A new type of war: Ukrainian experience and rethinking the philosophy of armed struggle

Oleksandr Syrskyi
Candidate of Military Sciences
Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine
03168, Povitrianykh Syl avenue, 6, Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: sirsk_os@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0001-6396-7559

Andrii Lebedenko
Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine
Office of the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine
03168, Povitrianykh Syl avenue, 6, Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: a.lebedenko@mil.ua
ORCID: 0009-0002-3332-1591

Oleh Semenenko
Doctor of Military Sciences, Professor
Deputy Commandant of the Central Research Institute of the
of the Armed Forces of Ukraine for scientific work
The Central Research Institute of the Armed Forces of Ukraine
03049, Povitrianykh Syl avenue, 28 B, Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: aosemenenko@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0001-6477-3414

Abstract. Modern armed conflicts have undergone significant transformations that change the perception of war, power and victory. The russian-Ukrainian war has become a testing ground for new approaches to warfare, asymmetric strategies and the integration of advanced technologies. It has changed not only tactics and strategy, but also the fundamental philosophical foundations of armed struggle, which requires a deep rethinking. Therefore, the main purpose of the article is to analyse the Ukrainian experience in conducting a new type of warfare, identify key trends in the transformation of armed conflict in modern conditions, and review and update approaches to the philosophy of warfare that meet the challenges of the 21st century. The main results of the article are that it: reveals the main postulates of war in the context of the russian-Ukrainian confrontation; identifies the characteristic features of a new type of war on the example of the russian-Ukrainian conflict; reveals key changes in the philosophy of armed struggle, in particular the importance of information, technological and psychological components; substantiates the need to revise traditional ideas about force, victory and strategy in modern wars; outlines possible vectors of transformation of armed struggle based on the experience gained. The materials of the article may be useful for military theorists and practitioners engaged in the development of strategies for modern warfare; security and defence analysts studying the transformation of armed conflicts; researchers in the field of philosophy of war, military history and international relations; politicians and military leaders who formulate defence policy and military doctrines.

Keywords: asymmetric struggle, struggle for independence, new type of war, military security, armed struggle, philosophy of war, military strategy, operational art, strategic thinking, military leadership, warfare technologies, tactics and strategy of warfare, network warfare, evolution of military art, national security, global stability, methods of warfare, morale, military training, future of armed conflicts.

Introduction

In every era, war appears not only as a manifestation of power, but also as a mirror of its time - its fears, technology, morality and anthropology. However, the current clash, which is taking place at the crossroads of history, has challenged not only armies, but the very essence of what we consider war. It has made the world realise that the philosophy of war that has guided us for centuries no longer accommodates the reality of the new warfare [1-12].

The canonical postulates - from Sun Tzu's shrewd cunning to Clausewitz's analytical determinism - were born of the age of centralised states, defined fronts, linear strategies and symmetrical confrontations [1, 2]. They described war as a clash of will, organised structure, manoeuvre and force, in which action had a spatial and temporal justification, and victory had a logic. Today we see a conflict that destroys the very fabric of these assumptions.

Modern warfare is no longer a theatre where two actors engage in a game according to set rules – it is a process in which the multiplicity of wills, the speed of change, the asymmetry of capabilities, and technological advancements distort classical notions of causality, operational effectiveness, and objectives.

Battle is no longer merely a field of physical confrontation but also one of cognitive, informational, networked, and moral clashes. Frontlines are blurred, armies are fragmented, dominance is temporary and local, and truth is dynamic. In this reality, it is impossible to say with certainty when an offensive begins, where defence ends, or who the "commander" is especially when the decisive factor is not individual genius but the ability of collective intelligence to adapt.

This war is unique because it does not replicate any of the past ones it transforms the very essence of armed conflict.

This is a war where machines think faster than humans, where the map is not a physical space but a cloud of data, where meanings matter more than munitions, and where moral resonance is more powerful than a tank breakthrough. It is a war where victory is not about establishing control but about sustaining the movement towards resilience and agency.

This is why there is an urgent need for a new philosophy of war—not merely a collection of updated tactics, but a profound rethinking of the very nature of armed conflict. A philosophy is required that accounts for the networked nature of power, the instability of dominance, the cognitive multidimensionality of influence, and the moral depth of resistance. It must be a philosophy that sees not only the battlefield but also the worldview behind it a philosophy in which war is no longer just an instrument of politics but becomes an ontological struggle for the future of humanity in a world of complexity.

War is no longer an event between nations it is a process within civilisations. And this process requires not new generals, but new thinkers.

The war raging today is not merely a clash of armies or nations it is a rupture in the world order, a fracture in the very geology of civilisation. This is not a war for territories; it is a war for meanings, and that is why it has changed the world forever. It has made undeniable what had long been concealed by the silence of diplomacy: the idea of justice as the foundation of international order has been shattered. The idea of power as responsibility has been distorted. The idea of peace is conditional.

This conflict has been the drop that shattered the illusion of security. Its continuation is not merely the agony of a region but the pulsation of a threat rippling through every vein of the global body. It is creating new frontlines not only geographical but also moral, economic, and technological. Every hesitation, every diplomatic evasion, every political "perhaps" in this conflict multiplies the instability of the global order. What began as a local act of aggression has become a mirror reflecting the depths of humanity's crisis.

