



Отримано: 03 липня 2026 р.

Прорецензовано: 15 липня 2026 р.

Прийнято до друку: 18 липня 2026 р.

Email: alla_centr@ukr.net

ORCID-ідентифікатор: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9834-8712>

Email: matweykrysak@gmail.com

ORCID-ідентифікатор: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4481-7202>

DOI: [http://doi.org/10.25264/2311-5149-2026-42\(70\)-114-121](http://doi.org/10.25264/2311-5149-2026-42(70)-114-121)

Krysak A. I., Krysak M. F. Identification of criteria for conflict in land relations: causes and consequences. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»* : серія «Економіка». Острог : Вид-во НаУОА, вересень 2026. № 42(70). С. 114–121.

UDC: 332.3

JEL-Classification: Q-56, Q-59

Alla Krysak,

*Doctor of Economics, Associate Professor, Department of Enterprise Economics and International Business,
National University of Water and Environmental Engineering, Rivne*

Matviy Krysak,

Lawyer,

Limited Liability Company «Economic and Accounting Center of Scientific and Technical Services – Plus», Lutsk

IDENTIFICATION OF CRITERIA FOR CONFLICT IN LAND RELATIONS: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

The article analyzes the causes of opposition and conflicting interests among stakeholders in land relations who pursue competitive goals that generate conflict situations. It examines the specific characteristics of land conflicts in the context of ensuring the ecological sustainability of agricultural land use, endorsing state land market regulation as a key mechanism to mitigate disputes and safeguard resource and ecological security against anthropogenic and natural hazards. The study addresses challenges to sustainable development in balancing economic growth, social justice, and environmental protection, framing conflict of interest as an enduring socio-civilizational phenomenon. The authors define and systematize conflicts of interest within land relations across three primary criteria: security, globality, and balance. Security criteria focus on mitigating economic, food, and environmental threats. Global criteria encompass international public interests, climatic conditions, territorial development, and discrepancies between Ukrainian and global land prices—attributed to the lack of integration with energy markets. Balance criteria address land ownership, disposal, protection, reproduction, rent distribution, environmental innovations, and the adoption of information technologies and artificial intelligence. Furthermore, the study examines intergenerational discrepancies, underscoring the necessity of preventive regulatory measures, stakeholder alignment, and collaborative governance. Differentiating conflicts of interest by these criteria allows for identifying root causes and risk consequences, thereby facilitating targeted resolution instruments tailored to the institutional environment and regulatory subjects of land relations.

Keywords: land relations, conflict of interest, security, globality, balance, risk, cause-and-effect relationships.

Крисак Алла Іванівна,

*докторка економічних наук, доцентка кафедри економіки підприємства та міжнародного бізнесу
Національного університету водного господарства та природокористування, м. Рівне*

Крисак Матвій Федорович,

юрист

ТОВ «Госпрозрахунковий центр науково-технічних послуг – плюс», м. Луцьк

ІДЕНТИФІКАЦІЯ КРИТЕРІЇВ КОНФЛІКТНОСТІ ЗЕМЕЛЬНИХ ВІДНОСИН: ПРИЧИНИ ТА НАСЛІДКИ

У статті проаналізовано причини протистояння та зіткнення інтересів суб'єктів земельних відносин, що мають протилежні мотиви та конкурентні цілі, які породжують виникнення конфліктних ситуацій. Розглянуто специфічні особливості земельних конфліктів при обранні заходів забезпечення екологізації аграрного землекористування. Схвалено позицію державного регулювання ринку земель для нівелювання конфліктних ситуацій. Обґрунтовано зв'язок ресурсно-екологічної безпеки із станом захищеності інтересів держави від реальних чи потенційних загроз, внаслідок антропогенного або природного впливу на навколишнє середовище. Виокремлено низку викликів сталого розвитку, які загрожують досягненню збалансованості між економічним зростанням, соціальною справедливістю та екологічною стійкістю. Прیدілено увагу інституту конфлікту інтересів як загальносуспільному, цивілізаційному явищу, що супроводжує людство. Авторами визначено та систематизовано аспекти конфлікту інтересів у системі земельних відносин за критеріями безпеки, глобальності та збалансованості земельних відносин. Критерії безпеки ідентифіковано за врахуванням зниження загрози небезпек та ризиків, що породжуються конфліктами економічного, продовольчого та екологічного характеру. Критерії глобальності ідентифіковано за виникненням конфліктів, які охоплюють протистояння міжнародних суспільних інтересів та передбачають використання міжнародних



