International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Strategic Management in Global Crises: Geopolitical, Economic, and Social Dimensions in an Era of Uncertainty

Venelin Terziev [1*], Marin Georgiev [2]
[1] Professor, D.Sc. (National Security), D.Sc. (Economics), D.Sc. (Social Activities), Ph.D., Eng., Black Sea Institute, Bourgas, Bulgaria
[2] Associate Professor, Ph.D., Black Sea Institute, Bourgas, Bulgaria

* Corresponding Author: **Venelin Terziev**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138
Volume: 07
Issue: 05
Received: 13-08-2026
Accepted: 16-09-2026
Published: 14-10-2026
Page No: 726-738

Abstract
This study examines strategic management's role in shaping economic trends amidst global instability. It argues that contemporary crises, driven by geopolitical tensions and resource competition, reshape the link between economic systems and conflict dynamics. Using an interdisciplinary perspective, the study analyzes how energy security and sanctions influence conflict management. By exploring cases including COVID-19, the Russia-Ukraine war, the Iran-USA-Israel strategic confrontation, and the Israel-Gaza humanitarian crisis, the findings suggest that effective strategic management requires integrating economic policy with geopolitical analysis. This integration is essential to enhance global resilience and adaptability in an increasingly fragmented era of uncertainty.

Keywords: Strategic Management, Global Crises, Geopolitics, Conflicts, Crisis Management, Economic Instability, Geoeconomic Competition, Resource Security

1. Introduction

In the context of the 21st century, global crises have become increasingly complex, interconnected, and difficult to predict. Military conflicts, economic disruptions, pandemics, and geopolitical tensions are no longer isolated phenomena but elements of a broader systemic transformation of the international environment. These developments challenge traditional approaches to strategic management, which were largely based on assumptions of relative stability and predictability.

Strategic management in times of global crisis extends beyond conventional crisis response mechanisms. It represents a dynamic and adaptive process that integrates economic, political, social, and technological dimensions. In such conditions, decision-making is characterized by uncertainty, limited information, and the need for rapid response, which increases the importance of flexibility, innovation, and interdisciplinary approaches.

Recent global events, including the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russia-Ukraine conflict, and escalating tensions in the Middle East, demonstrate the limitations of existing management models and highlight the need for new conceptual frameworks. These crises reveal structural weaknesses in institutions, expose inequalities, and reshape global power dynamics, requiring more resilient and integrated strategic approaches.

This study aims to analyze the role of strategic management in addressing global crises by examining their geopolitical, economic, social, and political dimensions. It explores how different theoretical perspectives and practical approaches can contribute to more effective crisis management and sustainable development in an increasingly uncertain world [2].

2. Literature Review

The following literature review synthesizes diverse theoretical perspectives to establish a multidisciplinary framework for understanding the mechanisms of state resilience and adaptive leadership in an era of global uncertainty.

2.1. Evolution of State Capacity and Institutional Stability

A review of the historical development of statehood reveals that modern governance capacity is genetically linked to the long-term balance between resource extraction and the mechanisms of systemic coercion. However, under the conditions of the contemporary poly-crisis, traditional models of state control are increasingly reaching their structural limits. Theoretical inquiries suggest that institutional inertia often becomes a primary obstacle to effective responses against global shocks, leading to a state of progressive political decay. This process is further intensified when the erosion of social capital and interpersonal trust undermines the civic foundations of governance. The resilience of public institutions is no longer merely a matter of administrative efficiency; it has become a derivative of a society's ability to maintain cohesion and collective endurance in the face of external destabilizing factors.

2.2. Adaptive Leadership in the Context of Digital and International Uncertainty

The examination of strategic management concepts in an era of global fragmentation highlights a necessary transition from predictable technical solutions to complex adaptive challenges. In an information-driven society, where the digital infosphere reshapes human reality and ethical boundaries, leadership is transformed into a tool for managing meaning and social adaptation. Theoretical frameworks of international cooperation demonstrate that in a world lacking a clear hegemon, stability is achieved through flexible institutional regimes that minimize transaction costs and uncertainty. An adaptive approach, in this sense, does not merely aim for the survival of the system, but for its evolution toward a state of "antifragility", where volatility and crises are utilized as mechanisms for structural improvement. This necessitates a new paradigm of governance based on scenario thinking and shared responsibility, capable of transforming systemic disturbances into strategic opportunities for development.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative and interdisciplinary research approach aimed at analyzing the role of strategic management in the context of global crises. Given the complexity and multidimensional nature of the subject, the research integrates perspectives from political science, economics, sociology, and international relations, building upon previous analyses of social inequalities within evolving global systems [1].

The methodological framework is based on a conceptual and analytical approach, combining theoretical analysis with comparative examination of selected global crises. The study draws on established theories in strategic management and international relations, including realism, liberalism, and constructivism, in order to interpret the behavior of states, institutions, and social systems under conditions of uncertainty. This theoretical integration follows established frameworks for understanding the transformation and change of social and educational infrastructures in response to systemic shifts [2]. The integration of these theories provides a holistic lens for examining how strategic decisions are shaped by power dynamics, economic interests, and normative frameworks.

A comparative case-based analysis is employed to examine key contemporary crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russia-Ukraine conflict, the strategic confrontation involving Iran, the USA, and Israel, and the humanitarian and security dimensions of the Israel-Gaza conflict. These cases are selected due to their global impact and their representation of different dimensions of crisis, specifically health, geopolitical, economic, and social aspects. The comparative approach allows for the identification of common patterns, differences, and systemic interdependencies across various regions and types of instability. The inclusion of both interstate and asymmetric conflicts ensures a comprehensive analysis of modern security challenges.

The research also incorporates elements of scenario-based thinking and systems analysis to address the dynamic and non-linear nature of global crises. This enables a broader understanding of potential developments and strategic responses beyond static models.

Data sources include academic literature, reports from international organizations (e.g., IMF, OECD, World Bank), and policy analyses. The study relies primarily on secondary data, critically evaluated to ensure reliability and relevance.

The limitations of the study are related to the qualitative nature of the analysis and the reliance on secondary sources, which may not fully capture rapidly evolving developments. However, this approach allows for a comprehensive and integrative understanding of complex global processes.

4. Strategic Management in Times of Crisis – Dynamics, Choices, and Responsibilities

The management of processes, and more broadly strategic management, faces particularly serious challenges in times of crisis. It is precisely in such moments that its true nature is revealed, not as a formalized system of rules and procedures, but as a dynamic and adaptive process in which rationality, intuition, and the need for rapid decision-making are intertwined. In crisis conditions, traditional planning models based on relative stability and predictability lose their effectiveness [3].

In essence, crisis management can be viewed as a form of crisis response management, but from a strategic perspective, it acquires a broader horizon. Decisions are not aimed solely at overcoming the current situation but have long-term consequences for the development of organizations and societies [4]. This defines strategic management in crisis as a process of high complexity, shaped by a dynamic and often unpredictable environment.

