

Дупин М. І.,
здобувач вищої освіти
Національна академія Служби
безпеки України
(м. Київ, Україна)

Кононова Д. В.,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри романо-германських
мов,
Національна академія Служби
безпеки України
(м. Київ, Україна)

THE IMPACT OF MARTIAL LAW ON THE SYSTEM OF MILITARY EDUCATION AND PERSONNEL TRAINING

Nowadays, it's really necessary to overhaul how the people are trained, improve professional training methods, and completely rethink how to get the officers and specialists ready for what they'll face at the battlefield. The troops need to be ready for chaos. They should pay attention to real skills, mental strength, and the kind of hands-on experience that keeps you alive when things go sideways. If we study how martial law's affecting military education, the problems can be spotted, identified what's actually effective, and figured out how to modernize everything in current conflicts.

There can't be a conversation in defense circles without martial law coming up, discussing it's fundamentally changing force organization and personnel preparation. Martial law changes not only the country's political and military landscape but also the institutional mechanisms through which professional soldiers are trained. In situations of prolonged military confrontation, the system of training must become flexible and adaptive, responding to new operational needs, limited resources, and the transformation of warfare methods [4].

Military scholars have been wrestling with this connection for decades. Huntington and Clausewitz laid the groundwork, and more recent others have really dug into how military and educational systems are intertwined. They emphasize that during national crises, military education fulfills a dual mission: it provides professional knowledge and skills, and at the same time strengthens the moral and psychological resilience of the armed forces [1]. When martial law gets declared, it basically forces everyone to step back and ask 'what are we actually trying to accomplish here?' with the training programs. Theoretical preparation must be closely combined with intensive practical training and immediate operational readiness. As Huntington noted in *The Soldier and the State*, the professionalism of an officer depends on the ability to balance theoretical understanding with practical application. Under martial law, however, this balance changes – training becomes more concentrated, the emphasis shifts toward simulation exercises, and real combat

experience is increasingly incorporated into the curriculum. Military schools have to pivot completely - they're dealing with new strategic realities, tech that's changing by the month, and honestly, just trying to make sure their graduates can handle the mental pressure among future officers [2].

This isn't just about tweaking technical aspects. Martial law's forcing us to rethink the entire ideological foundation of military education. In such conditions, it's not just about teaching facts anymore, but about trying to build people who actually believe in what they're fighting for and personal responsibility among service members. Historians and theorists like John Keegan and Martin van Creveld emphasize that modern warfare demands not only technical skills but also the ability of armed forces to learn quickly, adapt, and integrate battlefield experience into institutional practice.

Martial law often accelerates this process by blending formal education with direct combat exposure. Officers and cadets frequently undergo training in or near active conflict zones, gaining firsthand experience that reshapes traditional classroom instruction. Military instructors are juggling way more than they used to. They're still covering the fundamentals, but now they're also helping cadets deal with the mental side of leading people when everything's falling apart. This shift is now seen in people's training, because there's way more emphasis on the psychological side of things now such as stress management, building character and other kinds of thing. V. Kyva says: "Looking back, it makes sense why things changed. I remember when our unit first got exposed to Grossman's stuff about combat stress - it was like, oh shit, this explains so much about what we were seeing and what soldiers need to bounce back from trauma. When the shooting starts, schools and universities basically have to evacuate - I mean, what else can you do? A lot of schools end up moving somewhere safer or trying this mix of online classes and actual hands-on training. Scales and Howard make a good point - when you spread things out, people get better at thinking on their feet and solving problems without waiting for orders from headquarters in uncertain conditions and letting regional commanders make more of their own calls" [3]. When everyone's doing their own thing, some programs end up way better than others. The necessity of better oversight and some kind of standard way to evaluate everyone is clear, so the quality stays consistent for all military personnel, no matter where they trained or what their specialty is [1].

The biggest change can be noticed in making training relevant to what's actually going on out there. Today the actual mission reports and debriefs are used instead of textbook scenarios of what's happening out in the battlefield right now. The instructors bring in the veterans who can tell what it's really like, not just what the manual says, but to make sure that it's not just about learning the theory.

When there's actual fighting going on, the whole way to train leaders changes completely [3]. Once there is a martial law leadership training is focused on what really matters, i.e. the values. It means that you can train people, but you never really know if they can lead until the time comes. The hard part is keeping your humanity intact when everything's so called "going to hell". The most important thing is to teach officers to think for themselves when everything goes sideways, not just blindly follow

orders. “I've noticed they're starting to bring in more diverse officers lately - about time, honestly. Seeing more women and minorities becoming officers makes me think we're finally getting it - turns out we're way stronger when it's not just the same old boys' club running everything. In my experience, the units with female officers tend to run smoother - less ego, more focus on getting the job done, and it's not just about checking boxes either. Something I didn't expect was seeing military academies actually partnering up with civilian colleges” [2].

So, today military schools may work with regular colleges which help them in sharing research, doing joint tech projects, even offering combined degrees that mix defense studies with other subjects. The ideal thing is to have people who can combine politics, psychology, tech stuff into one. This way it is possible to get officers who can handle both the tech side and actually think through problems when they're dealing with all the crazy tech stuff in modern warfare.

The other big thing is mental toughness [4]. When the people constantly stressed and in danger, it becomes pretty obvious that everyone, including trainees and instructors, needs way better mental health support. All the support programs and helping people to deal with trauma afterward is absolutely crucial for maintaining emotional stability and operational performance. Teaching people how to deal with their emotions, handle trauma, and work better as a team is a must nowadays. These measures help prevent burnout and sustain soldiers' ability to perform effectively and ethically under extreme pressure [5].

In conclusion I'd like to say that this martial law stuff has totally changed: the whole structure of training, the goals and the methods. Taking real combat experience and using it in the classroom, focusing on mental toughness has become prioritizing. The whole point is to train officers who can think for themselves and make right decisions when everything's chaotic and unclear.

References:

1. Vavilova, N. (2023). *Quality Standards of Professional Military Education in NATO Military Educational Institutions*. *Military Education*, 2023, pp. 28–34. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33099/2617-1783/2023-47/28-34> (accessed: October 7, 2025).
2. Holovan, V., Horlichenko, H., & Drozdov, M. (2023). *Priorities for the Development of Distance Military Education*. *Distance Education in Ukraine: Innovative, Normative-Legal, and Pedagogical Aspects*, no. 3, pp. 146–154. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2786-5495.1.17774> (accessed: October 7, 2025).
3. Kyva, V. (2022). *Cyber Hygiene of Instructors in the System of Military Education*. *Youth and the Market*, no. 3(201). URL: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4634.2022.260003> (accessed: October 7, 2025).
4. Rakhmanov, V. (2023). *Quality Assurance in Higher Military Education and Problems of Professional Military Education Development in Ukraine*. *Military Education*, 2023, pp. 242–253. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33099/2617-1783/2023-47/242-253> (accessed: October 7, 2025).

5. Tsevelyov, O. (2020). *Standardization of Military Education: Approaches and Principles*. *Military Education*, no. 2(42), pp. 316–324.
6. Shchypanskyi, P. V., Tymoshenko, R. I., & Salkutsan, S. M. (2019). *Formation of a New Paradigm of Military Education*. *Science and Defense*, no. 2, pp. 37–42. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33099/2618-1614-2017-0-2-37-42> (accessed: October 7, 2025).