



Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game

by David Burden and the
Matrix Game Simulation (MGS) system

Final Summary: Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game – 2026

Strategic Overview

Ukraine

- **Achievements:** Major battlefield breakthroughs (Sumy, Volnovakha, push toward Mariupol), successful decapitation strikes, naval victories, strong domestic morale.
- **Diplomacy:** Secured a NATO & EU accession roadmap, resisted multiple coercion attempts, and deepened ties Europe.
- **End State:** Controls more territory than in early 2024 and holds the initiative in all theatres.

Russia

- **Achievements:** Tactical strike successes (briefly), temporary hybrid warfare disruptions in Moldova/Belarus.
- **Failures:** Winter offensive stalled, *mobilisation collapsed*, Crimea destabilised, command infrastructure *disrupted*.
- **End State:** Strategically overextended, *economically battered*, and facing potential internal unrest.

United States (Trump Admin)

- **Achievements:** Maintained political control over aid policy, avoided direct conflict, solidified domestic base.
- **Failures:** *Multiple failed peace plans, isolation from NATO, failed outreach to China, sanctions flopped.*
- **End State:** *Marginalized diplomatically; US credibility in Europe at a post-Cold War low.*

European Union

- **Achievements:** Took over leadership of Ukraine's war effort—logistics, arms, funds, and now boots on the ground.
- **Key Moves:** €140B frozen asset plan, Defence Compact, EU logistics corridor, ERRF creation, NATO/EU roadmap for Ukraine.
- **End State:** Geopolitically ascendant—*effectively replaced the US as Ukraine's patron and reshaped its own defence identity.*

Final Scorecard

Volodymyr Zelenskyy – 9/10

- A near-masterclass in asymmetric warfare, diplomatic survival, *aval*, and alliance building.

Vladimir Putin – 3/10

- Battlefield losses, failed mobilisation, *Crimea destabilising.*

Donald Trump – 2/10

- Pursued peace deals, but lost allies and NATO *influence.*

Ursula von der Leyen – 10/10

- Flawless EU leadership, *transformed Europe into a strategic power.*

Game Outcome:

- ✓ **Strategic Victory** for Ukraine & the EU
 - ✓ Russia is reeling. The US is sidelined. Europe is in charge.
-

Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game 2026.pdf

PDF

can we play this matrix game

Absolutely, we can play the **Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game 2026** using the scenario you've uploaded.

Here's what I'll do now:

✔ **Game Setup Summary**

- **Title:** Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game 2026
 - **Game Duration:** 6 turns (Feb–July 2026)
 - **Each turn = 1 month**
 - **Victory Points:** Each actor is scored at the end from **-5 to +5** based on how well they achieve their objectives.
-

🗣️ **Actor Roles & Objectives**

This game uses real-world leaders as the "player personalities," so no fictional personas needed — just me managing the turns based on their traits and decisions.

Here are the four actors:

RU Vladimir Putin, President of Russia

- Stay in power and keep an iron grip on Russia
- Capture all of Donbas and hold Crimea
- Keep Ukraine out of NATO
- Exploit Trump as a “useful idiot”

UA Volodymyr Zelenskyy, President of Ukraine

- Regain all territory lost to Russia since 2014 (Donbas + Crimea)
- Maintain alignment with the West
- Secure security guarantees from NATO or the US

us Donald Trump, President of the USA

- Win the Nobel Peace Prize by brokering any peace

- Get “good deals” from either side (e.g. resources)
- Stay out of direct military involvement
- Maintain a weird bromance with Putin... unless betrayed

EU Ursula von der Leyen, President of the EU

- Support Ukraine (military + economic aid)
 - Keep EU/NATO unity (especially Poland, Hungary)
 - Hurt Russia economically
 - Avoid direct war with Russia
-

Turn Mechanics

Each turn:

1. Randomise player order
 2. Each actor:
 - Declares one action
 - Provides **2 arguments** why it should succeed
 3. Two other actors give **counter-arguments**
 4. I adjudicate success or failure
 5. Significant impacts (if any) are applied
 6. Summary of the turn
-

Would you like:

- To **control any of the actors**, or
- Shall I run this as a solo simulation for you?

Let me know and we’ll get rolling with **Turn 1: February 2026!**

Don't give the game a 6 turn limit. Do turn 1

Perfect — we'll keep the game open-ended until you decide it's time to stop. Let's crack on!

Turn 1: February 2026

Randomised player order:

1. EU Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
 2. RU Vladimir Putin (Russia)
 3. us Donald Trump (USA)
 4. UA Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
-

Player 1: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Launches a major diplomatic push to rally EU nations behind a €140 billion loan for Ukraine, backed by frozen Russian assets held in Belgium.

Arguments for success:

1. Several EU nations (Germany, Poland, Nordics) are already vocal supporters of Ukraine and would push this through the European Council.
 2. The loan uses *existing* frozen Russian funds, reducing the fiscal burden on EU taxpayers and making it politically sellable even in more reluctant states like France or Italy.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Russia will retaliate economically and politically.
Using frozen assets this way sets a dangerous precedent and undermines the global financial system. Neutral or opportunistic countries (like India or Brazil) may side with Russia on this.
 - **us Trump:**
Trump publicly denounces the move as “theft” and threatens to sanction European companies involved.
This could undermine transatlantic unity and scare off hesitant EU members.
-

Adjudication:

Both supporting arguments are strong and well-grounded in institutional momentum and legal mechanisms. The EU has historically acted in this direction, and public support for Ukraine is still high.

Counter-arguments have weight — particularly Trump’s interference — but are external to EU sovereignty and unlikely to derail the internal process.

 **Result: SUCCESS**

 **Impact:**

- The €140 billion loan is approved.
 - Ukrainian confidence is boosted — they can now sustain operations despite US unpredictability.
 - Russia is enraged. Kremlin calls it “economic terrorism.”
 - Global South watching closely — some countries begin questioning holding reserves in EU banks.
-

Would you like to:

- React or adjust anything before moving to **Putin’s move**, or
- Shall we continue directly to the next activation?

do all of the rest of the players for turn 1

Brilliant — let’s keep the momentum going.

 **Turn 1: February 2026 (continued)**

 **Player 2: Vladimir Putin (Russia)**

Action: Orders a major winter offensive in central Donetsk, aiming to break through Ukrainian defences and take the strategic town of Kostiantynivka.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia has spent months building up fresh conscripts and rotating out exhausted units, giving it local superiority in manpower.
2. Ukrainian forces in the area are under-supplied due to US aid delays and stretched thin defending multiple axes (Sumy, Kherson, Kursk raids).

