 of the Constitution of Ukraine [50], the Law of Ukraine "On Culture" (No. 2778-VI) [51], the Laws of Ukraine "On Protection of Cultural Heritage" [49], "On Museums and Museum Affairs" [48], "On Libraries and Library Affairs" [53], as well as Article 27 of the UDHR [42] and Article 15 of the ICESCR [44]. A key problem of public administration remains overcoming the "residual principle" of funding culture through the introduction of guaranteed state standards for the provision of cultural services, grant investment (through the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation), and the attraction of private capital.

Under conditions of digital transformation, artificial intelligence technologies, 3D digitization of cultural heritage, and digital registries transition from the category of technological tools to the status of administrative-legal mechanisms for fixing, preserving, and disseminating national heritage under wartime risks.

Subjects and Administrative Procedures

Public administration entities in this sphere encompass the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, the State Agency of Ukraine for Arts and Art Education,

the State Agency for Tourism Development of Ukraine, the State Agency of Ukraine for Cinema, the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, the Ukrainian Book Institute, local self-government bodies, and cultural institutions.

The administrative-legal mechanism includes:

– Procedures for providing standardized basic cultural services in territorial communities;

– Procedures for maintaining the State Register of Immovable Monuments and the Register of Digital Cultural Heritage;

– Competitive procedures for granting financial and grant support to artistic projects and creative businesses;

– Procedures for including elements in the National List of Elements of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Ukraine;

– Administrative procedures for monitoring compliance with the heritage protection regime and measures to prevent the illegal export of cultural property.

Through this, the *Traditions and Modernization* paradigm ensures a balance between preserving heritage and its modern reinterpretation, turning cultural right into an effective resource for national sustainability [19].

The outlined conceptual line directly aligns with the strategic benchmarks defined by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34]. Comprehensive protection and modernization of the cultural space make a direct contribution to achieving Goal 11 ("Sustainable Cities and Communities"–in terms of preserving and protecting world and national cultural heritage) and Goal 16 ("Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions"), guaranteeing the preservation of cultural sovereignty, authenticity, and the formation of long-term legal and institutional sustainability of Ukrainian society [45].

2.5. Paradigm "Innovations for Future": Legal Dimension

The *Innovations for the Future* paradigm (English benchmark: *Innovation for the Future*; subjective formula: *"I and my right to the future"* / *"I and my digital rights"*) defines a conceptual model of public administration in which law transforms from a retrospective regulator into a strategic instrument for designing the future and managing technological uncertainty. The paradigm shift consists of a transition from perceiving digitalization as a technical tool to recognizing the digital environment

as an independent domain for the realization of human subjectivity and the protection of digital rights (digital identity, educational development, academic freedom, and autonomy).

The signature conceptual highlight and authorial legal emphasis of the paradigm is that "The future has already become an object of law," while its authorial legal accent lies in qualifying artificial intelligence (AI) and autonomous algorithmic systems as a source of increased legal risk (increased danger). The "black box effect," algorithmic discrimination, and privacy violations demand the implementation of risk-based public governance instead of formal oversight or unconditional authorization.

Normative Legal Matrix and International Legal Benchmarks

The legal framework of the paradigm relies on constitutional guarantees for the protection of personal data, freedom of thought and speech, education, and scientific and technical creativity (Arts. 32, 34, 53, 54 of the Constitution of Ukraine [50]), the provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Administrative Procedure" [60], and the Law of Ukraine "On Personal Data Protection" [53].

International doctrinal, European, and imperative standards: The doctrinal basis for the ethical-legal regulation of artificial intelligence is formed by the 23 Asilomar AI Principles (2017), which establish principles concerning human control (*human control / human-in-the-loop*), alignment of algorithms with human values (*value alignment*), and long-term risk assessment [15]. The conceptual European benchmark for building an ecosystem of trust is the European Commission's White Paper "On Artificial Intelligence – A European approach to excellence and trust" [8], which justifies a risk-based approach to AI technology regulation. The imperative international legal vector is the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (CETS No. 225, opened for signature in 2024, signed by Ukraine in 2025) [7], which establishes mandatory frameworks for protecting human dignity and subjective rights under conditions of high-risk AI system implementation.

