

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.61.01.20>

How to Cite:

Lepskyi, M., Masiuk, O., Skvorets, V., & Kudinov, I. (2023). Decision-making attractors in the conditions of war (the modern Russian-Ukrainian war example). *Amazonia Investiga*, 12(61), 193-201. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.61.01.20>

## Decision-making attractors in the conditions of war (the modern Russian-Ukrainian war example)

### Центри тяжіння прийняття рішень в умовах війни (на прикладі сучасної російсько-української війни)

Received: January 25, 2023

Accepted: February 28, 2023

Written by:

**Maksym Lepskyi**<sup>81</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5604-641X>**Oleh Masiuk**<sup>82</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3853-5863>**Volodymyr Skvorets**<sup>83</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7558-0773>**Igor Kudinov**<sup>84</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7785-1637>

#### Abstract

Features of the phenomenon of human decision-making in the conditions of war are analyzed. The paper is revealing the phenomenon of decision-making during war based on the events form the modern Russian-Ukrainian war. The research findings state that decision-making in the conditions of war has differences between people who defend their lives, family, country, and aggressors who seek to seize territories, turn free people into acolytes or colonies of their state, and impose autocracy on a democratic society. The authors defined the attractors of people's decision-making in war, such as: "home", "heart and mind", "strength and will", "heroism and dignity", "social order and victory". The conducted research has a conceptual nature and serves as a methodological basis for conducting practical scientific research on the development of effective decision-making skills in conditions of destructive human influence and existential disasters.

**Keywords:** attractor, decision making, home, actor, peace, war.

#### Анотація

У статті розкривається сутність феномену прийняття рішень в умовах війни на основі аналізу подій сучасної російсько-української війни. Результати дослідження свідчать, що прийняття рішень в умовах війни відрізняється між людьми, які захищають своє життя, сім'ю, країну, і агресорами, які прагнуть захопити території, перетворити вільних людей на прислужників чи колонії своєї держави, нав'язати авторитаризм. Автори визначили атрактори прийняття рішень людьми на війні: «дім», «серце і розум», «сила і воля», «героїзм і гідність», «суспільний лад і перемога». Проведене дослідження має концептуальний характер і слугує методологічною основою для проведення практичних наукових досліджень з розвитку навичок ефективного прийняття рішень в умовах деструктивного впливу людини та екзистенційних катастроф.

**Ключові слова:** атрактор, прийняття рішення, дім, суб'єкт, мир, війна.

<sup>81</sup> Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Academician of the European Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Professor of Sociology department, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

<sup>82</sup> Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Professor of Social Philosophy and Public Administration department, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

<sup>83</sup> Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Academician of the European Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Head of Sociology department, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

<sup>84</sup> PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of Sociology department, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

## Introduction

War changes the everyday life of people, social relations, structure, modes of operation of life – everything that defines stability and certainty of the social system in which people live and make decisions. In this context, war appears before people as conditions of uncertainty, complexity, and instability of the social system, where people begin to organize their lives. This provides an opportunity to apply the theories of self-organization and synergetics, which are applied to complex, unstable, and chaotic systems. At the same time, according to the theory of self-organization, we study the process of ordering the social system and people's lives as a series of decisions, which we consider as a phase transition from certainty to uncertainty, from a stable state of life to an unstable one, and the tendency of people towards ordering centers – to attractors.

Using the example of the modern Russian-Ukrainian war, where democratic and autocratic values collide, and where the international order of the democratic world depends on the resilience of the Ukrainian people and support from the global community, we investigate decision-making attractors, which depend on the choices of specific individuals and define their dynamics and the dynamics of their lives. First, we consider the choice of decision-making guidelines during the war, examining the home as an attractor for deciding whether to stay at home on the frontline, near the frontline, in the rear, or to be an internally displaced person or a refugee. The home, in a broad sense, defines the center of gravity for organizing everyday social life.

After addressing this issue, we turn to the foundation of subjectivity in conditions of uncertainty and threats to life, such as the "heart and mind" as the balance between rational and irrational decision-making (cognitive and emotional attractors), "strength and will" as attractors that determine people's capabilities in the conditions of military uncertainty (praxeological and conative attractors), and "heroism and dignity" as the axiological attractors, asserting the meaning of life in the war, defending the values that people are willing to fight for.

