




“Invisible lives: Occupied cities as a blind spot in geopolitical research”

AUTHORS	Yana Suchikova  
ARTICLE INFO	Yana Suchikova (2023). Invisible lives: Occupied cities as a blind spot in geopolitical research. <i>Geopolitics under Globalization</i> , 5(1), 35-45. doi: https://doi.org/10.21511/gg.05(1).2024.03
DOI	https://doi.org/10.21511/gg.05(1).2024.03
RELEASED ON	Monday, 13 January 2025
RECEIVED ON	Monday, 16 December 2024
ACCEPTED ON	Tuesday, 07 January 2025
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Geopolitics under Globalization"
ISSN PRINT	2543-5493
ISSN ONLINE	2543-9820
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	Sp. z o.o. Kozmenko Science Publishing



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

41



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2025. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine
www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 16th of December, 2024

Accepted on: 7th of January, 2025

Published on: 13th of January, 2025

© Yana Suchikova, 2024

Yana Suchikova, Dr., Prof., Vice-
Rector for Research, Berdyansk State
Pedagogical University, Ukraine.

Yana Suchikova (Ukraine)

INVISIBLE LIVES: OCCUPIED CITIES AS A BLIND SPOT IN GEOPOLITICAL RESEARCH

Abstract

This study examines the complexities of researching Ukraine's occupied territories, where silence often acts as both a defense mechanism and a barrier to understanding. It addresses the causes of informational isolation, including censorship, fear of repression, and restricted access to independent sources. The paper highlights the methodological and ethical challenges researchers face, particularly in working with sensitive data and engaging with vulnerable populations. The roles of universities, citizen science, media, and NGOs are explored as crucial avenues for gathering fragmented but vital information and fostering a broader understanding of life under occupation. Emphasis is placed on integrating FAIR principles (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, Reusability) with CARE principles (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, Ethics) to ensure data are both responsibly managed and ethically used. Combining analytical rigor with reflective narratives, this study advocates for interdisciplinary approaches and strategic collaborations that transcend academic boundaries. These efforts are vital for post-war recovery, reintegration, and developing socially inclusive and sustainable strategies that address the human realities of occupation.

Keywords

war, Ukraine, occupation, citizen science, displaced universities, research ethics, open data, FAIR, CARE, post-war reintegration

JEL Classification

F50, H56, I23, O15

REFLEXIVE PREFACE

In Ukraine, an assessment of scientific institutions and higher education establishments by scientific fields is currently underway. This process aims to evaluate scientific activity, determine its impact on society and the economy, and create conditions for obtaining additional funding to develop scientific infrastructure and research.

As Vice-Rector for Scientific Work, I sat and carefully filled out the application for this assessment. I reached the section titled "Total area of buildings and structures of the scientific institution / higher education establishment registered and accounted for by the institution." I filled it in: $S_{\text{total}} = 32,450.6 \text{ m}^2$.

Next section: "Area of damaged infrastructure according to the Register of Damaged and Destroyed Property:" $S_{\text{damaged}} = 0 \text{ m}^2$.

Everything is intact; nothing is damaged.
However, there is a nuance.

I have not been within the walls of our university for almost three years, nor has anyone from our university community. Like so many others, our city is occupied, and our university has been displaced. Formally, all our areas remain on the balance sheet. However, in reality, these are just numbers on paper. The new Methodology for



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Conflict of interest statement:

Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Assessing Scientific Institutions and Higher Education Establishments by Scientific Fields also describes the impacts of activities on the development of science, society, and the economy.

I read the description of one department's impact:

“On August 2, 2021, a grant agreement was signed between Berdyansk State Pedagogical University and the USAID project ‘Economic Support for Eastern Ukraine,’ under which it was planned to improve the quality of training specialists in the tourism field at the university. Berdyansk State Pedagogical University was supposed to become a base institution where a Student Tourism Hub and a Tourism Laboratory equipped with modern technology and software would be established. In addition, BSPU was meant to become a center for interaction with the tourism business in the city of Berdiansk, a hub for training tourism professionals.”

The university was meant to become...

This allusion compels one to reflect: what is lost in the space between what was planned and what became impossible? How can we evaluate the absent, measure the invisible, and describe what no longer exists in a tangible sense but continues to live on in documents, numbers, and reports? And most importantly – how can we breathe life back into something now frozen in formal indicators and strategic plans?