стандартів, кліматичних умов, водозабезпеченості територій, освоєності територій, рівня світових цін на земельні ресурси (зокрема, сфокусовано увагу, що невідповідність вартості землі в Україні світовим цінам є наслідком відсутності «прив'язки» ціни землі до вартості енергоносіїв на світових біржах, що не дає можливості досягнути високого рівня соціо-еколого-економічного розвитку країни, так як саме ціни визначають конкурентоспроможність більшості економік світу). Критерії збалансованості земельних відносин ідентифіковано щодо використання, володіння та розпорядження, охорони та відтворення земельних ресурсів, за способом використання земельних ресурсів, ресурсоемністю, рентою, розподілом благ, моніторингом земельних ресурсів, інформаційними технологіями та штучним інтелектом, формами землекористування, суміжним і черезсмужним землекористуванням, а також нецільовим використанням, договірними зобов'язаннями, природоохоронними інноваціями, цілями сталого розвитку. Також проаналізовано причини та наслідки конфліктів, які спонукають до неузгодженості інтересів теперішніх і майбутніх поколінь, що вимагає застосування превентивних заходів у системі регулювання земельних відносин із узгодженням інтересів різних соціальних верств, розвитку стейкхолдерства та вироблення спільної політики прийняття управлінських рішень. Групування конфлікту інтересів, що виокремлено в розрізі окремих критеріїв дозволить визначити причини виникнення та наслідки ризиків з метою подальшої диференціації інструментів усунення конфліктних ситуацій, виходячи з наявного інституціонального середовища землекористування, суб'єктів та об'єктів регулювання земельних відносин.

Ключові слова: земельні відносини, конфлікт інтересів, безпека, глобальність, збалансованість, ризик, причинно-наслідкові зв'язки.

Problem Statement. In contemporary conditions, the conflict in land relations is primarily associated with the military aggression of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine, including the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the temporary occupation of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, and ultimately the full-scale invasion in 2022 and ongoing military actions in parts of the regions occupied by Russia [1]. According to analytical materials from Deep State, by the end of 2025, 116,165 square kilometers of Ukrainian land remained under Russian occupation. This accounts for 19.25% of the entire territory, or every 5th square kilometer. Specifically, during 2025, Russians occupied 4,336 square kilometers of Ukrainian territory, which, according to Deep State analysts, constitutes approximately 0.72% of the total territory of Ukraine [2]. Overall, from the total area of 603,628 km² [3], as of January 1, 2026, about 81% of Ukraine's territory remains temporarily under its control, but legally the borders remain unchanged and inviolable. Understanding the true scale of the state's territory allows for comprehension not only of its geographical location and area parameters, which constitute 5.7% of Europe's territory [3] and 0.44% of the entire world [3], but also the economic potential that can secure Ukraine's strategic global position. This necessitates the examination of contemporary realities in identifying criteria for conflict in land relations.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Despite the relevance and prevalence of the problem of land use conflicts, relatively few scientific studies have been dedicated to this issue. Even fewer investigations concern conflicts of interest in the regulation of land relations (notably studies by Kupinets L.E., Zhavnerchik O.V., Zayets V.M., Burkinsky B., Stepanov V., Kharichkov S., Ivanchenkov V.S., among others).

Aim and objectives of the study. The aim of this article is to identify and systematize the conflictuality of land relations by specific criteria for further differentiation of regulatory instruments.