The research on the state and role of organizing decision-making in wartime conditions is defined as the structures of organizing social life that create the social order of the state in wartime and define the image of victory as an attractor for organizing life, the image of a desired future in

decision-making that carries the meaning of victory.

## Theoretical Framework

Our research was based on:

- 1) analysis of the interaction of emotional and rational systems (Kahneman, 2020), the subjective influence on a person's perception of the world (Berne, 1975), (Fisogni, 2022), (Jung, 1953), as well as the logical interrelationship development of optimism and pessimism, which determines the extent of existence during non-standard situations (Lepskiy, 2006), (Perellin, 2009);
- 2) analysis of previous victories and defeats, where well-known examples of heroic behavior of the past and present (Lane-Poole, 2018), (Rusch, 2022), as well as traumatic experiences that needs to process by a human (Herman, 2015) and the world (Benard et al., 2022);
- 3) synergistic methodology of I. Prigogine, I. Stenger (Prigogine & Stengers, 1984), and the fractal approach to scaling self-organizing processes by J. West (West, 2016) and attraction and repulsion in migration (Lepskiy, 2016).

## Methodology

The authors of the article investigate war as a state of chaos in people's lives, who perceive peace as order and war as disorder, uncertainty, and chaotic processes. Therefore, our methodology applies the concept of social synergetics, transitioning from the peaceful order through the chaos of war to the military state, to the attractors of military order (sometimes strange attractors). In synergetic methodology, we rely on the works of I. Prigogine, I. Stenger (Prigogine & Stenger, 1984), and the fractal approach to scaling self-organizing processes by J. West (West, 2016).

The main method of the research is document and content analysis of Ukrainian mass and social media concerning Russian-Ukrainian war. At the center of our research is mainly civilian population, which makes decisions about its fate. At the same time, with all the uncertainty of the processes, there are attractors that determine individual and group decisions, and scale to mass decisions, as they are replicated. War also determines the processes of repulsion from ordinary everyday life, attractors of people's

movement, which, together with centripetal forces, determine people's decisions (directions of movement) in war conditions. Decision-making is a central process of management and organization of actors' activity, the meaningful aspect of which is the cognitive and evaluative and volitional choice of alternatives for solving the problem by a person. This central organizational process provides a communicative process that supposedly permeates all management and organizations. All these processes are under the pressure of the war situation, which is another phase of the society.

## Results and Discussion

Peace is considered as a special phase of the existence of society and relations between societies, in which the desire for progressive development and evolutionary improvement of living arrangement prevails. This phase of society's development has its own economy, politics, culture and technology, ecology and orientation of social relations. War is considered as a phase of confrontation and irreversible destruction (protection from destruction) of society and relations between societies, living arrangement is restructured to ensure this destruction and the social development of peace is destroyed, the question arises of survival and victory over the enemy. It is important for us to understand that war has a negative, destructive economy, since it is aimed at the survival of society, the development of means of death and defeating the enemy.

Decision-making phenomenon during wartime is a complex, multi-layered representation that is often influenced by propaganda, ideological and sometimes insane influences, information war for worldview, thought patterns and impulsive mass actions. The war phase has a simplification of the multifaceted activity of peaceful life and the stability of everyday life in the search for a balance of human relations, the military sphere is in a "cold" (minimally sufficient) or "warm" restorative state of security readiness. Everything is changing during the war: the military and security spheres become dominant which restructure the social organism of the country according to their needs, according to the needs of the survival of society and the state, and victory over the enemy.

People's actions during war are determined by instincts (for example, life and death), vital needs, as C.G. Jung wrote, by that what defines the body, archetypes – that what defines the psyche in the collective unconscious, and senses,

which determines the mind and will. The satisfaction of vital needs in instincts shifts from the usual everyday life to the deficient everyday life and adaptation to the new social reality. The archetypes of social relations are shifting to the mobilizing collective unconscious, in its way in Ukraine there is an actualization of the archetypes of protective heroes – Cossacks, warriors, women guards, generals, diplomats, at the same time, in the full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation, we see an actualization of the archetypes of criminals, looters, executioners and others. War, as the military psychologist Lawrence LeShan proved, always tends to the transition to the level of archetypes, to the transition from sensitive reality to mythological (LeShan, 1992).

