Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Psychological Stratification in Wartime: A Socio-Structural Analysis of Civilian Mental Health Amid Russia's Invasion of Ukraine

Wendy Carter *

Posted Date: 23 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

Keywords: war; PTSD

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

Article

Psychological Stratification in Wartime: A Socio-Structural Analysis of Civilian Mental Health Amid Russia's Invasion of Ukraine

Wendy Carter

Independent Researcher, Australia; wendycarter8866@gmail.com

Abstract

Since the onset of Russia's full-scale invasion in February 2022, Ukraine has endured an unparalleled humanitarian emergency accompanied by a profound psychological crisis. This review critically examines both the immediate and unfolding long-term mental health consequences of the war for Ukrainian civilians, with particular attention to the prevalence and dynamics of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, depression, and broader psychosocial degradation. Drawing on a growing body of empirical research, public health evaluations, and theoretical frameworks concerning trauma and structural vulnerability, the article investigates the cumulative psychological effects of sustained bombardment, mass displacement, and the collapse of civil infrastructure. Special emphasis is placed on high-risk groups—including children, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and socioeconomically marginalized populations—whose exposure to trauma is both intensified and prolonged by unequal access to safety, healthcare services, and protective resources. The analysis contends that psychological harm in wartime is inherently stratified, shaped by intersecting axes of social inequality and infrastructural breakdown. In conclusion, the review advocates for a comprehensive, justice-oriented public health approach capable of addressing the complex layers of trauma inflicted upon Ukraine's civilian population.

Keywords: war; PTSD

Introduction

The Russian Federation's large-scale military incursion into Ukrainian territory in February 2022 constituted a significant intensification of a protracted geopolitical conflict that has profoundly transformed the psychosocial fabric of Eastern Europe. As civilian spaces were rapidly reconstituted as combat zones and mass internal and external displacement ensued, the mental health ramifications for the Ukrainian population have emerged as a crisis of considerable magnitude. Psychological distress—rooted in acute exposure to violence, protracted uncertainty, and pervasive collective bereavement—has become a defining feature of the civilian experience across all regions, including those geographically remote from direct hostilities (An et al., 2025; WHO & Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 2023).

The deleterious impact of armed conflict on mental health has been extensively documented within public health and psychological literature. Prevalent conditions include acute stress disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), major depressive disorder (MDD), and generalized anxiety disorder. These manifestations are particularly pronounced under conditions of sustained trauma, forced displacement, and the breakdown of social and institutional infrastructure (Charlson et al., 2019; Javanbakht, 2024). In Ukraine, such symptomatology has reached alarming prevalence. By late 2023, empirical assessments estimated that approximately 30% of the adult population demonstrated clinical indicators of PTSD, with even higher incidences observed among internally displaced persons (IDPs)—a demographic whose psychological vulnerability is frequently compounded by

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

impoverishment, social atomization, and systemic neglect (WHO & Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 2023).

Crucially, contemporary trauma scholarship underscores that wartime psychological injury is not uniformly distributed across populations. Vulnerable demographics—including women, children, the elderly, and individuals of lower socioeconomic status—experience heightened exposure to traumatic stimuli and face greater impediments to accessing mental health services. Solomon and Bayer (2023), while writing from a different geopolitical context, offer a compelling ethical-legal proposition: "mental harm caused by war is not experienced equally," necessitating response mechanisms that are attuned to "the intersection of trauma with structural vulnerability and state responsibility" (p. 530). Within Ukraine, such disparities are particularly pronounced in regions where access to reinforced shelters, mobile medical units, and psychological support professionals remains severely limited. In this context, socioeconomic marginalization serves as both a determinant and amplifier of trauma.

Bayer (2024) further elucidates the structural dimensions of trauma, arguing that "the ability to regulate fear and maintain psychological resilience is directly connected to access to safe spaces, information, and institutional support" (p. 418). In the Ukrainian case, rural areas and conflict-intense oblasts such as Donetsk and Kharkiv frequently suffer from infrastructural incapacitation and informational isolation. The resulting conditions—marked by the absence of electricity, healthcare delivery, and viable evacuation routes—exacerbate psychological distress not merely through the amplification of fear, but through the erosion of meaning, communal bonds, and subjective agency.