Presentation of the main material. The accessibility and utilization of natural resources (land, water, forest, mineral, energy, etc.) and, consequently, redistribution of benefits have in most cases generated conflict situations. Problems inherent to land relations produce conflict scenarios because different social groups' use of land resources results in opposition and clashes of interests among land relation subjects who have opposing motives and competing goals. On one side, conflict manifests in compliance with environmental or food security requirements, and on the other—in achieving economic benefits to meet existing societal needs. Hence, it is exceptionally important to balance the interests of public and private, state and local, rural and urban, land users and landowners, employers and employees to avoid dangers and risks in implementing these interests within the socio-ecological-economic regulatory sphere concerning land use, possession, disposal, protection, and reproduction of land resources. Regulation can be viewed as a system of impulses leading to the development of a qualitatively new object of regulation (ownership relations, lease relations, rent relations, commodity-money relations, security relations, organizational-legal relations, etc.) and, accordingly, changes in its structure.

Conflict aspects in land use have been studied by Kupinets L.E. and Zhavnerchik O.V., who propose to consider specific features of land conflicts when selecting measures to ensure the ecological orientation of agricultural land use to prevent destructive behavior of subjects with opposing interests [4]. These scholars identify the following factors influencing the conflictuality of land relations: demographic (population size, distribution, migration); economic (deterioration of land productivity); social (interests of populations dependent on land, such as peasants); ethical-cultural (consumer society psychology shaping land resource management); and ecological factors [4].

Zayets V.M. argues that the development of conflict situations in land relations is caused by excessive concentration of functions in the State Geocadastre, duplication of control powers over land use and protection by



various ministries and agencies, polycentrism in decision-making, risks of multiple interpretations of the legislation, and, consequently, uncertainty and direct losses of land relation subjects leading to unpredictable costs [5]. Therefore, the current Ukrainian system of state regulation of land relations is doomed to create disproportions, dissatisfaction, and conflicts among land relation subjects [5]. The scholar advocates state regulation of the land market that should include:

Legislative definition of market access criteria (qualification requirements), establishment of legal regimes for land use (including ecological standards) within certain territories by zoning, establishment of public servitudes on private lands, and defining market transaction procedures.

Economic regulation through the development of land ownership taxation based on market attractiveness, development and implementation of social infrastructure programs at regional and local levels, support of financial services, and incentives for environmentally safe land use.

Administrative measures and controls including standards for economic land use (permissible pollutant and heavy metal content, requirements for use of erosion-prone lands, etc.).

Thus, state regulatory policy aims not at decision-making for each land use object but at establishing general rules allowing current and potential landowners and users to determine individual land use plans within established requirements [5].

In natural resource use theory, Burkinsky B., Stepanov V., and Kharichkov S. emphasize the special place of resource-ecological security as a critical component of national security. Broadly, resource-ecological security relates to the protection of vital state interests (individuals, society) from real or potential threats arising from anthropogenic or natural impacts on the environment, and to meeting needs that reliably ensure the existence and progressive development of society and the state, including needs for natural resources and a healthy living environment [6]. Security is guaranteed by a system of legislatively fixed political, legal, economic, and ecological measures that neutralize risky and conflict situations caused by destabilizing development factors. Therefore, land relations and land resources must also be viewed from the security perspective.

Regarding the paradigms of sustainable development, Ivanchenkov V.S. pragmatically considers contemporary world realities by highlighting multiple challenges that threaten the balance between economic growth, social justice, and environmental sustainability, including limited natural resources, economic inequality, climate change and ecosystem vulnerability, institutional weaknesses and corruption, insufficient human capital investments, conflicts among sustainable development goals, and reliance on external financing [7]. He argues that sustainable development challenges are multidimensional, interconnected threats of a complex, dynamic, and interrelated nature that cannot be overcome by traditional or fragmented policy tools [7]. We believe this multidimensionality of threats contributes to diverse conflicts in land and other production sectors.