No less interesting is the study of emotions and irrationality, meanings and rationality in decision-making. According to the Nobel laureate D. Kahneman, there are two modes of human thinking that lead to impulsive and rational decisions (Kahneman, 2020). However, the question arises about the specifics of the functioning of these modes in wartime conditions. Practice has shown that impulsive emotional decisions at the beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian war were dominant in the short-term behavior of most people. It is generally accepted that a person based on emotions chooses life through escape. However, this is only half the truth. The emotion of indignation at aggression can also trigger a choice in favor of weapons and self-sacrifice for the benefit of a common future. There are many reasons for choosing one of the options, but the basis is the dominance of egoism and altruism in the value world of a person and society.

Previous attempts to rationally evaluate the behavior of a potential aggressor were erroneous. At the root of the flaw in the rational understanding of war lies in a person's habituation to risk during his long stay in his/her life. Such a problem is characteristic of the inhabitants of the whole world. Analyzing the complexities of danger perception in the USA, C. Perellin remarks on specific blindness: "I have been interested for years in the near – total lack of connection between perception and reality of fear. If you think about this, you can easily find many examples. About 3,000 people died in 9/11. Forty-two thousand Americans die on our highways each year. How proportional is our government's response?" (Perellin, 2009, 144). So, this is an irrational unwillingness of a person to see the near non-existence and to think about its possibility, to accept the fact that death is

always nearby and accompanies his/her life. That is, evil that is constantly present in our living space ceases to be perceived as a danger, and unexpected evil creates panic and suspicion. This can be attributed to the periodic return of Ukrainian refugees to their homes before the war gives rise to a new shock.

### 1. Choosing decision-making guidelines during war

Within the framework of the philosophical discourse, the worldview of peace and the worldview of war are separately distinguished, in which optimism and pessimism are combined with the help of evaluative and volitional activity. In the worldview, optimism is established through the measure of life (the existence of people, the acquisition of soul and spiritual, and their implementation in practical activities), and pessimism is realized through the measure of death (as the protection of the measure of life from irreversible destruction – the measure of death), this dichotomy always has an intensity of force vs powerlessness, will vs lack of will.

War as an existential tension illuminates this measure of life and death of people, society, homeland, humanity, which becomes a manifestation of a dignified and fulfilled life. As claimed by K.G. Jung, death instinct is about the fullness of life (Jung, 1953). The value orientations of a person immerse the activity to the deep essence – “who is a person in this humanity”. The measure of death acquires an intersubjective character. Arises the spectrum of emotions of *mortido* and *destrudo* instincts. Sometimes endless revenge can become the leitmotif of existence, destroying the soul and spiritual. Affirmation of life becomes possible only after accepting the fact of its vulnerability, near and accidental end.

Decision-making in the conditions of war has differences between people who defend their lives, family, country, and aggressors who seek to seize territories, turn free people into acolytes or colonies of their state, and impose autocracy on a democratic society.

Human behavior during war is based on the priorities of survival and achieving victory, development in the negative destructive political economy of war is compressed and moved mainly to the military sphere and its provision. Basic human aspirations, as well as ideal images of life, are contained in a worldview with a divided reality, where the desired and

unacceptable, pre-war and wartime, are clearly demarcated, which is what constitutes the space for finding solutions, as well as models of behavior and activities of its participants.

War is a choice of one's own destiny, which differentiates people into military and civilian, “ours” and “enemies”, not only in the reality of warring actors, but also at the level of awareness of their desired future. At the same time, these roles become part of a person's worldview, which directly affects the decision-making process. A problematic question arises – what are the attractors of people's choices in war-decision-making? This choice is based on an identity that allows to survive in difficult conditions. R. Nalbandov explains it as follows: “Specific identity constructs force them to choose different options not based on the objective utility calculations but on their subjectively constructed assessment of the objective reality” (Nalbandov, 2013, 94). In our case, the decision is made on the basis of a subjectively constructed assessment of objective reality, which turns into directed actions, which is based on the identification of a person with war or with peace, and the main formation of reality, the interaction of people in the social relations of war. In our opinion, these are the following attractors: “home”, “heart and mind”, “strength and will”, “heroism and dignity”, “social order and victory”.

