RUSSIA UKRAINE WAR AND THE SEARCH FOR GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY.

Inna Frank Ogbise, PhD [1*]

[1*] Department of Political Science, University of Africa Toru Orua, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

* Correspondence: Inna Frank Ogbise, PhD

ABSTRACT: The study examined the impact of the Russia-Ukraine war on global peace and security. The Russia-Ukraine war, which began in February 2022, significantly affected global peace, security, and international relations. This conflict not only posed a direct threat to regional stability in Eastern Europe but also had far-reaching implications for global geopolitics, economic stability, and the principles of international law. The war disrupted energy supplies, escalated global food insecurity due to blocked grain exports, and led to significant refugee flows, creating humanitarian crises across Europe. Additionally, the conflict strained relations between major world powers, rekindled Cold War-era tensions, and challenged existing global security frameworks such as NATO and the United Nations. To achieve the study's objectives, the researcher employed a descriptive and qualitative research design, drawing exclusively on secondary data sourced from academic databases through a systematic search strategy. The data were analyzed using thematic content analysis. The study uncovered the multidimensional nature of the war, revealing a complex interplay of historical, geopolitical, economic, and cultural factors. Findings showed that Ukraine's Western orientation, Russia's regional ambitions, and the symbolic and strategic value of contested territories like Crimea and Donbas

were central to the conflict.The war triggered global economic disruptions, energy crises, humanitarian displacement, and environmental degradation. It also highlighted ideological rifts reminiscent of Cold War dynamics and exposed systemic weaknesses in global governance frameworks. The study concluded that the Russia-Ukraine war transcended bilateral disputes, reflecting broader structural tensions in the international order. It recommended preventive diplomacy, diversification of global supply chains, integration of environmental considerations into peacebuilding, and institutional reforms to strengthen international conflict resolution mechanisms.

Introduction

Ukraine's journey toward independence and distancing from Russia has been shaped by significant historical, political, and strategic factors. After declaring independence in 1991, following the Soviet Union's collapse, Ukraine faced economic and political challenges, as well as identity debates linked to its Russian ties. The 2004 "Orange Revolution" signaled a shift towards the West, with aspirations for closer EU and NATO integration, although internal divisions slowed progress. The 2013-2014 Euromaidan protests revived Ukraine's pro-Western ambitions, particularly after Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea, which prompted accelerated NATO membership efforts (Gould-Davies, 2022).

In response, Russia employed military and economic strategies to maintain influence, supporting separatists in eastern Ukraine and using energy supplies as leverage. The 2022 invasion intensified the conflict, leading to Western sanctions on Russia and increased support for Ukraine, reinforcing its alignment with NATO and the EU (Pifer, 2022). The Russia-Ukraine war, which began in February 2022, has emerged as one of the most significant war conflicts in recent history, profoundly affecting global peace and security. This conflict, initiated by Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, has resulted in widespread destruction, loss of life, and a massive displacement of populations, creating one of the largest refugee crises in Europe since World War II (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 2022).

The invasion marked a stark escalation from the ongoing tensions that have persisted since Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the subsequent conflict in Eastern Ukraine involving Russian-backed separatists (Mankoff, 2022). Beyond the immediate humanitarian impact, the war has triggered severe economic, political, and security ramifications globally. The conflict has disrupted global supply chains, particularly in energy and food sectors, given both Russia and Ukraine's roles as major exporters of oil, gas, and grain (World Bank, 2023). The war has significantly impacted global energy markets, caused price volatility and prompting countries to seek alternative energy sources to reduce dependency on Russian oil and gas, a situation that has affected economies worldwide, from Europe to Africa and Asia (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2023).

Moreover, the conflict has intensified tensions between Russia and Western powers, leading to a renewed focus on military alliances such as NATO and a re-evaluation of defense policies among European nations (North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], 2022). The expansion of NATO's presence in Eastern Europe, including the deployment of additional troops and military assets, has been perceived by Russia as a direct threat, further complicating diplomatic efforts to de-escalate the situation (Walt, 2022). This escalation has also led to a significant increase in military spending across Europe, with countries like Germany, Sweden, and Finland significantly raising their defense budgets, a move that marks a dramatic shift in their traditionally neutral or minimally militarized policies (Pifer, 2022).