A separate focus should be given to the institution of conflict of interest. Under anti-corruption legislation, the primary legal framework regulating measures to prevent and resolve conflicts of interest is the Law of Ukraine «On Prevention of Corruption» No. 1700-VII dated October 14, 2014. It defines: private interest as any property or non-property interest of a person, including those arising from personal, family, friendly, or other non-official relationships with physical or legal entities, including membership or activity in public, political, religious, or other organizations; potential conflict of interest as the presence of a private interest in the sphere where a person exercises official or representative powers, possibly influencing objective or impartial decision-making or actions during the exercise of powers; and real conflict of interest as a contradiction between a person's private interest and official or representative powers impacting objectivity or impartiality in decision-making or actions during said powers [8]. Overall, conflict of interest exists when professional judgment regarding a primary interest (e.g., research validity) may be influenced by a secondary interest (e.g., financial gain). Understanding this conflict is as important as recognizing actual conflicts of interest.

Regarding conflicts of interest in the development of public management science and practice, Lipich L.G. and colleagues consider conflict of interest a societal, civilizational phenomenon accompanying humanity [9, p. 155]. Only through combining strict anti-corruption laws with flexible but more universal ethical norms of civil servants can a dynamic mechanism for preventing conflicts of interest in public management be developed [9, p. 158]. This approach is applicable to implementing core regulatory tasks in land relations for avoiding stakeholder interest imbalances.

In addition to the above scholars' work and consistent with authorial research, we define characteristics of land conflicts based on several significant regulatory criteria and systematize their cause-effect relationships. Table 1 presents safety criteria.



Table 1

Characteristics of Land Conflicts Based on the Identification of Security Criteria

Criterion	Types of Conflicts	Causes of the conflict	Consequences
Security	Economic Security	Intensifying competition for resources, particularly territories containing raw materials and energy resources. Declining income levels. Inflation. Military conflict.	Threats to sovereignty and territorial integrity resulting from occupation and annexation of territories. Decline in the purchasing power of the majority of the population. Loss of investment due to negative regional development trends, changes in government, and imbalances between supply and demand in the land market. Withdrawal of land resources from economic circulation as a result of military operations during wartime and the post-war period.
	Food Security	The Threat of Food Shortages	Decline in soil fertility. Soil degradation.
	Environmental Security	Increased human impact. Violations of environmental protection laws. Low level of environmental awareness.	Increased human impact. Violations of environmental protection laws. Low level of environmental awareness.

Source: developed by the authors based on an analysis and expansion of [4] and [6].

The analysis of Table 1 demonstrates that conflicts within the system of land relations, when considered through the security criterion, are complex, interconnected, and multi-level in nature, encompassing economic, food, and environmental dimensions.

First and foremost, economic security conflicts arise under the influence of intensified competition for limited resources, particularly territories containing raw material and energy potential, as well as due to declining incomes, inflationary processes, and military actions. The combination of these factors results in significant adverse consequences, including threats to state sovereignty and territorial integrity, reduced purchasing power of the population, investment losses, and the withdrawal of land from economic circulation, especially under conditions of wartime and post-war recovery. Thus, the economic dimension of conflicts directly affects the stability of the land market and the efficiency of land resource utilization.

Food security conflicts, in turn, are determined by the risks of food shortages emerging against the backdrop of deteriorating land resources. The principal consequences of such processes include declining soil fertility and land degradation, which directly undermine the productive capacity of the agricultural sector and threaten long-term food security.

Environmental security conflicts are driven by increasing anthropogenic pressure, violations of environmental legislation, and a low level of environmental awareness. Their consequences include soil contamination, expansion of cultivated land areas, and increased ecosystem vulnerability, leading to the deterioration of the natural resource potential of territories and a decline in their environmental resilience.

In summary, security-related conflicts in the land sector constitute a systemic risk to sustainable development, as economic, food, and environmental consequences are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. This substantiates the necessity of an integrated approach to the regulation of land relations and land resource management aimed at simultaneously ensuring economic stability, food security, and environmental balance.