Accordingly, this review endeavors to interrogate the psychological ramifications of the ongoing conflict through a bifocal analytical framework. Firstly, it synthesizes emergent empirical data concerning the scope and nature of trauma-related psychopathologies among Ukrainian civilians. Secondly, it examines the extent to which social stratification and infrastructural asymmetries modulate both the experience and persistence of psychological suffering. This investigation seeks not only to catalog civilian distress, but to examine systemic failures in support provision critically and to explore the normative underpinnings of a more equitable and integrated psychosocial response.

Short-Term Psychological Effects on Ukrainian Civilians (Revised)

Since the escalation of hostilities with Russia's full-scale invasion in February 2022, Ukrainian civilians have been subjected to continuous psychological trauma, engendered by direct exposure to violence, widespread displacement, and the systemic disintegration of everyday infrastructure. The war has undermined not only the physical safety of the population but also its psychological integrity. The omnipresence of air raid sirens, sustained shelling, the destruction of homes, familial separations, prolonged power outages, and forced migration have coalesced into a climate of pervasive fear and emotional dislocation. These conditions have precipitated widespread manifestations of acute psychological distress—including insomnia, hypervigilance, panic attacks, emotional numbing, and dissociative states—symptoms indicative of early-stage post-traumatic stress responses.

Data collected throughout Ukraine during 2023–2024 confirm that such psychological responses are not isolated anomalies but rather constitute a systemic phenomenon. In one of the most comprehensive studies to date, An et al. (2025) observed that civilians residing in regions subjected to intense bombardment exhibited significantly elevated rates of suicidal ideation (a 2.2 percentage point increase), emotional withdrawal, and pervasive feelings of helplessness (an increase of 4.9 percentage points). These psychological disturbances were frequently reported even by individuals who had neither sustained physical injuries nor experienced displacement, thereby illustrating that protracted exposure to ambient violence, existential uncertainty, and material destruction alone suffices to generate severe mental health impairments. As the authors assert, "the psychological footprint of war is visible even in populations not directly injured but chronically exposed to uncertainty, noise, and displacement" (An et al., 2025, p. 4).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

Among the most severely affected cohorts are the internally displaced persons (IDPs), whose numbers exceed five million. Predominantly fleeing active combat zones in Ukraine's eastern and southern regions, many have resettled in the west or sought refuge in neighboring states, often housed in overcrowded shelters or improvised living quarters. IDPs are subject to a tripartite trauma: the initial trauma of exposure to warfare; the secondary trauma of loss—of home, livelihood, and community; and the tertiary trauma entailed in negotiating the uncertainties and indignities of displacement. According to estimates by the World Health Organization and the Ministry of Health of Ukraine (2023), one in three IDPs displays clinical symptoms of PTSD, while 22% suffer from depression and 18% from anxiety. These figures reflect not only psychological trauma in the narrow clinical sense but also the compounding effects of socioeconomic destabilization, which both intensifies psychological suffering and inhibits access to effective coping mechanisms.

Recent scholarship has underscored the structural and stratified dimensions of civilian psychological injury during armed conflict. Solomon and Bayer (2023), writing in the context of international humanitarian law, emphasize that psychological trauma in war is neither uniformly distributed nor solely a matter of individual pathology. Rather, it is mediated through entrenched social, economic, and legal hierarchies. As they write, "Civilian trauma must be viewed not only through clinical indicators but through structural filters; socioeconomic insecurity, legal invisibility, and access to redress all shape the psychological experience of war" (p. 532). In Ukraine, this observation acquires particular salience: IDPs with lower levels of education or income, those lacking digital connectivity, and residents of rural or peripheral regions are both more likely to experience traumatic exposures and less likely to receive professional care or institutional support.