A crisis acts as a catalyst for change. It intensifies existing contradictions, reveals structural weaknesses, and calls into question the sustainability of established management models. As Taleb [5] notes, it is precisely under conditions of high uncertainty that systems are truly tested for resilience. This is particularly evident in global crises, where the interdependence between economies, institutions, and societies becomes apparent.

4.1. Adaptation of Strategies and the Testing of Alliances

In times of crisis, organizations and states are faced with the need to adapt their strategies. This process involves choosing among alternatives that differ in terms of risk, resource availability, and time horizon. As Porter [6] emphasizes, strategic choice is always associated with trade-offs, and in crisis conditions these trade-offs become even more

pronounced.

The choice of strategy is not a purely rational process; it reflects the values, cultural characteristics, and institutional environment of a given society [7]. In this sense, strategic management acquires not only economic but also socio-political dimensions.

Crises also test the resilience of international alliances. Political and economic relations are often reshaped under the pressure of national interests. The observation that states comply with agreements as long as they serve their interests corresponds to realist theory in international relations [8]. In times of crisis, this can lead to the transformation or even disintegration of existing alliances.

The implementation of strategies should not be an end in itself. It should be directed toward creating value: economic, social, and cultural. According to Kaplan and Norton [9], effective strategic management requires a balanced approach to performance evaluation, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative indicators [10].

However, the evaluation of results inevitably contains an element of subjectivity. Different social groups perceive outcomes through the lens of their own interests and expectations [11]. This creates tension and may undermine trust in management decisions, even when they are economically justified.

Trust and communication become key factors for the success of strategic management. As Drucker [12] notes, effective management is not only a matter of making the right decisions, but also of ensuring that they are understood and accepted by society.

The formulation of clear, measurable, and realistic goals is critical in times of crisis. They serve as a guide in an environment of high uncertainty [13]. However, planning is often carried out with limited information and under strong time pressure, which necessitates the use of flexible approaches such as scenario planning [14].

The crisis environment requires a reassessment of priorities and a transformation of management processes. In many cases, decisions are made with incomplete information, which increases the role of intuition and experience [15].

The COVID-19 pandemic is a striking example of a global crisis that put strategic management to a serious test. It required rapid, coordinated, and often unprecedented decisions [16]. Differences in national responses highlighted the importance of institutional capacity, trust in governance, and the availability of resources.

The uneven distribution of financial, material, and human resources led to significant differences in countries' ability to cope with the crisis [17]. This underscores the need to build resilient systems capable of responding effectively to future shocks.

Innovation and idea generation play a key role in this process. The ability to create and test multiple ideas increases the likelihood of finding effective solutions [18]. At the same time, the mechanical transfer of foreign models often proves ineffective due to differences in institutional and cultural environments [19].

Strategic management in times of crisis represents a combination of science and art. It requires an analytical approach, but also an understanding of human and social factors.

In conditions of a global crisis, strategic management has a direct impact on economic stability. Crises disrupt market mechanisms, reduce investment, and increase uncertainty [20]. The role of the state is strengthened through fiscal stimulus, regulatory measures, and support for businesses.

Effective management implies the optimal allocation of limited resources and the prioritization of strategic sectors. As Rodrik [21] emphasizes, government intervention in times of crisis can be a key factor in stabilizing and subsequently restoring the economy.

5. Geopolitical Crises and Strategic Management – Between Reality and Interpretation

The military conflict between Russia and Ukraine has confronted the international system with a qualitatively new type of crisis, one that is difficult to explain through classical models of crisis management. This conflict goes beyond the framework of a regional clash, encompassing historical, political, economic, and civilizational dimensions that turn it into a multilayered and systemic phenomenon [22-23]. It is precisely this complexity that limits the effectiveness of traditional management tools.

At the core of the crisis lies the failure of long-standing strategies aimed at building a sustainable balance in Europe. Policies such as the partnership between the European Union and Russia, as well as initiatives like the "Eastern Partnership" and the "Black Sea Synergy", were intended to create a zone of stability and mutual interdependence. However, according to Smith [24], these policies failed to address deep geopolitical contradictions and differences in strategic visions.

A turning point in the development of the conflict was the events in Ukraine in 2013-2014, which led to a fundamental transformation of the regional balance [25]. The subsequent sanctions and political confrontation turned economic and diplomatic tools into primary instruments of strategic influence. Sanctions policy has become a key element of modern geoeconomics [26].

This transformation has led to profound consequences: disruption of economic ties, restructuring of energy dependencies, and a reduction in political dialogue. As Nye [27] emphasizes, in the contemporary world, economic and energy resources become instruments of both "soft" and "hard" power that can be used strategically.

In such conditions, the need for strategic thinking becomes particularly significant. It involves not only analyzing current processes but also developing possible scenarios for future development [14]. However, an objective assessment of the situation is often hindered by political interests, informational limitations, and ideological interpretations.

Different states respond to the crisis depending on their strategic interests and dependencies, leading to fragmentation of the international response. This corresponds to the logic of neorealism, according to which the international system is anarchic and states act primarily in their own interest [28]. Strategic management becomes a process of balancing national interest with global stability.

The role of political leaders is crucial. Their decisions are often based on interpretations of reality that are not always supported by sufficient objective data. As Kahneman [15] notes, cognitive limitations and biases can significantly influence decision-making under conditions of uncertainty.

The words of Linus Carl Pauling on the need to combine objectivity with morality gain particular relevance. They highlight the importance of ethical responsibility in strategic management, a factor often underestimated in political practice [18].

The role of science and expert knowledge in geopolitical crises has increased significantly. According to Jasanoff [29], the interaction between science and politics is key to shaping effective public decisions. Scientists can contribute to a better understanding of complex processes and to the development of sustainable strategies.

International scientific communities and forums should function as independent spaces for knowledge exchange. Only through open dialogue and an interdisciplinary approach can an adequate understanding of global processes be achieved.

Effective strategic management requires not only institutional mechanisms but also highly qualified human resources. The ability to think systemically, analyze, and innovate is critical in complex crises [30]. A strong scientific and educational foundation is essential for building such capacity.

Neglecting expert knowledge can lead to strategic mistakes with long-term consequences. Investments in education, science, and research should be regarded as a strategic priority [31].

Contemporary political reality is characterized by a high degree of complexity and contradiction. It includes both successes and failures, and analyzing these outcomes is key to drawing lessons and improving future strategies [32].

There is also the emergence of new centers of power and influence, driven by economic, technological, and informational factors. The struggle for influence becomes a primary driver of international relations [33].

Despite the availability of vast informational resources, the predictability of processes remains limited. This is due to their nonlinearity and interconnectedness, as well as the influence of hard-to-measure factors [5].

A historical perspective shows that certain patterns tend to repeat, albeit in different forms. This raises the question of societies' ability to learn from the past [34].

However, if analysis is conducted without prejudice and with critical thinking, there is a possibility of avoiding negative repetitions. In this sense, strategic management is not merely a tool for reaction, but a mechanism for consciously shaping the future.