Table 2 identifies the criteria of globality as those reflecting the development of land relations not within an individual country or region but across numerous states constituting the global community, thereby contributing to the stabilization of public goods through the regulation of land relations.

The analysis of Table 2 indicates that conflicts identified according to the criterion of globality are formed under the influence of systemic international, natural-resource, and economic imbalances that transcend national boundaries and acquire a transnational character.

Primarily, conflicts associated with international standards and agreements emerge as a result of non-compliance with international commitments, the refusal of certain countries to fulfill obligations regarding greenhouse gas emission reductions, and the insufficient responsiveness of the global community to environmental challenges. This contributes to the intensification of global climate change, including the greenhouse effect and global warming. Furthermore, the utilization of natural resources by one state may generate adverse environmental impacts for other countries, while weakened international cooperation in land use reduces the level of coordination in conflict prevention efforts.

Conflicts conditioned by climatic factors are associated with the heterogeneity of natural landscapes and the uneven distribution of climatic conditions. This stimulates migration processes involving both population and labor



resources, as well as the relocation of production capacities to more favorable regions. Consequently, the structure of land use as the spatial basis for the allocation of productive forces undergoes significant transformations.

Table 2

Characteristics of Land Conflicts Based on the Identification of Criteria for Global Significance

Criterion	Types of Conflicts	Causes of the conflict	Consequences
Globality	International standards (agreements)	Failure to comply with international agreements. Countries' refusal to accept greenhouse gas emission quotas. Society's slow response to environmental challenges.	Global warming, the greenhouse effect. The use of natural resources in one country can have negative environmental consequences for another country or group of countries. The declining role of international cooperation in the field of land use leads to insufficient coordination among the parties in preventing conflict.
	Climatic conditions	Contrast in Landscapes.	Unfavorable climatic conditions for living and conducting economic activities lead to an increase in population and labor migration, as well as the relocation of production facilities to regions with more favorable climatic conditions, which will affect the utilization of land resources as the spatial basis for the distribution of productive forces.
	Water availability in the regions	The varying abilities of countries and individual regions to provide the necessary amount of water to meet the needs of their populations or industrial facilities.	Uneven water supply across different regions leads to unsanitary conditions, a substandard quality of life, a decline in GDP, and reduced ability to prevent desertification, soil erosion, and soil salinization in irrigated areas.
	Level of development of the regions	Uneven access to land resources. The presence of undeveloped areas.	The prioritization of economic gains over the interests of indigenous populations in the struggle for access to resources by companies seeking to exploit land and resource potential leads to the implementation of large-scale resettlement programs or coercive measures involving internal and cross-border migration, as well as an increase in disturbed and degraded lands.
	Global prices for land resources	The discrepancy between land prices in Ukraine and global prices.	The lack of a «link» between land prices and the cost of energy resources on global exchanges prevents the country from achieving a high level of socio-ecological-economic development, since it is precisely these prices that determine the competitiveness of most of the world's economies.

Source: developed by the authors based on an analysis and expansion of [4], [5], and [7].

Conflicts related to territorial water availability arise due to substantial interstate and regional disparities in access to water resources.

Such disparities result in deteriorating sanitary conditions, declining living standards, reduced economic potential (including GDP), and weakened capacity to combat desertification, soil erosion, and salinization.

Conflicts concerning territorial development emerge as a consequence of unequal access to land resources and the existence of vast undeveloped areas. The predominance of economic interests over the interests of local communities in the utilization of land potential leads to the implementation of large-scale resettlement programs, increased migration flows, and the expansion of degraded and disturbed land areas.

Conflicts associated with global land price levels are caused by discrepancies between land values in individual countries and global market trends. The absence of a coordinated relationship between land prices and global economic indicators, particularly energy prices, constrains opportunities for achieving high levels of socio-ecological and economic development, as pricing mechanisms largely determine the competitiveness of national economies.