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
Ukrainian drones and HIMARS systems have heavily degraded Russian logistics and staging areas.
Intelligence shared by European allies has warned of this offensive in advance.
- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Even if Russia advances, it's unlikely to achieve a decisive breakthrough.
Russian forces are over-reliant on conscripts and old equipment, which will struggle in winter combat against entrenched defenders.

✗ Adjudication: FAILURE

Putin's arguments were tactically reasonable, but not overwhelming. The counter-arguments — especially about pre-warning and degraded logistics — hit hard.

Russian tactics remain attritional and lack the surprise or mobility needed for a major breakthrough. Conscripts are poorly trained, and Kostiantynivka is well-defended.

Impact:

- Russian forces make marginal gains but fail to take Kostiantynivka.
- Russian casualties mount sharply in frozen trench warfare.
- Morale and domestic patience in Russia take another hit.
- Western media frame it as a "mini-Stalingrad in the steppe."

Player 3: Donald Trump (USA)

Action: Publicly announces a "Grand Deal for Peace" initiative, proposing a Trump-brokered ceasefire: Ukraine keeps current lines, Russia keeps Crimea and most of Donbas, and US companies gain exclusive mining rights in both nations.

Arguments for success:

1. Trump positions himself as the *only* one who can speak to both sides — Zelenskyy owes the West, Putin likes a good deal.

2. By tying peace to economic opportunity for US firms, Trump gives Republicans in Congress a reason to support it and dangle new aid as a carrot.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
This isn't the deal Russia wants.
Putin won't accept a peace that leaves Ukrainian forces in parts of Donbas — and he's already bleeding, so he wants to bleed Ukraine too.
 - **UA Zelenskyy:**
This is a sellout.
Any deal that leaves Crimea and Donbas in Russian hands is politically toxic in Ukraine. Trump's plan ignores Ukrainian sovereignty and strength on the battlefield.
-

✗ Adjudication: FAILURE

This is peak Trump — ambitious but tone-deaf. His “deal” is seen as a vanity project with little diplomatic groundwork.

Putin doesn't get what he wants. Zelenskyy gets nothing but humiliation. The EU is frozen out. No actor buys in.

Impact:

- Trump's initiative is widely ridiculed in Europe and Kyiv.
 - Kremlin calls it “naïve.”
 - Trump blames Zelenskyy on Truth Social for "not wanting peace."
 - Ukraine-US relations fray slightly — but EU support cushions the blow.
-

■ Player 4: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Launches a coordinated sabotage and drone campaign against Russian oil and gas facilities, particularly in the Ural region and on tankers in international waters.

Arguments for success:

1. Ukraine has demonstrated growing capability with long-range drones and asymmetric maritime attacks (“ghost fleet” tactics).
 2. These strikes hit Russia’s economy directly and create logistical chaos without requiring a risky ground offensive.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **US Trump:**
The US may distance itself further if Ukraine keeps escalating the war.
These attacks risk global oil prices spiking and angering US voters — Trump might halt all remaining aid.
 - **RU Putin:**
Russian air defences and electronic warfare have improved significantly.
New Chinese-supplied systems make drone attacks less effective now than in 2025.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

Zelenskyy’s campaign is low-cost, high-impact — ideal asymmetric warfare. Arguments are specific and credible. While Trump grumbles, EU support and domestic Ukrainian approval soar.

Russia’s defences are stretched thin across a vast geography; even with improvements, they can’t cover it all.

📊 Impact:

- Multiple drone strikes ignite fires at key refineries and tank farms in the Urals.
 - Two tankers from Russia’s ghost fleet are damaged in the Black Sea.
 - Global oil markets spike briefly, but stabilise as Gulf states increase output.
 - Kremlin furious, promises retaliation — possibly in kind.
-

📄 End of Turn 1 Summary – February 2026

- EU EU secures a €140B frozen asset loan for Ukraine — massive diplomatic win.
- RU Russia’s winter offensive fails — casualties rise, morale drops.

- us Trump's "peace plan" flops hard — seen as self-serving and unworkable.
- ua Ukraine scores a win with deep strikes on Russian oil infrastructure.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Ukraine gains momentum** — morale up, economy supported.
 - **Russia bleeds slowly** — battlefield failure + economic pain.
 - **Trump alienates both sides** — but may double down next turn.
 - **EU steps up** as the new backbone of Ukraine's support.
-

Would you like:

- To make adjustments or interject before we begin **Turn 2 (March 2026)**?
- Or shall I carry on directly into the next turn?

turn 2

Right then — on to **Turn 2: March 2026**.

Turn 2: March 2026

Randomised player order:

1. ru Vladimir Putin (Russia)
 2. ua Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
 3. us Donald Trump (USA)
 4. eu Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
-

Player 1: Vladimir Putin (Russia)

Action: Orders the GRU and SVR to launch a *major cyber operation* against European arms manufacturers supplying Ukraine, aiming to disrupt production and sabotage supply chains.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia has deep cyber capabilities and decades of experience targeting NATO infrastructure — especially civilian contractors.

2. European cybersecurity is uneven — many key suppliers are in mid-sized firms that are not hardened against state-level actors.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **US Trump:**
The US still shares some cyber threat intel with Europe, and firms are better defended than Russia thinks. Western cyber teams could trace and expose Russian fingerprints, backfiring diplomatically.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Post-2022, European defence firms hardened their networks. Many now operate in secure cloud environments with real-time threat detection, and the EU has funded cyber-response teams.
-

Adjudication: FAILURE

The idea is plausible, but the arguments are shaky. Russia's cyber talent pool has been hit by sanctions and emigration, and recent EU hardening efforts dull the impact. The element of surprise is limited.

Impact:

- A few smaller firms in Slovakia and Italy face production delays.
 - No major systemic disruption.
 - Russia's signature is exposed — damaging diplomatic credibility further.
 - Poland demands EU sanctions on Russian tech firms.
-

Player 2: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Conducts a limited offensive along the Sumy axis, aiming to push back Russian artillery positions and secure a buffer zone to protect civilians in northeastern Ukraine.

Arguments for success:

1. Ukrainian forces in Sumy are well-prepared, and recent intel drops from European allies have revealed Russian battery locations.