5.1. Theoretical Interpretations of Geopolitical Crises

Understanding geopolitical crises requires the use of different theoretical approaches that offer various explanatory frameworks for state behavior and the dynamics of the international system. Among the most significant are realism, liberalism, and constructivism.

The realist school views international relations as a system dominated by competition for power and security. According to this approach, states act rationally, pursuing their national interests in an anarchic international environment [8, 28]. The conflict between Russia and Ukraine can be interpreted as a result of a clash of geopolitical interests and a pursuit of a balance of power.

The liberal approach, in turn, emphasizes the importance of international institutions, economic interdependence, and democratic values. According to it, cooperation between states is both possible and desirable, but crises reveal the limitations of this model, especially when there is a lack of trust and alignment of interests [35].

Constructivism focuses on the role of ideas, identities, and social constructs in international relations. It suggests that conflicts are not inevitable but are shaped by perceptions, interpretations, and historical narratives [36]. In the case of Ukraine, differing interpretations of history and identity play a significant role in the escalation of tensions.

5.2. The Information Environment and the Hybrid Nature of Contemporary Crises

Modern geopolitical crises are characterized not only by military actions but also by the active use of informational and hybrid tools. The information environment has become a key battlefield, where influence over public opinion and the legitimacy of actions is contested.

Hybrid strategies involve a combination of military, economic, cyber, and informational means [37]. They blur the boundaries between peace and war and create new challenges for strategic management. Managing information and communication becomes critically important.

The spread of disinformation and propaganda complicates decision-making processes by creating alternative interpretations of reality. This calls into question the very concept of objective truth and makes it more difficult to build consensus at both national and international levels [38].

5.3. Strategic Resilience and Future Perspectives

In conditions of increasing uncertainty, the concept of resilience becomes central. It includes the ability of systems to withstand crises, adapt, and recover [39].

Strategic resilience requires an integrated approach that encompasses economic, social, institutional, and technological dimensions. This includes resource diversification, strengthening institutions, and developing human capital.

In the future, geopolitical crises are likely to become even more complex, incorporating new dimensions – technological, climatic, and demographic. This necessitates the development of more flexible and adaptive models of strategic management [40].

Strategic management must evolve from a reactive to a proactive process, based on early warning, scenario planning, and cross-sectoral cooperation.

6. The Iran-USA-Israel Conflict: Strategic Dimensions and Global Consequences

The contemporary conflict between Iran, the United States, and Israel represents one of the most significant geopolitical challenges of the 21st century. It cannot be viewed as an isolated regional clash, but rather as a complex system of interrelated processes involving political, economic, military, social, and cultural dimensions. In this sense, the conflict reflects the broader transformation of the international system toward a multipolar and more conflict-prone order [41].

At the core of the confrontation lies not only a clash of interests, but also of strategic visions and value systems. The alliance between the United States and Israel is based on a long-standing strategic partnership aimed at ensuring regional security and limiting Iran's influence. Iran, in turn, pursues a strategy that combines state policy with the use of non-state actors and asymmetric tools to expand its regional influence [42].

This dynamic can be interpreted through the concept of "proxy conflicts", in which states avoid direct military confrontation and use intermediaries to achieve strategic objectives [43]. This makes the conflict more difficult to manage and increases the risk of escalation.

The political dimension of the conflict reveals the erosion of

traditional balance-of-power mechanisms. As Walt [44] notes, systems of deterrence function effectively only when there is relative predictability and trust-conditions that are significantly weakened in the current context.

The economic dimensions of the conflict are particularly significant. The Middle East remains a key region for global energy security, and any instability leads to disruptions in global markets. According to BP [45], the region holds a substantial share of the world's oil and gas reserves, making it strategically critical.

Disruptions in energy supplies lead to rising prices, inflationary pressure, and economic instability on a global scale [46]. Sanctions regimes against Iran have a serious impact on its economy by restricting access to international markets and financial systems [47].

These processes accelerate the trend toward economic fragmentation, in which states seek diversification of energy sources and new partnerships. This corresponds to the broader trend of "geoeconomics", where economic tools are used to achieve strategic objectives [48].

The social consequences of the conflict are also significant. In Iran, economic sanctions and internal tensions lead to social discontent and political instability. In Israel, the constant security threat creates a high level of public mobilization and influences political processes [49].

In a broader context, the conflict affects public attitudes in various countries, increasing polarization and the sense of insecurity. Migration processes driven by regional instability create additional pressure on social and political systems [50].

The informational dimension of the conflict is becoming increasingly important. Modern conflicts are waged not only through military actions, but also through control over information and narratives. Social media and digital platforms play a key role in shaping public opinion [38].

Information warfare includes the use of disinformation, propaganda, and psychological operations, which can influence political decisions and international support. This creates new challenges for strategic management related to the need to protect the information environment.

The conflict between Iran, the United States, and Israel is indicative of the broader transformation of the international system. There is a shift toward a world characterized by intensified competition among major powers, weakening international institutions, and the formation of new geopolitical blocs [33].

Strategic management must adapt to this new reality. This includes the use of integrated approaches that combine diplomatic, economic, military, and informational tools.

The conflict can be seen not only as a threat but also as an opportunity to rethink existing models of international cooperation. As Nye [51] notes, sustainable security cannot be achieved solely through force, but requires a combination of hard and soft power.

The future of the international system will depend on the ability of states to find a balance between competition and cooperation. Understanding the conflict in its entirety is a key condition for building a more stable and predictable global order.

6.1. Geoeconomics, Energy Security, and Strategic Dependencies

The energy factor is one of the key elements in the conflict between Iran, the United States, and Israel. Control over energy resources and transportation corridors becomes a strategic instrument of influence.

The Strait of Hormuz, through which a significant portion of global oil supplies passes, is of critical importance to the global economy. Any tension in the region increases the risk of supply disruptions and leads to global economic shocks [52].

States seek to diversify energy sources and develop alternative routes. This leads to a restructuring of global energy networks and the emergence of new dependencies.

Energy security becomes a key element of national security, which increases the role of strategic management in this sector.

7. Between Security and SurvivaL: The IsraeL–Gaza Conflict

In the contemporary system of international relations, there are conflicts that cannot be explained solely through classical categories of politics and military strategy. They are deeply rooted in historical processes, collective memory, and the identity of societies. Such is the conflict between Israel and the Gaza Strip, representing a prolonged confrontation that shapes not only regional but also global perceptions of security, justice, and human rights [53-54].

The conflict is characterized by its dynamism and cyclicality, where periods of escalation alternate with temporary calm, without achieving a sustainable resolution. This cyclicality can be explained through the concept of "protracted conflicts", in which structural causes remain unresolved [55].

At its core, the confrontation represents a clash between different forms of security. On one side stands Israel's state security, based on protecting its territory and population from external threats. On the other hand, the human security of the population in Gaza is related to access to basic resources and conditions for normal life [56].