Children, as is consistently observed in conflict zones, constitute one of the most vulnerable demographic groups. According to UNICEF (2023), over 1.5 million Ukrainian children are at risk of developing psychological disorders as a consequence of direct or indirect exposure to hostilities. Schools have been destroyed, repurposed for military operations, or shuttered due to instability; families have been separated; and entire communities have lost access to essential services. Child psychologists working in conflict-affected regions such as Dnipro and Lviv have reported dramatic increases in symptoms such as selective mutism, aggression, enuresis (bedwetting), recurrent nightmares, and psychosomatic illnesses among children as young as four. These behaviors are consistent with acute stress disorder and early-onset trauma, and their severity is exacerbated by the absence of stable caregiving environments, shelter, or educational continuity.

As Bayer (2024) insightfully observes in a related context, "resilience is not simply an individual trait, it is built on social conditions: continuity in care, access to safety, and the presence of trusted adults" (p. 419). In Ukraine, the wholesale destruction of community infrastructure has eroded these essential protective factors. Where schools are non-operational, caregivers are incapacitated or absent, and medical services are reduced to emergency triage functions, children are effectively deprived of the psychosocial scaffolding necessary for trauma recovery. The persistent threat of aerial attacks, coupled with rolling blackouts, contributes to an environment of radical unpredictability, which undermines the formation of stable emotional and cognitive patterns in developing children.

Geographical disparities further exacerbate the mental health burden. Regions on or near the frontline—such as Donetsk, Zaporizhzhia, Mykolaiv, and Kharkiv—have been subjected to relentless bombardment while simultaneously experiencing acute shortages of mental health resources. Medical facilities have been destroyed or abandoned, mental health professionals displaced, and telecommunications infrastructures rendered unreliable. In such settings, many survivors remain entirely without access to formal psychological support, relying instead on informal community networks or personal resilience strategies. As the World Health Organization (2023) has noted, "regions with the most frequent attacks are paradoxically those least covered by emergency psychological services," a mismatch that underscores the systemic misalignment between need and institutional capacity (p. 12).

Bayer (2024) has conceptualized this dynamic as constituting a "geography of trauma," wherein the likelihood of psychological harm is inversely correlated with the availability of therapeutic

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

interventions. He argues that "the absence of institutional response in high-impact zones transforms trauma into abandonment, compounding the sense of vulnerability" (p. 429). This claim is corroborated by firsthand accounts from medical practitioners and social workers operating in high-conflict areas, who report not only the severity and complexity of psychological symptoms among the civilian population but also a deepening distrust of state institutions perceived as absent or overwhelmed.

Crucially, the short-term psychological effects of the war are not confined to clinical symptoms alone; they also encompass profound existential disruptions. As Frie and Fuchs (2024) contend, wartime trauma must be understood as a fundamental rupture in the "lived world"—a breakdown in the structures of meaning that normally organize human experience. Ukrainian civilians have not merely lost their homes or daily routines; they have experienced a disintegration of temporal coherence, spatial orientation, and interpersonal trust. This ontological destabilization manifests as cognitive disarray, affective withdrawal, and a paralyzing sense of helplessness—phenomena observable across lines of age, gender, and geography.

Taken together, the immediate psychological ramifications of the war in Ukraine constitute a public mental health emergency. These effects are widespread, acute, and structurally uneven, disproportionately burdening populations already disadvantaged by geography, class, or institutional neglect. The available evidence strongly suggests that absent comprehensive, regionally nuanced, and socially equitable mental health interventions, these acute disturbances are likely to ossify into chronic psychological pathologies. As Solomon and Bayer (2023) aptly note, "post-trauma is not clinically neutral; it is patterned by law, policy, and social stratification" (p. 534). Any ethical or effective response must therefore move beyond symptom treatment to address the broader sociopolitical and infrastructural contexts in which trauma is produced and in which recovery must take place.