2. This is a *limited*, achievable objective — not a major push, but a tactical move to ease civilian pressure and morale.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Russian forces have heavily mined and fortified the area since 2023.
Any Ukrainian advance will face significant attritional cost.
 - **us Trump:**
The US still isn't sending significant new arms.
Ukraine may not have enough precision munitions to sustain this offensive — it risks bleeding units better used in Donbas.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

Zelensky's objective is realistic and tightly scoped. With European financial and limited military support now flowing again, Ukraine has just enough resources for this kind of tactical manoeuvre.

The counter-arguments highlight risks, but not enough to derail the action.

📊 Impact:

- Ukraine retakes 3–5 villages near the Sumy border.
 - Russian artillery positions are pushed back, reducing shelling of civilian centres.
 - Media coverage inside Ukraine is celebratory — a much-needed morale win.
 - Russia is forced to redeploy some units, stretching its lines further.
-

■ Player 3: Donald Trump (USA)

Action: Cuts off all remaining *direct* US military aid to Ukraine, citing Zelensky's "ungratefulness" and escalating drone strikes as "reckless." Reallocates funds to domestic "border defence" projects.

Arguments for success:

1. Trump controls the executive branch and Pentagon purse strings, and the Ukraine aid freeze has been building for months.

2. This plays well with his voter base and neutralises political pressure over oil prices and foreign entanglements.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Europe is increasingly taking over support for Ukraine anyway.
This move may hurt short-term, but the EU, UK, and others are ramping up production and aid.
 - **UA Zelenskyy:**
This will damage US credibility globally.
Other US allies will see this as proof America is unreliable under Trump, undermining deterrence against China and Iran.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

The decision is unilateral — and Trump has the authority. While there's pushback, especially from NATO allies, the decision goes through.

📉 Impact:

- US military shipments stop. Ukraine loses access to spare parts, drones, munitions.
 - EU must scramble to fill the gap, increasing pressure on European arsenals.
 - China and Iran both take note — confidence in US extended deterrence weakens.
 - Trump's base cheers. NATO's cohesion wobbles.
-

■ Player 4: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Announces a fast-tracked European Defence Production Act, increasing EU-wide coordination and funding for arms manufacturing — to compensate for the loss of US support.

Arguments for success:

1. European arms makers have already been scaling up; centralising procurement and investment will accelerate the process.

2. Political will is high following the Trump cut — even normally reluctant members (e.g. France, Italy) feel the urgency now.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **us Trump:**
The EU is all talk.
In practice, it will take too long for ramp-ups to make a difference — especially without US logistical and industrial support.
 - **RU Putin:**
Russian intel shows EU unity is fragile.
Hungary and Slovakia may block or water down joint measures.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

While there are internal divisions, the strategic shock of US withdrawal catalyses EU action. A defence production act is plausible, and Ursula's leadership is decisive here.

📊 Impact:

- EU passes legislation centralising weapons production and stockpile sharing.
 - Massive subsidies flow to German, Polish, and Czech arms industries.
 - Ukraine now has a longer-term supply plan — not fixed yet, but the foundation is laid.
 - Hungary grumbles, but doesn't veto — for now.
-

📄 End of Turn 2 Summary – March 2026

- RU Russia's cyberattack fizzles, exposing its hand and strengthening EU unity.
- UA Ukraine wins a tactical success near Sumy, protecting civilians and boosting morale.
- us Trump ends all US military aid to Ukraine, creating a strategic shockwave.
- EU EU steps up, launching a centralised arms production act — a new chapter in EU defence autonomy.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **EU emerges as the new arsenal of democracy.**
 - **Russia grows frustrated** — failing offensives, failed cyber ops.
 - **Trump isolates the US** diplomatically while scoring domestic points.
 - **Ukraine survives the US cut** thanks to quick EU action, but time is tight.
-

Would you like:

- To make any adjustments or reactions?
- Or shall I go straight into **Turn 3: April 2026?**

turn 3

On we go — into the spring thaw and the political deep freeze.

Turn 3: April 2026

Randomised player order:

1. ua Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
 2. eu Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
 3. us Donald Trump (USA)
 4. ru Vladimir Putin (Russia)
-

Player 1: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Launches a strategic communications and diplomatic campaign to pressure NATO into granting Ukraine a *formal invitation to begin accession talks*, backed by Baltic and Polish leaders.

Arguments for success:

1. With US support gone, European security now hinges on clear lines — and Ukraine inside NATO would send a strong deterrent message to Russia.
 2. Ukraine's battlefield resilience, democratic credentials, and EU alignment make it a better NATO candidate than ever before.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**

This would be seen as a direct provocation by Russia.

Any move toward Ukrainian NATO accession would eliminate any chance of diplomacy and could trigger escalation — even against Western targets.

- **us Trump:**

NATO isn't credible without the US, and Trump makes it clear he would veto any Ukrainian accession as long as he's in office. He threatens to withdraw from NATO entirely if it proceeds.

Adjudication: FAILURE

Though Ukraine's case is strong, the political risk is simply too high. With the US acting as a spoiler and Russia issuing direct threats, NATO leadership kicks the can down the road. Again.

Impact:

- NATO affirms “Ukraine’s future is in NATO” (again), but no formal invitation is issued.
 - Zelenskyy’s position at home remains strong, but frustration grows — especially among soldiers and hardliners.
 - Putin claims a diplomatic win.
 - Trump gloats that he “stopped World War 3.”
-

Player 2: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Launches an “Arms to Ukraine” logistics corridor — a fast-track rail and road supply route from EU factories directly to Ukrainian front lines, bypassing red tape and national bottlenecks.

Arguments for success:

1. The EU has already passed the Defence Production Act; the next step is delivery — and this initiative uses existing infrastructure (TEN-T corridors) to move material faster.

2. Eastern European states (Poland, Romania, Slovakia) are all eager to support and offer their territory, while Germany commits logistics and finance.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Russia can target this corridor with cyberattacks and sabotage.
It becomes a known weak point, and resistance movements in Moldova, Transnistria, or even Belarus could interfere.
 - **US Trump:**
This is another example of “wasteful European adventurism.”
Trump calls the plan reckless and says it risks dragging NATO into conflict — again hinting at pulling the US out of the alliance.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

The infrastructure exists, the politics line up, and the EU has the momentum. Sabotage is a threat, but not enough to stop the core implementation — and resilience planning mitigates risks.