Occupied cities are like dark spots on the map of modern geopolitics, spaces that exist simultaneously in reality and outside of it. They become objects of strategic planning, diplomatic negotiations, and topics for bold headlines but almost never – objects of genuine understanding (Lai et al., 2025). Life in these cities seems frozen in time, yet it continues – with different rules, compromises, and fears. These are spaces where daily choices, silence, and invisible compromises create a parallel reality that remains imperceptible from the outside (Horden & López de Sa, 2024). The numbers about the “integrity of infrastructure” have nothing to do with how people live. Strategic plans hang suspended between past and future, and every bureaucratic metric conceals countless human stories.

This paper is not an academic study with formal conclusions or quantitative metrics. Rather, it is a reflection that combines personal observations, analytical reasoning, and fragments of a reality that any spreadsheet cannot measure. It is an attempt to speak about these territories not as statistics or geopolitical abstractions but as spaces where people continue to live with their stories, fears, and hopes.

In the following sections, I will try to unpack why occupied cities remain silent and why this requires research and public discourse exposure. I will focus on how one can work with limited and sensitive data and how the interaction of science, governance, and civil society can assist in this process. This text does not claim to offer exhaustive answers, but it aims to outline the contours of important questions that cannot be postponed until “after victory.” It is, rather, an invitation to dialogue – a difficult one, but necessary if we truly want to understand what lies behind the silence of occupied cities.

1. OCCUPIED CITIES: SILENCE AS A CHALLENGE AND THE NECESSITY OF RESEARCH

1.1. Why do occupied cities remain silent?

Occupied cities exist in a state of informational isolation, resulting from systematic control

over communications, repressive practices, and a lack of access to independent sources of information (Malyarenko & Kormych, 2024; Posylnyi, 2023). The informational space of these territories is entirely regulated by occupying administrations, which actively employ censorship and propaganda tools. This silence is often reinforced by brutal, demonstrative actions that deepen the atmosphere of fear among the local population.

A symbolic example is the story of two teenage partisans from Berdiansk – Tigran Ohannisyan and Mykyta Khanhanov – who were previously detained on charges of “terrorism” and later executed. Before his death, Tigran recorded a video message with the words:

“This is death, guys. Goodbye. Glory to Ukraine.”

They were only 16 years old. Next year, they might have become students at our university.

They might have become...

This case illustrates how any act of resistance is brutally suppressed and how such stories disappear into the silence of occupation, never reaching broader public discourse.

In such conditions, any attempt to express an independent opinion or share information beyond the occupation zone can have severe consequences – from persecution to physical repression (Tsybuliak et al., 2023). Silence, therefore, becomes a survival mechanism for the local population (Bukricieva & Afanasieva, 2023), making access to accurate data about social sentiments and living conditions nearly impossible. The informational blockade is compounded by limited opportunities for researchers, journalists, and civil activists to conduct field research or monitor developments in occupied areas. Data required for analyzing social, psychological, and economic processes remain fragmented and often inaccessible (Hlavatskyi et al., 2023). This creates a significant analytical vacuum.

Another contributing factor to this silence is the shift of public and media attention toward the frontlines (Vorotnyuk, 2024). Active combat operations generate dramatic visual images easily broadcasted through media and become central to public discourse (Pancheva et al., 2024). In contrast, occupied cities appear static, seemingly devoid of dynamics and change. This leads to the marginalization of the topic of life in occupied territories within the global informational space.

In geopolitical discourse, occupied cities are often reduced to strategic assets, “territories,” or “controlled zones” (Pidgrushnyi & Sikorska, 2024). Their social, cultural, and psychological dimen-

sions are overshadowed by rhetoric dominated by military and political terminology (Ivanysko et al., 2024). Such a simplified perspective leads to the depersonalization of life under occupation and distances it from its profoundly human dimension.

Prolonged occupation exacerbates social and cultural alienation between those who remained in occupied cities and those who were forced to leave (Tsybuliak et al., 2024). This alienation is accompanied by the formation of stereotypes and prejudices, complicating future reintegration efforts. Individuals who survived under occupation often face stigmatization and accusations of collaboration with occupying authorities, further reinforcing their silence and closing off opportunities for dialogue. The stigmatization of residents of occupied territories is a significant socio-psychological barrier. Simplistic notions of “betrayal” or “indifference” erode trust and hinder the development of constructive dialogue. The fear of being judged – both by occupying authorities and one’s society – creates a dual pressure on those who remain in occupied areas.

Ressler et al. (2024) highlight that feelings of isolation and social alienation are significant predictors of elevated PTSD levels among residents of deoccupied Ukrainian villages. This underscores the need to address these factors during reintegration efforts and provide psychosocial support.