The danger is not just in missiles and tanks; the danger lies in silent approval. In the indifference that justifies the aggressor because he is strong. In the blurring of moral boundaries, which allows a dictator to act as though his will is the destiny of nations. For when the opinion of one person begins to outweigh the freedom of millions, the world becomes a hostage to endless tyranny.

The balance of the world was upheld by a conditional belief: if the strong attack the weak, there will always be another strong force to stop this injustice. But today, this philosophical

postulate is falling apart. Some giants are paralysed by internal chaos, while others are tempted to trade security for stability. And between them stands the weak, who must stand alone, like a unified Universe that has chosen dignity over fear.

The continuation of this war is not just the prolongation of a battle; it is the destruction of the moral contract on which global coexistence has rested. If evil is not stopped at one point, it ceases to be local it becomes a method, a norm, a template. And if the strong do not stop evil today, tomorrow this evil will transform into a new form of global governance a rule of violence, not of principle [1–12].

This is a war that has forced humanity to look into a mirror and fail to recognise itself. And that is why it is not the war of one country it is a test for the entire species. It asks: does humanity still have the strength to stand for values, or is it ready to surrender them for peace? Does the concept of moral responsibility for power still exist, or has the world become a field of chaos, where it is not the one who is right who wins, but the one who is louder? This is a war that has brought an end to the era of compromises with falsehood. And it will either be the beginning of a new philosophy of freedom, or the final chapter in belief in it.

Materials and Methods

The war between Ukraine and russia did not begin in 2014, nor even in 2022. This confrontation has been ongoing for centuries. The form of the struggle, the assets, tactics, and strategies have changed, but the essence has remained the same: the Ukrainian people are fighting for their freedom and statehood against russian imperialism. Each era has had its own challenges, losses, and victories. However, the unchanging desire of Ukrainians for independence has run like a red thread throughout history. Table 1 outlines the key stages of the armed struggle between Ukraine and russia for the independence of the state and the freedom of the Ukrainian people [1–21].

Modern philosophy of war is rooted in centuries of the Ukrainian struggle for statehood. History teaches us that survival belongs to those who are ready to fight, adapt, and change methods of warfare. Ukraine has a unique experience of resisting russian imperialism, and this experience will be decisive in future military conflicts around the world.

Results

We live in a moment when history is no longer just being written it is burning, scorching new contours of human understanding. In this fire, a new philosophy of war is taking shape, and for this reason, we cannot allow it to dissipate with the ashes of oblivion. We must leave not only facts and chronology for the next generation, but above all meanings. Because war is not just about what happened, but about why and how it changed everything we once considered undeniable.

The russian-Ukrainian war has become not just a battlefield, but a laboratory for rethinking. It has shattered traditional notions of how and why armed struggle is conducted. It has blurred the clear lines between the front and the rear, between soldier and programmer, between weapon and word. It has made it evident that the modern conflict is not just a matter for the military, but a deep crisis of the entire social existence. And if we do not capture these transformations in a thoughtful form, we will lose the chance to teach the future how to avoid the mistakes of our time.

We must formulate the fundamental laws of modern armed conflicts not to limit freedom of action, but to preserve humanity in a space where it is easiest to lose. These new laws must reflect principles that arise not from ancient codes of honour, but from a new reality: where war is waged not only with arms but also digitally; where victory is measured not by occupied land, but by resilience to destruction; where moral superiority becomes an element of strategic advantage.