📊 Impact:

- The corridor is activated in stages — from western factories to rail hubs in Poland and onward into Ukraine.
 - Ukraine sees delivery times on critical munitions drop by 20–30%.
 - Russia hacks and jams a few nodes, but no major disruptions occur... yet.
 - Hungary abstains from involvement — but doesn't block the plan.
-

■ Player 3: Donald Trump (USA)

Action: Secretly greenlights *backchannel talks between his advisors and Russian officials* to discuss a “postwar security architecture” — potentially carving up Ukraine’s future without Kyiv’s input.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia is exhausted and may be open to negotiation, especially if the US offers to guarantee a “neutral Ukraine” outside NATO.

2. Trump believes he can sell a “peace” deal as a masterstroke of statesmanship — and both sides might accept something the EU would never push alone.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
This is pure betrayal.
Europe will never accept a deal made behind its back that sells out Ukraine’s sovereignty.
 - **UA Zelenskyy:**
Ukraine will never accept a partition.
Trump has no mandate — and any secret talks undermine trust with Kyiv and trigger an internal political backlash in Ukraine.
-

Adjudication: FAILURE

The talks happen, but they go nowhere. Russia demands too much (Crimea + full Donbas), and Trump’s team doesn’t have buy-in from NATO or Ukraine. Word leaks — and the backlash is swift.

Impact:

- Europe and Ukraine erupt in anger at Trump’s secret diplomacy.
 - Kyiv formally requests a clarification from the White House — which Trump brushes off.
 - Putin, annoyed by US arrogance, leaks selected details to poison relations further.
 - Trump’s move alienates European allies further — but boosts his image with isolationists at home.
-

Player 4: Vladimir Putin (Russia)

Action: Orders a retaliatory *missile strike on Ukrainian oil depots and rail hubs* linked to the new EU logistics corridor, aiming to slow Western arms flows.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia retains long-range missile capabilities — especially via Black Sea assets and Belarus — and these fixed targets are relatively easy to hit.
 2. Ukraine's air defences are thinly spread and degraded without new US systems — allowing a window of opportunity.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
Ukraine has been dispersing and hardening key logistics nodes since 2023.
Redundancy and deception measures mean the strikes may hit targets — but not the most critical ones.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Any damage will be rapidly repaired.
The EU and Ukraine have invested heavily in resilience and rapid repair units since the start of the war.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

This is a solid tactical strike with clear logic. While not a knockout blow, it achieves its goal — temporary disruption and psychological pressure.

📉 Impact:

- Four oil/fuel depots and two rail hubs near Lviv and Dnipro are damaged.
 - Arms deliveries slow for 7–10 days — some battlefield shortages emerge.
 - Ukraine responds with more drone strikes inside Russia, escalating the tit-for-tat.
 - EU moves to harden supply lines and considers deploying *civilian contractors* to Ukraine to assist with logistics — a controversial step.
-

📄 End of Turn 3 Summary – April 2026

- ua Ukraine fails to win NATO accession talks but holds diplomatic ground.
- eu EU builds a military logistics lifeline — speeding aid to Ukraine despite sabotage risks.
- us Trump's secret diplomacy backfires, damaging trust and unity further.

- RU Russia scores a win with precision strikes on Ukrainian supply hubs — but at the cost of further drone reprisals.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Ukraine remains resilient**, but starts to feel the strain.
 - **EU shows increasing resolve** — infrastructure, funding, logistics.
 - **Russia adapts** tactically, but lacks strategic breakthroughs.
 - **Trump becomes increasingly isolated diplomatically**, but keeps playing to his base.
-

Would you like:

- To respond or make a meta-change?
- Or go straight into **Turn 4: May 2026**?

turn 4

Right then — the mud's drying, the drones are flying, and the war rolls into **May 2026**.

Turn 4: May 2026

Randomised player order:

1. us Donald Trump (USA)
 2. RU Vladimir Putin (Russia)
 3. EU Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
 4. UA Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
-

Player 1: Donald Trump (USA)

Action: Announces a sweeping new sanctions package *against the EU*, targeting companies involved in arms shipments to Ukraine and accusing Europe of "prolonging the war for profit."

Arguments for success:

1. Trump can wield trade tariffs and sanctions via executive authority, bypassing Congress — especially on national security grounds.

2. This plays well with Trump’s domestic narrative of “America First” and punishing “globalist Europe” for dragging the US into endless wars.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Any sanctions on EU defence industries will provoke retaliatory tariffs and deepen the transatlantic rift.
This could hurt US exporters and trigger a trade war in an election year.
 - **RU Putin:**
Ironically, this will push Europe closer together.
Trump's unpredictability makes NATO more cohesive, not less — Europe will double down on autonomy, not give in.
-

Adjudication: FAILURE

Trump floats the idea, but political, economic, and corporate pressure forces a walk-back. The plan stalls in legal wrangling and interagency resistance.

Impact:

- Trump issues an executive order — but it’s immediately challenged in court.
 - The EU responds furiously, and NATO states close ranks against the US move.
 - European and American business lobbies push back — fearing a transatlantic trade war.
 - Trump’s base cheers, but international credibility dips further.
-

Player 2: Vladimir Putin (Russia)

Action: Deploys Wagner-style private military contractors (PMCs) and *irregular units* to stir up unrest in Transnistria (Moldova) and Belarusian border regions, aiming to distract Ukraine and rattle the EU.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia has used PMCs and hybrid warfare successfully in the past — they’re deniable and can create confusion and pressure without official escalation.

2. Moldova is fragile, and Belarus is already under Moscow's thumb — destabilising these regions could stretch Ukrainian forces thin and scare NATO's eastern flank.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
Ukraine has planned for this scenario and can handle hybrid threats.
Territorial defence units and border security forces are on alert, and Ukraine has interior ministry assets that can respond rapidly.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
The EU has increased support for Moldova's security forces.
Any Russian irregular activity will be exposed and politically backfire in the region — further isolating Moscow.
-

Adjudication: SUCCESS

The move is plausible, deniable, and fits the Russian playbook. Even if not strategically decisive, it creates friction and forces Ukraine to divert attention.