Thus, the silence of occupied cities is not merely the absence of information. It is the product of fear, systematic control, stigmatization, and isolation, turning reality into an invisible space for external observers. Overcoming this silence requires courage from those who dare to speak and attentiveness and responsibility from those who listen. Moreover, it is precisely here that the next critical step begins – researching occupation as the key to understanding these hidden realities.

1.2. Why is it necessary to study occupation?

Occupation is not merely a military or political phenomenon. It is a complex, multi-layered process that transforms every city’s social, cultural, psychological, and economic realities under the control of occupying authorities (Pidgrushnyi &

Sikorska, 2024). However, the scientific study of these territories remains fragmented and often superficial, resulting in significant analytical gaps. The absence of systematic data complicates the understanding of current challenges and the development of effective strategies for future recovery.

Research on occupation goes beyond collecting statistical indicators or documenting events. It seeks to understand how life is transformed under isolation, fear, and repression (K. Mezentsev & O. Mezentsev, 2022). Social research helps reveal how social ties are rebuilt, how informal support networks emerge, and what new social hierarchies arise under constrained conditions (Kittichaisaree, 2019). Psychological studies provide insights into the impact of prolonged stress, isolation, and uncertainty on individual and collective mental health (Natanzi, 2024; Fluri, 2023; Gebreyesus et al., 2024). Political science analyzes how people interact with occupying authorities, the level of trust in institutions, and strategies of adaptation or resistance (Kastrinou et al., 2023; Nishiyama, 2023). Economic analysis investigates how local markets survive and how barter systems and informal economies emerge in contexts with limited access to resources (Lipinski & Shomali, 2024).

However, research on occupation must not remain confined within the boundaries of academic discourse. It must be integrated into global scientific discussions, becoming part of interdisciplinary research initiatives and international projects. Scientific publications, conferences, and participation in global research consortia are platforms where acquired knowledge can be scaled, cross-referenced with other studies, and contribute to a better understanding of the occupation's impact on regional and global stability.

At the same time, research must have a practical component. It should not only diagnose problems but also offer tangible tools for addressing social alienation, economic disparities, and psychological trauma. The collected data should translate into reintegration strategies that account for both objective socio-economic indicators and the subjective experiences of residents of occupied cities (Tarkhanova, 2023). Without this foundation, any recovery plans risk remaining declarative, detached from reality, and ultimately ineffective.

It is essential to understand that occupation does not end with the liberation of territory. Its consequences persist in social structures, individual trauma, and collective memory. Therefore, the occupation must not be seen as a concluded episode but as an ongoing process requiring long-term study and monitoring.

In this context, studying occupation is not just an academic task but a practical necessity. It is not merely about data collection or event documentation but about attempting to see what often remains invisible: social mechanisms of adaptation, psychological strategies for survival, and economic models of coexistence within semi-collapsed systems. Studying occupation is also about creating a map for the future – how to overcome alienation, rebuild trust, and integrate deoccupied communities into a cohesive social fabric.

I will outline specific approaches to studying these realities in the following section. This will not be a universal formula or a methodological prescription but a proposal for a framework within which the silent voices of these cities can be recorded and interpreted. This framework will address how to combine academic research with practical goals, overcome ethical dilemmas in working with sensitive data, and involve civil society and the media in this complex process. This next step attempts to answer the question: how can we study what is deliberately concealed, what remains silent, and what often turns our gaze away with its complexity and pain?

2. HOW TO STUDY OCCUPIED TERRITORIES?

Research on occupied territories cannot rely on standard methodological approaches. It requires specific strategies that account for limited data access, ethical challenges, and the need for collaboration among different stakeholders. In this context, universities play a crucial role as educational and scientific institutions and analytical hubs capable of generating solutions, modeling scenarios, and providing evidence-based foundations for political and social strategies.

2.1. Interaction between science and governance and the strengthening of the third mission of universities

Adequate research on occupied territories is impossible without a constructive dialogue between scientists and government authorities. State institutions require high-quality data to understand social sentiments, predict reactions during de-occupation, and engage in strategic planning (Brovko, 2024). At the same time, universities can collect relevant data, build predictive models, and provide actionable recommendations. However, this dialogue cannot be one-sided—authorities must not merely wait for ready-made analytical products but must actively integrate academics into decision-making processes (Bohdanov & Suchikova, 2024). This dialogue demands trust, transparency, and mutual accountability. Universities can become reliable partners in this process, but this requires establishing sustainable mechanisms for cooperation that go beyond one-off requests and reports.