In summary, global conflicts in the sphere of land relations are multifactorial in nature and arise at the intersection of environmental, economic, social, and institutional imbalances. Their common characteristic is the transboundary nature of their impacts, which necessitates strengthened international coordination, harmonization of land-use regulations, and the development of a coherent global policy for the regulation of land relations and land resource management.

Table 3 identifies the criteria of balance in land relations, differentiating them according to the economic, socio-institutional, and environmental nature of conflicts of interest, as well as their cause-and-effect relationships.



Table 3

Characteristics of Land Conflicts Based on the Identification of Criteria for Balanced Land Relations

Criterion	Types of Conflicts	Causes of the conflict	Consequences
Balance in Land Relations	<i>The Economic Nature of Conflicts of Interest</i>		
	Land Use Patterns	Inefficient use. Consumer use	Depletion of land resources. The temptation to prioritize the use of attractive areas (coastlines of water bodies, recreational areas, and suburban zones).
	Resource Intensity	The presence of mineral deposits, mineral resources (oil, natural gas, amber, etc.), balneological resources, etc.	Decrease in forest cover, desertification, depletion of mineral resources, creation of quarries, and sinkholes.
	Land Rent	The Unjustified Nature of Rent Payments.	Insufficient measures to ensure that natural resource rents are channeled into the appropriate funds; the lack of transparent procedures for the use of rent payments; and reduced accountability for noncompliance with or violations of state policy on the collection of rent payments.
	Distribution of Resources	Uneven distribution of land resources among parties to land relations.	Growing tensions between different social groups (rural and urban populations, the rich and the poor) regarding the distribution and consumption of goods derived from the use of land resources.
	Land Resource Monitoring	Insufficient monitoring and evaluation of results	The lack of high-quality data and systematic monitoring of progress on the land cadastre hinders policy adjustments and improvements in the efficiency of land relations
	Information Technology and Artificial Intelligence (AI)	Asymmetry in innovation among parties to land relations. Unlocking the significant potential of the low-skilled labor force	Asymmetry in innovation among parties to land relations. Unlocking the significant potential of the low-skilled labor force
	Self-seizure of territories	Lack of inventory of land resources and issued documents for ownership or use of land plots	Failure to receive rent payments for the use of land resources to local budgets due to improper use of land
	<i>The Social and Institutional Nature of Conflicts of Interest</i>		
	Forms of land use (emphyteusis, superficies, etc.)	Imposition of restrictions, prohibitions, and moratoriums. Lack of regulation regarding the mechanisms for use, ownership, and disposal in connection with the transfer of land under emphyteusis, superficies, and other rights.	The lack of widespread adoption of various forms of land use encourages the emergence of illegitimate land-use practices and the establishment of shadow schemes for the use of land resources.
	Adjacent and cross-field land use	Discrepancies in the boundaries of land parcels between neighboring land users.	Violation of the principle of good neighborliness. The emergence of land disputes that lead to their resolution in court.
	Institutional weaknesses and corruption risks	The lack of transparent governance mechanisms, limited political will and coordination of reforms, and widespread corruption at all levels of land management.	Ineffective implementation of policies for the sustainable development of land relations, a loss of trust in institutions, and a slowdown in transformational changes aimed at enhancing the adaptive capacity of economic models.
	<i>The Environmental Nature of Conflicts of Interest</i>		
	Contractual obligations	Inaction or unprofessional conduct on the part of land users.	Failure to comply with the terms of land use agreements regarding the rational use and improvement of land.
	Environmental technologies (innovations)	The residual principle for financing the implementation of innovative environmental protection technologies.	Lack of measures for land reclamation, implementation of soil conservation systems and technologies in high-risk farming areas, and crop management practices. Underdevelopment of the "green" economy
	Sustainable development goals	Conflicts between the demands of economic growth, particularly between increasing production and environmental constraints	The risk of undermining strategic sustainable development outcomes due to compromised and uncoordinated decisions

Source: developed by the authors based on an analysis and expansion of [4], [5], and [7].