### 2. Home

“Home” is a multi-layered semantic concept that determines people's decisions to leave or stay home. For instance, the first wave of refugees (IDPs) in Ukraine was caused not so much by the war itself, but by its threat. People left their homes to move to a safe territory or country. Sometimes the motives were also the search for a better fate, a new home – under the pretext of war. The search for safety as a shelter, sometimes a temporary home, was both global, international, and regional (within the country) (Razumkov Center, 2022a). The second wave is refugees from the areas near the frontline zone, which is exposed to shelling, and the frontline zone, where hostilities are taking place, has significant differences in the psychological state of people. Often it is a home destroyed by the war, a family that lost loved ones or was injured. Their motivation to seek shelter and often find a new home is to “start over” (Razumkov Center, 2022b). “Home is under fire”, “home is a fortress”, “ruined home” is not only the conditioning of decisions – it is also a long-term trauma and motivation of the defenders to fight



against the occupiers. The third wave of refugees is determined by displacement from the occupied territory, it is “home under occupation” (BBC Nvs, Zaporizhia, 2022). A home under occupation is a home in lawlessness and looting. The occupation is “home under the rule of violence”, destroyed self-governance and everyday life, it is a home of lawlessness. “Home under occupation” causes resistance and the formation of partisans and the underground.

Let’s turn to the decisions of the people-of-war who chose the path of fighting and destroying the enemy. Here, the most important component of life is the feeling of family unity with people with whom you have experienced a common disaster and overcame insurmountable challenges. In fact, this is a reproduction of family relations in the military circle. A special category is the “home of military personnel”, when a military unit becomes the image of a family – with a father as a commander, brothers, and sisters. As an example, let us give the return to the ranks of one of the most famous British officers of the First World War, “Crazy Jack” Z. Sassoon, who was treated by V. Rivers for post-traumatic stress disorder after the death of part of his squad. Thus, having gained the experience of reconstructing the life narratives of his protégé Z. Sassoon, his friend and doctor V. Rivers claimed: “The most effective motivation to overcome that fear was something stronger than patriotism, abstract principles, or hatred of the enemy. It was the brotherly love of soldiers for one another” (Herman, 2015, 22). That is, shared grief, the challenge of death and victory over it form a stable “family circle” that influences decision-making in wartime. This happens due to the establishment of landmark actors, to which an active or former participant in hostilities listens. A similar situation is typical for the military, as well as for medics and volunteers, as well as all those who have experienced the devastating effects of war together.

### 3. Heart and mind

I. Moiseyv defines a category as “cordocentrism” which “accompanies the genesis of personal self-awareness. The heart is primarily a valuable integrator of the integrity of being. Cordocentrism attributes feeling, reason, cognition (intuitive), will, contemplation, memory to the heart, which to a certain extent inhibits the differentiation and systematic subordination of these abilities” (Moiseyv, 2002, 303). The concept is consistent with an idea of the Arbinger Institute. They convince that even in war the heart can be at peace and war, and the

difference is in the attitude towards other people: “The contrast between Saladin’s taking of Jerusalem and the Crusaders’ taking of Jerusalem teaches an important lesson: almost any behavior – even behavior as stark as war – can be done in two different ways” (The Arbinger Institute, 2015, 43). Such way there is two ways of being with “heart at peace” and “heart at war”. “Heart in peace” defines the protection of human rights, their equality. Unjust war, unmotivated aggression asserts “heart in war”, where people are objects, the fight is for territories, for acolytes, but not for people, their dignity and the future. The heart can be in the past, revanchism, political and geopolitical traumas, but certainly not in peace, these are the signs of the heart in war. The extreme forms of the heart in war, to recall Erich Fromm, are necrophilia, the love of death and destruction, or, to recall Karen Horney (Horney, 1994), the neurotic lust for power. The heart at war always seeks to impose its will on others in war crimes.