Particular attention should be given to displaced universities (Porkuian et al., 2023; Spivakovsky et al., 2023; Lopatina et al., 2023). They represent a unique phenomenon, combining challenges and opportunities for studying occupation. These universities continue to operate amid persistent uncertainty, often without access to their infrastructure, archives, and scientific resources (Suchikova & Tsybuliak, 2023; Falko & Zhukov, 2023). They have lost physical assets and valuable data that can never be fully restored. This loss is an institutional tragedy and a blow to the integrity of scientific knowledge accumulated over the years.

Personally, I feel this loss every time I open reporting tables where infrastructure figures remain formally accurate but are devoid of real meaning. Yet, even under such conditions, universities continue to fulfill their mission, maintaining connections with faculty and students who still remain in occupation. This is not just an educational process – it is a way to preserve academic identity and sustain a fragile connection with one's hometown and university community (Zakharova & Prodanova, 2023).

The third mission of universities, traditionally encompassing their social and cultural role, has acquired new significance in wartime conditions (Petrushenko et al., 2023). Universities have become points of connection for dispersed communities, hubs for coordinating humanitarian aid, and platforms for open dialogue between government authorities, academia, and society (Novomlynets et al., 2023).

However, the third mission must not remain confined to volunteer initiatives or social projects. It must be integrated into the research activities of universities. Studies conducted within these institutions should not merely document current conditions but also generate a tangible social impact. This means creating analytical reports that serve as the foundation for government decisions and practical recommendations for local communities and international partners.

Science must not exist in a vacuum. It must become an instrument for transformation – from the local to the national level. This is particularly important in the context of post-war recovery when universities can serve as educational hubs and intellectual and social centers for renewal.

Thus, universities, particularly displaced ones, possess a unique potential for studying occupation and developing strategies for future recovery. Their third mission must not only be declared but actively implemented through the integration of research, education, and social impact.

Displaced universities can and must play a key role in researching occupied territories. Their unique access to networks of students and faculty members, both within and beyond the occupied areas, allows these institutions to gather fragmented yet extremely valuable data (Popova et al., 2024). At the same time, these universities possess an incredible potential to become magnets for young people after de-occupation. They can become spaces where not only infrastructure but also trust, identity, and community will be rebuilt (Bohdanov et al., 2023). To achieve this, it is essential to start building strategic bridges between universities, authorities,

and communities now. These bridges must be based on transparent support mechanisms, investments in research, and the creation of conditions that encourage young professionals to return.

In the next subsection, another crucial tool for researching occupied territories will be examined – citizen science, media, and the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These tools have the potential to fill data gaps, give voice to those who are often silenced, and ensure the sustainability of research processes even under the most challenging conditions.

2.2. Strengthening citizen science, the role of media, and NGOs

Occupied cities remain silent, yet this silence is filled with voices waiting to be heard. One of the key ways to amplify these voices is to strengthen citizen science, providing people with tools and opportunities to document their reality, collect testimonies, and preserve narratives. Sometimes, it is a simple kitchen conversation, a discussion with relatives still living under occupation or mundane correspondence that holds fragments of essential data. People’s testimonies, their stories, and even the silent pauses between their words form the fabric from which a map of occupation can be woven. These data do not always resemble traditional science: they are scattered, fragmented, and challenging to organize. Yet, they form the foundation upon which more systematic research can be built.

Citizen science in occupied territories is not merely data collection – it is an act of resistance. It is a way to say, “My life matters, my story is important.” However, for this to become possible, safe platforms must be created for transmitting these data, ensuring confidentiality and protection for those who dare to speak. This is particularly crucial for those risking their lives to share pieces of the truth. Universities can serve as such platforms – a space where these data can be recorded, analyzed, and transformed into strategies for the future.

For example, researchers from Berdyansk State Pedagogical University have implemented several significant projects related to studying occupation, including:

- “Southeastern Ukraine: Under Temporary Occupation” (Documenting Ukraine);
- “Art in Occupation: Reflection” (Izolyatsia Foundation);
- “Resistance and Transformation of Civil Society under Occupation: The Experience of Berdyansk” (ISAR Ednannia);
- “Berdyansk Art as a Means of Resistance: The Role of the Civic Sector, Universities, and Local Governance in Supporting Artists Who Survived Occupation” (ISAR Ednannia).

Volunteers were essential in finding respondents and participants in these projects, collecting information, and processing data. These volunteers, trusted within local communities, maintained discreet but effective communication with those living under occupation. It is crucial to emphasize that such projects document the experience of occupation and create a unique support network where firsthand knowledge becomes the foundation for reintegration strategies and rebuilding trust in the post-conflict period.