Table 1. Stages of the Ukrainian people's struggle for independence

Stages	Motto, Goals, and Ideals	Description of the struggle period
The First Era of Struggle: The Wars of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi (1648–1657)	Motto of the period: "For faith, for freedom, for Ukraine!" Goals and ideals: liberation from Polish rule, the establishment of an independent Cossack state, a military-political alliance with equal partners.	The period of the National Liberation War led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi became the first major phase of the Ukrainians' struggle for their own statehood. The primary weapon of that time was the military skill of the Cossacks: mobility, manoeuvrability, the ability to fight in open fields and conduct raiding operations. However, the Ukrainians were at a disadvantage compared to the Poles and muscovites in terms of organizing a regular army and resources. The alliance with the tsarist moscow, which initially seemed like salvation, later became a new threat.
The First World War and the Ukrainian Revolution (1914–1921)	Motto of the period: "Freedom for Ukraine or death!" Goals and ideals: the revival of an independent Ukrainian state, the establishment of a national army, avoiding colonisation by russia or Poland.	The First World War brought destruction and division to Ukraine. Military technology, machine guns, artillery, armoured vehicles changed the way battles were fought, but the key factor in the struggle was political initiative. The Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the West Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) were attempts to create an independent state, but the lack of unity and external pressure led to their defeat. The Ukrainian army had experienced units (such as the Sich Riflemen and the UNR army), but it lacked heavy weaponry and external support.
The Second World War and the Struggle of the UIA (1939–1954)	Motto of the period: "For an Independent, Sovereign Ukrainian State!" Goals and ideals: an independent Ukraine free from totalitarian regimes, the struggle against the Nazis and Bolsheviks.	The Ukrainians found themselves between two totalitarian empires: Nazi Germany and the ussr. The organised struggle of the UIA demonstrated the ability of the Ukrainians to wage guerrilla warfare in conditions of overwhelming enemy superiority in technology and resources. The main weapons were mobility, knowledge of the terrain, and popular support. The UIA lacked heavy machinery, which ultimately complicated the fight against the Soviet forces.
The Soviet Period (1954–1991): Underground Struggle and Cultural Resistance	Motto of the period: "We will lay down our soul and body for our freedom!" Goals and ideals: the preservation of Ukrainian identity, cultural struggle, independence.	Direct armed confrontation shifted to ideological and cultural resistance. Ukrainian dissidents, writers, and artists became weapons against russification. The absence of independent media, repression, and persecution did not halt the struggle.
The Formation of the Ukrainian State (1991–2014)	Motto of the period: "Ukraine above all!" Goals and ideals: nation-building, integration into the global community, strengthening the army.	Ukraine gained independence without war, but the lack of a strategy to strengthen its defence led to weakness in the face of future invasion. The neutralisation of the nuclear arsenal and corruption within the military sector made the country vulnerable to russian aggression.
The War 2014–2022: The Beginning of the Great Struggle	Motto of the period: "Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the heroes!" Goals and ideals: defending territorial integrity, transitioning to NATO standards, creating a combat-ready army.	russia began a hybrid war, using "little green men," information attacks, and terrorist methods. Ukrainians won in the manoeuvre warfare in Donbas, but were losing in aviation, missile forces, and the navy.
The War 2022–2025: A War for the Future	Motto of the period: "The struggle continues! We will win!" Goals and ideals: full deoccupation, destruction of russia's military potential, integration into NATO.	The full-scale invasion became the culmination of the war. Ukraine demonstrated superiority in the use of drones, precision strikes, and the effectiveness of mobile units. The lack of air dominance became a weak point, but the will of the Ukrainian people turned this struggle into a fight for the future not only of Ukraine but of the entire democratic world.

These changes will not go unnoticed. They have already begun to alter the mindset of military leaders. Where once strategy was based on numerical superiority, the ability to be flexible, creative, and practice horizontal management now takes precedence. Generals of the new era must think like architects of systems, like integrators of knowledge, rather than as bearers of old templates. And this is just the beginning.

For the civilian population, war has also ceased to be a "foreign affair." It has become part of everyday life, an environment, a space for survival and co-creation. People can no longer be mere spectators.

In the new war, everyone is either a participant, a target, or a defender. And that is why we must leave to future generations not just an analysis, but a philosophical map – a way to navigate this chaos without losing ourselves.

We are not just writing the history of war. We are shaping the anthropology of resistance, the ethics of decisions, the metaphysics of resilience. And if this remains only in the memory of eyewitnesses, it will disappear. But if it becomes a text, a book, a doctrine – it will become the foundation for new thinking about war. Thinking that does not glorify war, but does not try to escape it either. Thinking that recognises war as the dark side of existence, and that is precisely why we must speak about it in the light.

The Philosophy of war – definition and meaning in the context of the russian-Ukrainian conflict.

The philosophy of war is a system of thought that comprehends war not only as an event but as a phenomenon of existence. It encompasses the nature of violence, the nature of conflict, the meaning of sacrifice, the boundaries of enmity, issues of justice, and the right to resist. It is not a strategy or tactics – it is reflection on why war occurs, how it changes individuals and societies, and what it reveals about us – as species that seek peace, yet resort to bloodshed.

In the context of the ongoing russian-Ukrainian war, **the philosophy of war takes on crucial significance**. For here, it is not only about the clash of two armies, but also the clash of two worldviews, two civilisational narratives, two conceptions of what freedom, the people, the state, and the right to be oneself truly mean. This is a war that has raised not just political or territorial questions – but the existential question of the people: *to be or not to be*?

It is paradoxical that two peoples, who once fought side by side against evil in a world war, now find themselves on opposite sides of a new divide. But the answer does not lie in the history of alliances – it lies in the history of thought. For while one people felt themselves to be part of the free world, a people of dignity and their own voice, the other remained trapped in an imperial paradigm where might equals right, and closeness is a form of subjugation.

russian political and cultural consciousness, nurtured on the traditions of centralised control, sacralised leadership, and the fear of the chaos of freedom, sees difference as a threat. Ukrainian identity, on the other hand, is rooted in the struggle for the right to be unlike others, in the eternal strengthening of itself through resistance. One people seeks *to dominate*, the other *seeks to exist*. And it is here that the philosophy of war reveals its essence: war begins when the existence of one is unacceptable to the other.

The imperial mentality, which despises freedom as weakness, seeks to turn another people into its mirror – while those who value their uniqueness resist even when all seems lost. War has become a symbol not of strength, but of fear: fear of the freedom of others, of their right to think, speak, and be different. And this fear has turned into aggression.