The Gaza Strip is one of the most densely populated regions in the world, where socio-economic conditions are highly constrained. The blockade, limited access to resources, and recurring military actions create a humanitarian situation characterized by a high degree of vulnerability [57]. The lack of stable infrastructure and access to essential services such as electricity, water, and healthcare further complicates the situation.

From the Israeli perspective, security is a central priority. Rocket attacks and threats from armed groups create a constant need for defensive measures. Systems such as "Iron Dome" and advanced civil protection mechanisms are part of the strategic response to these challenges (Inbar, 2016).

A complex interdependence between security and insecurity is formed, wherein actions by one side are often perceived as threats by the other, leading to a self-reinforcing cycle of escalation. This phenomenon can be examined through the concept of the "security dilemma", in which efforts by one side to increase its security lead to a decrease in the security of another [58].

The political framework of the conflict further complicates the situation. The governance of Gaza by Hamas (an organization designated as a terrorist by a number of states) creates serious obstacles to dialogue. Differing interpretations of the legitimacy of actors make the negotiation process extremely difficult [59].

Military operations, although aimed at achieving specific strategic objectives, rarely lead to long-term stability. They often deepen the humanitarian crisis and increase distrust between the parties [60]. This confirms the thesis that force-

based solutions have limited effectiveness in complex and deeply rooted conflicts.

The economic consequences of the conflict are significant. Gaza's economy is highly constrained and dependent, hindering sustainable development [61]. At the same time, Israel allocates substantial resources to security, which affects public spending distribution and economic priorities.

The deepest consequences, however, are social and psychological. Prolonged exposure to violence and insecurity leads to trauma that is transmitted across generations [62]. This creates a culture of fear and distrust that hinders reconciliation processes.

The information environment adds a new dimension to the conflict. Social media and global communication platforms turn every event into part of a global narrative. This leads to polarization of public opinion and the emergence of competing interpretations of reality [38].

The question of the possibility of a sustainable solution remains open. Conflict resolution theories emphasize the need to include all stakeholders, build trust, and establish long-term institutional mechanisms [63].

Strategic management must go beyond traditional approaches and include elements of diplomacy, economic development, and social integration. Only through a comprehensive and balanced approach can sustainable peace be achieved.

The conflict between Israel and Gaza represents not only a regional challenge but also a test for the international community. It raises questions about the role of international law, the effectiveness of institutions, and the ability of the global system to respond to humanitarian crises.

This conflict demonstrates the limits of force as a tool for solving complex problems. It highlights the need for new approaches based on cooperation, mutual recognition, and strategic thinking.

7.1. Human Security and Strategic Conflict Management

The concept of human security expands the traditional understanding of security by focusing on the individual rather than the state [56]. In the context of the Gaza conflict, this means prioritizing access to basic resources, healthcare, and safety.

Strategic management of such conflicts requires an integrated approach that combines humanitarian aid, development, and security. This includes coordination between international organizations, states, and non-governmental actors.

Without incorporating the humanitarian dimension, any strategy remains incomplete and risks deepening existing problems.

8. Social Dimensions of Strategic Management of Global Crises

Global crises of the 21st century, including military conflicts, pandemics, and economic shocks, reveal that strategic management cannot be limited solely to political and economic instruments. The need to integrate the social dimension as a key element of effective management is becoming increasingly evident. Social systems not only respond to crises but also actively shape them through their structures, values, and behavioral patterns [64].

8.1. Social Vulnerability and Inequalities in Times of Crisis

One of the most significant characteristics of global crises is their uneven impact on different social groups. Vulnerable groups, including low-income individuals, migrants, the elderly, and children, bear disproportionately severe consequences [65].

The COVID-19 pandemic, for example, demonstrated that socio-economic inequalities deepen in times of crisis. According to the World Health Organization, the crisis led to significant disparities in access to healthcare services, vaccines, and social protection. Similar trends are observed in military conflicts, where civilians are the most affected.

Social vulnerability is not only a result of the current crisis but is accumulated over time through structural inequalities [66]. This means that effective strategic management must include long-term policies aimed at reducing these inequalities.

8.2. Trust, Legitimacy, and Social Capital

Trust in institutions is a key factor in the success of any crisis management strategy. In times of uncertainty, societies rely on governing bodies for information, guidance, and protection. A lack of trust can lead to non-compliance with measures, social tension, and even political instability [67].

The concept of social capital highlights the importance of networks, norms, and trust within society [68]. In crisis situations, high levels of social capital facilitate collective action and improve the effectiveness of management decisions.

An example of this is the varying levels of public cooperation during the pandemic, where countries with higher institutional trust achieved better outcomes [31].

8.3. Communication, Disinformation, and Public Opinion Management

In the modern digital environment, information management has become a key element of strategic crisis management. The spread of disinformation can undermine institutional efforts and create confusion and distrust [69].

Social media plays a dual role. On one hand, they facilitate rapid information dissemination, while on the other hand, they create conditions for manipulation and polarization. This necessitates the development of effective communication strategies based on transparency, credibility, and timeliness.

According to the World Economic Forum, information-related risks are among the leading global threats in the modern world [40].

8.4. Psychological and Behavioral Aspects of Crises

Crises have a strong impact on mental health and human behavior. Stress, uncertainty, and fear can lead to irrational decisions and social tension [15].

Behavioral economics shows that under conditions of uncertainty, people often rely on cognitive heuristics, which can lead to systematic errors [70]. This is directly relevant to governance, as policies must be aligned with actual human behavior, not only with rational models.

Investments in mental health and social support become key elements of sustainable crisis management.

8.5. Social Resilience and Adaptability

The concept of social resilience refers to the ability of societies to adapt to crises and recover from them [71]. It includes factors such as institutional effectiveness, social cohesion, and access to resources.

Resilient societies are those that can not only overcome crises but also transform as a result of them. This requires strategic management focused on long-term development rather than short-term reaction.

8.6. The Role of Social Policies and State Intervention

The state plays a central role in mitigating the social consequences of crises. Social policies, including social protection, healthcare, and education, are key instruments for maintaining social stability.

During the COVID-19 crisis, many countries implemented large-scale fiscal and social measures. According to the International Monetary Fund, these interventions were crucial in preventing a deeper economic and social crisis [72].

Effective strategic management requires coordination between different policies and institutions, as well as cooperation at the international level.

8.7. Global Crises and the Transformation of Social Systems

Global crises not only disrupt existing structures but also create conditions for their transformation. They accelerate processes such as digitalization, changes in labor models, and the restructuring of social systems.

As Castells [73] notes, contemporary society is characterized by a network structure in which information and communication play a central role. Strategic management must take into account new forms of social organization.

9. Economic Aspects of Managing Global Crises – Stability, Interventions, and Recovery

Global crises have a strong and often immediate impact on economic systems. They disrupt market mechanisms, reduce production, interrupt supply chains, and increase uncertainty among economic actors. Economic governance becomes a key component of strategic crisis management [74].

Crises function as "shocks" to economic systems, which may be external (geopolitical conflicts, pandemics) or internal (financial imbalances). Their impact is often nonlinear and difficult to predict, requiring flexible and adaptive economic policies [75].