Collaboration between citizen science, academic institutions, and volunteers can lead to a deeper understanding of the social, cultural, and psychological consequences of occupation. This process requires technical support and constant ethical oversight to ensure the safety of research participants and researchers.

In parallel, media and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play an exceptionally significant role in maintaining this delicate connection between occupied territories and the free world. Many journalists were forced to leave their cities to continue their work, documenting letters, diaries, and oral histories from occupied territories. For example, the BRD24 platform publishes “Letters from Occupation,” which serves as a way to hear voices and as an archive that can be used to analyze social sentiments after de-occupation. Podcasts produced by such media outlets offer the world a glimpse into lives that would otherwise remain invisible.

It is also essential to understand that these fragmented data – conversations, letters, podcasts, and testimonies – are not isolated stories. They must be integrated into a broader scientific and social discourse. These voices must not be treated as background noise but as central to the conversation about occupation, loss, and the future. This is not just about documenting history – it is about building the foundation for dialogue, reintegration, and recovery after de-occupation.

Occupied cities cannot remain silent forever. However, scientists, media professionals, and citizens, whether they live in these cities or far beyond their borders, must do quiet and meticulous work to hear their voices. Every letter, diary entry, and fragment of a conversation is a building block in the bridge we construct between the present and the future. Silence can only be overcome when all these voices are gathered, heard, and, most importantly, protected.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can also serve as a bridge between people and researchers. Thanks to their flexibility and proximity to local communities, they can collect information and create support mechanisms for those who dare to speak out. Through monitoring, advocacy, and awareness campaigns, they can raise issues that might otherwise remain marginalized in public attention.

This potential of citizen science, the role of media, and NGOs is not just a tool for data collection but also a means of strengthening social resilience and rebuilding trust. In the next section, we will examine another critically important aspect of researching occupied territories – data sensitivity and ensuring their ethical use.

2.3. Data sensitivity considerations

Occupied cities do not merely remain silent – they conceal an immense layer of sensitive information that can be either life-saving or destructive, depending on whose hands it falls into. When discussing research on occupied territories, we inevitably face critical questions: who collects the data, how is it stored, and who has access to it? These questions gain particular importance in the context of Ukraine's modern commitment to Open Science principles.

The National Open Science Plan, adopted in 2022 (Nazarovets, 2022), emphasizes the importance of data accessibility, interoperability, transparency, and reusability in accordance with the FAIR principles. The methodology for evaluating scientific institutions and universities already includes indicators focused on preprints, open publications, and the availability of open data that are aligned with FAIR principles. This is an important step toward the global integration of Ukrainian science. However, are we ready to implement these principles unconditionally when it concerns the lives of people in occupied territories?

The CARE principles (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, and Ethics) remind us that open data cannot be an end in itself (Carroll et al., 2020). It must benefit the community it originates from while simultaneously protecting it from potential threats. In occupied territories, any information – sociological surveys, economic indicators, or infrastructure reports – can be weaponized by aggressors as tools for pressure, blackmail, or repression.

It is crucial to understand and accept that CARE principles are not an alternative to or a rejection of FAIR principles; instead, they complement them, adding an essential ethical dimension to data management (Carroll et al., 2022). While FAIR principles ensure data accessibility, interoperability, and reproducibility, CARE emphasizes the social context in which one collects, processes, and uses the data (Belarde-Lewis et al., 2024). This becomes particularly significant during war and occupation, where information carries scientific value and strategic importance. Striking a balance between openness and responsibility is a key challenge for researchers working with data from occupied territories. Only through the interaction of FAIR and CARE principles can we ensure scientific integrity and ethical resilience in such research.

At this point, it is essential to recognize that war is not the time for naive openness. Discussions about occupied cities cannot rely on blind faith in data neutrality. Every file, table row, and indicator can carry hidden weight and consequences. Information about residents of occupied terri-

tories is not just statistics – it represents a deep vulnerability that must be protected. Openness without responsibility is not science; it is reckless risk-taking.

Thus, research on occupied territories requires specialized data management protocols. These protocols must include anonymization, restricted access, secure repositories, and, most importantly, constant ethical reflection on how this information is handled. Some data may need to remain closed until safer times arrive. Researchers must learn to balance the drive for transparency with the duty to protect those who become research subjects.

Occupied cities are already blind spots on our scientific and social discourse map. But if we allow irresponsible handling of data about them, we risk turning this blind spot into an irreversible void. Scientific openness must always be accompanied by responsibility, especially when human lives are at stake. Sometimes, silence is not a sign of weakness but a manifestation of the highest caution.

Did you know, for example, that people who remain in occupied territories continue to work and study at universities relocated from these areas?