Impact:

- Russian-backed groups provoke unrest in Transnistria and stage “border incidents” in Belarus.
 - Ukraine is forced to deploy extra forces to monitor these areas.
 - Moldova requests urgent EU security assistance — prompting NATO to quietly deploy more ISR (intelligence, surveillance, recon) assets in Romania.
 - The action disrupts, distracts, and complicates Ukraine's planning for the summer.
-

Player 3: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Signs a new *EU-Ukraine Defence Compact* — formalising Europe's long-term military commitment with a €100 billion pledge over 5 years, including guaranteed arms deliveries, training, and reconstruction.

Arguments for success:

1. This institutionalises the de facto support Europe is already giving and signals that Europe is replacing the US as Ukraine's key partner.
 2. It is politically popular across most EU states — especially after Trump's recent anti-EU moves and Russian threats near Moldova.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **US Trump:**
This is just a provocation.
Trump warns that EU "warmongers" are making peace impossible and again threatens to withdraw the US from NATO entirely.
 - **RU Putin:**
This confirms that Europe is a belligerent.
Russia will treat EU assets as legitimate military targets if this continues — and warns of consequences.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

The EU is on a roll. Member states want certainty, Ukraine needs it, and Trump's behaviour justifies deeper alignment. The arguments against it are mostly bluster.

📊 Impact:

- EU-Ukraine Defence Compact is signed in Warsaw with great fanfare.
 - It includes fixed delivery schedules, industrial coordination, and a roadmap to post-war reconstruction.
 - Ukraine hails it as a "historic step" — public morale surges.
 - Russia issues vague nuclear threats — but no immediate action.
-

🟠 Player 4: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Orders a bold drone campaign targeting *Russian naval assets* in the Black Sea and occupied Crimea, aiming to neutralise key parts of the Black Sea Fleet and open maritime lanes.

Arguments for success:

1. Ukraine has developed proven asymmetric naval drone capabilities — having already hit multiple ships in 2023–2025.
 2. Russia’s naval command has been degraded and is increasingly reliant on vulnerable logistics hubs in Sevastopol.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Crimea is the most heavily defended zone Russia holds.
Air defences, electronic warfare, and naval patrols make this extremely risky.
 - **us Trump:**
This will only escalate tensions.
Trump uses the strike to argue Ukraine is being too aggressive and responsible for prolonging the war.
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

This is what Ukraine excels at: bold, creative asymmetric strikes. Despite defences, enough drones get through to make it count.

📊 Impact:

- A major Russian supply ship is sunk in Sevastopol harbour; two more are damaged.
 - Ukraine reopens limited grain shipping from Odesa under drone protection.
 - Russia retaliates with missile strikes, but Ukraine’s defences hold.
 - International coverage boosts Ukraine’s image as inventive and resilient.
-

📄 End of Turn 4 Summary – May 2026

- us Trump fails to sanction the EU but further alienates allies — his threats ring increasingly hollow.
- RU Putin scores a win in the hybrid war with unrest in Transnistria and Belarus.
- EU EU solidifies its support with a long-term Defence Compact — replacing the US as Ukraine’s main backer.

- ua Ukraine deals a serious blow to Russia's Black Sea Fleet, expanding naval options.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Russia gains traction in the grey zone**, but is bleeding militarily.
 - **Ukraine regains momentum**, scoring key symbolic and tactical wins.
 - **EU increasingly acts as a unified geopolitical power.**
 - **Trump becomes increasingly performative**, with fewer real results.
-

Would you like to:

- Respond or change anything?
- Or continue directly to **Turn 5: June 2026**?

turn 5

Into the heat of **June 2026** we go — campaign season (and drone season) is in full swing.

Turn 5: June 2026

Randomised player order:

1. ru Vladimir Putin (Russia)
 2. eu Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
 3. us Donald Trump (USA)
 4. ua Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
-

Player 1: Vladimir Putin (Russia)

Action: Authorises a full mobilisation of Russia's remaining reserve manpower — calling up an additional **400,000 conscripts** to reinforce front-line units and establish new defensive lines in Crimea and Belgorod.

Arguments for success:

1. Russia has a large pool of military-age males and has used mass conscription before — domestic control remains strong, and the population is heavily propagandised.
 2. Mobilisation buys time. Even if these troops aren't well-trained, they can bolster defences and free up better units for potential offensives.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
This is just more cannon fodder.
Ukrainian intel suggests morale among new conscripts is terrible, and desertions are up. Throwing bodies at the problem won't win the war.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Mobilisation shows desperation.
Russia's economy is already overstretched — another mass draft risks breaking what's left of its industrial capacity and internal stability.
-

✘ Adjudication: FAILURE

Putin's plan is logistically feasible but politically and economically brittle. Mobilisation fails to meet targets. Avoidance, fake medical exemptions, and quiet unrest increase.

Impact:

- Only 180,000 of the planned 400,000 show up — many reluctantly.
 - Russian social media (heavily monitored but still leaking) shows frustration in provincial towns.
 - EU intelligence warns of increasing Kremlin paranoia and purges.
 - Putin is forced to reshuffle top military officials, again.
-

Player 2: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Announces a **joint EU military mission to Ukraine's western regions**, composed of engineers, medics, and logistics specialists — all "non-combat," aimed at infrastructure, hospitals, and humanitarian aid.

Arguments for success:

1. The mission is purely humanitarian and technical — carefully framed to avoid escalation, but it allows deeper European presence inside Ukraine.
 2. It's popular with EU publics and politicians alike — a way to show support without “boots on the front line.”
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
This is a creeping occupation.
Russia denounces the move as a violation of neutrality and warns that EU personnel “will not be safe,” even if unarmed.
 - **us Trump:**
Trump calls it "EU mission creep" and says it increases the risk of NATO-Russia war. He tweets (or rather, Truths) that the US will “not come to Europe’s rescue when it all goes wrong.”
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS

The action is well-framed and politically grounded. EU nations coordinate tightly and send civilian-led, military-backed teams under strict non-combat protocols.

📊 Impact:

- EU teams deploy to Lviv, Uzhhorod, and Rivne — supporting hospitals, refugee centres, and rail lines.
 - Symbolically powerful: the EU is *on the ground* in Ukraine.
 - Russia fumes but avoids direct retaliation — unclear how far they’re willing to escalate.
 - The mission increases public support in Ukraine and boosts EU-Ukraine integration sentiment.
-

■ Player 3: Donald Trump (USA)

Action: Orders a **covert diplomatic outreach to China**, suggesting the US would **tolerate Chinese economic expansion into eastern Ukraine** (post-war) *if* Beijing leans on Russia to accept a ceasefire.