Long-Term Psychological Consequences in Ukraine

While the immediate psychological impact of armed conflict is often observable through acute stress responses, the long-term mental health consequences for civilian populations subjected to protracted violence tend to be more insidious, persistent, and structurally embedded. In Ukraine, where civilians have endured continuous exposure to direct and ambient threats for over two years following Russia's full-scale invasion, the psychological burden is undergoing a paradigmatic shift—from transient distress toward entrenched psychiatric disorders. These include, but are not limited to, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), major depressive disorder (MDD), complex PTSD (C-PTSD), prolonged grief disorder, and a diverse array of trauma-related somatic symptoms. Importantly, these conditions are not confined to individuals directly injured or forcibly displaced; they are increasingly manifesting across diverse civilian populations, including caregivers, first responders, educators, and children, frequently in intersecting and compounding ways.

As of late 2024, official estimates by the Ukrainian Ministry of Health in collaboration with the World Health Organization indicate that more than 15 million individuals will require psychological assistance during and in the aftermath of the war (WHO & Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 2023). This figure encompasses not only acute clinical interventions but also the long-term development of robust mental healthcare infrastructure capable of addressing the multifaceted aftermath of trauma. However, the gap between escalating psychological needs and institutional capacity remains pronounced. Numerous regions across Ukraine continue to lack essential psychiatric personnel, trained counselors, or even functioning community mental health facilities. This infrastructural deficit is particularly concerning given the well-documented progression of trauma: absent timely intervention, acute stress reactions frequently crystallize into chronic disorders, adversely affecting emotional regulation, cognitive function, interpersonal relationships, and occupational integration (Charlson et al., 2019; Javanbakht, 2024).

Among the most alarming developments is the rising prevalence of complex PTSD (C-PTSD), especially among internally displaced persons and civilians exposed to sustained bombardment.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

Distinct from classical PTSD, C-PTSD arises in contexts of prolonged trauma with no access to safety or recovery, and is characterized by severe emotional dysregulation, persistent mistrust, chronic feelings of emptiness, and a fragmented sense of self. Mental health professionals operating in regions such as Dnipro and Khmelnytskyi report an increase in such presentations, particularly among individuals who endured siege-like conditions, multiple displacements, or the deaths of close family members. Patients frequently describe not isolated traumatic events, but entire epochs of their lives as being suffused with fear, confusion, and moral ambivalence. As one practitioner noted, these individuals "relive time periods rather than moments," encapsulating the diffuse and enduring nature of their psychological suffering.

Children, once again, emerge as a highly vulnerable demographic with particularly complex long-term risks. Trauma sustained during critical developmental windows is widely recognized to disrupt normative trajectories of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral maturation. According to UNICEF (2023), a significant proportion of Ukrainian children exposed to chronic wartime stress since 2022 are exhibiting symptoms indicative of developmental delays, learning impairments, and severe emotional dysregulation. These outcomes are compounded by the widespread disruption of formal education, the erosion of daily routines, and the diminished availability—or psychological unavailability—of parental figures due to death, separation, or mental health deterioration. As Bayer (2024) astutely observes, "infrastructure collapse is not only physical, it severs the intergenerational transmission of stability, predictability, and trust" (p. 430). In this sense, the harm inflicted on children is not solely the product of discrete violent events but of a broader institutional rupture that interrupts the foundations of psychological resilience and development.

In addition to psychiatric syndromes, Ukrainian civilians are increasingly presenting with long-term somatic expressions of trauma—such as chronic pain, persistent fatigue, gastrointestinal dysfunction, and immunological dysregulation. The mind-body interface is well established in trauma studies, wherein unprocessed psychological injuries often surface as physical symptoms in the absence of diagnosable organic pathology (Frie & Fuchs, 2024). General practitioners, particularly in rural and understaffed clinics, report a notable surge in such cases. Yet in the absence of trauma-informed diagnostic frameworks, these symptoms are frequently misattributed, over-medicated, or pathologized in purely physiological terms. The lack of psychosocial integration in primary care settings risks entrenching these conditions without addressing their etiological core.