Therefore, the philosophy of war today is not an abstraction, but a tool for understanding the depth of our conflict. It allows us to grasp that this is not simply a war of states, but a war of worldviews. A war between the past, which does not want to let go, and the future, which refuses to wait. Between the violence of memory and the will to live.

And only through this philosophical lens can we see that war does not always begin with a

shot. It begins with the denial of another's right to be – to be themselves. In this war, Ukraine does not conquer – it defends. It does not advance – it protects. And for this reason, this war is not the tragedy of just one people. It is the philosophical boundary of humanity: whether the world is capable of accepting the plurality of truths, or whether it will again succumb to the temptation of violent unity.

In conclusion, the philosophy of war is not a description of battles and generals. It is an attempt to answer eternal questions that have once again become painful: **Who are we in war? Why are we fighting? What is victory?** And the russian-Ukrainian war has become not only a historical event but a mirror of world civilisation, in which every state, every nation, every individual is forced to see themselves without adornment.

1. **The irreversibility of war…** War is not simply a clash of two military forces. It reveals deeper processes within society, alters the very nature of human relationships, destroys established structures, and creates new benchmarks for the future. For Ukraine, war is a constant reality to which we must adapt, but the irreversibility of this war also means that its outcome cannot be altered through peaceful negotiations or compromises if it is a national matter of survival. With each new battle, the price of our freedom increases, yet the war itself has already sent us to a point of no return, where every moment is either our progress or the prolonged disaster.

2. **The weak before the strong…** In the classical understanding of war, the weaker side seeks to compensate for its weakness through cunning, superior tactics, or external alliances. However, in modern warfare, weakness is not only defined by physical strength, but also by moral and psychological resilience. Weakness is not synonymous with defeat, but can serve as a catalyst for struggle, which in turn leads to the formation of new concepts of warfare – a war of strength and will, not just weaponry. In Ukraine, the weakness of the defensive forces is offset by the mobilisation of national unity, adaptive strategies, and the drive for victory.

3. **The ambiguity of victory for opponents…** The war between Ukraine and russia is an example of how victory can be blurred in both time and space. For one side, victory is national survival; for the other, it is the restoration of imperial grandeur. However, each of these understandings contains internal contradictions, as neither territorial gains nor a change in political leadership guarantee definitive victory. Victory can only be achieved when one side is able to change the very nature of the conflict, not just its outcomes on the battlefield.

4. **What is power in war?** Power in war is not only the size of the army or the number of weapons, but also the depth of the will to fight. It is the ability to continue despite losses, to adapt strategies to new conditions, to gain the support of external partners, and to create new strategies while maintaining flexibility. For Ukraine, the power of war is not superiority in technical means, but cohesion, the will to survive, and the resilience of moral principles, which enable us to withstand even the aggression of a much stronger opponent.

5. **All wars end, but not all end in victory… Some wars end through political will, and this will is not always present in the participants of the conflict…** Victory is not always determined solely by military achievements. Political will, a nation's inner ability to preserve itself, and the desire for peace are sometimes more important than military power. In the case of the ongoing russian-Ukrainian war, the presence of political will to continue the fight for independence determines success. At the same time, such will may be absent in the aggressor, whose goals go far beyond mere political achievements.

6. **Unfortunately… victory in war is not always achieved on the battlefield…** War in the modern world is not only about military clashes. It is an informational, economic, and political struggle, where victory depends on the ability to control the situation on all fronts, not just the physical one. Therefore, even if combat operations are ongoing, the war can be won in the arena of international negotiations, through economic sanctions, and in managing the morale of the nation.

7. **Youth and the new generation are not to blame, but they can choose the path of a**

warrior, the defender of their state!!! War shapes new generations of people who grow up in the conditions of a struggle for their identity and future. Young people who did not participate in previous conflicts realise that their choice is between preserving national dignity and submitting to foreign rulers. Therefore, the call to defend one's land is not only a moral duty but also a fight for justice and the right to a future that they themselves will determine.

8. **What defines a leader is the absence of groupthink. Listen to everyone, but make the decision yourself!!!**Leadership in wartime cannot be based on the consensus of the majority. A leader must go beyond the usual frameworks and have the ability to make decisions guided only by the most important and strategic objectives, even if this contradicts the general opinion. At this moment, it is important not to follow the crowd, but to lead your people to victory, even through uncertainty and the pain of loss.

9. **A leader is not someone who thinks like the majority, but someone who can make the majority think like him…** A leader who guides a country through war must have the ability to transform the mentality of the nation. His role is not to follow the mood of the people, but to turn every citizen into a conscious fighter, a part of a great mechanism capable of achieving the goal. He defines the direction, not answering the question: "Why" does the majority agree with his plans.

10. **Victory achieved through violence is the same as defeat, for it is temporary…** Violent victory is an illusion of a lasting result. It may lead to a temporary change in the situation, but does not ensure lasting peace. A victory achieved through force, without moral or political legitimacy, cannot be stable. It will only become a burden for future generations, who will continue to seek justice. The war must end with a change in the fundamental conditions, not temporary solutions through violence.