National legislation, strategic benchmarks, and innovative education: The sectoral dimension encompasses the Laws of Ukraine "On Education" [56], "On Higher Education" [54], "On Scientific and Scientific-Technical Activity" [55], and the Concept for the Development of Artificial Intelligence

in Ukraine (Cabinet of Ministers Decree No. 1556-r) [15]. The practical basis for the step-by-step harmonization of domestic legislation with European acts is provided by the "White Paper on Artificial Intelligence Development in Ukraine" of the Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine (2023) [31], which outlines a strategy of soft law and the preparation of business and society for the full AI Act. Within the development of STEAM education and the NUS (New Ukrainian School) reform [32], the state acts as a guarantor of protecting teachers and learners from "digital exploitation," algorithmic assessment errors, and the threat of the digital divide.

Cross-Cutting Nature of the Paradigm and Administrative-Legal Procedures

Artificial intelligence and digitalization serve not only as a separate domain, but also as a cross-cutting factor in transforming all five paradigms (partnership and security, united in diversity, care for life, traditions and modernization). Public administration is carried out by the Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine (MinDigital), the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU), the Ministry of Health of Ukraine (MoH), the Educational Ombudsman, the National Police of Ukraine (NPU), and specialized regulatory bodies.

The administrative-legal mechanism for implementing the paradigm encompasses:

– Procedures for AI Human Rights Impact Assessment;

– Application of regulatory sandboxes for testing innovative LegalTech and EdTech solutions;

– Administrative procedures for ensuring transparency and explainability of algorithmic decisions in public administration and education;

– Procedures for administrative and pre-trial protection against algorithmic discrimination and violations of personal data privacy;

Distribution of administrative liability for failures of innovative systems among developers, operators, and public entities, protecting the individual (educator, medical professional, citizen) from the monopoly fault of the algorithm.

Ultimately, the *Innovation for the Future* paradigm consolidates a key rule of the digital era: innovation is a public good only when it expands human capabilities without destroying fundamental human rights [25; 26; 27].

The outlined vector directly aligns with strategic national goals defined by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019 [34]. Systemic implementation of this paradigm makes a direct contribution to achieving Goal 4 ("Quality Education" – through the development of STEAM technologies and secure educational infrastructure), Goal 9 ("Industry, Innovations and Infrastructure" – by building a resilient AI ecosystem and supporting science-intensive technologies), and Goal 16 ("Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions"), guaranteeing the transparency of algorithmic administration, the rule of law, and a high level of legal protection for the individual in the digital era [45].

3. Delictual Aspect of Meta-Paradigm

In the system of public administration, the delictual component acts as a guarantor of the effectiveness of value-normative precepts. In this context, the delictual aspect of the paradigm (*Liability / Delictual aspect of paradigm*) is defined as a specialized legal and functional dimension of the administrative-legal paradigm that establishes the boundaries of lawful and unlawful behavior of subjects in the public sphere, determines the procedure for normative-authoritative response to violations, and carries out the prevention of social risks. The key emphasis is that *administrative liability is not an isolated element, but a central mechanism for ensuring and stabilizing the functioning of the entire system.*

Subjective rights and public-legal mechanisms for their provision constitute one vector of humanitarian policy, whereas legal liability for violating the procedure for their exercise serves as a necessary stabilizing element of the entire legal system. In the system of public administration, administrative liability is viewed not as a discrete punitive instrument, but as a final element of the meta-paradigm "Sustainability through Identity," which transforms legal regulation from formal sanctioning into risk-based balancing of public relations.

The system-forming logic of maintaining legal order requires a clear distinction between types of legal liability: administrative (for violations of established rules of public order), disciplinary (within public service), civil-law (in case of causing property or moral damage), and criminal (when an act exceeds the bounds of an administrative offence). The central analytical question of the delictual component is determining the line between the

lawful exercise of freedom and the abuse of right, as well as establishing the liability of public authority subjects in cases where a right is formally recognized, but the system of public administration failed to ensure its actual implementation.

The modern transformation of delictual legislation–from the punitive model of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences [46] to the risk-based model of the Draft Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences No. 11386 [64]–is reflected in specific paradigmatic shifts across sectoral spheres:

– *"Partnership and Security" (Freedom of Conscience)*:

- *Paradigm shift*: From punitive control over public manifestations to partnership security. The principle of restricting specific unlawful conduct is applied, rather than punishment for religious or worldview affiliation.