It is imperative to recognize that long-term psychological harm is not merely a clinical phenomenon; it is also inherently political and structural. Solomon and Bayer (2023) argue persuasively that wartime trauma is intensified by conditions of inequality, legal invisibility, and institutional neglect. "When civilian trauma is not acknowledged, addressed, or compensated by the state," they write, "it lingers in legal and social silence, transforming into intergenerational harm and political alienation" (p. 541). This diagnosis is particularly salient for populations that were already structurally marginalized prior to the invasion, including ethnic minorities, individuals with disabilities, LGBTQ+ civilians, and residents of economically peripheral regions. For these communities, the absence of tailored mental health interventions does not merely prolong psychological suffering—it entrenches existing patterns of social exclusion and forecloses meaningful participation in post-war recovery.

In territories that are or were under Russian occupation, the long-term psychological toll is further compounded by experiences of moral injury, humiliation, and identity disruption. Civilians who were coerced into silence, forced collaboration, or who bore witness to atrocities often report enduring states of guilt, shame, and existential disorientation. These forms of injury frequently elude conventional clinical taxonomy but nonetheless represent a critical dimension of post-conflict mental health. As Ukrainian society begins to confront the moral complexities of post-war reconstruction, such invisible wounds must be integrated into both psychological recovery and processes of historical and legal reckoning.

One of the most enduring—and potentially underrecognized—consequences of the war lies in the intergenerational transmission of trauma. Decades of research on Holocaust and genocide

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

survivors have demonstrated that children of traumatized individuals frequently exhibit elevated levels of anxiety, emotional hypervigilance, and dysregulation, even in the absence of direct exposure to trauma. Such patterns are now beginning to surface in Ukrainian families attempting to reconstruct daily life amid persistent grief, instability, and psychological fragmentation. As Yehuda and Lehrner (2018) emphasize, trauma may not simply be remembered—it can be biologically embedded and socially inherited. Without sustained, trauma-informed mental health support integrated into schools, community services, and cultural narratives, there is a significant risk that wartime trauma will become a durable feature of Ukraine's peacetime social fabric.

In summary, the long-term psychological consequences of the war in Ukraine are multifaceted, deeply embedded, and structurally mediated. They encompass far more than classical psychiatric diagnoses, extending into complex trauma, somatic illness, institutional distrust, social alienation, and the transgenerational perpetuation of suffering. Addressing this multifaceted crisis will require more than clinical interventions; it will necessitate a justice-oriented, public health framework that foregrounds social stratification, historical context, and the structural conditions that either inhibit or enable recovery. As Bayer (2024) succinctly concludes, "trauma may begin with violence, but it is sustained by the structures that fail to repair it" (p. 437).

Policy and Intervention Strategies for Addressing Ukraine's Mental Health Crisis

The psychological toll of war in Ukraine has evolved into a wide-ranging public health emergency that cannot be resolved through short-term interventions or fragmented services. Rather, it requires a long-term, coordinated, and socially embedded response that treats mental health as an essential pillar of postwar recovery. Trauma in this context is not only an individual affliction but a collective and structural phenomenon that intersects with housing, education, governance, and justice. As such, any meaningful intervention must operate across multiple levels—clinical, institutional, and societal.

The first step in effective policy design is the comprehensive recognition of need. Millions of Ukrainian civilians are currently facing emotional, psychological, and psychosomatic consequences stemming from prolonged exposure to violence, displacement, and instability. These mental health needs are not evenly distributed; the most severely affected populations are often the least likely to receive care. Internally displaced persons, children, the elderly, rural residents, and socioeconomically marginalized communities consistently face barriers to access due to geography, lack of personnel, bureaucratic gaps, or stigma. Addressing this disparity requires mental health policy that centers equity and outreach rather than relying solely on centralized, urban-based care models.

Scaling up Ukraine's community-based mental health services is therefore essential. This includes the development of multidisciplinary teams that combine psychological expertise with social support, trauma-informed primary care, and peer-based outreach. These teams should be embedded in local communities, especially in conflict-affected or underserved regions, to ensure access to care that is responsive, flexible, and destigmatizing. Mobile clinics, remote counseling platforms, and local partnerships with trusted institutions—such as religious organizations or civil society groups—can extend the reach of mental health services beyond traditional settings.