9.1. Macroeconomic Instability and Crises

One of the first effects of global crises is the disruption of macroeconomic stability. This manifests through: decline in gross domestic product (GDP); increase in unemployment; inflationary or deflationary pressures; reduction in investment.

For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy experienced its most severe downturn since World War II [20]. Similar processes occur during geopolitical conflicts, which lead to uncertainty and capital outflows.

Economic instability creates conditions for social tension and political instability, further complicating crisis management.

9.2. The Role of the State and Economic Interventions

In times of crisis, the role of the state increases significantly. Market mechanisms are often insufficient to cope with large-scale shocks, requiring active intervention through fiscal and monetary policies [11].

Fiscal measures include: increased public spending; business subsidies; social payments; tax relief.

Monetary policy includes: lowering interest rates; quantitative easing; providing liquidity.

According to OECD [76], the scale of government interventions during COVID-19 was unprecedented, with many countries mobilizing resources exceeding 10–20% of GDP.

9.3. Supply Chains and Global Economic Interdependence

The modern global economy is characterized by a high degree of interdependence. This makes it efficient in normal conditions but vulnerable during crises [77].

Disruptions in global supply chains lead to shortages of raw materials, delays in production, and rising prices.

Crises have highlighted the need to rethink globalization and strengthen regionalization and diversification of production.

9.4. Financial Markets and Systemic Risk

Financial markets react extremely sensitively to crises. Increased uncertainty leads to market volatility, asset declines, and an increased risk of financial crises.

As Minsky [78] notes, financial systems are inherently prone to instability, which intensifies during crises.

Central banks play a key role in stabilizing financial systems by providing liquidity and maintaining confidence.

9.5. Energy Economics and Resource Security

Energy resources are a strategic factor in economic crisis management. Geopolitical conflicts often lead to rising energy prices, supply disruptions, and increased energy insecurity.

For example, the crisis in Ukraine caused significant disruptions in European energy markets [79].

This highlights the need for: diversification of energy sources; investment in renewable energy; strategic reserves.

9.6. Economic Recovery and Sustainable Growth

After a crisis, economic recovery becomes a primary priority. It includes: stimulating investment; restoring employment; supporting innovation; developing sustainable economic models.

The concept of "green recovery" is gaining increasing importance, combining economic growth with environmental sustainability [80].

9.7. Inequality and Economic Justice

Crises often deepen economic inequalities. This leads to: concentration of wealth; social tension; reduced economic mobility.

According to Piketty [81], inequality is a structural problem that can worsen during crises.

Effective management requires policies for: redistribution; social protection; access to education and resources.

9.8. Toward a New Model of Economic Governance in Times of Crisis

Modern crises show that traditional economic models are insufficient. A new approach is needed, incorporating: flexibility and adaptability; coordination between states and institutions; integration of economic and social policies; resilience as a core principle.

As Rodrik [21] emphasizes, the future of economic governance depends on the ability to balance globalization with national interests.

10. Geoeconomic Dimensions of Global Crises

In the contemporary global system, economic instruments are increasingly used as tools of strategic influence, transforming the nature of conflict and international competition. This shift toward geoeconomics reflects the growing importance of economic power in achieving political and security objectives.

Sanctions regimes have become a central mechanism of economic coercion, particularly in the context of geopolitical conflicts. Their use in cases such as the Russia-Ukraine war demonstrates both their strategic relevance and their limitations. While sanctions can impose high economic costs, they may also lead to unintended consequences, including economic realignment, the emergence of alternative financial systems, and increased global fragmentation.

Trade policies and supply chain restructuring also play a critical role. The reconfiguration of global production networks, driven by security concerns, technological competition, and risk mitigation, signals a shift from efficiency-based globalization toward resilience-oriented regionalization. This transformation affects not only economic performance but also the distribution of power in the international system.

Energy markets represent another key dimension of geoeconomic competition. Control over energy resources, transit routes, and technological capabilities in the energy sector has become a strategic priority for states. The transition toward renewable energy further complicates this dynamic, introducing new dependencies related to critical raw materials and technological infrastructure.

The increasing integration of economic and geopolitical strategies requires a rethinking of strategic management frameworks. Understanding geoeconomic dynamics is essential for anticipating future conflicts and designing effective policy responses in an era of global instability.

10. Political Consequences of Global Crises – Transformations, Regime Change, and New Power Configurations

Global crises inevitably lead to profound political transformations that can reshape both domestic political structures and the configuration of the international system. They act as catalysts for processes that would normally develop gradually, but in times of crisis accelerate and often take on dramatic forms [82-83].

The political consequences of crises manifest in various forms - from changes in governing elites and institutional reforms to radical transformations of political regimes. In this sense, crises are not only destructive phenomena but also drivers of political restructuring.

10.1. Crises as Catalysts for Political Change

Historical experience shows that major crises often trigger significant political change. Economic collapses, military conflicts, and social upheavals can undermine the legitimacy of ruling authorities and lead to changes in power [84].

When institutions fail to respond effectively to a crisis, public dissatisfaction grows, creating conditions for political instability. This may result in early elections, government changes, mass protests, and social movements.

In some cases, crises can lead to deeper transformations, including changes in political regimes.

11.2. Regime Change and Political Transitions

One of the most significant political effects of crises is the possibility of regime change. This can occur both toward democratization and toward authoritarianism.

According to Huntington [82], periods of crisis often coincide with so-called “waves of democratization”, characterized by the expansion of democratic institutions – for example, the processes following the end of the Cold War.

On the other hand, crises can also lead to the strengthening of authoritarian tendencies. In conditions of uncertainty, societies are often willing to accept more centralized authority in the name of stability [85].

This dual dynamic shows that crises do not predetermine the direction of political change but create conditions for multiple possible scenarios.

11.3. Populism, Radicalization, and Political Polarization

Crises often lead to the rise of populist and radical political movements. These movements capitalize on public dissatisfaction and uncertainty, mobilizing support through simplified solutions and opposition between “elites” and “the people”.

This contributes to political polarization, erosion of democratic institutions, and declining trust in traditional political parties.

Social and economic inequalities, deepened by crises, further intensify these processes.

11.4. Institutional Transformations and Crisis Governance

Crises test the institutional capacity of states. They require rapid decision-making, coordination, and efficiency, often leading to institutional changes.

These changes may include the expansion of executive power, the introduction of emergency measures, and reforms in administrative structures.

As Fukuyama [32] notes, strong institutions are key to successful crisis management. A lack of institutional capacity can lead to governance failure and the deepening of the crisis.

11.5. Geopolitical Consequences and New Power Balances

Global crises not only reshape domestic political systems but also transform international relations. They can weaken existing alliances, lead to the formation of new geopolitical blocs, and redistribute influence among major powers.

According to Allison [33], periods of systemic change are often accompanied by an increased risk of conflict, especially when the balance of power is shifting.

11.6. The Role of Leadership in Times of Crisis

Political leaders play a crucial role in managing crises and shaping their outcomes. Their decisions can either accelerate stabilization or deepen the crisis.