- *Delictual accent*: Legislation (Arts. 89, 90 of Draft No. 11386) qualifies the religious sphere exclusively through general public order, leaving a normative gap regarding liability for violations of freedom of religion, improper conduct of religious studies expertise, and abuse of religious influence.

– *"United in Diversity" (Ethnopolitics)*:

- *Paradigm shift*: From formal-declarative equality to functional consideration of differences and protection against discrimination.

- *Delictual accent*: Despite the consolidation of the principle of equality (Art. 9 of Draft No. 11386), delictual legislation lacks specific elements of offences for ethnic or linguistic discrimination, as well as mechanisms for protecting the rights of national minorities and minority languages in public administration.

– *"Care for Life" (Healthcare and Social Protection)*:

- *Paradigm shift*: From a sanitary-punitive response to human-centric liability for action and inaction in the fields of protecting life, dignity, and health.

- *Delictual accent*: Regulation focuses on sanitary requirements (Arts. 60, 168–169 of Draft No. 11386). A normative gap arises due to the absence of offence elements for failure to render assistance, violations in the spheres of psycho-rehabilitation of veterans, telemedicine, and the use of artificial intelligence in healthcare.

– *"Traditions and Modernization" (Culture)*:

- *Paradigm shift*: From a protective-punitive model of protecting tangible objects to integrated liability for preserving and developing the cultural space.

- *Delictual accent*: Legislation views culture as a static object of protection (Art. 92 of the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offences; Arts. 79, 80, 83 of Draft No. 11386). There is no mechanism for bringing to liability for violations in the spheres of digital culture, intangible heritage, and distortion of cultural identity.

– *"Innovations for the Future" (Education, Science, Digitalization)*:

- *Paradigm shift*: From fragmented responses to information violations to preventive management of technological, educational, and managerial risks.

- *Delictual accent*: The fragmented nature of norms regarding data and communications (Arts. 365, 377–379 of Draft No. 11386) does not solve the lack of delictual architecture in the spheres of AI technologies, STEAM education, academic integrity, and protection of children's digital rights.

The delictual component of the meta-paradigm "Sustainability through Identity" proves that administrative liability acts not simply as a punishment tool, but as a core mechanism for restoring social equilibrium and guaranteeing legal order under conditions of modern societal transformations.

4. Conclusions

The meta-paradigm "Sustainability through Identity" constitutes the conceptual core of Ukraine's modern humanitarian policy, transforming fragmented branches of public administration into a holistic, human-centric administrative-legal system. It proves that societal and state resilience is achieved not by conserving the status quo, but by providing public-legal resources for the preservation, recovery, and development of the individual without losing their intrinsic essence.

Under conditions of martial law, systemic crises, and technological transformations, the meta-paradigm acts as the binding element of legal logic: identity – subjective right – public administration – administrative-legal mechanisms – legal liability – protection and restoration of rights – sustainability.

Results of Addressing the Defined Research Objectives:

1. The essence of the paradigm shift and the legal content of identity: A transition has been made from subject-object state administration to subject-subject public partnership. Identity is revealed not as an abstract category, but as a legally defined resource of the individual, which is specified through a system of subjective public rights. The freedom to be oneself imposes a positive obligation on public administration to guarantee and ensure the conditions for exercising this right.

2. Normative legal framework of the meta-paradigm: The normative basis of the meta-paradigm is formed by harmonizing national legislation (specifically Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 722/2019) [34] with the UN Sustainable Development Goals [45]. This integrates Ukraine's humanitarian policy into the global legal context, converting sustainable development benchmarks into normatively codified performance criteria for public administration entities.

3. Synthesis of the five paradigms of humanitarian policy and a new "state–human" balance: Five dimensions of humanitarian policy have been systematized, each implementing a corresponding formula of subjective right:

– *Partnership and Security* ("I and freedom of conscience"): A shift from state non-interference to ensuring freedom in a safe environment.

– *United in Diversity* ("I and my belonging"): A shift from unification to guaranteeing the right to identity, language, and non-discrimination.

– *Care for Life* ("I and the right to health"): A shift from treatment to public-legal provision of rehabilitation and the "right to return to life."

– *Traditions and Modernization* ("I and my cultural right"): A shift from safeguarding the past to dynamic "living tradition" and the right to cultural creativity.