At the same time, the educational system must be reimagined as a frontline venue for trauma prevention and intervention. Schools are often the only stable spaces available to children and adolescents during times of disruption. Training educators to identify trauma symptoms, embedding psychosocial support into daily school routines, and ensuring the presence of school psychologists and counselors are all necessary measures. Such initiatives not only safeguard mental health but also create conditions for long-term developmental resilience in younger generations.

The situation of internally displaced persons requires particular attention. Displacement creates both acute and chronic psychological stressors—loss of home, rupture of community, financial insecurity, legal ambiguity—that together compound emotional distress. Many IDPs live in

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

temporary shelters with limited access to services, where trauma is frequently reactivated by uncertainty and overcrowding. Mental health support for this population should be integrated into broader assistance frameworks, such as legal aid, employment services, and housing programs. Moreover, registration systems and shelters must be designed to include routine psychological screening and immediate access to crisis intervention where needed.

The long-term nature of war trauma demands durable infrastructure, not short-term humanitarian measures. This means investing in the national mental health workforce by expanding academic training in clinical psychology and psychiatry, incentivizing placements in high-need areas, and offering continuing education in trauma-informed care. It also means building or upgrading psychiatric facilities in rural or conflict-affected regions, which often lack basic access to specialized services. Without a strong internal professional base, Ukraine risks overdependence on external NGOs or temporary programs that may not align with national priorities or be sustainable over time.

Mental health must also be integrated into the legal and civic frameworks that shape postwar reconstruction. Too often, psychological suffering is rendered invisible in legal processes focused solely on physical injury or material damage. To counter this, transitional justice initiatives must include mechanisms that recognize psychological harm as legitimate, compensable, and narratable. This includes public processes of acknowledgment, reparation schemes that consider mental injury, and institutional spaces where survivors can share their experiences safely and meaningfully. Such practices not only validate victims but also help rebuild public trust and strengthen social cohesion.

Finally, international actors have a vital role to play. Mental health must be positioned as a core component of Ukraine's recovery agenda—not an auxiliary issue relegated to the margins of reconstruction funding. Donor frameworks, multilateral partnerships, and integration initiatives should explicitly include psychological recovery in their goals and benchmarks. Technical support, capacity-building, and sustained financial investment in Ukraine's mental health infrastructure are not optional extras—they are central to building a peaceful and resilient society.

In sum, the psychological consequences of war in Ukraine cannot be treated solely through clinical channels or emergency services. They must be addressed as part of a broader effort to rebuild institutions, empower communities, and restore the social fabric torn by violence. Only by embedding mental health into the core of recovery—across policy, law, education, and public health—can Ukraine ensure that trauma does not become a permanent feature of its postwar identity.

Conclusion

The full-scale invasion of Ukraine has triggered not only a geopolitical and humanitarian catastrophe but a profound and persistent mental health emergency that penetrates every layer of society. From cities under siege to rural villages uprooted by displacement, civilians have endured repeated exposure to violence, loss, uncertainty, and disruption—conditions that generate acute psychological suffering and plant the seeds of long-term psychiatric disorders. While attention often focuses on visible destruction—damaged infrastructure, economic collapse, demographic dislocation—the invisible wounds of trauma are no less destabilizing and, in many cases, far more enduring.

This review has underscored that the psychological impact of armed conflict cannot be separated from the social structures in which it unfolds. Trauma is never purely individual or internal. It is mediated by access to care, legal recognition, institutional responsiveness, and the broader context of vulnerability. In Ukraine, certain populations—particularly internally displaced persons, children, residents of frontline areas, and economically marginalized groups—are consistently more exposed to psychological harm and systematically excluded from the resources needed to address it. Their suffering is compounded not only by the violence itself, but by the absence of stable housing, disrupted education, weak healthcare infrastructure, and often, a lack of legal acknowledgment.