11. **reject the most desirable thoughts, for they are the ones that can destroy you the most…** war changes a person's inner world, and the greatest danger lies in desires that can entrap one in the illusionary trap. The desire to achieve peace, end the war, or save people may distract from the main thing – from the real possibilities and necessary decisions, which must be based on the objective situation. These illusions, built on hopes, can make you vulnerable, for the struggle cannot depend on naïve expectations, but only on cold calculation and clear vision.

12. **Sometimes you have to trust even the most uncertain commander and entrust everything to someone you are completely unsure of, because such a risk can open the chance to achieve what you never expected…** The history of war teaches us that sometimes the greatest risk can be the key to victory. An unexpected choice or trust in a person who seems less reliable or familiar can open up new opportunities. People who do not have clearly defined ambitions or habits are capable of finding innovative approaches that may surpass traditional methods. War does not allow playing by the usual rules; it demands openness to new ideas and unconventional solutions.

13. **A step for retreat during a military operation can only be one, because the second might be the last…** In war, retreat is not just a tactical move; it is a matter of life and death. It is important to know when to choose the moment for retreat to preserve strength, but this decision must be precise and decisive. You must retreat once, not twice, as each subsequent step can lead to disaster. A lack of clear strategy in such cases can lead to the complete collapse of the defence.

14. **War provides a chance for one of the opponents to thrive, and not always the stronger or the victorious…** Every conflict has two sides, and victory does not always guarantee prosperity. Sometimes, the aggressor may achieve their short-term goals but feel failure in the long term. Meanwhile, even defeat can become the beginning of a nation's recovery if it finds the strength for self-restoration. Ukraine is already experiencing these processes, restoring its dignity and the path to development even during the war.

15. **The post-war period is sometimes more terrifying than the war itself, as the support of those who helped fight disappears along with the war…** War is not only a battle on the battlefield, but also a constant shared experience of trials. After it ends, the support of allies can

weaken, and the fear of being left alone with the consequences of war arises. More important than the combat itself is the nation's readiness to overcome the devastation after the war, the ability to rebuild the economy, infrastructure, and morale. The post-war period is crucial in shaping the new order.

16. **The war in the minds of the personnel must become a war for light in the dark Kkngdom. The only way forward for the nation and humanity as a whole is for the warriors to become crusaders in the fight against the infidels. Only then will there be a chance to preserve their idea and their country...** In times of war, the personnel must understand their mission not just as a struggle for territory or victory, but as a fight for light, truth, and the future of the nation. This moment is not only a fight for survival but for preserving the values that make the nation unique. It is, in a way, a crusade, where every warrior is a bearer of the idea, not just a soldier on the battlefield.

17. **Do not look for mistakes in the enemy's strategy, but implement your own war strategy! Let it not be understood at first, but later it will become the foundation of the fight, because those who seek flaws in the enemy, when they cannot find any, will be left with only your strategy!!!** Instead of focusing on the weaknesses of the opponent, you need to formulate your own strategy based on your own strengths. If the enemy's strategy cannot be dismantled or adapted to your own, it is better to concentrate on creating your own conditions for victory. A strategy born from deep reflection may not be understood immediately, but in time, it will find support and become the foundation for success.

18. **Sometimes the life of one person depends on the life of the whole nation. But this person can either honour the nation or tarnish it for years to come. Unfortunately, the lives of millions lost cannot always influence the course of events in history or save the nation…** The history of war shows that individual decisions can have a far greater impact than they first appear. The actions of one leader or soldier not only determine the fate of a military operation but also the moral spirit of the nation. Sometimes even one person can change the course of the war. However, sometimes a great contribution to history cannot bring back what has already been lost. The millions lost may be irreparable, but the heroic actions of individuals can change the path to victory.

19. **The most important – kindness and courage...** Kindness and courage are not just moral categories; they are the fundamental pillars upon which a nation fighting for its freedom stands. They are the foundation of military resilience because without them, it is impossible to defend truth and justice. War is dreadful, but it is the kindness in the heart of the warrior and the courage born from faith in their cause that determine the outcome.

20. **Unfortunately, everyone understands that they will Ffght, but they also understand that the longer the war in Ukraine continues, the shorter and less costly the war will be for others…** War is not only a physical conflict but also a global political dynamic. The continuation of the war in Ukraine forces other nations to reconsider their foreign policies. In this context, each day of conflict brings new lessons and compels the world to reassess its strategies. Ukraine has to pay the highest price, but this also affects the stability of the entire world. Therefore, other nations must learn from this war to avoid similar catastrophes in the future.

21. **Collective security makes sense only when the leader's opinion is supported by others, and responsibility for the decisions made ss shared among all members of the collective security block. The more members the collective security block has, the fewer security guarantees it provides...** Collective security cannot exist without unity of thought and decision-making among its participants. Each member of the block must be ready to share responsibility for security equally, but it is also important to understand that when there are too many participants, effectiveness weakens. All countries have different interests and strategies, and therefore guaranteed security can only be achieved when the collective block acts as a cohesive whole, rather than a mosaic of separate parts.