### 4. Strength and will

The beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian military conflict in 2014 proved that the strength of a society striving to preserve the independence of its own state can be weakened by the position of “pacification” of the aggressor, unreadiness to protect its own interests, this also relates to international actors that make up the international security architecture. The full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation in 2022 showed that the will to fight of people and society has changed the course of aggression. The war decision-making leader sets not only the nature of decision-making within the group, but also acts as a model for decisions regarding interaction with the enemy. Thus, describing Sultan Saladin's victory over Saif al-Din in the conquest of Syria, S. Lane-Pool wrote about the exemplary dignity of the victory and consideration in the use of its results. Saladin did not take any of war mining for himself: “In this he displayed alike the instincts of a generous nature and the foresight of a statesman. He bound both his own troops and the enemy’s to him with ties of gratitude and personal devotion” (Lane-Poole, 2018, 111). Therefore, the image of the military-political leadership, the ruler-general, who builds connections with other participants in the conflict based on complicity in their lives, and also models the nature of “us–them” interaction, is of great importance in the decision-making process in war.

Difficult events in the life of the country and the world can leave their mark on decision-making

both during war and in peacetime. The Battle of Thermopylae (480 BC), the Siege of Jerusalem (1187), the Battle of the Alamo (1836), the Verde Meat Grinder (1916), the Battle of Kruty (1918) and the defense of the Donetsk airport (2014) became not only the object of attention of researchers of military history, but also the choice in favor of the decision to self-sacrifice for the sake of the collective good, which still affects people today who associate themselves with the participants of those events, regardless of the conditions of life and circumstances. The image of war affects the nature of people's decisions even in periods of peace at the subconscious level. K.G. Jung diagnosed the danger of irrational behavior of a Swiss patient who dreamed of the tragic and desperate battle of the Swiss army at Basel in 1444 (Jung, 1953). Therefore, the image of important battles of the past can serve as an example for heroic behavior during war, as well as an indicator of the tendency to make unreasonably risky decisions in peacetime.

Any society in the conditions of war lives in a mythical reality, where evil exists here and now, and the fight against it can only be to the death. At the same time, the accumulated malice towards the enemy in a civilian does not have a direct outlet in the form of armed confrontation. Something similar to the sublimation of the mortido takes place, whereby civilians respond to reflexive calls of conscience and contribute, real or illusory, to a common victory. A supporter of mortido sublimation was E. Berne, who insisted that: "Mortido can also be I sublimated, as in stonecutting, carpentry, and mining, which create beautiful or useful things by attacking inanimate objects. Surgery involves one of the most useful sublimations of mortido" (Berne, 1975, 65). We note that the attack is carried out on an object, but at the same time the image of the enemy is used, which is defeated at the level of a creative act. In such cases, a civilian in the conditions of war associates himself with a soldier, but gives his forces not to the front, but to the rear. Thus, when it is impossible to use force in war to satisfy the need for revenge, the energy of the mortido is directed into sublimation. It manifests itself in active volunteering for the defense of the country, wartime songs, informational marathons, works of street artists and other similar humanitarian and patriotic activities.

## 5. Heroism and dignity

War is a special time for every person. Time to rethink your own existence. Updated weighting of your deeds from birth and probable death. And

here it will be appropriate to modernize M. Heidegger's thesis: "...the meaningfulness of human existence rest on our "being – towards – death" (Bowring, 2021). That is, during the war, only the active fulfillment of life until death gives meaning to existence. In order to determine the value of life before its end, standards of social interaction are needed, which serve as "beacons" for decision-making. Here it is worth distinguishing two attractors "Hero" and "Antihero", which depend on the vector of interaction "man – world", as well as on the choice of being and non-being by a person for himself and for the surrounding world. Overall, these attractors are fundamental components that define the decision-making space in war. The basic characteristics of hero are dignity and respect for the opponent. One of the first illustrations of this thesis can also be found in S. Lane-Poole, who describes the course of the relationship between René de Chatillon and Saladin in 1184 during the siege of the last castle of the city of Carac, in which the wedding took place: "Reginald sent Saladin meat and wine, – as it were a piece of the bridecake, – to share in the feast; and in return the Sultan gave strict orders, proclaimed to the army, that the nuptial tower of the bride and bridegroom should be scrupulously respected by his archers and artillery!" (Lane-Poole, 2018, 136). That is, chivalrous manners and noble decisions during war are possible, but this requires the proper behavior of all parties to the conflict. Today, the code of ethics in making decisions in war is effective only if the participants in the conflict agree to rely on the reference images of the heroes of the past. Another important virtue of a hero is self-sacrifice. H. Rusch sees it as: "...altruistic suicide" operationalized as protecting comrades from explosions using their own body as a shield" (Rusch, 2022, 239). That is, it is a choice in favor of death, but from altruistic motives and with the preservation of optimism, but in relation to the already immeasurable future of the war participant. In addition, the author's conclusions about the fact that the heroic behavior of a person is fixed and developed with the help of symbolism and identification with intangible values are important. According to H. Rusch, the owners of the Medal of Honor in the US armed forces act more courageously and selflessly than those who do not have such a distinction. So, social responsibility recorded through identifying symbols and a code of honor promotes heroic behavior of individuals, and in some cases, groups of people. However, people must share the values and ideals of society that produce such