The war has raised critical questions about the future of global peace and security frameworks. The international community, through various diplomatic efforts and sanctions, has attempted to de-escalate the conflict and promote negotiations. Sanctions imposed by the United States, the European Union, and other allies against Russia have targeted key sectors of the Russian economy, including finance, energy, and defense, aiming to pressure Moscow into ceasing hostilities (O'Rourke, 2022). However, these efforts have often been met with limited success, highlighting the complexities of mediating in a highly polarized geopolitical environment where both sides view the conflict in existential terms (International Crisis Group, 2023). The economic sanctions have also had unintended global consequences, contributing to inflationary pressures and economic instability in various regions, particularly in

developing countries that rely heavily on wheat and other commodities from Ukraine and Russia (Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO], 2022).

The Russia-Ukraine war has also underscored the limitations of existing international institutions, such as the United Nations, in effectively managing and resolving conflicts involving major powers with divergent interests (United Nations, 2022). The United Nations Security Council has been paralyzed by Russia's veto power as a permanent member, which has prevented a unified international response to the conflict and raised questions about the efficacy and fairness of the current global governance structures (Bosco, 2023). Additionally, the conflict has exposed the limits of international law, particularly the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which have been blatantly violated in this instance (Williams & Schabas, 2022). As the war continues with no clear resolution in sight, it is imperative to examine its implications for global peace and security and explore potential pathways to a more stable international order.

Statement of the Problem

The ongoing Russia-Ukraine war, which escalated into a full-scale invasion in February 2022 after years of underlying tensions since the 2014 annexation of Crimea, has evolved into one of the most pressing global challenges in the 21st century. War presents a serious threat to international peace, global economic stability, environmental sustainability, and the authority of international institutions. Despite various diplomatic efforts, including negotiations broke up by the United Nations and regional bodies such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the war continues unabated. This persistence of hostilities underscores a fundamental flaw in the global conflict resolution architecture, which has proven ineffective in de-escalating tensions or compelling compliance with peace agreements.

At the heart of this conflict lies a complex web of geopolitical interests. The underlying triggers of the war—ranging from NATO's eastward expansion to Russia's ambition to reassert influence in Eastern Europe—reflect deeper contestations over power and sovereignty. These factors have created a confrontational environment where diplomacy has failed, and militarization prevails.

The inability to address these root causes and mediate an effective resolution threatens global peace and raises the risk of a broader international military escalation, including potential nuclear engagement or cyber warfare.

Economically, the war has had far-reaching consequences. Global oil and gas markets have been severely disrupted due to sanctions on Russian exports and the destruction of energy infrastructure. These disruptions have led to soaring energy prices, inflation, and economic instability across both developed and developing countries. Trade routes have been obstructed, and vital commodities such as wheat and fertilizers—of which Ukraine and Russia are major suppliers—have become scarce. This has led to increased food insecurity, particularly in low-income countries across Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. Yet, global economic institutions have struggled to coordinate a cohesive response that cushions vulnerable economies from the war's ripple effects.

Beyond the economic impacts, the war has also inflicted significant environmental and humanitarian damage. The deliberate targeting and collateral destruction of energy facilities, water supply systems, and industrial infrastructure have increased pollution and environmental degradation. Meanwhile, the mass displacement of populations has created one of the fastest-growing refugee crises in modern history, with over 7 million Ukrainians seeking asylum across Europe. These developments have overwhelmed social services in host countries and raised concerns about long-term sustainability, public health, and regional resource security.

Furthermore, the war has revealed deep structural weaknesses in the international institutional framework. Bodies such as the United Nations Security Council have been paralyzed by political divisions, particularly due to Russia's veto power. NATO's involvement has been cautious and limited, seeking to avoid direct confrontation with Russia while providing support to Ukraine. Similarly, the OSCE and other regional organizations have struggled to enforce compliance or mediate effective dialogue. These limitations highlight the urgent need to reassess the role, authority, and capacity of international institutions to manage and resolve high-stakes conflicts involving major powers.

Given these multi-dimensional challenges, this study seeks to address four key objectives:

i. To identify the factors that triggered the Russia-Ukraine war and assess their consequences on global peace and security;

ii. To evaluate the economic repercussions of the war, particularly the effects on oil and gas prices, trade disruptions, and food insecurity in developing economies;

iii. To examine the environmental consequences of the conflict, including damage to infrastructure, the refugee crisis, and long-term implications for resource security; and

iv. To investigate the challenges faced by international institutions in effectively responding to and resolving the war.