22. **Victory is not always immediately visible or felt. Sometimes the enemy believes it has succeeded, but later realises that this is the beginning of its end… Ukraine has lost, but it has forced russia to make irreversible decisions regarding its global status and image in history. They themselves understand this, but there is nothing they can do about it now, as they have already lost on the global scale, and the nation has forever marked itself with blood that can never be washed away.** Victory in war is not always measured by territories or military victories. Sometimes, even a temporary defeat can lay the foundation for a grand strategy that will change the course of history. Although russia achieved military successes at certain stages, it found itself in a historical and political trap that cannot be resolved in the short term. History will remember this conflict as evidence of the fall of not only strategic power but also the moral image of the aggressor.

23. **You may not believe in yourself, but you must believe in those around you who are doing the hard, routine work of fighting for the idea, because only they can convince you that believing in yourself gives them the strength to continue the fight, which is the very meaning of their existence today in wartime…** In moments of war, when your own belief may falter, the collective comes to the forefront. War is not just about the heroism of individuals, but about mutual support and trust in those around you. Belief in the team and its ability to achieve a common goal becomes the foundation for overcoming difficulties. The routine work of soldiers and their dedication to the cause is just as important as any strategic plans. They may be the ones who ensure the continuation of the fight.

24. **… only the search for new ideas can give you an advantage over an equal or stronger opponent. Never forget that the enemy is also constantly searching for them, so innovative superiority is the key to armed struggle today…** War is not static; it always requires constant renewal and adaptation. Innovation is what gives an advantage, even to those who seem weaker or less prepared. The enemy, like us, is seeking new ideas, and if we do not stay one step ahead, their new approaches may surpass us. Constant renewal and out-of-the-box thinking are the key conditions for victory in modern warfare.

25. **… war between two countries changes not only the external policy of the state, but also alters the rules of life within the country, both economically and politically. Either the country is a unified mechanism, or it is easy prey…** War forces the state to rethink its internal structures and approaches to governance. If a country is unable to become a unified mechanism for mobilising resources, supporting the economy, and maintaining national unity, it becomes vulnerable. Internal resilience and political stability must align with the challenges presented by war, otherwise, even a strong external defence will not be able to protect the country from defeat.

26. **…if your personal goals are more prioritised than military ones, you should not attempt to become a leader, because your gain will be the loss of your unit and the country as a whole.** War requires leaders to be selfless and free from personal ambitions when it comes to the collective goal. Leadership is not a place for the pursuit of glory or personal gain. Every decision, every step a leader takes must be directed towards achieving the shared objective, without regard for personal interests. Otherwise, everything they do will cause harm to both the unit and the entire nation.

27. **The main purpose of armed struggle is not the destruction of the enemy's country or nation, but the transformation of its identity…** In modern warfare, the key goal is not to physically destroy the enemy. The aim of war is to change the internal foundations of the enemy, its identity, and its ability to recover. It is a fight for values, ideas, and the mentality of the nation, not just for territory. Destroying the morale and self-awareness of the enemy is far more effective than physical destruction.

28. **Force your own and others to live by your rules, but give them the right to think that it is their life and their rules… Coercion is the foundation of effective military function**

within the state, and forcing the enemy to act according to your plan is the main way to gain an advantage in armed struggle. You need to make your fight for control of the situation more cunning and farsighted (strategic) than that of your enemy... In war, every act of coercion is part of the control strategy. By forcing the enemy to play by your rules, you are effectively controlling the course of events. At the same time, it is important to give them the illusion that they are choosing the path. This helps preserve their morale and ability to fight until you can fully implement your strategy.

29. **You cannot force the enemy to peace by strength… Therefore, if you are strong, then strength is already an advantage over the enemy. If you are stronger, peace will come only through the enemy's fear of losing everything. Even when the chances of winning in a conflict outweigh the possibility of losing, but there remains a risk of losing everything, the enemy may agree to end the war. However, this is not coercion – it is an agreement.** Peace through force may be temporary, but it does not resolve the problem permanently. If the enemy sees they could lose everything and their position becomes hopeless, they may agree to peace. However, this will not be coercion, but a settlement based on the realities of strength and the fear of losing everything.

30. **Hope is an illusion if You cannot fix what you have broken – you are already lost… So, if you get the opportunity to lead a functioning combat-ready unit, do not let emotions and superstitions guide you, because the consequences could be irreversible both for the unit you are leading and for yourself. War demands cold calculation and discipline.** Hope for luck or emotional decisions can lead to catastrophe. A leader commanding armed forces must see beyond the immediate battle, thinking not only of victory in individual skirmishes but also of the consequences of each decision on the course of the entire war. Hope cannot replace a clear strategy, just as impulsiveness cannot replace careful planning. If you hope the situation will resolve itself, you have already lost. However, if you act wisely, even in the darkest times of war, you give not only yourself but also your people a chance for the future. War does not forgive weakness. It does not offer second chances to those who make decisions based on illusions. A true leader relies not on hope, but on willpower, knowledge, and the ability to make decisions that, while painful today, will save an entire nation tomorrow.