symbols, as well as pass them down from generation to generation.

If heroism is the acceptance of the energy of *mortido* as a certain driving force for continuing life in war conditions, then treason is the sublimation of *mortido*, when a person's loss of honor, property, value orientations, love, social status turns into a desire to fill the insufficiency of being by going to the opponent of militarily conflict. Starting from Tarpeia (the daughter of a Roman general) to modern collaborators – all traitors try to fill the void of existence, but “nothing” materializes just after their decision to change the side of the conflict in the war, the measure of life is determined only by existence, the soul and spiritual are distorted by the lack of unity with humanity and humanness, fear pushes them to the side of the aggressor. The ratio of altruism and selfishness is especially important in choosing the next role model. The main functional load of the role of the defender is a reference point for the continued existence of the world. Opposite to the defender is the role model of the terrorist, who is involved in making a decision about the complete destruction of the enemy's world. At the same time, the most brutal form of this is the destruction of the future enemy at the expense of killing and raping the civilian population. I. Chowdhury and M. Lanier note: “Dating from the very first wars and civil disturbances, “rape and pillage” of the losing force has been one of the “spoils of war” taken by the victors. In ancient times in addition to rape and pillage, slavery was commonly employed against losing families, tribes, city-states or countries (Chowdhury & Lanier, 2012, 47). It illustrates the nature of terrorism, which, unlike the activity of the defender, is built on the destruction of the world of a hypothetical or real enemy. At the same time, the authors of the terrorist act build their own irrational reality, where the value of justice as the harmony of life is replaced by retribution to the world. In contrast to protection, terror does not carry a constructive social meaning, but is only a means for the formation of a vicious circle of resentment, when the emptiness of nothingness is transferred from the terrorist to the victim.

The role of a peacemaker as a guide to life is not possible without forgiveness, but in war there can be no forgiveness without atonement, which in the end gives rise to revenge. Forgiveness and revenge are attempts to restore the balance of interaction between a person and the world based on the restoration of life in oneself or through the realization of a subjective idea of justice. This is reflected not as the pacification of the aggressor,

the rapist and the terrorist, but as the restoration of justice after victory in the free choice of the heart in peace. S. Benard and co-authors associate such restoration of balance as an increase or restoration of social status: “Whether moral behaviors are perceived to be status worthy, and whether morality provides a pathway from intergroup revenge or forgiveness to intragroup status” (Benard et al. 2022, 123). However, revenge in war or after it has much deeper roots, because it touches the categories of being and non-being, and also forms the possibility of a constructive future. Accordingly, the role of a peacemaker and an avenger is a story not only about social status, but also about finding a solution to how to live on in the conditions of war and after it.

Another question arises: how to make difficult decisions in the conditions of war and not become pure evil? Comparing the views of H. Arendt and T. Aquinas, P. Fisogni considers evil as the possibility of action without thought: “The norms taken as a parameter of the action, (‘you must’) had been able to de-empower human responsibility both with respect to reason (I do not need to think about what I do, but only at the command of the norm) and will (which follows the ‘you must’ command)” (Fisogni, 2022, 143). That is, a constructive decision during a war is not possible not only without thought, but also without a proper evaluative and volitional act, when the chosen model of the future is supported by a positive emotional assessment and the will to win.