CONCEPTUAL AND OPERATIONAL LITERATURE

The Concept of Global Peace

Global peace is another multifaceted concept that has been defined in several ways to reflect different perspectives on international relations and human coexistence. Broadly, global peace is defined as a state of worldwide tranquility and harmony characterized by the absence of war, violence, and conflict among nations (Kant, 2006). According to the Global Peace Index (2023), global peace is "the absence of violence or fear of violence at a national or international level," which incorporates both actual peace and the perception of peace. Galtung (1969) offers a more nuanced definition, describing global peace as "a condition where there is a sustainable state of justice, equity, and harmony between individuals, communities, and nations," emphasizing the structural and cultural dimensions of peace. Annan (1999) describes global peace as "a universal state of coexistence without armed conflict or violence among countries," suggesting that peace involves both the absence of war and positive relations between nations.

Boutros-Ghali (1992) defines global peace as "a situation where international relations are characterized by stability, cooperation, and non-violence," highlighting the importance of diplomatic engagement and cooperation. Kaldor (2007) expands on this by stating that global peace involves "the creation of conditions in which all nations and peoples can live free from fear and want," pointing to the role of social

justice and economic equity in fostering peace. Richmond (2008) defines global peace as "the absence of direct, structural, and cultural violence at the international level," which includes a broader spectrum of social and systemic factors. Huntington (1996) views global peace as "the absence of conflict between major civilizations and harmonious relations among states," which introduces the idea of civilizational compatibility and understanding. Hobbes (1651/1985) defines global peace simply as "the absence of war in the international system," focusing on the cessation of armed conflict. Wright (1942) sees global peace as "a state where there is no war or potential for war between nations," which suggests both current peace and long-term stability.

Kriesberg (1998) defines global peace as "a dynamic process involving conflict resolution and reconciliation at the international level," emphasizing the ongoing efforts required to maintain peace. Archibugi (2008) describes global peace as "a world order where democratic principles prevail and wars are replaced by legal and peaceful dispute resolutions," suggesting that peace is linked to democratic governance and international law. Boulding (2000) defines global peace as "the end of all kinds of violence and establishment of a global community," pointing towards a utopian vision of global unity. Elias (2007) views global peace as "the process of creating a world order based on human rights, democracy, and social justice," highlighting the interconnectedness of peace with broader human rights issues. Doyle (1997) defines global peace as "a condition where democratic states do not engage in war with each other, contributing to a peaceful international environment," drawing from democratic peace theory.

The Concept of Global Security

Global security encompasses a broad range of measures and strategies aimed at ensuring international peace and safety. It refers to the measures taken by states and international organizations, such as the United Nations, to ensure mutual survival and safety, emphasizing cooperative measures, arms control, and crisis management (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). Williams (2008) defines global security as "the prevention of global threats such as nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and international crime through international cooperation," which underscores the need for collaborative efforts to tackle global threats. Baldwin (1997) provides a broader perspective,

defining global security as "the protection against threats that transcend national borders, requiring cooperative international efforts," indicating the interconnected nature of modern security challenges. Baylis (2005) defines global security as "a comprehensive approach to international stability and peace involving military, economic, political, and environmental dimensions," which suggests that global security is not just about military might but also involves economic stability and environmental sustainability.

Chomsky (2003) views global security as "a condition where states and international institutions work together to reduce the risk of war and maintain peace," emphasizing the role of international organizations. Walt (1991) describes global security as "the means by which states seek to ensure their survival and safety in an anarchic international system," pointing to the realist perspective on state behavior. Tickner (1992) defines global security as "an approach to international relations that emphasizes cooperative security, human rights, and global governance," which aligns with liberal approaches to international relations. Barnett (2001) sees global security as "a multidimensional concept involving military, economic, and political strategies to prevent conflicts and promote stability," highlighting the complexity and interdependence of security strategies. Buzan (1991) defines global security as "a condition where international cooperation prevents global threats from escalating into major conflicts," stressing the preventive aspect of global security efforts.

Drezner (2007) defines global security as "the maintenance of international order and protection against global threats through cooperative international policies," suggesting that global governance plays a crucial role in maintaining global security. Kaldor (2012) views global security as "a state where non-state actors, international institutions, and states collaborate to address global risks and threats," acknowledging the role of non-state actors in global security dynamics. Collins (2010) defines global security as "the practices and policies adopted by states and international organizations to mitigate global threats," which encompasses a range of activities from diplomacy to military intervention.