Ensuring their safety requires significant efforts from university administrations. You will not find the profiles of these faculty members on official university websites, nor will you see their class schedules publicly listed. For instance, at Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, specific protocols are in place to ensure the safety of respondents and faculty members. These include anonymous interviews, where participants do not enable video, and their data are not recorded. Communication often occurs via encrypted channels, and any information that could identify individuals is destroyed once it has been processed. Each research study undergoes ethical oversight and approval by the relevant committee to minimize risks for all participants.

These protocols are not merely technical instructions; they represent the delicate balance between openness and protection. They demonstrate that during wartime, science cannot afford absolute transparency. Every decision regarding data sharing or publication of research results must be made with full consideration of the potential risks to individuals involved. The responsibility for ensuring safety is not optional; it is an ethical obligation that guides every stage of working with sensitive information.

INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION: THE GEOPOLITICS OF SILENCE – TIME TO ASK DIFFICULT QUESTIONS

Occupied territories cannot remain just numbers in tables and abstract points on military strategists' maps. Behind every square kilometer, every administrative unit, and every abandoned building stand human lives – complex, painful, and often invisible to the outside world. As Adriana Petryna aptly notes: “Not only is territory an extension of empire, whether or not people assent to it, but the territorialization of a country makes its resources and people transactable between dueling empires” (Petryna, 2023, p. 13). This idea underscores that occupation is not only about control over land but also about control over human lives, their stories, and their futures.

Geopolitics is not just about frontlines and peace agreements; it is, above all, about people: those who stayed and those who were forced to leave. Each carries a unique story, and every one of these stories demands attention, listening, and understanding.

When we speak of de-occupation, we must think not only about restoring territories but also about restoring trust, a sense of security, and, most importantly, dignity. Are we ready for the possibility that deoccupied cities will not greet us with joy, that there will be anger, disappointment, and even fear? Are we prepared to engage in dialogue with those who remained, those who survived however they could, and those who made choices we may not agree with?

These will be difficult conversations with no room for black-and-white answers, where every answer will lead to even more questions. Nevertheless, if we want to speak about reintegration rather than merely administrative ‘return under control,’ we will have to have these conversations. We will have to look into the eyes of people who lived under occupation and acknowledge their experience, their pain, and their truth. It is essential to accept the axiom: “Military de-occupation does not mean decolonization, and some complex questions remain unanswered” (Sviezhentsev & Kisly, 2023, p. 1).

From the book by Nobel Laureate Svetlana Alexievich: “I went to apply to the teacher’s college, as I had dreamed. There was a questionnaire to fill out... I wrote everything and reached the question: Were you or your relatives in captivity or under occupation? I answered – yes, of course, we were. The director of the college called me into his office: ‘Young lady, take back your documents.’ <...> That is how I learned that we... all of us who were under occupation... are unreliable. Under suspicion” (Aleksievich, 2021, p. 97).

This excerpt reminds us how easily social stigmas can become invisible barriers, destroying lives, dreams, and futures. These stigmas will not disappear on their own after the war ends. They require attention, honest dialogue, and efforts to overcome them.

Universities, researchers, media, and civil society organizations must witness this process and actively participate in it. Scientific research, collected testimonies, archives of letters, podcasts, and diaries – these are not just data. They are artifacts of life in isolation, keys to understanding what must be done next.

Do we have a plan? Are we ready to listen, analyze, empathize, and, most importantly, act? Because if we limit ourselves to talking about maps and numbers in reports, we risk losing not only territories but also people. And this would be a loss that no victorious report could ever compensate for.

De-occupation is not the end; it is the beginning. The beginning of a long, complex, and painful process of returning to life. For this process to succeed, we must learn today to see faces behind numbers, stories behind statistics, and destinies behind maps. Because no victory is worth it if there is no place left in it for humanity.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Yana Suchikova.

Formal analysis: Yana Suchikova.

Investigation: Yana Suchikova.

Methodology: Yana Suchikova.

Project administration: Yana Suchikova.

Resources: Yana Suchikova.

Supervision: Yana Suchikova.

Writing – original draft: Yana Suchikova.

Writing – review & editing: Yana Suchikova.