The analysis of Table 3 demonstrates that the balance of land relations constitutes a multidimensional category, the disruption of which generates systemic conflicts of an economic, socio-institutional, and environmental nature. All identified conflict types share a common feature—an imbalance between the interests of various stakeholders in land relations and the limited nature of natural resource potential.

Within the economic dimension, key conflicts are associated with methods of land resource utilization, resource intensity, rent relations, benefit distribution, and the level of development of monitoring systems and digital technologies. Their causes are primarily linked to irrational and exploitative land use practices, the presence of valuable resources, the opacity of rent mechanisms, unequal distribution of land assets, insufficient availability of high-quality data, and technological backwardness. The consequences include depletion of land resources, degradation of natural capital, increasing social tensions, institutional inefficiency, and reduced economic returns from land use.

The socio-institutional dimension encompasses issues related to forms of land use, adjacent land use, and institutional weakness. These conflicts arise from regulatory uncertainty, restrictions and moratoria, inconsistencies in land parcel boundaries, a lack of transparent governance, and the spread of corrupt practices. Their consequences include the development of shadow land-use schemes, an increase in land disputes, declining trust in institutions, and slower progress in reforms aimed at the sustainable development of land relations.

The environmental dimension of conflicts is determined by violations of contractual obligations, insufficient implementation of environmentally friendly technologies, and contradictions between economic growth objectives and environmental constraints. The principal causes include inaction or inadequate professionalism among land users, residual financing of environmental innovations, and the prioritization of economic interests over environmental requirements.

The consequences comprise failure to comply with the principles of rational land use, the absence of land restoration measures, ecosystem degradation, and the risk of undermining sustainable development goals.

In summary, conflicts related to the balance of land relations are systemic in nature and arise from violations of three key dimensions: economic (efficiency and resource allocation), socio-institutional (rules, institutions, and trust), and environmental (environmental conservation). Their interdependence indicates the necessity of an integrated approach to the regulation of land relations and land resource management that combines economic rationality, institutional capacity, and environmental responsibility within the framework of sustainable development.

The systematization of the analysis presented in the tables demonstrates that security factors contribute to reducing threats and risks generated by economic, food, and environmental conflicts; globality factors determine the emergence of conflicts involving the confrontation of international public interests; and factors of balanced land relations ensure the maintenance of equilibrium between measures related to the use, ownership, and disposal of land resources and measures aimed at their protection and reproduction in the interests of both present and future generations.

Considering the multidimensional nature of conflicts, the process of state regulation of land relations should not be limited to fragmented solutions addressing isolated problems that give rise to conflict situations. Instead, it should encompass a comprehensive and coherent system developed in accordance with scientifically grounded conceptual principles that define long-term strategic directions [10]. The objects of regulation in land relations are these complex social subject-object interactions among legal entities and individuals, landowners, and land users regarding the use, possession, and disposal of land, as well as its protection and restoration [10]. The subjects of land relations regulation include institutions, agencies, public organizations, executive authorities, local self-government bodies, and stakeholders that implement measures related to the use, protection, and restoration of land resources and the protection of rights concerning their ownership and disposal [10]. The outcome of land relations regulation is the effect achieved through the implementation of these measures in the land sector by means of an effective regulatory mechanism and its instruments, namely, the development of land relations on the principles of sustainability.

Conclusion. The authors identifies and systematizes the aspects of conflicts of interest within the system of land relations according to the criteria of security, which encompass the reduction of threats and risks generated by economic, food, and environmental conflicts; globality, which involves conflicts arising from the confrontation of international public interests; and the balance of land relations concerning the use, possession, disposal, protection, and restoration of land resources. Furthermore, the causes and consequences of conflicts leading to the inconsistency of interests between present and future generations are analyzed, highlighting the necessity of preventive measures within the system of land relations regulation through the harmonization of interests among different social groups, the development of stakeholder engagement, and the formulation of a common policy for managerial decision-making. The classification of conflicts of interest according to specific criteria makes



it possible to identify the causes and consequences of risks and to further differentiate instruments for resolving conflict situations, taking into account the existing institutional environment of land use as well as the subjects and objects of land relations regulation.