Krahmann (2005) describes global security as "a comprehensive approach to address transnational threats and promote global stability through international cooperation," which reflects the contemporary challenges posed by globalization. Hough (2008)

defines global security as "a framework that incorporates military, economic, and political strategies to safeguard against global threats," emphasizing the need for a holistic approach. Williams (2013) views global security as "the collective efforts of states and international organizations to prevent global conflict and ensure international stability," underscoring the importance of collective action in addressing global security challenges.

Review of Empirical Literature

Douglas and Michake (2022) conducted an empirical study examining Great Power Competition and the Russian Invasion of Ukraine, focusing on the invasion's geopolitical implications and its resonance with Cold War-era tensions. Their research employed a thematic content analysis of secondary data, drawing from government publications, intelligence briefings, scholarly journals, and global news media. The study identified key strategic objectives of the Russian Federation and assessed the broader consequences for international relations, particularly with the United States and NATO. Notably, the research revealed that Russia's failure to achieve a swift victory led to a prolonged military conflict and intensified political tensions. The deterioration of diplomatic engagements, exemplified by the suspension of cooperation on projects like the International Space Station (ISS), underscores a re-emergence of bipolar ideological divisions in Europe. Their findings suggest the need for renewed diplomatic initiatives, strategic military preparedness, and robust crisis communication mechanisms between global powers to prevent further escalation.

Similarly, Sylwia (2017) explored the Ukrainian conflict through the lens of hybrid warfare, tracing its roots to post-Soviet geopolitical alignments. This study contextualizes the Ukraine crisis as a manifestation of Russia's long-standing desire to retain influence over its near abroad, particularly countries such as Ukraine that have shown aspirations to align with the European Union and NATO. The analysis focuses on Russia's strategic use of hybrid warfare—integrating conventional military action with cyberattacks, disinformation campaigns, and economic coercion. Using qualitative historical analysis, Sylwia highlights the Maidan Revolution and the annexation of Crimea as pivotal moments that transitioned the conflict into a hybrid war paradigm. The study offers a nuanced understanding of how identity

politics and strategic narratives such as *Russkiy Mir* underpin Russia's foreign policy and operational tactics in Eastern Europe.

In a separate contribution, Becker et al. (2022) present a policy-oriented empirical framework titled *A Blueprint for the Reconstruction of Ukraine*. This study combines policy analysis and expert consensus to propose a multi-dimensional reconstruction plan amidst ongoing conflict. Structured around five central pillars—humanitarian relief, economic stabilization, infrastructure rebuilding, institutional reform, and sustainable development—the framework draws on economic indicators, institutional diagnostics, and international cooperation models. The authors argue for an immediate response to humanitarian needs, such as shelter, food security, and healthcare, while simultaneously calling for macroeconomic stabilization measures like inflation control and debt management. Notably, the study emphasizes infrastructure development, especially in transport and energy, and advocates for anti-corruption reforms and legal institutional strengthening as foundational to long-term recovery. The sustainable development pillar integrates climate-conscious planning, including green energy investments and climate-resilient infrastructure. The authors underscore the necessity of international donor coordination and transparency mechanisms to ensure effective resource utilization and prevent mismanagement during reconstruction.

Bachmann et al. (2022) examined the economic ramifications of a sudden halt in energy imports from Russia in their study *What if? The Economic Effects for Germany of a Stop of Energy Imports from Russia*. Utilizing macroeconomic modeling techniques and scenario analysis, the study quantified the short- and long-term impacts on key economic indicators in Germany, including GDP, inflation, and employment. The researchers found that an abrupt end to Russian energy supplies would have substantial negative effects, particularly in energy-intensive industries such as chemicals and manufacturing. The analysis also evaluated policy responses such as increasing energy reserves, enhancing energy conservation, and accelerating the shift towards renewable energy. Moreover, the study highlighted the need for a coordinated European Union energy policy to diversify sources and enhance the EU's resilience against geopolitical disruptions. The findings serve as a crucial input

for policymakers navigating the balance between economic costs and strategic autonomy in the energy sector.