REFERENCES

1. Aleksievich, S. (2021). *Chas second-hand. Kinets chervonoi liudyny [Time for second-hand: The end of the red man]* (475 p.). FOLIO. (In Ukrainian).
2. Belarde-Lewis, M., Littletree, S., Braine, I. R., Srader, K., Guerrero, N., & Palmer, C. L. (2024). Centering relationality and CARE for stewardship of indigenous re-
3. Bohdanov, I., & Suchikova, Y. (2024). EXTENDED COMMENTARY: Search data. *Data Science Journal*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2024-032>

- TARY – Navigating the labyrinth of youth return to deoccupied territories in Ukraine: Stakeholders, strategies, and ethical imperatives. *World Affairs*, 187(4), 559-573. <https://doi.org/10.1002/waf2.12034>
4. Bohdanov, I., Suchikova, Y., Kovachov, S., Hurenko, O., & Aleksandrova, H. (2023). Youth views on the role of local government and universities in the development of deoccupied territories. *Knowledge and Performance Management*, 7(1), 29-46. [https://doi.org/10.21511/kpm.07\(1\).2023.03](https://doi.org/10.21511/kpm.07(1).2023.03)
 5. Brovko, O. (2024). Local government resilience in the face of Russian aggression: The case of Ukraine. *Territory, Politics, Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2024.2327369>
 6. Bukrieva, I., & Afanasieva, L. (2023). The Russian occupation of Melitopol, Ukraine. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 39(2), 236-252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796x231168151>
 7. Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., Holbrook, J., Lovett, R., Materechera, S., Parsons, M., Raseroka, K., Rodriguez-Lonebear, D., Rowe, R., Sara, R., Walker, J. D., Anderson, J., & Hudson, M. (2020). The CARE principles for indigenous data governance. *Data Science Journal*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-043>
 8. Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Plevel, R., Small-Rodriguez, D., Hiratsuka, V. Y., Hudson, M., & Garrison, N. A. (2022). Using indigenous standards to implement the CARE principles: Setting expectations through tribal research codes. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2022.823309>
 9. Falko, N., & Zhukov, O. (2023). Transition from hierarchy to adhocratic organizational culture in a Ukrainian university: From survival to successful development in the conditions of war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 15-22. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.03](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.03)
 10. Fluri, J. L. (2023). Distance, detachment, and division: A response to “Midnight’s victims”. *Area Development and Policy*, 8(4), 392-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2023.2274054>
 11. Gebreyesus, A., Gebremariam, A. G., Kidanu, K. G., Gidey, S., Haftu, H., Nigusse, A. T., Shishay, F., & Mamo, L. (2024). Post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms among internally displaced persons: Unveiling the impact of the war of Ti-gray. *Discover Mental Health*, 4(1), Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44192-024-00069-2>
 12. Hlavatskyi, D., Poliachenko, I., Melnyk, G., & Bakhmutov, V. (2023). Impact of war on geophysical research in Ukraine: An eyewitness report from the formerly occupied palaeomagnetic lab. *Contributions to Geophysics and Geodesy*, 53(special), 85-95. <https://doi.org/10.31577/congeo.2023.sp.1>
 13. Horden, J., & López de Sa, D. (2024). People and places. *Notús*, 58(4), 1137-1155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12496>
 14. Ivanysko, S., Kazakevych, G., & Shydlovskiy, P. (2024). Cultural heritage in the Russo-Ukrainian war: A victim in the conflict. *Complutum*, 35(1), 191-214. <https://doi.org/10.5209/cmpl.95930>
 15. Kastrinou, M., Said, S., Jarboub, R., & Emery, S. B. (2023). Still there. *Conflict and Society*, 9(1), 147-166. <https://doi.org/10.3167/arcs.2023.090110>
 16. Kittichaisaree, K. (2019). International humanitarian law and the Asia-Pacific struggles for national liberation. In S. Linton, T. McCormack & S. Sivakumaran (Eds.), *Asia-Pacific Perspectives on International Humanitarian Law* (pp. 139-155). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108667203.010>
 17. Lai, L. W. C., Davies, S. N. G., Leung, N. T. H., Lau, P. L. K., & Kee, T. (2025). Remembering walls by map naming and planned attempts to eradicate and salvage a wall-less “walled city”: Kowloon City. *Land Use Policy*, 148, Article 107375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107375>
 18. Lipinski, J., & Shomali, R. Q. (2024). Navigating adversity: Re-visiting entrepreneurial theories in the context of the occupied Palestinian territories. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), Article 313. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14120313>
 19. Lopatina, H., Tsybuliak, N., Popova, A., Bohdanov, I., & Suchikova, Y. (2023). University without Walls: Experience of Berdyansk State Pedagogical University during the war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 4-14. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.02](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.02)
 20. Malyarenko, T., & Kormych, B. (2024). New wild fields: How the Russian war leads to the demodernization of Ukraine’s occupied territories. *Nationalities Papers*, 52(3), 497-515. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.33>
 21. Mezentsev, K., & Mezentsev, O. (2022). War and the city: Lessons from urbicide in Ukraine. *Czasopismo Geograficzne*, 93(3), 495-521. <https://doi.org/10.12657/czageo-93-20>
 22. Natanzi, P. M. (2024). Jender Bazi temporality: Gender-related research and writing in Afghanistan during NATO’s war and military occupation. *Afghanistan*, 7(suppl), 66-91. <https://doi.org/10.3366/afg.2024.0145>
 23. Nazarovets, S. (2022). Ukraine approves National Plan for Open Science. *Nature*, 611(7935). <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03583-x>
 24. Nishiyama, H. (2023). Decolonial encounter with neo-nationalism: The politics of indigeneity and land rights struggles in Okinawa. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 48(2), 290-303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12582>
 25. Novomlynets, O., Marhasova, V., Tkalenko, N., Kholiavko, N., & Popelo, O. (2023). Northern outpost: Chernihiv Polytechnic National University in the conditions of the Russia-Ukrainian war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 31-39. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.05](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.05)