31. **Undervaluing the enemy is a mistake of the commander**, but overestimating the enemy’s capabilities is a tragedy for the entire army, because even if there are chances to win morally, the army has already lost… underestimating the enemy’s strength or resources can lead to overconfidence, which will later result in serious losses. However, overestimating their capabilities is even more dangerous. It creates an atmosphere of fear, confusion, and paralysis of the will to win. If the army does not believe in its ability to win because it exaggerates the enemy’s power, even a small success by the opponent can sow doubts among the troops and lead to a psychological defeat.

32. **A resource-superior enemy can only be defeated when their losses in battle are seen not as the sacrifice of a defender**, but as pointless losses driven by the desire of a person strengthening their power through war. The influence on the enemy nation's consciousness is the key to bringing the war to an end. War to the last soldier and cent in the enemy's mind must become a fight for its preservation, but this is one of the toughest tasks for military and state leadership on both sides. A great resource advantage of the enemy is not a verdict. To achieve victory, one must focus not only on strategy but also on the morale of the enemy. When soldiers begin to realise that their sacrifices benefit only the strengthening of a dictatorship or the power of an individual, and not their nation, morale will be shattered. The key struggle becomes one for the consciousness of the nation: if the enemy does not feel the need to continue the conflict, the war will come to an end when both sides no longer have the strength to continue fighting.

33. **The war between russians and Ukrainians is an eternal historical conflict between two nations with different identities**, where one nation is aggressive and sees its prosperity at the

expense of others, while the other strives for peaceful and independent life with its own strategic vision for development. A country with a future will constantly fight against a country living in the past. This conflict is not only military but also cultural, ideological, and historical. Ukraine, as a nation, is future-oriented, aiming to be part of the European community, with a strategic vision for development. Russia, on the other hand, looking back to the greatness of past empires, cannot allow Ukraine to achieve independence, as it undermines its authority on the international stage. This is a confrontation between two worldviews, where each side is not just fighting for territory, but for the future of their people and nation.

34. **Often, what distinguishes an average commander from an outstanding one is not their strategies or maneuvers, but their vision: they simply view the same problem from different angles**. An outstanding commander, free from the dead grip of tradition, naturally chooses the correct strategy. A great commander has the ability to see a situation in a broader context, not limited to traditional strategies or established approaches. Their decisions are not always the most obvious, but they are always optimal for the specific situation. This is not only a matter of technical preparation but also of a deep understanding of the psychology of war, consideration of the human factor, and the ability to act in conditions of constant uncertainty.

35. **In a war against a stronger opponent, what matters most is not what has Been lost or what may be lost**, but what has been saved or can still be saved. When facing a more powerful enemy, it's crucial to focus not on the losses, but on what can still be preserved, protected, or salvaged. War is not always about an unconditional victory, but about survival, the ability to adapt to circumstances, and preventing total destruction. In difficult moments, the ability to safeguard what is crucial for the nation provides the strength to continue the struggle and ensure a future.

36. **Never give your enemy a chance to deceive you, and even more so, never allow your friends to do so**. When an enemy lies, it is expected – it is their nature. But when a friend hides the truth, manipulates, or betrays – that is poison within your own army, system, and state. The enemy destroys from the outside, but a betrayed trust undermines from within. Therefore, the commander's attention must be not only on the front but also on the heart of each person around them. Trust is a weapon, but an even greater weapon is timely suspicion. War is not just about gunfire; it is a daily struggle for truth, which protects you better than any bulletproof vest.

Conclusion

Today, the study of the philosophy of war in the context of the russian-Ukrainian confrontation allows us not only to understand the events unfolding but also to deeply examine the nature of armed struggle in the 21st century – as it has emerged, without the mask of romanticism, without illusions about the "noble" wars of the past, and without the classical canons that have lost their relevance on the battlefield of a new type.

The research reveals:

1. A new ethics of war.

In this war, the meanings of the terms "enemy," "defender," "victim," and "hero" have ceased to be black and white. We are confronted with a new moral reality, where a soldier is not just a fighter but a philosopher with a rifle, and every strategic mistake costs not only territory but also meaning.

2. A shift in the logic of power.

Power is no longer measured by the number of tanks or soldiers. True advantage lies in will, ideas, the ability to adapt, and thinking unconventionally. This rethinking is the key to understanding victory in a war where the weaker side can push out the stronger.

3. The expansion of military thinking..

The science of war no longer belongs solely to military academies. Civilians, scholars,

analysts, engineers, and psychologists have become participants in armed resistance, even without holding weapons. This brings together military philosophy with science, technology, and the humanities.

Why is this information useful?

For military personnel: it provides understanding, not just orders. A commander who understands the nature of war makes better decisions in conditions of uncertainty; it teaches flexible thinking – expanding the strategic horizon; it helps form new guidelines and postulates that are relevant to contemporary reality.

For scholars: it offers living material for rethinking classical theories of war, power, identity, and culture; it creates a platform for interdisciplinary dialogue; philosophers, historians, sociologists, and legal experts can collaboratively create a new humanitarian language for understanding armed conflict; it allows for the development of new concepts of security, freedom, responsibility, and leadership.