Arguments for success:

1. China has leverage over Russia — especially financially and militarily.
 2. Trump’s administration believes it can dangle economic incentives and play “realpolitik” to get a deal no one else can.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Europe would never accept Chinese influence in Ukraine.
Allowing this risks turning Ukraine into a pawn — and Europe will resist with everything it has.
 - **UA Zelenskyy:**
Ukraine is not for sale.
Zelenskyy would never agree to Chinese corporate colonisation of the Donbas — it would be politically suicidal.
-

✗ Adjudication: FAILURE

China plays along for information, but is non-committal. Ukraine and Europe react harshly when the plan leaks — even partially.

Impact:

- China says little publicly, but privately distances itself.
 - The leak causes a political storm in Europe and Kyiv.
 - Trump is accused of trying to carve up Ukraine behind closed doors — again.
 - The outreach causes even more strain between the US and NATO.
-

Player 4: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Launches a **combined arms summer offensive** in the western Donetsk region, using Western-provided precision artillery, armour, and infantry to attempt a major breakthrough toward Volnovakha.

Arguments for success:

1. With EU logistics running, and Russian forces distracted (Belarus, Crimea), Ukraine sees a window to push before new conscripts arrive.
 2. Ukrainian troops are better trained and motivated — and precision munitions give them an edge over Russian dug-in forces.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Russian defences in Donetsk are extensive and layered.
Ukraine has tried this before. The area is heavily mined and covered by artillery — no one's breaking through quickly.
 - **us Trump:**
This is reckless.
He blames Zelenskyy for prolonging the war and risking more Ukrainian lives for "optics."
-

Adjudication: SIGNIFICANT SUCCESS

Zelenskyy's forces achieve a real breakthrough — the first in months. Russian lines bend, then break, and Ukraine advances over 25km before consolidation.

Impact:

- Ukraine retakes Volnovakha and several key villages nearby.
 - Russian frontline morale collapses in parts of Donetsk — videos of retreating units circulate.
 - EU celebrates the advance; Trump ignores it.
 - Russia scrambles to redeploy elite airborne units from Crimea and Belgorod to stabilise the front.
-

End of Turn 5 Summary – June 2026

- RU Putin's mobilisation sputters — not enough men, not enough will.
- EU boots hit the ground in western Ukraine (non-combat) — a powerful political signal.

- us Trump's outreach to China backfires — again seen as trying to bargain away Ukraine's sovereignty.
- ua Ukraine scores a **significant battlefield victory**, breaking through near Volnovakha and capturing territory.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Ukraine now holds the initiative** for the first time since 2023.
 - **EU's presence in Ukraine is no longer just economic or diplomatic — it's physical.**
 - **Putin looks increasingly reactive**, with no clear path to victory.
 - **Trump's credibility erodes**, even among previously sympathetic voices in Europe.
-

Would you like:

- To respond, reflect, or change anything?
- Or push ahead into **Turn 6: July 2026**?

turn 6

Here we go — **Turn 6: July 2026** — the summer campaign is in full swing, and the consequences of six months of escalation are coming home for every player.

Turn 6: July 2026

Randomised player order:

1. eu Ursula von der Leyen (EU)
 2. ua Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
 3. ru Vladimir Putin (Russia)
 4. us Donald Trump (USA)
-

Player 1: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Formally proposes a **roadmap for Ukraine to join both the EU and NATO by 2028**, with milestones based on governance reforms, military standards, and territorial control — to be agreed at the upcoming Brussels Summit.

Arguments for success:

1. After the EU Defence Compact and Zelenskyy's battlefield success, momentum is on Ukraine's side. With US support unreliable, a firm European guarantee is essential.
2. Most EU and NATO members are already onboard — the formal roadmap gives structure without forcing immediate accession, defusing internal dissent.

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
This is a red line.
Any official NATO path for Ukraine legitimises Russian fears and justifies escalation — including against European targets.
- **us Trump:**
Trump calls it "stupid."
He threatens to withdraw all US support from NATO if Europe moves forward with Ukrainian accession planning.

 **Adjudication: SUCCESS**

Ursula walks a fine line — not full membership, but a structured, conditional path. Enough allies support it, and the political timing is right. Trump's threats no longer carry the same weight.

 **Impact:**

- A formal NATO+EU roadmap is announced at the Brussels Summit.
 - Ukraine celebrates; public morale surges again.
 - Russia threatens "military-technical" responses.
 - Trump storms out of the NATO ministerial, claiming "America doesn't need Europe."
-

■ Player 2: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Pushes the **Volnovakha offensive further east**, launching a fast-moving mechanised assault toward Mariupol, aiming to *cut the Russian land bridge to Crimea*.

Arguments for success:

1. Russian troops are overstretched and demoralised — Ukrainian forces now have momentum, and taking Mariupol would be a symbolic and strategic blow.
 2. EU logistics and command support are better than ever; even limited air support is coming in the form of ISR drones and targeting coordination.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Mariupol is a fortress.
It was heavily rebuilt and militarised after 2022. Any Ukrainian assault risks high casualties and will be fiercely contested.
 - **us Trump:**
If Ukraine cuts the land bridge, Crimea will be next — and that means total war.
Trump warns Zelenskyy is pushing too far and risks “global destruction.”
-

✅ Adjudication: SUCCESS (Narrow)

This is a high-risk, high-reward move. Ukrainian forces break through Russian outer defences west of Mariupol, but the city itself holds — for now. The land bridge is threatened, but not severed.

🚧 Impact:

- Ukraine liberates multiple villages and key logistics roads between Volnovakha and Mariupol.
 - Russian forces begin urgent withdrawals from the Zaporizhzhia front to reinforce the city.
 - Mariupol becomes the new flashpoint — heavily bombed, increasingly unstable.
 - International observers call it the most significant Ukrainian advance since Kharkiv in 2022.
-

■ **Player 3: Vladimir Putin (Russia)**

Action: Declares **martial law across occupied Ukraine**, tightens internal repression, and deploys elite *Kadyrovite* units to Mariupol for urban defence. Also orders tactical ballistic missile strikes on suspected EU logistics hubs in western Ukraine.