Prier (2017) conducted a case study analysis of Russia's information operations during the Ukraine crisis, emphasizing the strategic use of social media manipulation, state-sponsored disinformation, and psychological warfare. Drawing on data from Twitter, Facebook, and official government reports, the study revealed how Russian actors deliberately propagated false narratives to polarize public opinion and diminish trust in both Ukrainian institutions and Western alliances. These efforts, embedded within Russia's hybrid warfare doctrine, were shown to be instrumental in shaping perceptions and weakening adversarial cohesion, with far-reaching implications for NATO's cognitive security and cyber-defense strategies.

Talmon (2022) examined the Russia-Ukraine conflict from the standpoint of international law, particularly concerning the legitimacy of Russia's military invasion under the UN Charter and customary legal norms. Utilizing case precedents, United Nations resolutions, and treaty interpretations, the study established that Russia's actions represent a blatant violation of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, which prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. The research also considered potential avenues for international accountability, including prosecution under international criminal law and the establishment of transitional justice mechanisms to address war crimes and human rights violations in Ukraine.

Hoskins and O'Loughlin (2022) analyzed how Western media outlets framed the Russian invasion of Ukraine, using content analysis of reports from CNN, BBC, and Deutsche Welle. Their findings indicated a dominant narrative portraying Russia as the aggressor and Ukraine as the victim, which effectively mobilized public support in Western societies for sanctions and military assistance to Ukraine. However, the study also highlighted that such framing often relied on sensationalism and omitted complex historical or geopolitical contexts, thereby constraining public discourse and reducing opportunities for nuanced policy discussions regarding the broader implications of the war.

Chepeliev and van der Mensbrugghe (2022) assessed the macroeconomic consequences of the Russia–Ukraine war using global computable general equilibrium (CGE) models. Their analysis uncovered extensive disruptions to international commodity markets, particularly in the supply chains of food, energy, and fertilizers. These disruptions were found to have cascading effects on developing economies, intensifying inflationary pressures and aggravating food insecurity. The study concluded that the conflict has significantly altered global economic interdependencies and called for enhanced international cooperation and governance to address these structural vulnerabilities and stabilize markets affected by the war.

Factors that Triggers Russia-Ukraine War and their Consequences on the World Global Peace and Security?

Ukraine's quest for independence and its shift away from Russia has been a complex process, driven by historical, political, and strategic considerations. Ukraine declared independence on August 24, 1991, in the wake of the Soviet Union's disintegration, a decision confirmed by over 90% of voters in a national referendum held on December 1, 1991 (Kuzio, 2015). This marked the emergence of Ukraine as a sovereign state, aiming to establish its own governance and economic system amidst economic difficulties and lingering Soviet-era influences (Wilson, 2014). Ukraine's early years of independence were marked by economic hardships, political instability, and debates over national identity, particularly with regards to language and its cultural ties with Russia (Plokhy, 2015). The "Orange Revolution" of 2004, driven by mass protests against election fraud, underscored a shift towards a pro-Western stance, resulting in the election of Viktor Yushchenko, who sought closer integration with the European Union (EU) and NATO (Wilson, 2014). However, inconsistent political commitment and internal divisions slowed the process of European integration.

The Euromaidan protests in 2013-2014 reignited Ukraine's aspirations for closer ties with the West, especially after President Viktor Yanukovych's decision to abandon an EU association agreement in favor of closer relations with Russia (Sasse, 2017). The protests led to Yanukovych's removal and the signing of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in 2014, reflecting a definitive turn towards European integration (Lough, 2019). This shift was further solidified following Russia's annexation of Crimea in

2014, which occurred after a controversial referendum widely condemned as illegitimate by the international community (Giles, 2019). Russia's actions were perceived as a direct challenge to Ukraine's sovereignty, prompting the country to accelerate its NATO membership aspirations to secure its territorial integrity (Menon & Rumer, 2015). In 2017, Ukraine legislated NATO membership as a strategic goal, and in 2019, amended its constitution to enshrine its commitment to joining NATO and the EU (Charap& Colton, 2018). Despite NATO's recognition of Ukraine as an Enhanced Opportunities Partner, full membership remains elusive due to ongoing conflicts and the alliance's policy of excluding countries with unresolved territorial disputes (Gould-Davies, 2022).