Recommendations

the russian-Ukrainian war has changed the very philosophy of conducting armed conflict, dismantling traditional notions of power, strategy, and victory. This conflict has become not just a military confrontation, but a struggle of worldviews: between imperial violence and the desire for freedom, between the past and the future.

Wars are no longer conflicts that end with a traditional military victory. They have become multidimensional, where military power is combined with economic, informational, and technological opposition.

Ukraine has proven that victory is not just about destroying the enemy on the battlefield, but also about undermining their ability to wage war. Russia, despite temporary military successes, has suffered a strategic defeat, as its international isolation and internal crisis are already irreversible.

Modern warfare has shown that strength is no longer measured solely by the number of troops and equipment. Flexibility, innovation, speed of adaptation to new conditions, and the will to fight have become the defining factors.

A nation's resilience during war depends not only on the army but also on the society’s ability to self-organise, endure, and sacrifice. War changes the social order, economy, and political systems of a state, transforming it either into a unified, cohesive mechanism or into the victim of an aggressor.

Command during war requires abandoning groupthink, constantly searching for new strategies, and being ready to take responsibility for the nation's fate. A leader is not someone who thinks like the majority, but someone who makes the majority think like him.

Violence never brings long-term victory unless it is backed by a strategic vision for the future. Victory in war is not only about defeating the enemy, but also about laying the foundations for peace, security, and the development of the state.

Acknowledgments

The authors declare that they have no competing interests regarding the subject matter of the article.

References

1. Clausewitz, C. von. (1984). *On War* (Edited and translated by M. Howard & P. Paret). Princeton University Press.
2. Sun Tzu. (2009). *The Art of War* (Translated by L. Giles). Skyhorse Publishing.
3. Mao, Z. (2000). *On Guerrilla Warfare* (Translated by S. B. Griffith). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

4. Liddell Hart, B. H. (1991). *Strategy: The Indirect Approach*. Penguin Books.
5. Gerras, S. J., & Wong, L. (2016). *Changing Minds in the Army: Why It's So Difficult and What to Do About It*. Strategic Studies Institute. https://press.armywarcollege.edu/monographs/346
6. United States Army Futures Command. (2020). *Army Futures Command Vision*. U.S. Army. https://armyfuturescommand.army.mil/about/vision
7. Freedman, L. (2017). *The Future of War: A History*. PublicAffairs.
8. Belov, V. (2022). Anticipatory defense planning: the way to deter the aggressor. *Defense Bulletin, 4*, 12–21. https://www.defensebulletin.ua/issue4
9. Moseley, A. (n.d.). *A Philosophy of War*. https://www.hugoperezidiart.com.ar/epistemologia-pdf/Moseley_A_Philosophy_of_War.pdf
10. Hooker, R. D. Jr. (2019). *The Character and Conduct of Modern War*. https://web.ung.edu/media/university-press/Beyond%20Vom%20Kriege%20sample%20chapter.pdf
11. Koval, V., & Semenenko, O. (2023). Irrational wars in the context of the modern world geopolitical situation: the Ukrainian aspect. *Military Science Journal, 1* (1), 14–32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62524/msj.2023.1.1.02
12. Paret, P. (Ed.). (1992). *The Oxford History of Modern War*. Oxford University Press. https://www.cia.gov/library/abbottabad-compound/4F/4FE6BEDB616C0FD2603CA0D307DEE670_MODERN_WAR.pdf
13. Libicki, M. C. (1995). *The Mesh and the Net: Speculations on Armed Conflict in a Time of Free Silicon*. National Defense University. https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1140&context=monographs
14. Gouré, D. (2019). *The Nature of Warfare: Has Clausewitz Maintained Relevancy? ARMOR*, Fall (c. 4–10). https://www.moore.army.mil/armor/earmor/content/issues/2019/Fall/4Cook-Wharton-Slider19.pdf
15. Echevarria, A. J. II. (2017). *Clausewitz's Theory of War and Victory in Contemporary Conflict*. *Parameters, 47* (4), 5–16. https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3100&context=parameters
16. U.S. Marine Corps. (1997). *MCDP 1 Warfighting*. Department of the Navy. https://www.marines.mil/portals/1/publications/mcdp%201%20warfighting.pdf
17. *An Annotated Guide to Tactics: Carl von Clausewitz's Theory of the Combat*. (2019). U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence. https://www.usmcu.edu/Portals/218/AnnotatedGuidetoTactics_web.pdf
18. Libicki, M. C. (1995). *Armed Conflict in the 21st Century: The Information Revolution and Post-Modern Warfare*. Strategic Studies Institute. https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1140&context=monographs
19. Dubik, J. M. (2022). *Retired Lt. Gen. James Dubik talks with students about the ethics of war*. U.S. Army. https://www.army.mil/article/257549/retired_lt_gen_james_dubik_talks_with_students_about_the_ethics_of_war
20. *Systems Confrontation and System Destruction Warfare: How the Chinese People's Liberation Army Seeks to Wage Modern Warfare*. (2017). RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1708.html
21. *Leveraging Complexity in Great-Power Competition and Warfare.* Vol. I. (2021). Framework. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RRA500