References:

1. Pro zatverdzhennia Pereliku terytorii, na yakykh vedutsia (velysia) boiovi dii abo tymchasovo okupovanykh Rosiiskoiu Federatsiieiu [On approval of the List of territories in which hostilities are (were) being conducted or temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation], zatverdzheno Nakazom Ministerstva rozvytku hromad ta terytorii Ukrainy vid 28.02.2025 r. № 376. <<https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0380-25#Text>>. (2026, June, 06). [in Ukrainian].
2. Saakov, V. DeepState: RF okupuvala 19,25 % usiei terytorii Ukrainy [DeepState: Russia occupied 19.25% of the entire territory of Ukraine]. <<https://www.dw.com/uk/u-deepstate-pidrahuvali-plosu-okupovanoi-rf-ukrainskoi-zemli-u-2025-roci/a-75362496>>. (2026, June, 22). [in Ukrainian].
3. Maiorov, M.V. Ukraina, Derzhava: Zahalni vidomosti [Ukraine, State: General information]. [Elektronnyi resurs]. URL: https://www.history.org.ua/?termin=ukrajina_derzhava_zagalni_vidomosti (ostannii perehliad: 22.06.2026).
4. Kupinets, L.Ye. and Zhavnerchuk, O.V. (2016). *Ekolohichna bezpeka ahrarnoho zemlekorystuvannia: teoriia i mekhanizmy zabezpechennia* [Ecological safety of agricultural land use: theory and mechanisms of ensuring it] : monohrafiia. Nats. akad. nauk Ukrainy, In-t problem rynku ta ekon.-ekol. doslidzh. Odesa: IPREED, 246–269. [in Ukrainian].
5. Zaiats, V.M. (2012). Formuvannia rynku silskohospodarskykh zemel: metodolohiia i rehuliuivannia [Formation of the agricultural land market: methodology and regulation]. Dys. d-ra ekon. nauk: 08.00.03 – ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom. Kyiv, Ukraine, 457. [in Ukrainian].
6. Burkynskyi, B. V., Stepanov, V. M., & Kharychuk, S. K. (2005). *Ekonomiko-ekolohichni osnovy rehionalnoho pryrodokorystuvannia ta rozvytku* [Economic and Ecological Foundations of Regional Nature Management and Development]. Odesa: Feniks, 575. [in Ukrainian].
7. Ivanchenkov, V.S. (2025). Obgruntuvannia vyklykiv staloho rozvytku v umovakh hlobalnoi nestabilnosti [Justification of the challenges of sustainable development in the face of global instability]. *Ekonomichnyi prostir* [Economic space], 201, 304–310. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.201.304-310>.
8. Zakon Ukrainy «Pro zapobihannia koruptsii» [Law of Ukraine «On Prevention of Corruption»]. № 1700-VII vid 14 zhovtnia 2014 roku. Redaktsiia vid 30.05.2026 r. <<https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1700-18/ed20260530#Text>>. (2026, June, 23). [in Ukrainian].
9. Lypych, L.H. Khilukha, O.A. Kushnir, M.A. and Rublov, V.V. (2021). Konflikt interesiv u publichnomu menedzhmenti: poniattia ta shliakhy podolannia [Conflict of interest in public management: concepts and ways to overcome them]. *Naukovi Zapysky Lvivskoho Universytetu Biznesu ta Prava. Serii Ekonomichna. Serii Yurydychna* [Scientific Papers of the Lviv University of Business and Law. Economics Series. Law Series], 31, 153–159. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7089955>.
10. Krysak, A.I. (2016). *Rehuliuivannia zemelnykh vidnosyn na zasadakh stalosti: teoriia, metodolohiia, praktyka* [Regulation of land relations on the basis of sustainability: theory, methodology, practice] : monohrafiia. Lutsk: Nadstyria, 577. [in Ukrainian].