Leadership in times of crisis requires strategic thinking, the ability to make decisions under uncertainty, and effective communication.

As Boin *et al.* [86] emphasize, successful crisis management depends not only on institutions but also on the qualities of leadership.

11.7. Democracy, Security, and the Balance of Freedoms

One of the most important issues in times of crisis is the balance between security and freedom. Emergency measures introduced to address crises may restrict civil rights and freedoms.

This raises questions about the legitimacy of such measures, their duration, and the risk of a lasting erosion of democratic principles.

According to Agamben (2005), there is a risk that a state of emergency may become a "new normal", with serious implications for democracy.

11.8. Toward A New Political Order In The Context Of Global Crises

Contemporary crises show that the world is entering a period of political transformation. Traditional governance models are proving insufficient, while new challenges require adaptation.

The emerging political order is likely to be characterized by greater uncertainty, intensified competition between states, a greater role for non-state actors, and a growing need for global cooperation.

Strategic management must focus not only on addressing current crises but also on building resilient political systems for the future.

12. Models, Strategies, and Policies for Overcoming Global Crises

The analysis of contemporary global crises shows that their effective management requires new approaches that go beyond traditional response models. Crises are becoming increasingly complex, interconnected, and difficult to predict, which necessitates an integrated, multidisciplinary, and proactive approach to their management [89].

Strategic management must transform from a reactive into a preventive and adaptive system, capable of identifying risks, minimizing consequences, and creating sustainable development mechanisms [88].

12.1. Integrated Crisis Management Model

Modern crises require a coordinated approach that combines different domains–political, economic, social, and technological. The integrated management model implies: inter-institutional cooperation; coordination between national and international levels; participation of both public and private sectors; involvement of civil society.

This model is based on the concepts of "whole-of-government" and "whole-of-society" approaches, emphasizing shared responsibility [90].

12.2. Preventive and Proactive Management

One of the key conclusions from crisis analysis is the need to shift the focus from reaction to prevention. This includes: early warning systems; risk analysis; scenario planning; strategic forecasting.

Scenario thinking enables the development of alternative future pathways and enhances preparedness [14].

A proactive approach reduces the costs and consequences of crises by enabling timely action.

12.3. Resilience as a Core Principle

The concept of resilience has become central in crisis management. It includes the ability of systems to withstand shocks, adapt to changing environments, and recover quickly.

According to Taleb [89], the most effective systems are not just resilient, but they are "antifragile" because they improve under stress.

Building resilience requires investments in infrastructure, human capital, and institutional capacity.

12.4. Data, Technology, and Digital Governance

Modern technologies are playing an increasingly important role in crisis management. Big data, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms enable more accurate situation analysis, faster decision-making, and effective coordination.

However, the use of technology also raises concerns related to data protection and ethical standards [91].

12.5. International Cooperation and Global Governance

Global crises require global solutions. No single state can manage challenges such as pandemics, climate change, or geopolitical conflicts alone.

Effective management requires strengthening international institutions, coordinating policies, and sharing resources and information.

As Keohane [92] notes, international cooperation is both possible and necessary, even in conditions of competition.

12.6. Socially Oriented Policies and Public Engagement

Successful crisis management requires active public participation. This includes: transparent communication; building trust; involving citizens in decision-making processes.

The social legitimacy of measures is crucial for their effectiveness [68].

12.7. Leadership and Strategic Thinking

Leadership is a decisive factor in times of crisis. Effective leaders must combine vision, analytical thinking, the ability to make rapid decisions, and ethical responsibility.

According to Heifetz [93], adaptive leadership is particularly important in complex and uncertain situations.

12.8. Education, Training, and Capacity Building

Long-term resilience depends on preparedness. This includes training professionals, developing expert capacity, conducting simulations, and exercises.

Investments in knowledge and education are key to future crisis management.

12.9. Toward a New Paradigm of Strategic Management

Contemporary crises require a new management paradigm characterized by flexibility, adaptability, policy integration, and global thinking.

This paradigm must combine economic efficiency, social justice, and political stability.

Crisis management is evolving from merely responding to problems into a process of building a more resilient and balanced future.

13. Policy Implications

The findings of this study have important implications for policymakers operating in an increasingly fragmented and conflict-prone global environment. Contemporary crises demonstrate that economic policy is no longer separable from security and geopolitical considerations. Governments must adopt integrated approaches that align economic strategies with broader national and international security objectives.

First, the growing use of geoeconomic instruments, such as sanctions, export controls, and investment screening, requires careful calibration. While these tools can be effective in exerting strategic pressure, they may also generate unintended consequences, including market distortions, supply chain disruptions, and long-term fragmentation of the global economy. Policymakers must balance short-term strategic gains with long-term economic stability.

Second, energy security and resource management emerge as critical priorities. The increasing politicization of energy markets and critical raw materials highlights the need for diversification strategies, investment in alternative energy sources, and the development of resilient supply chains. Strategic planning in this area is essential to reduce vulnerability to external shocks.

Third, effective crisis management requires strong institutional capacity, transparent communication, and public trust. Policies that fail to account for social dynamics and public perception risk undermining their own effectiveness. Integrating social considerations into economic and security policies is essential.

Finally, international cooperation remains a key factor despite growing fragmentation. Multilateral frameworks, international economic law, and coordinated policy responses can help mitigate the negative effects of crises and prevent escalation. Policymakers must navigate the tension between national interests and global stability by promoting cooperative solutions where possible [88, 94].

14. Discussion

The contemporary landscape of social systems is defined by a state of "permanent crisis", where traditional management models and established systemic approaches increasingly prove insufficient for the accelerated social processes of the 21st century. As Terziev [94] posits, these systems face profound functional exhaustion, driven by the high level of interdependence between health, economic, and geopolitical disruptions. The role of leadership undergoes a fundamental transformation, moving away from the administration of stable structures toward navigating a "permanent state of exception". This reality blurs the boundaries between normal institutional functioning and crisis management, necessitating a model of socially dominant leadership that can address systemic dysfunctions while maintaining the delicate balance of social cohesion. The research suggests that the current global instability is not a temporary deviation but a structural characteristic of modern social systems, requiring a shift from reactive robustness to a paradigm of continuous adaptation and strategic foresight.

A critical point of discussion is the disproportionate influence of socially dominant leaders in shaping the trajectory of systemic transformations. Terziev [94] highlights that in conditions of high uncertainty, leadership decisions are frequently influenced by irrational factors and subjective perceptions of risk, which can exacerbate structural inequalities and lead to deeper social imbalances. This is particularly evident in the analysis of post-socialist contexts, such as Bulgaria, where the lack of established institutional resilience and the presence of significant social disparities amplify the impact of leadership failures. The transition toward a proactive leadership model requires a conscious effort to overcome "cognitive blind spots" and to foster a systemic vision that accounts for the long-term sustainability of social values. The challenge for modern leaders is to manage the inevitable distress of society while guiding it through painful but necessary structural changes, ensuring that the transformation of the social system does not lead to its disintegration.