– *Innovations for the Future* ("I and my digital rights"): A shift from purely technical digitalization to ensuring digital subjectivity and human rights in the digital space.

4. Institutional, procedural, and delictual mechanisms: It is proven that the exercise of subjective rights is guaranteed by a clear structure of administrative procedures and institutional accountability. Delictual and restorative mechanisms (specifically public-legal liability of public authorities) are viewed not as an auxiliary tool, but as an independent

guaranteeing element for ensuring the entire model of humanitarian sustainability.

5. Digitalization and artificial intelligence as a transformation factor: Digital technologies and artificial intelligence have been reconceptualized from simple service tools into a cross-cutting factor in the transformation of public administration. They establish new standards of transparency, accessibility of public services, and procedure automation, guaranteeing the protection of human digital rights and laying the foundation for digital subjectivity.

Prospects for further research: Promising directions for future scientific research include adapting the administrative-legal mechanisms of the meta-paradigm to the requirements of Ukraine's European integration, developing special normative standards for implementing the "right to restoration" for veterans and war-affected individuals, as well as legal regulation of the use of artificial intelligence systems in public-administrative decision-making procedures within the humanitarian sphere.

References:

1. Boiko I. V., Mekh Y. V., Soloviova O. M., Somina V. A., Cherviakova O. B. (2020) Universal human rights and state sovereignty. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, vol. 9, pp. 3014–3022. Available at: https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.367 (accessed September 11, 2026).

2. Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2020) *Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii rozvytku shtuchnoho intelektu v Ukraini* [On approval of the Concept for the Development of Artificial Intelligence in Ukraine] (Rozporiadzhennia No. 1556-r, adopted on December 2, 2020). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-2020-%D1%80#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

3. Council of Europe (1950) *Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* (European Treaty Series No. 5, adopted on November 4, 1950). Available at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/005 (accessed September 11, 2026).

4. Council of Europe (1985) *European Charter of Local Self-Government* (European Treaty Series No. 122, adopted on October 15, 1985). Available at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/122 (accessed September 11, 2026).

5. Council of Europe (1992) *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (European Treaty Series No. 148, adopted on November 5, 1992). Available at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/148 (accessed September 11, 2026).

6. Council of Europe (1995) *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (European Treaty Series No. 157, adopted on February 1, 1995). Available at: https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/treaty/157 (accessed September 11, 2026).

7. Council of Europe (2024) *Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law* (CETS No. 225). Available at: https://rm.coe.int/1680afae3c (accessed September 11, 2026).

8. European Commission (2020) *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence – A European approach to excellence and trust* (COM(2020) 65 final). Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52020DC0065 (accessed September 11, 2026).

9. European Commission (2025) *Ukraine 2025 report* (Commission Staff Working Document SWD(2025) 759 final). Available at: https://enlargement.ec.europa.eu/document/download/17115494-8122-4d10-8a06-2cf275eecde7_en?filename=ukraine-report-2025.pdf (accessed September 11, 2026).

10. European Court of Human Rights (1993) *Case of Kokkinakis v. Greece* (Application no. 14307/88, Judgment of May 25, 1993). HUDOC. Available at: https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-57827 (accessed September 11, 2026).

11. European Court of Human Rights (2007) *Case of Yakovenko v. Ukraine* (Application no. 15825/06, Judgment of October 25, 2007). Available at: https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-82987 (accessed September 11, 2026).

12. European Court of Human Rights (2022) *Guide on Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights: Freedom of thought, conscience and religion*. Council of Europe. Available at: https://ks.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr-ks/guide_art_9_eng (accessed September 11, 2026).

13. European Union (2012) *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*. Official Journal of the European Union, C 326, pp. 391–407. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12012P/TXT (accessed September 11, 2026).

14. European Union (2012) *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union* (Consolidated version). Official Journal of the European Union, C 326, pp. 47–390. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT (accessed September 11, 2026).

15. Future of Life Institute (2017) *Asilomar AI Principles*. Available at: https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/ai-principles/ (accessed September 11, 2026).

16. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2020) Muzei [Museum]. In Yu. P. Bytyak (Ed.), *Velyka ukrainska yurydychna entsyklopediia* [Great Ukrainian Legal Encyclopedia] (Vol. 5: Administrative Law, pp. 544–546). Pravo. Available at: https://nlu.edu.ua/personnel/ignatchenko-iryna-georgiyivna/ (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

17. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2021) Sutnist ta znachennia kulturnykh prav liudyny u derzhavi: Mizhnarodno-pravovi standarty realizatsii ta zakhystu [The essence and significance of human cultural rights in the state: International legal standards of implementation and protection]. *Naukovi perspektyvy*, No. 10(16), pp. 206–224.

Available at: https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2021-10(16)-206-224 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

18. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2021) Teoretychni pytannia publichnoho administruvannia kulturno-informatsiinoi sfery v Ukraini (zarubizhnyi dosvid ta vitchyzniani realii) [Theoretical issues of public administration of the cultural and information sphere in Ukraine (foreign experience and domestic realities)]. In L. Belkin, J. Iurynets, & I. Sopilko (Eds.), *Hermeneutic of law and philosophy of jurisprudence: collective monograph* (pp. 18–28). Primedia eLaunch. Available at: https://isg-konf.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Monograph-USA-Legal-2021-I-isg-konf.pdf (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

19. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2022) Problemy publichnoho administruvannia v kulturno-informatsiinii sferi v umovakh pandemii COVID-19: mizhnarodnyi ta natsionalnyi dosvid [Problems of public administration in the cultural and information sphere under COVID-19 pandemic conditions: International and national experience]. *Yurydychnyi naukovyi elektronnyi zhurnal*, No. 2, pp. 96–101. Available at: http://www.lsej.org.ua/2_2022/22.pdf (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

20. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2026) Administratyvno-pravova paradyhma "Partnerstvo ta bezpeka": transformatsiia derzhavno-tserkovnykh vidnosyn v Ukraini [Administrative and legal paradigm "Partnership and Security": transformation of state-church relations in Ukraine]. *Naukovi innovatsii ta peredovi tekhnolohii*, No. 1(53), pp. 2295–2311. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2026-1(53)-2295-2311 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

21. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2026) Administratyvno-pravove zabezpechennia movnoho riznomanittia v etnopolitychnii systemi Ukraini [Administrative and legal support of linguistic diversity in the ethnopolitical system of Ukraine]. In *Aktualni pytannia funktsionuvannia derzhavnoi movy v Ukraini: materialy VII Mizhvyshivskoho kruhloho stolu* [Urgent issues of state language functioning in Ukraine: Proceedings of the 7th Interuniversity Round Table] (pp. 46–52). Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University. Available at: https://nauka.nlu.edu.ua/nauka/vnd/zbirnyky-naukovyh-konferenczij/ (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

22. Ihnatchenko, I. H. (2026) Mizhnarodni ta yevropeiski standarty administratyvno-pravovoho zabezpechennia prava na okhoronu zdorov'ia: vyklyky voiennoho chasu ta perspektyvy povoiennoho vidnovlennia v Ukraini [International and European standards of administrative and legal support for the right to healthcare: Wartime challenges and prospects for post-war recovery in Ukraine]. In A. I. Berlach, N. A. Lytvyn, & A. A. Melnyk (Eds.), *Reformuvannia systemy okhorony zdorov'ia v umovakh voiennoho stanu: pravovi harantii ta mekhanizmy realizatsii: materialy Vseukrainskoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii* [Healthcare system reform under martial law: Legal guarantees and implementation mechanisms: Proceedings of the All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference] (pp. 40–45). Talkom. (in Ukrainian)

23. Ihnatchenko, I. H., & Riabchenko, Ya. S. (2026) Humanitarna polityka v umovakh viiny: administratyvno-pravovyi zakhyst kulturnykh ta etnonatsionalnykh prav liudyny [Humanitarian policy in conditions of war: administrative and

legal protection of cultural and ethno-national human rights]. In L. I. Tkachenko & V. M. Shulha (Eds.), *Kultura, nauka, osvita: smyslozhyttievi tsinnosti v suchasnykh umovakh: materialy VII Mizhnar. mizhhaluz. nauk.-prakt. onlain-konf.* [Culture, science, education: life-meaning values in modern conditions: Proceedings of the 7th International Interdisciplinary Scientific and Practical Online Conference] (p. 86). Institute of the Gifted Child of the NAES of Ukraine. Available at: https://iod.gov.ua/content/events/86/vii-mizhnarodna-mizhgaluzeva-naukovo-praktichna-onlayn-konferenciya_publications.pdf (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