## 6. Social order and victory

The organization of society as a relationship between civil society and the state determines the strength of the integrity of society, this happens both in peacetime and in wartime. Civil society in Ukraine is formed as an extension of self-organization, first of all, starting from opposition to corrupt political system and falsification of elections in 2004, then to the revanchist post-colonial state in 2013 and finally to Russian full-scale military aggression in 2022. This resistance formed a special large-scale phenomenon – the volunteer movement as a self-organization of society (Liubyva, 2022). Civil society progressed with the development of local self-government and a network of public organizations, which proved the effectiveness and stability of Ukrainian society in the war. Civil society puts pressure on the state and co-evolutionarily fills the gaps in the state system. Civil society forces the state to overcome inertia, stiffness, over-bureaucratization, inflexibility, since the price of

the issue is the life of soldiers at the front or citizens in the areas near the frontline, the frontline and liberated territories. This contradiction also manifests itself in the military sphere as the interaction of territorial defense and professional military units. This approach determined the creativity, flexibility and responsibility of the junior command and officer staff. Admiral James Stavridis claims that under the new conditions of confrontation between global actors, the joint actions of the armies of the democratic world, the coordination of the actions of irregular military formations and the professional regular army are needed. "In the end, the nation needs to maintain the lighthouse of deterrence shining well away from its shores, where it can have the most effect. And it is on the anvil of those forward deployments that it will forge the most combat-ready force. Together, the anvil of deployment and the lighthouse of deterrence must remain the touchstones of the Navy and Marine Corps team in this turbulent 21st century" (Stavridis, 2022).

Such an interaction of civil society (which came to like the image of "a beehive that stings an aggressor bear") and the state has greater speed, maneuverability and ability to innovate in the military sphere, as opposed to an autocratic state. The disadvantages of the autocratic state with its slow hierarchical system, dependent on the decisions of the autocrat, which nevertheless has a great potential for forced mobilization, but despises and destroys the democratic social potential of creativity of individuals and reference communities. An important problem of the organization of society is the harmonization of "civil society – state" relations as a representation of self-organization and organization of society for victory.

### Conclusions

Summarizing the results of this study, we note that decision-making during war is a complex and multi-vector process of approval by the decision-making actor of a plan of action for further life, which depends on the existing construction of the interaction "man – world" and its emphasis on existence and non-existence in the conditions of a military conflict. The decision-making process during war is determined by several attractors, which named as "home", "heart and mind", "strength and will", "heroism and dignity", "social order and victory".

Attractor "home" ensures the stability of the people in war, as people identify themselves with

this source of existence and gravitate towards it. "Heart and mind" is the basic attractor during decision process, which determine priorities "Peace – War" and "I – World". The heart and mind in peace give birth to actors' decision-making models that are reflected in the heroic defense of one's world against an aggressor. The heart and mind in war give birth to objectified models of behavior of traitors and terrorists. "Strength and will" and "heroism and dignity" attractors form and reflect the figures of decision-making leaders whom one wants to follow, whom one wants to transfer power and place responsibility on them. War actually gives birth to a mythical reality, but it is not a degradation of world perception, but the creation of a basis for a potential change of reality in the desired direction. Civil society resistance together with self-organization contributes to the restoration of the balance "society – state", "individual – collective", which should lead the country to victory.

### Bibliographic references

- BBC Nvs, Zaporizhia (2022). How Ukrainians from the occupied territories will build a new "iron curtain" URL: <https://www.bbc.com/ukrainian/features-63142849>
- Benard, S., Doan, L., Nicholson, D.A., Meanwell, E., Wright, E.L., & Lista, P. (2022). To Forgive Is Divine? Morality and the Status Value of Intergroup Revenge and Forgiveness. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(6), 122-139. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2022.8.6.07>
- Berne, E. (1975). *A Layman's Guide to psychiatry and psychoanalysis*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bowring, F. (2021). Death and the form of life. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 25(3), 349-365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310211024534>
- Chowdhury, I., & Lanier, M. (2012). Rape and HIV as Methods of Waging War: Epidemiological Criminology's Response. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 2, 47-52. <https://doi.org/10.4236/aasoci.2012.21006>
- Fisogni, P. (2022). The Emptiness of Evil: A Dialogue between Arendt and Aquinas. *Sun Text Rev Neurosci Psychol*, 3(1), 141-147. <https://doi.org/10.51737/2766-4503.2022.041>
- Herman, J. (2015). *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence - From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*. New York: Basic Books.