26. Pancheva, G., Ardhelas, A. A., Gil, A. T., & Spencer, A. (2024). 'Russian warship, go fuck yourself': Romantic narratives of the hero in the war of Ukraine. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13691481241303258>
27. Petrushenko, Y., Vorontsova, A., Dorczak, R., & Vasylieva, T. (2023). The third mission of the university in the context of war and post-war recovery. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 67-79. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.09](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.09)
28. Petryna, A. (2023). De-occupation as planetary politics. *American Ethnologist*, 50(1), 10-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.13140>
29. Pidgrushnyi, G. P., & Sikorska, L. B. (2024). Destruction of Ukrainian cities during the Russian aggression (Socio-geographical analysis based on Mariupol). *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*, 2024(1), 30-39. <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2024.01.030>
30. Popova, A., Tsybuliak, N., Lopatina, H., Suchikova, Y., Kovachov, S., & Bogdanov, I. (2024). I (don't) want to go home. Will young people return to the deoccupied territories of Ukraine? *Heliyon*, 10(15), Article e35230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e35230>
31. Porkuian, O., Tselishchev, O., Halhash, R., Ivchenko, Y., & Khandii, O. (2023). Twice displaced, but unconquered: The experience of reviving a Ukrainian university during the war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 98-105. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.12](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.12)
32. Poslynyi, I. (2023). The Soviet pillar of belonging: How Donbas schools construct the reality in occupation. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 57(2), 112-134. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cpcs.2023.2002005>
33. Ressler, A., Hinchey, L. M., Mast, J., Zucconi, B. E., Bratchuk, A., Parfenukt, N., Roth, D., & Javanbakht, A. (2024). Alone on the frontline: The first report of PTSD prevalence and risk in deoccupied Ukrainian villages. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 70(5), 915-925. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207640241242030>
34. Spivakovsky, O., Omelchuk, S., Malchykova, D., Tsapiv, A., & Lemeshchuk, O. (2023). Academic solidarity and digitization: Management of a displaced university. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 40-51. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.06](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.06)
35. Suchikova, Y., & Tsybuliak, N. (2023). Universities without walls: Global trend v. Ukraine's reality. *Nature*, 614(7948). <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00380-y>
36. Sviezhentsev, M., & Kisly, M.-O. (2023). De-occupation or (de)colonization? Challenges for Crimea's future. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 65(2), 232-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.2023.2202554>
37. Tarkhanova, O. (2023). No longer a citizen. In C. Wanner (Ed.), *Dispossession* (pp. 82-99). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003382607-6>
38. Tsybuliak, N., Popova, A., Lopatina, H., & Suchikova, Y. (2024). In a stranger's house: Social isolation of internally displaced people in Ukraine during wartime. *Human Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2024-0027>
39. Tsybuliak, N., Suchikova, Y., Gurenko, O., Lopatina, H., Kovachov, S., & Bohdanov, I. (2023). Ukrainian universities at the time of war: From occupation to temporary relocation. *Torture Journal*, 33(3), 39-64. <https://doi.org/10.7146/torture.v33i3.136256>
40. Vorotnyuk, M. (2024). Black Sea as a battlefield: Ukraine's perspectives and strategies in the region. In K. Kakachia, S. Malerius, & S. Meister (Eds.), *Contributions to International Relations* (pp. 111-128). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-62957-0_10
41. Zakharova, O., & Prodanova, L. (2023). A university displaced twice: Irreversible and erroneous losses of human capital. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2-si), 123-132. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.15](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.15)