24. Ihnatchenko, I. H., & Riabchenko, Ya. S. (2026) Suchasna transformatsiia administratyvno-pravovoi paradyhmy zakhystu subieaktyvnykh etnonatsionalnykh prav "Obiednani v riznomanittii" [Modern transformation of administrative and legal paradigm for protection of subjective ethno-national rights "United in diversity"]. *International Bulletin on Public Administration and Legal Affairs*, Vol. 7, No. 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32844/ibpala-2026-1.03 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

25. Ihnatchenko, I. H., & Ryabchenko, Y. S. (2026) Administratyvno-pravovi vyklyky STEAM-osvity v umovakh innovatsii ta ryzykiv: zakhyst subiektyvnykh prav osoby na osvitu i nauku v Ukraini [Administrative and legal challenges of STEAM education under conditions of innovation and risks: Protection of individual subjective rights to education and science in Ukraine]. In V. M. Shulha & H. V. Onopchenko (Eds.), *STEAM-osvita: vid teorii do praktyky: materialy II Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi onlain-konferentsii* [STEAM education: From theory to practice: Proceedings of the 2nd International Scientific and Practical Online Conference] (pp. 474–484). Institute of the Gifted Child of the NAES of Ukraine. DOI: https://doi.org/10.63437/978-617-7734-62-7-2026-1592 (in Ukrainian)

26. Ihnatchenko, I. H., & Ryabchenko, Y. S. (2026) Publichne administruvannia u sferi tsyfrovykh prav nepovnolitnikh: vyklyky, problemy, perspektyvy [Public Administration in the Sphere of Digital Rights of Minors: Challenges, Problems, and Prospects]. *Aktualni problemy prava: teoriia i praktyka*, No. 1(51). Available at: https://journals.snu.edu.ua/index.php/app/article/view/1231/1183 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

27. Ihnatchenko, I., & Ryabchenko, Y. (2025) Protection of children's subjective rights to personal data in the digital age: Administrative and legal foundations and socio-cultural context. In *Transformation of the scientific area in the context of contemporary challenges* (pp. 510–533). Baltija Publishing. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-631-7-1

28. Konstytutsiinyi Sud Ukrainy (1999) *Rishennia Konstytutsiinoho Sudu Ukrainy u spravi za konstytutsiinymy podanniamy 51 narodnoho deputata Ukrainy i Ministerstva osvity Ukrainy shchodo ofitsiinoho tlumachennia polozhen statti 10 Konstytutsii Ukrainy stosovno zastosuvannia derzhavnoi movy organamy derzhavnoi vlady, organamy mistsevoho samovryaduvannia ta vykorystannia yii u navchalnomu protsesi v navchalnykh zakladakh Ukrainy (sprava pro zastosuvannia ukrainskoi movy)* [Decision of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine

on the official interpretation of the provisions of Article 10 of the Constitution of Ukraine regarding the use of the state language (case on the use of the Ukrainian language)] (No. 10-rp/99, adopted on December 14, 1999). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v010p710-99#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

29. Konstytutsiinyi Sud Ukrainy (2021) *Rishennia Konstytutsiinoho Sudu Ukrainy u spravi za konstytutsiinym podanniam 51 narodnoho deputata Ukrainy shchodo vidpovidnosti Konstytutsii Ukrainy (konstytutsiinosti) Zakonu Ukrainy "Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi"* [Decision of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine regarding the conformity to the Constitution of Ukraine of the Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language"] (No. 1-r/21, adopted on July 14, 2021). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v001p710-21#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

30. Mekh Y., Georgiievskyi I., Ignatchenko I., Maslova I., Kostenko I. (2021) Public-private partnership in the security sector: Updating in the conditions of counteracting the COVID-19 and armed aggression in Eastern Ukraine. *Revista de la Universidad del Zulia*, vol. 13(37), pp. 347–361. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/80865781/Public_Private_Partnership_in_the_Security_Sector_Updating_in_the_Conditions_of_Counteracting_the_COVID_19_and_Armed_Aggression_in_Eastern_Ukraine (accessed September 11, 2026).

31. Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine (2023) *Bila knyha z pytan rozvytku shtuchnoho intelektu v Ukraini* [White Paper on the Development of Artificial Intelligence in Ukraine]. Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine. Available at: https://thedigital.gov.ua/projects/ai-white-paper-ukraine (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

32. Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (2016) *Nova ukrainska shkola: kontseptualni zasady reformuvannia serednoi shkoly* [New Ukrainian School: Conceptual principles of secondary school reform]. Available at: https://mon.gov.ua/ua/tag/nova-ukrainska-shkola (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

33. OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2023) *Svoboda relihii chy perekonan ta bezpeka: posibnyk iz pytan polityky* [Freedom of religion or belief and security: Policy guidance]. OSCE/ODIHR. Available at: https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/9/a/538080.pdf (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

34. President of Ukraine (2019) *Pro Tsili staloho rozvytku Ukrainy na period do 2030 roku* [On the Sustainable Development Goals of Ukraine for the period up to 2030] (Ukaz No. 722/2019, adopted on September 30, 2019). Official Website of the President of Ukraine. Available at: https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/7222019-29825 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

35. UN General Assembly (1966) *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 171, adopted on December 16, 1966). Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights (accessed September 11, 2026).

36. UN General Assembly (2006) *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 2515, p. 3, adopted on December 13, 2006). Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities (accessed September 11, 2026).

37. UN Human Rights Committee (1994) *General Comment No. 23: Article 27 (Rights of Minorities)* (CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.5, adopted on April 8, 1994). Available at: https://www.refworld.org/legal/general/hrc/1994/26900 (accessed September 11, 2026).

38. UNESCO (1954) *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (adopted on May 14, 1954). United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 249, p. 240. Available at: https://treaties.un.org/pages/showDetails.aspx?objid=0800000280145bac (accessed September 11, 2026).

39. UNESCO (1972) *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (adopted on November 16, 1972). United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 1037, p. 151. Available at: https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/ (accessed September 11, 2026).

40. UNESCO (2003) *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (adopted on October 17, 2003). United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 2368, p. 35. Available at: https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention (accessed September 11, 2026).

41. UNESCO (2005) *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (adopted on October 20, 2005). United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 2440, p. 311. Available at: https://en.unesco.org/creativity/convention (accessed September 11, 2026).

42. United Nations (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (U.N. General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III), adopted on December 10, 1948). Available at: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights (accessed September 11, 2026).

43. United Nations (1989) *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (U.N. General Assembly Resolution 44/25 adopted on November 20, 1989). UNICEF. Available at: https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention/convention-text (accessed September 11, 2026).

44. United Nations General Assembly (1966) *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (Resolution 2200A (XXI) adopted on December 16, 1966). United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 993, p. 3. Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights (accessed September 11, 2026).

45. United Nations General Assembly (2015) *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (Resolution A/RES/70/1 adopted on September 25, 2015). Available at: https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda (accessed September 11, 2026).

46. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (1984) *Kodeks Ukrainy pro administratyvni pravoporushennia* [Code of Administrative Offences of Ukraine] (No. 8073-X, adopted on December 7, 1984). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/8073-10#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

47. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (1992) *Osnovy zakonodavstva Ukrainy pro okhoronu zdorov'ia* [Fundamentals of Health Care Legislation of Ukraine] (Zakon No. 2801-XII, adopted on November 19, 1992). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2801-12#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

48. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (1995) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro biblioteky i bibliotechnu spravu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Libraries and Library Science"] (No. 32/95-VR, adopted on January 27, 1995). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/32/95-%D0%B2%D1%80#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

49. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (1995) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro muzei ta muzeinu spravu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Museums and Museum Business"] (No. 249/95-VR, adopted on June 29, 1995). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/249/95-%D0%B2%D1%80#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

50. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (1996) *Konstytutsiia Ukrainy* [Constitution of Ukraine] (Zakon No. 254k/96-VR, adopted on June 28, 1996). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254к/96-вр (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

51. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2000) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro okhoronu kulturnoi spadshchyny"* [Law of Ukraine "On Protection of Cultural Heritage"] (No. 1805-III, adopted on June 8, 2000). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1805-14#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

52. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2010) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro kulturu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Culture"] (No. 2778-VI, adopted on December 14, 2010). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

53. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2010) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro zakhyst personalnykh danykh"* [Law of Ukraine "On Personal Data Protection"] (No. 2297-VI, adopted on June 1, 2010). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2297-17#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

54. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2014) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro vyshchu osvitu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education"] (No. 1556-VII, adopted on July 1, 2014). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

55. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2015) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro naukovu i naukovo-tekhnichnu diialnist"* [Law of Ukraine "On Scientific and Scientific-Technical Activity"] (No. 848-VIII, adopted on November 26, 2015). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/848-19#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

56. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2017) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro osvitu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Education"] (No. 2145-VIII, adopted on September 5, 2017). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

57. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2019) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi"* [Law of Ukraine "On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language"] (No. 2704-VIII, adopted on April 25, 2019). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2704-19#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

58. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2020) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro reabilitatsiiu u sferi okhorony zdorov'ia"* [Law of Ukraine "On Rehabilitation in Health Care"] (No. 1053-IX, adopted on December 3, 2020, as amended on January 1, 2026). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1053-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

59. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2021) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro Sluzhbu viiskovoho kapelanstva"* [Law of Ukraine "On the Military Chaplaincy Service"] (No. 1915-IX, adopted on November 30, 2021). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1915-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

60. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2022) *Pro administratyvnu protseduru* [On administrative procedure] (Zakon No. 2073-IX, adopted on February 17, 2022). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2073-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

61. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2022) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro natsionalni menshyny (spilnoty) Ukrainy"* [Law of Ukraine "On National Minorities (Communities) of Ukraine"] (No. 2827-IX, adopted on December 13, 2022). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2827-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

62. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2022) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro systemu hromadskoho zdorov'ia"* [Law of Ukraine "On the Public Health System"] (No. 2573-IX, adopted on September 6, 2022). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2573-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

63. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2023) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro vnesennia zmin do deiakykh zakonodavchykh aktiv Ukrainy shchodo funktsionuvannia telemedytsyny"* [Law of Ukraine "On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding the Functioning of Telemedicine"] (No. 3301-IX, adopted on August 9, 2023). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3301-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

64. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2024) *Proiekt Kodeksu Ukrainy pro administratyvni prostupky* [Draft Code of Ukraine on Administrative Misdemeanors] (Draft Law No. 11386, registered on June 28, 2024). Available at: https://itd.rada.gov.ua/billinfo/Bills/Card/44507 (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

65. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2024) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro zakhyst konstytutsiinoho ladu u sferi diialnosti relihiinykh orhanizatsii"* [Law of Ukraine "On Protection of the Constitutional Order in the Sphere of Activity of Religious Organizations"] (No. 3894-IX, adopted on August 20, 2024). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3894-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

66. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2025) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro systemu okhorony psykhichnoho zdorov'ia v Ukraini"* [Law of Ukraine "On the Mental Health Care System in Ukraine"] (No. 4223-IX, adopted on January 15, 2025). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4223-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

67. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2025) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro vnesennia zmin do deiakykh zakoniv Ukrainy u zviazku z onovleniam ofitsiinoho perekladu Yevropeiskoi khartii rehionalnykh abo mynorytarnykh mov"* [Law of Ukraine "On Amendments to Certain Laws of Ukraine in Connection with the Update of the Official Translation of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages"] (No. 4699-IX, adopted on December 3, 2025). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4699-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

68. Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy (2026) *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro vnesennia zmin do deiakykh zakoniv Ukrainy shchodo zabezpechennia prava viiskovosluzhbovtsiv, veteraniv ta viiskovopolonenykh, yakykh zvilneno z polonu, na nalezhnu medychnu dopomohu, reabilitatsiiu, protezuvannia"* [Law of Ukraine "On Amendments to Certain Laws of Ukraine Regarding the Provision of the Right of Servicemen, Veterans, and Prisoners of War Released from Captivity to Proper Medical Care, Rehabilitation, and Prosthetics"] (No. 4954-IX, adopted on August 19, 2026). Available at: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4954-20#Text (accessed September 11, 2026). (in Ukrainian)

69. Verkhovod I., Oleksenko R., Ratsul O., Kushnir N., Ihnatchenko I. (2023) Social communications and their role in the development of the social sphere. *Review of Economics and Finance*, vol. 21(1), pp. 836–843. Available at: https://refpress.org/ref-vol21-a91/ (accessed September 11, 2026).