The emergence of new global centers of influence and the rapid evolution of the digital infosphere have created an environment where "ontological resilience" becomes a prerequisite for effective governance. Terziev [94] underscores that the dysfunctions within contemporary social systems often stem from a mismatch between accelerated technological change and lagging institutional adaptation. Socially dominant leaders must act as catalysts for "adaptive learning", ensuring that the system does not merely survive external shocks but evolves into a more sophisticated and robust form. This necessitates a shift toward inclusive decision-making processes that can mitigate the risks of political decay and institutional mistrust. The strategic management of global crises is inextricably linked to the quality and ethical foundation of leadership. As the era of permanent crisis continues to unfold, the survival of democratic social systems will depend on leaders who can balance the need for decisive action with the imperative to protect the social fabric, thereby preventing a systemic collapse of legitimacy and public trust.

15. Conclusion

The analysis of global crises in the contemporary international system demonstrates that strategic management is undergoing a profound transformation. Traditional models based on stability, predictability, and linear development are increasingly inadequate in addressing the complexity and uncertainty of modern crises.

Global crises, whether geopolitical, economic, social, or technological, are deeply interconnected and require integrated, multidisciplinary approaches. Effective strategic management must move beyond reactive responses and embrace proactive, adaptive, and resilience-oriented frameworks. This includes the use of scenario planning, data-driven decision-making, and the integration of social and institutional factors.

The case studies examined, including geopolitical conflicts and global disruptions, highlight the importance of institutional capacity, leadership, trust, and communication. They also demonstrate that crises not only pose risks but also create opportunities for transformation, innovation, and the development of more sustainable systems.

A key implication of this study is the need for a new paradigm of strategic management that combines economic efficiency, social equity, and political stability. This paradigm should emphasize resilience, inclusiveness, and global cooperation as essential components of effective crisis management.

Future research should focus on developing practical frameworks for implementing these approaches, as well as on exploring the role of emerging technologies, international institutions, and societal factors in shaping crisis response strategies.

This research underscores that the era of "permanent crisis" requires a fundamental shift in the ontological foundation of leadership. Strategic management is no longer about returning to a pre-crisis equilibrium, but about navigating a continuous state of exception where systemic dysfunctions are inherent. The survival of democratic social systems in this fragmented landscape depends on the ability of socially dominant leaders to foster adaptive learning and institutional

antifragility. By bridging the gap between technical expertise and the ethical imperative to maintain social trust, strategic management can transform global uncertainty from a source of systemic decay into a powerful catalyst for institutional evolution and collective resilience.

16. Declaration on the Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools

During the preparation of this study, artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools were used solely for technical support related to the visualization, graphic design, editing, and structuring of selected figures, tables, and other visual elements presented in the manuscript.

All scientific ideas, concepts, methodological approaches, analyses, interpretations, discussions, conclusions, and recommendations were developed, critically evaluated, verified, and approved by the authors. The authors assume full responsibility for the content, accuracy, and scientific integrity of the publication.

Artificial intelligence tools were not used to generate scientific results, conduct data analysis or interpretation, formulate scientific conclusions, or create original scholarly contributions. Their use was strictly limited to technical and editorial assistance during the preparation of the manuscript.

References

1. Terziev V, Simeonov S. Social inequalities in the new social systems. In: 7th International Conference on Global Practice of Multidisciplinary Scientific Studies; 2024; Kyrenia, Cyprus. IKSAD Publishing House; 2024. p. 567-573. doi:10.5281/zenodo.13119073.
2. Terziev V, Georgiev M, Simeonov S. Transformation and change of the social and educational system. Sofia, Bulgaria: Gabriell-e-lit; 2025.
3. Mintzberg H. The rise and fall of strategic planning. New York: Free Press; 1994.
4. Pearce JA, Robinson RB. Strategic management. New York: McGraw-Hill Education; 2013.
5. Taleb NN. The black swan: the impact of the highly improbable. New York: Random House; 2007.
6. Porter ME. Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance. New York: Free Press; 1985.
7. Hofstede G. Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 2001.
8. Mearsheimer JJ. The tragedy of great power politics. New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 2001.
9. Kaplan RS, Norton DP. The balanced scorecard: translating strategy into action. Boston: Harvard Business School Press; 1996.
10. Terziev V, Georgiev M. Highlights of the evolution of the 'Balanced Scorecard' idea as a model for managing strategy development and control. In: SOCIOINT 2017: 4th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities; 2017. p. 607-610. OCERINT-International Organization Center of Academic Research; 2017.
11. Stiglitz JE. Freefall: America, free markets, and the sinking of the world economy. New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 2010.
12. Drucker PF. The practice of management. New York: HarperBusiness; 2006.
13. Locke EA, Latham GP. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: a 35-year odyssey. Am Psychol. 2002;57(9):705-717. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705.
14. Schoemaker PJH. Scenario planning: a tool for strategic thinking. Sloan Manage Rev. 1995;36(2):25-40.
15. Kahneman D. Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2011.
16. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Coronavirus (COVID-19): policy responses to the pandemic. Paris: OECD; 2020.
17. World Bank. Global economic prospects, June 2021. Washington (DC): World Bank Publications; 2021.
18. Pauling L. Orthogonalization of science. Science. 1968;160(3826):381.
19. North DC. Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
20. International Monetary Fund. World economic outlook, April 2020: the great lockdown. Washington (DC): IMF; 2020. Available from: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2020/04/14/weo-april-2020.
21. Rodrik D. The globalization paradox: democracy and the future of the world economy. New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 2011.
22. Sakwa R. Frontline Ukraine: crisis in the borderlands. London: I.B. Tauris; 2015.
23. Mearsheimer JJ. Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: the liberal delusions that provoked Putin. Foreign Aff. 2014;93(5):77-89. Available from: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2014-08-18/why-ukraine-crisis-wests-fault.
24. Smith KE. European foreign policy: in a changing world. 4th ed. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2019.
25. Wilson A. Ukraine crisis: what it means for the West. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2014.
26. Drezner DW. The sanctions paradox: economic statecraft and international relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
27. Nye JS. Soft power: the means to success in world politics. New York: PublicAffairs; 2004.
28. Waltz KN. Theory of international politics. Reading (MA): McGraw-Hill; 1979.
29. Jasanoff S, editor. States of knowledge: the co-production of science and social order. London: Routledge; 2004.
30. Checkland P. Systems thinking, systems practice: includes a 30-year retrospective. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 1999.
31. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Government at a glance 2021. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2021. doi:10.1787/1c258f55-en.
32. Fukuyama F. Political order and political decay: from the Industrial Revolution to the globalization of democracy. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2014.
33. Allison G. Destined for war: can America and China escape Thucydides's Trap? Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2017.
34. Ferguson N. Civilization: the West and the rest. London: Penguin Books; 2011.
35. Keohane RO, Nye JS. Power and interdependence:

world politics in transition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company; 1977.
36. Wendt A. Social theory of international politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
37. Hoffman FG. Conflict in the 21st century: the rise of hybrid wars. Arlington (VA): Potomac Institute for Policy Studies; 2007.
38. Rid T. Active measures: the secret history of disinformation and political warfare. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2020.
39. Walker B, Holling CS, Carpenter SR, Kinzig A. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. Ecol Soc. 2004;9(2):5. doi:10.5751/ES-00650-090205.
40. World Economic Forum. The global risks report 2022. 17th ed. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2022. Available from: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2022.pdf.
41. Haass R. A world in disarray: American foreign policy and the crisis of the old order. New York: Penguin Press; 2017.
42. Byman DL. Iran's proxy strategy. Washington (DC): Brookings Institution; 2018.
43. Mumford A. Proxy warfare. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2013.
44. Walt SM. The origins of alliances. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press; 1987.
45. BP. Statistical review of world energy 2022. 71st ed. London: BP; 2022. Available from: https://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/business-sites/en/global/corporate/pdfs/energy-economics/statistical-review/bp-stats-review-2022-full-report.pdf.
46. International Monetary Fund. World economic outlook: war sets back the global recovery. Washington (DC): IMF; 2022. Available from: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2022/04/19/world-economic-outlook-april-2022.
47. Nephew R. The art of sanctions: a view from the field. New York: Columbia University Press; 2017.
48. Blackwill RD, Harris JM. War by other means: geoeconomics and statecraft. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2016.
49. Inbar E. Israeli national security: issues and challenges since the Yom Kippur War. London: Routledge; 2016.
50. Castles S, de Haas H, Miller MJ. The age of migration: international population movements in the modern world. 5th ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2014.
51. Nye JS Jr. The future of power. New York: PublicAffairs; 2011.
52. US Energy Information Administration. World oil transit chokepoints [Internet]. Washington (DC): EIA; 2021. Available from: https://www.eia.gov/international/analysis/special-topics/World_Oil_Transit_Chokepoints.
53. Pappé I. The ethnic cleansing of Palestine. Oxford: Oneworld Publications; 2006.
54. Morris B. 1948: a history of the first Arab-Israeli war. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2008.
55. Azar EE. The management of protracted social conflict: theory and cases. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing; 1990.
56. United Nations Development Programme. Human development report 1994: new dimensions of human security. New York: Oxford University Press; 1994. Available from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-1994.
57. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Gaza Strip: humanitarian impact of 15 years of blockade [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://www.ochaopt.org/content/gaza-strip-humanitarian-impact-15-years-blockade-june-2022.
58. Jervis R. Cooperation under the security dilemma. World Polit. 1978;30(2):167-214.
59. Gunning J. Hamas in politics: democracy, religion, violence. New York: Columbia University Press; 2007.
60. B'Tselem. A regime of Jewish supremacy from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea: this is apartheid [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.btselem.org/publications/fulltext/202101_this_is_apartheid.
61. World Bank. Economic monitoring report: volatility and vulnerability in the global economy. Washington (DC): World Bank Group; 2022. Available from: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/.
62. Bar-Tal D. Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. Am Behav Sci. 2007;50(11):1430-1453.
63. Fisher R, Ury WL, Patton B. Getting to yes: negotiating agreement without giving in. 3rd ed. London: Penguin Books; 2011.
64. Beck U. Risk society: towards a new modernity. London: SAGE Publications; 1992.
65. World Bank. World development report 2021: data for better lives. Washington (DC): World Bank Group; 2021. Available from: https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2021.
66. Sen A. Development as freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999.
67. Fukuyama F. Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York: Free Press; 1995.
68. Putnam RD. Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster; 2000.
69. Vosoughi S, Roy D, Aral S. The spread of true and false news online. Science. 2018;359(6380):1146-1151. doi:10.1126/science.aap9559.
70. Thaler RH, Sunstein CR. Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2008.
71. Adger WN. Social and ecological resilience: are they related? Prog Hum Geogr. 2000;24(3):347-364. doi:10.1191/030913200701540465.
72. International Monetary Fund. Fiscal monitor: strengthening the credibility of public finances. Washington (DC): IMF; 2021. Available from: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2021/10/13/fiscal-monitor-october-2021.
73. Castells M. The rise of the network society. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2010.
74. Blanchard O, Amighini A, Giavazzi F. Macroeconomics: a European perspective. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson; 2021.
75. Reinhart CM, Rogoff KS. This time is different: eight centuries of financial folly. Princeton (NJ): Princeton

University Press; 2009.
76. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. OECD economic outlook. 2021;2021(1). Paris: OECD Publishing; 2021. doi:10.1787/ed0345fa-en.
77. Baldwin R, Evenett SJ, editors. COVID-19 and trade policy: why turning inward won't work. London: CEPR Press; 2020.
78. Minsky HP. Stabilizing an unstable economy. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 1986.
79. International Energy Agency. World energy outlook 2022 [Internet]. Paris: IEA; 2022. Available from: https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2022.
80. United Nations. Sustainable recovery report: bridging the gap between economic growth and social equity. New York: UN Publications; 2021.
81. Piketty T. Capital in the twenty-first century. Translated by Goldhammer A. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press; 2014.
82. Huntington SP. The third wave: democratization in the late twentieth century. Norman (OK): University of Oklahoma Press; 1991.
83. Tilly C. Coercion, capital, and European states, AD 990-1992. Oxford: Blackwell; 1992.
84. Acemoglu D, Robinson JA. Why nations fail: the origins of power, prosperity, and poverty. New York: Crown Publishers; 2012.
85. Levitsky S, Ziblatt D. How democracies die. New York: Crown; 2018.
86. Boin A, 't Hart P, Stern E, Sundelius B. The politics of crisis management: public leadership under pressure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
87. Agamben G. State of exception. Translated by Attell K. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2005.
88. Terziev V, Georgiev M. Social efficiency in contemporary social systems: an integrative model, evaluation criteria, and practical implications. In: Al Mokdad M, editor. Collective action and social regulation in complex societies. Hershey (PA): IGI Global Scientific Publishing; 2027. p. 169-196. doi:10.4018/979-8-3373-9280-6.ch007.
89. Taleb NN. Antifragile: things that gain from disorder. New York: Random House; 2012.
90. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. The OECD's response to the COVID-19 pandemic: insights for global crisis management. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2020.
91. Floridi L. The fourth revolution: how the infosphere is reshaping human reality. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014.
92. Keohane RO. After hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 1984.
93. Heifetz RA. Leadership without easy answers. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 1994.
94. Terziev V. Modern social systems in conditions of permanent crisis: transformations, dysfunctions, and the role of socially dominant leaders. SPECTRUM J Soc Sci. 2026;3(2):117-130. doi:10.61552/SJSS.2026.02.007.

How to Cite This
Terziev V, Georgiev M. Strategic management in global crises: geopolitical, economic, and social dimensions in an era of uncertainty. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. 2026;7(5):726-738.

Creative Commons (CC) License
This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercialShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.