Russia's reaction to Ukraine's Western orientation has been marked by military, economic, and political strategies aimed at maintaining influence over its neighbor. Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 was justified by the Kremlin as a protective measure for ethnic Russians and Russian-speaking populations, but was widely condemned as a violation of international law and Ukraine's territorial integrity (Giles, 2019). In eastern Ukraine, Russia has supported separatist movements in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions, contributing to an ongoing conflict that has resulted in significant loss of life and displacement, further complicating Ukraine's NATO ambitions (Menon & Rumer, 2015). Additionally, Russia has leveraged energy supplies as a tool of influence, using its control over gas exports to exert economic pressure on Ukraine during disputes over pricing and supply (Pirani, Stern, &Yafimava, 2010). The situation escalated dramatically in February 2022, when Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine under the pretext of a "special military operation" aimed at "demilitarizing" and "denazifying" the country (Gould-Davies, 2022). This invasion has led to extensive sanctions against Russia and increased military and financial support for Ukraine from Western nations, reinforcing Ukraine's desire to solidify its alignment with NATO and the EU (Charap& Colton, 2018).

As Ukraine navigates these challenges, its commitment to Western integration has only strengthened. The country has significantly enhanced its military capabilities with support from NATO member states and continues to reform its governance and economy to meet the criteria for NATO and EU membership (Lough, 2019). The EU

granted Ukraine candidate status in 2022, marking a pivotal step in its European integration journey (Gould-Davies, 2022). The ongoing conflict has also shifted public opinion in Ukraine toward greater support for NATO membership, as the nation seeks to secure its future as a sovereign and independent state amidst persistent Russian aggression (Sasse, 2017). Thus, Ukraine's struggle for independence has not only been a pursuit of political sovereignty but also a quest to redefine its position within the broader European geopolitical landscape.

The ongoing Russia-Ukraine conflict, which began in 2014, serves as a poignant example of how a complex interplay of political, economic, social, and geopolitical factors can converge to produce a prolonged and multifaceted dispute. This conflict illustrates how deep-rooted causes can lead to extensive consequences that reshape regional and global dynamics.The political roots of the Russia-Ukraine conflict are profoundly significant. Mearsheimer (2024) argues that the expansion of NATO into Eastern Europe, including Ukraine, has been perceived by Russia as a direct threat to its national security. This expansion is seen not just as a military threat but as a challenge to Russia's traditional sphere of influence, provoking aggressive actions from Moscow as it seeks to counter what it perceives as a strategic encirclement. This sense of encirclement has driven Russia to assertively resist NATO's advances, exacerbating the conflict. Gegeshidze (2022) elaborates that Ukraine's shift towards Western institutions and its deliberate distancing from Russian influence have further intensified tensions. This geopolitical pivot undermines Russia's strategic interests and destabilizes the region, contributing significantly to the ongoing conflict.

Economic factors also play a crucial role in the dynamics of the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Kalinowski (2023) highlights the impact of Western-imposed economic sanctions on Russia, which have led to significant economic contraction and inflation. These sanctions aim to weaken Russia's ability to sustain military operations and exert influence in Ukraine, thereby pressuring Moscow to alter its behavior. Conversely, Russia's annexation of Crimea, a region rich in natural resources, underscores underlying economic motivations. Krasner (2023) argues that control over Crimea provides Russia with strategic assets and economic leverage, allowing it to influence regional energy markets and secure vital resources, thereby bolstering its economic position amid international pressures.

The social and cultural dimensions of the conflict are also crucial to understanding its depth. Wilson (2014) examines how historical narratives and cultural identities contribute to the dispute, highlighting the deep-seated social and cultural divides within Ukraine. The divide between pro-European and pro-Russian factions reflects these fractures and has been exploited by both Russia and Ukraine to rally support and justify their respective actions. Snyder (2014) further notes that the historical and cultural ties between Russia and Eastern Ukraine have intensified the conflict. The manipulation of these cultural and historical elements has exacerbated ethnic and social divisions, fueling ongoing tensions and complicating efforts toward resolution.

Geopolitical factors are central to the conflict's escalation and persistence. Pomerantsev (2023) underscores that the geopolitical rivalry between Russia and Western powers has significantly intensified the conflict. Russia views Ukraine as a critical buffer against NATO expansion and Western influence, while Western nations regard Ukraine as a counterbalance to Russian aggression. This geopolitical contest has transformed the conflict into a broader struggle for influence and control in Eastern Europe. Trenin (2022) argues that this rivalry has led to heightened tensions and strategic realignments, with profound implications for global security dynamics.