Emerging data paint a stark picture. Civilians in bombarded regions report high rates of anxiety, suicidality, and emotional disconnection. Displaced populations exhibit chronic stress and trauma-related symptoms, while children show signs of developmental regression, behavioral disorders, and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

psychosocial withdrawal. These findings make clear that Ukraine is not only facing a mental health crisis, but one of national scale and intergenerational depth. The psychological consequences of war, left unaddressed, risk undermining social cohesion, impeding institutional trust, and obstructing democratic recovery long after the cessation of armed conflict.

Importantly, trauma is not simply suffered—it is structured and distributed. The capacity to cope, to heal, and to reintegrate is shaped by political and economic conditions: who receives care, who is believed, who is supported, and who is left out. Therapy alone is not enough. A national mental health response must be embedded in broader systems of justice, inclusion, and reconstruction. This includes community-based mental health services, trauma-informed education, legal reforms that recognize psychological injury as compensable, and sustained investment in the development of Ukraine's professional mental health workforce.

Legal and civic frameworks must evolve accordingly. Psychological injury should not remain invisible in transitional justice mechanisms or compensation systems. The state has a responsibility to recognize trauma not merely in symbolic terms, but through tangible policy instruments: reparations, public truth-telling processes, and legal standards that treat mental suffering as real, measurable, and deserving of redress. Acknowledging psychological harm is not only therapeutic—it is political. It affirms the dignity of survivors and lays the groundwork for collective recovery.

International actors, too, must treat mental health as a central component of Ukraine's reconstruction—not an optional domain to be addressed once physical infrastructure is rebuilt. Funding for psychological services, professional training, and research capacity should be woven into all layers of international aid and reconstruction strategy. Without this commitment, the burden of untreated trauma will persist, reproducing cycles of suffering, social alienation, and emotional fragmentation across generations.

Yet with the right investments—material, institutional, and symbolic—Ukraine has the opportunity not only to repair what war has broken, but to reimagine a more just and resilient society. A society that places mental health at the heart of its public policy, that treats trauma recovery as a civic right rather than a private burden, and that honors the full range of suffering—seen and unseen—left in war's wake.

As Frie and Fuchs observe, trauma is not only about the pain we experience, but about the disruption of our capacity to make meaning, to trust others, and to feel whole. Ukraine's path forward must therefore center not only on rebuilding roads and cities, but on healing the damaged inner worlds of its people—worlds shaped by fear, loss, and silence, but also by resilience, solidarity, and the enduring human will to recover.

References

An, K. S., Cheung, S., Halliday, D., & Perng, S. (2025). Psychological impacts of war exposure in Ukraine: Evidence from a national survey. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-025-02468-0

Bayer, Y. M. (2024). Sound of sirens, echoes of trauma: Unpacking socioeconomic vulnerabilities in the Israel-Hamas conflict. *Israel Affairs, 30*(3), 415–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2024.2342136

Carter, W. 2025 Mental Health and Economic Decision-Making: A Systematic Review of Behavioral Consequences across Psychiatric Disorders. Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202505.1314.v1

Charlson, F. J., van Ommeren, M., Flaxman, A., Cornett, J., Whiteford, H. A., & Saxena, S. (2019). New WHO prevalence estimates of mental disorders in conflict settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet, 394*(10194), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30934-1

Frie, R., & Fuchs, T. (2024). Trauma, violence and the destruction of the lived world: Reflections on the war in Ukraine. *Neuropsychoanalysis, 26*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2024.2342136

Javanbakht, A. (2024). The mental health cost of war and displacement. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 96*, 102671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2024.102671

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1917.v1

Oppenheimer (2024) Economic Vulnerability and Legal Rights of Victims in International Law: Challenges and Pathways to Equitable Redress (August 18, 2024). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5001102 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5001102

Solomon, S., & Bayer, Y. M. (2023). Is all mental harm equal? The importance of discussing civilian war trauma from a socio-economic legal framework's perspective. *Nordic Journal of International Law, 92*(4), 528–547. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-bja10061

UNICEF. (2023). *Children in war: The impact of conflict on mental health*. https://www.unicef.org

World Health Organization & Ministry of Health of Ukraine. (2023). *Mental health needs assessment of conflict-affected populations in Ukraine*. WHO Regional Office for Europe.