- Horney, K. (1994). *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*. New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company. URL: [https://books.google.pl/books?id=oA9RVp0\\_mrWC](https://books.google.pl/books?id=oA9RVp0_mrWC)
- Jung, C.G. (1953). *The Symbolic Life: Miscellaneous Writings (The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Volume 18) Illustrated Edition*. New York: Princeton University Press.
- Kahneman, D. (2020). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Jakarta: Main Library Gramedia, Year. URL: <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/11468377-thinking-fast-and-slow>
- Kharytonov, E., Kharytonova, O., Kharytonova, T., Kolodin, D., & Tolmachevska, Y. (2019). Human rights as the basic value of the concept of private law in modern Europe. *Amazonia Investiga*, 8(20), 477-485. Retrieved from <https://amazoniainvestiga.info/index.php/amazonia/article/view/177>
- Lane-Poole, S. (2018). *Saladin and the Fall of Jerusalem*. Cairo: Ozymandias Press.
- Lepskiy, M. (2016). Human security in the local, state and international dimension and the contemporary functioning of the border. Ethnic conflicts and religious security in local, national and international dimensions. *KRAKÓW "NOMOS": University of Wrocław & Publishing House*. (pp. 189-228). (in Polish)
- Lepskiy, M.A. (2006). Interconnection between Optimism and Pessimism: Problem of Social Perspective. Kyiv: Institute of Higher Education of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine. (in Ukrainian).
- LeShan, L. (1992). *The Psychology of War: Comprehending Its Mystique and Its Madness*. Helios Press.
- Liubyva, T. (2022). Civil identity of the inhabitants of Ukraine on the eve and in the conditions of the war. Ukrainian society in wartime. 2022: Collective monograph / Dembitskyi, S., Zlobina, O., Kostenko, N. & others; Golovakha, Ye. (ed.), Makeiev, S. (ed.). Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, pp. 284-291. URL: [https://i-](https://i-soc.com.ua/assets/files/monitoring/maket-vijna...2022dlya-tipografiivse.pdf)
- soc.com.ua/assets/files/monitoring/maket-vijna...2022dlya-tipografiivse.pdf
- Moiseyev, I. (2002). Cordocentrism. *Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary*. Kyiv: Abris. (p. 303). (in Ukrainian). URL: [https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Shynkaruk\\_Volodymyr/Filosofskyi\\_entsyklopedychnyi\\_slo\\_vnyk.pdf](https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Shynkaruk_Volodymyr/Filosofskyi_entsyklopedychnyi_slo_vnyk.pdf)
- Nalbandov, R. (2013). Irrational Rationality of Terrorism. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 6(4), 92-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.6.4.5>
- Perellin, Ch. J. (2009). *How NASA Builds Teams*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature; with a foreword by Alvin Toffler*. Toronto, New York, London: Sydney Bantam Books.
- Razumkov Center (2022a). Ukrainian refugees: attitudes and assessments (March 2022) URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/ukrainski-bizhentsi-nastroi-ta-otsinky> [Ukrainian refugees: attitudes and assessments (March 2022)]
- Razumkov Center (2022b). Attitudes and assessments of Ukrainian refugees (July–August 2022). URL: <https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/nastroi-ta-otsinky-ukrainskykh-bizhentsiv-lypen-serpen-2022p>
- Rusch, H. (2022). Heroic behavior: A review of the literature on high-stakes altruism in the wild. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 5(43), 238-243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.07.024>
- Stavridis, J. (2022). *The Anvil and the Lighthouse: Why Forward Deployments Are Vital*. US Naval Institute, 148/7/1, 433. <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2022/july/anvil-and-lighthouse-why-forward-deployments-are-vital>
- The Arbinger Institute. (2015). *The Anatomy of Peace: Resolving the Heart of Conflict*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- West, B. J. (2016). *Fractional Calculus View of Complexity: Tomorrow's Science*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.