Arguments for success:

1. Martial law and terror tactics have worked in Chechnya and Syria — Putin believes fear will hold the land while the military regroups.
 2. Russia's missile forces still pack a punch — and EU convoys in western Ukraine are now legitimate targets in Kremlin eyes.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
Kadyrovites are infamous but brittle.
These units are often better at Instagram than actual fighting — and their presence may inflame local resistance.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Attacking EU convoys is a massive escalation.
Even if "non-military," killing EU personnel will be treated as a strike on a NATO-linked force — and may trigger consequences.
-

✗ **Adjudication: FAILURE**

The missile strikes are launched — but intercepted. And the martial law crackdown backfires, sparking widespread unrest and sabotage in occupied areas.

Impact:

- Russia fires 12 ballistic missiles at western Ukraine; 10 are intercepted, 2 hit empty depots.
- EU civilians are unharmed, but Brussels declares the attacks a "quasi-act of war."
- In occupied Donetsk and Luhansk, mass protests and sabotage flare up.
- Kadyrovite deployment is mocked on social media — several units are ambushed en route.

■ **Player 4: Donald Trump (USA)**

Action: After months of chaos, Trump announces a dramatic "**Ukraine Peace Plan 2.0**" — offering to mediate direct talks in Reykjavik between Russia and Ukraine, excluding the EU and promising "final borders and final peace."

Arguments for success:

1. Trump still has influence over parts of the US foreign policy machine and believes he can pressure both sides into accepting a ceasefire in exchange for economic incentives.
2. Some parts of Ukraine are exhausted and might welcome a pause — even if temporary.

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
No deal without Crimea.
Zelenskyy rejects any plan that freezes lines with Russia in control of Mariupol, Crimea, or Donbas — not negotiable.
- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
This is pure ego.
Europe won't allow a peace process that excludes the EU, especially when its citizens and funds are supporting the war effort.

✗ Adjudication: FAILURE

Nobody shows up to Reykjavik. The "peace summit" becomes a PR farce.

🗑️ Impact:

- Putin ignores the offer entirely.
- Zelenskyy calls it "a distraction from real victory."
- Trump is mocked by European media — but continues to rally isolationist voters at home.
- NATO quietly moves to reduce US influence on its internal planning.

End of Turn 6 Summary – July 2026

- EU EU formalises Ukraine's roadmap to membership — bold, historic, controversial.
- UA Ukraine pushes hard toward Mariupol — the land bridge to Crimea is now within reach.
- RU Putin's efforts to regain control fail — martial law triggers rebellion, and his missiles miss.
- us Trump tries one more “peace deal” — and is ignored by everyone involved.

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Ukraine holds the initiative** on the battlefield and the diplomatic front.
- **Russia is in a reactive spiral**, bleeding territory, troops, and credibility.
- **The EU is now Ukraine's strategic guarantor**, not just its funder.
- **The US is increasingly isolated**, its president out of step with NATO, Kyiv, and reality.

Would you like:

- To end the game here and receive a final **summary and scorecard**?
- Or continue on into **Turn 7: August 2026**?

turn 7

Onward, into the inferno of **August 2026** — the summer heat mirrors the temperature of this conflict: global, political, and strategic.

Turn 7: August 2026

Randomised player order:

1. UA Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)
2. RU Vladimir Putin (Russia)
3. us Donald Trump (USA)

4. EU Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Player 1: Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Ukraine)

Action: Launches a **decapitation strike campaign** using long-range drones and special forces to target *Russian command-and-control* elements — focused on Crimea and Belgorod oblast.

Arguments for success:

1. Ukrainian ISR, backed by EU satellite intelligence, has mapped Russian command nodes with precision. The recent offensive has opened airspace windows.
 2. Previous deep strikes have shown Russian defences are porous. Cutting command links now could trigger cascading collapses — particularly near Mariupol.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
Russia has hardened key C2 sites since early 2024.
Critical nodes are mobile or underground. Attacks may hurt, but won't cripple operational command.
 - **us Trump:**
This is assassination by another name.
Trump condemns the tactic as "dangerous escalation" and suggests it violates wartime norms.
-

Adjudication: SUCCESS

Zelenskyy's campaign hits multiple HQs. The strikes are highly surgical, causing significant disruption — especially around Crimea. Not everyone dies, but key officers are wounded or routed.

Impact:

- Ukrainian drones hit a Russian field HQ near Tokmak, killing a senior commander and his staff.

- A special forces raid inside Belgorod obliterates a communications hub before exfiltrating.
 - Russian coordination around Mariupol falters — allowing further Ukrainian advances.
 - Kremlin panic rises — media blackout imposed in affected areas.
-

■ **Player 2: Vladimir Putin (Russia)**

Action: Desperately declares **Crimea a “fortress oblast”** — placing it under the direct control of the Russian National Guard and relocating elite airborne units to Sevastopol.

Arguments for success:

1. This creates a strong point to prevent Ukraine from breaking through and psychologically reassures Russians that Crimea will hold at any cost.
 2. The use of National Guard removes potentially mutinous regular army units from the defence of Putin’s crown jewel.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **UA Zelenskyy:**
This reeks of desperation.
Ukraine interprets this as weakness, not strength — and the redeployment of elite troops just creates gaps elsewhere.
 - **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
The EU now sees Crimea as vulnerable.
This action confirms the strategic priority of severing the land bridge and isolating the peninsula — and increases resolve.
-

✗ **Adjudication: FAILURE**

The symbolic move backfires. National Guard troops are not well-suited to high-intensity warfare, and redeploying VDV units weakens other fronts dangerously.

Impact:

- Russian morale in Crimea plummets — locals begin to flee en masse.

- Ukrainian strikes on road and rail links into the peninsula increase.
 - Russian airborne troops en route are targeted by HIMARS and drone swarms — losses are high.
 - Putin's move confirms to NATO and Kyiv that Crimea is vulnerable.
-

■ **Player 3: Donald Trump (USA)**

Action: In a shock move, Trump suspends US participation in *all NATO joint military exercises* and threatens to withdraw from NATO in 30 days if European nations do not commit to a “peace settlement” on his terms.

Arguments for success:

1. Trump’s base supports leaving NATO. He believes the threat will force Europe to blink and pressure Ukraine to accept a ceasefire.
 2. The legal ambiguity of NATO withdrawal allows Trump to act first and force others to scramble.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **EU Ursula von der Leyen:**
Europe is ready.
NATO minus Trump is still a powerful alliance — and Europe has made contingency plans for a US break since early 2024.
 - **UA Zelenskyy:**
This attempt at blackmail will only backfire.
Ukraine won’t be coerced into surrender because of US theatrics — and the EU will not bend.
-

✗ **Adjudication: FAILURE**

Europe doesn’t blink. NATO calls an emergency meeting *without Trump*. Canada, the UK, and most of Europe reaffirm their commitments. Poland offers to lead NATO drills *without the US*.

🗺️ **Impact:**

- Trump’s threat isolates the US further.

- European militaries ramp up joint planning — excluding US observers for the first time.
 - Domestic political backlash in the US begins to grow, especially among hawkish Republicans and defense industry lobbyists.
 - China and Russia both express “interest” in the situation — but also confusion.
-

Player 4: Ursula von der Leyen (EU)

Action: Proposes the formation of a **European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF)** — a 60,000-strong multinational deployment unit capable of independent operations *without US support*, focused on eastern and southeastern Europe.

Arguments for success:

1. With Trump threatening NATO coherence, Europe must act — and public/political support is strong. The ERRF gives Europe autonomy and deterrence.
 2. Much of the infrastructure and command framework already exists under the EU’s Common Security and Defence Policy.
-

Counter-arguments:

- **RU Putin:**
This is NATO by another name.
Russia claims the ERRF is illegal under prior treaties and threatens to treat any EU unit in Ukraine as a military target.
 - **us Trump:**
Trump calls it a “fake army.”
He mocks the ERRF and warns that the EU can’t fight without “American steel.”
-

Adjudication: SUCCESS

This is the logical next step after the EU Defence Compact. The ERRF becomes real — and is seen across Europe as a historic turning point.

Impact:

- France, Germany, Poland, and the Nordics commit to the ERRF, with HQ based in Brussels and forward elements in eastern Slovakia.
 - Russia denounces it but cannot respond meaningfully.
 - Ukraine hails it as “the spine of Europe’s security.”
 - NATO fractures — but does not collapse.
-

End of Turn 7 Summary – August 2026

- ua Ukraine escalates the deep battle — C2 strikes cripple Russian frontline cohesion.
 - ru Putin’s desperate moves backfire — Crimea looks increasingly like a strategic liability.
 - us Trump threatens to leave NATO — and is largely ignored.
 - eu EU forms the **European Rapid Reaction Force** — marking a decisive step toward defence autonomy.
-

Strategic Balance Shifts:

- **Ukraine is winning** — not just on the battlefield, but diplomatically.
 - **Russia is crumbling** — bleeding manpower, morale, and control.
 - **The EU is now acting as a superpower**, not just a bloc.
 - **The US is in self-inflicted retreat**, with its president fighting the alliance, not the enemy.
-

Would you like to:

- End the game and receive the **final summary and scorecard**?
- Or push forward to **Turn 8: September 2026**?

End the game and receive the final summary and scorecard

Absolutely — let's close out this geopolitical rollercoaster.

 **Final Summary: Russo-Ukraine Matrix Game – 2026**

Over seven intense turns spanning February to August 2026, the strategic landscape of Europe and the world has been transformed. The war, far from being frozen or forgotten, has become the crucible in which new alliances, doctrines, and fault lines have been forged.

Strategic Overview

UA Ukraine

- **Achievements:** Major battlefield breakthroughs (Sumy, Volnovakha, push toward Mariupol), successful decapitation strikes, naval victories, and strong domestic morale.
- **Diplomacy:** Secured a NATO & EU accession roadmap, resisted multiple coercion attempts, and deepened ties with Europe.
- **End State:** Controls more territory than in early 2024 and holds the initiative in all theatres.

RU Russia

- **Achievements:** Tactical strike successes (briefly), temporary hybrid warfare disruptions in Moldova/Belarus.
- **Failures:** Winter offensive stalled, mobilisation collapsed, Crimea destabilised, command infrastructure disrupted.
- **End State:** Strategically overextended, economically battered, and facing potential internal unrest.

us United States (Trump Admin)

- **Achievements:** Maintained political control over aid policy, avoided direct conflict, solidified domestic base.
- **Failures:** Multiple failed peace plans, isolation from NATO, failed outreach to China, sanctions flopped.
- **End State:** Marginalised diplomatically; its president openly ridiculed on the international stage. US credibility in Europe at a post-Cold War low.

EU European Union

- **Achievements:** Took over leadership of Ukraine's war effort — logistics, arms, funds, and now boots on the ground.

- **Key Moves:** €140B frozen asset plan, Defence Compact, EU logistics corridor, ERRF creation, and a NATO/EU roadmap for Ukraine.
 - **End State:** Geopolitically ascendant — effectively replaced the US as Ukraine's patron and reshaped its own defence identity.
-

Final Scorecard

Scored out of 10 based on how well each actor met their objectives (as defined in the scenario) and acted within their personality profile.

UA Volodymyr Zelenskyy – 9/10

- A near-masterclass in asymmetric warfare, diplomatic survival, and alliance building.
 - Missed full NATO entry — but got the roadmap.
 - Balanced aggression and caution with exceptional skill.
-

RU Vladimir Putin – 3/10

- Almost every strategic initiative failed.
 - Battlefield losses, failed mobilisation, Crimea destabilising.
 - Only marginally successful in hybrid warfare.
 - Personality profile (risk-tolerant, military-first) led to overreach and blowback.
-

us Donald Trump – 2/10

- Pursued peace deals and economic leverage in line with his personality.
 - But none succeeded, and each isolated him further.
 - Turned potential soft power into strategic irrelevance.
 - Lost allies, NATO influence, and respect.
-

EU Ursula von der Leyen – 10/10

- Flawless execution: financial, diplomatic, logistical, military.

- Transformed the EU from a backseat donor into a forward-deployed strategic actor.
 - Acted decisively, collaboratively, and within character at every step.
-

 **Game Outcome:**

 **Strategic Victory for Ukraine & the EU**

- Russia is reeling.
 - The US, under Trump, has effectively removed itself from the equation.
 - Europe has taken charge of its security — and Ukraine is winning both the war and the peace.
-

Thanks for playing, Commander.

Would you like:

- A PDF-style summary/export?
- To play a follow-on scenario (e.g., **The Collapse of Russia, Trump vs NATO**, or **The Battle for Crimea**)?
- Or start a fresh Matrix Game with a new setting?