The consequences of the Russia-Ukraine conflict are far-reaching and multi-dimensional. The humanitarian impact has been severe, with Menkiszak (2022) reporting extensive civilian casualties, widespread displacement, and substantial infrastructure damage. According to the UNHCR (2023), millions of Ukrainians have been displaced both internally and externally, enduring harsh conditions in refugee camps and conflict-affected areas. The humanitarian crisis has led to shortages of essential supplies, including food and medical aid, significantly exacerbating the suffering of affected populations. Economically, the conflict has wrought significant repercussions for both Russia and Ukraine. Anderson (2022) notes that the conflict has led to reduced foreign investment in Ukraine, disrupted trade, and caused economic devastation in affected areas. For Russia, economic sanctions have resulted in currency devaluation, economic isolation, and contraction of the economy. Guriev and Melikhov (2022) observe that the prolonged conflict strains national resources and disrupts regional economic stability, adversely affecting economic growth and development in both countries.

Politically, the conflict has reshaped regional and global power dynamics. Götz (2021) argues that the war has led to increased NATO military presence and strategic adjustments in Eastern Europe, ushering in a new phase of Cold War-like tensions. The conflict has strained relations between Russia and Western countries, leading to a reassessment of international alliances and security strategies. Kuehn (2022) highlights that these developments have influenced global diplomatic relations and security frameworks, resulting in shifts in the international balance of power. The social and cultural impacts of the conflict are also significant. Snyder (2018) explains that the war has intensified nationalist sentiments and ethnic divisions within Ukraine and among Russian-speaking populations. The conflict has heightened cultural and social divides, with long-term implications for intergroup relations and national identity. Miller (2022) adds that the manipulation of historical and cultural narratives has further polarized the societies involved, deepening the social rifts created by the conflict.

The conflict has had extensive ramifications, influencing global security dynamics. Mearsheimer (2023) notes that the Russia-Ukraine conflict has intensified geopolitical competition between Russia and Western powers. The conflict has led to increased military deployments, strategic realignments, and heightened global tensions. Trenin (2022) emphasizes that these geopolitical shifts have impacted international policies and security frameworks, shaping the geopolitical landscape in Eastern Europe and beyond.

Economic Costs of the Russia-Ukraine Conflict on Global Markets

The Russia-Ukraine conflict, which erupted in February 2022, has had profound and far-reaching impacts on global economic stability, beginning with major disruptions to energy supply. Before the war, the European Union was highly dependent on Russia for its energy needs, sourcing around 45% of its natural gas, 27% of crude oil, and 46% of coal from the country (Siddi, 2022). With the onset of hostilities, Russia began restricting gas flows through key infrastructure like the Nord Stream pipelines, resulting in the worst energy crisis Europe has faced in recent history. Natural gas prices spiked dramatically, with spot prices reaching over €300 per megawatt-hour at the height of the crisis in 2022 (Goldthau& Westphal, 2023).

As energy insecurity deepened, the EU responded by launching the REPowerEU plan in mid-2022, an ambitious strategy aimed at phasing out dependence on Russian fossil fuels by diversifying energy sources, ramping up renewable energy investments, and enhancing energy efficiency. The initiative yielded quick results; by 2023, the EU had slashed Russian gas imports to just 15%, replacing them largely with liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the United States, Qatar, and Algeria, as well as increasing imports from Norway (Tagliapietra, 2023; Eurostat, 2024). However, this abrupt transition caused a secondary economic shock—sharp inflationary pressures—due to the skyrocketing cost of energy, which spilled over into other sectors. Energy-intensive industries reduced operations, and gas use in the European industrial sector dropped by almost 25% in 2022, further compounded by a 10% decrease in demand due to renewable energy deployment (International Energy Agency, 2023).

To mitigate the adverse effects on households and businesses, many governments instituted energy support schemes including price caps and direct transfers. Collectively, more than \$500 billion was spent globally in 2022 on energy subsidies and relief measures (International Monetary Fund, 2023). While these measures offered temporary relief, they placed immense pressure on national budgets and risked prolonging inflation, particularly in countries with fragile economies in the Global South (World Bank, 2023). Beyond energy and inflation, the conflict has also destabilized global food security. Ukraine and Russia, both major agricultural exporters, were key suppliers of wheat, maize, barley, and fertilizers, accounting for nearly 30% of global wheat exports before the war (Darfour& Rosenthal, 2023). The conflict led to massive disruptions in agricultural supply chains, blocked Black Sea ports, and increased logistical and insurance costs for exporters. A devastating turning point came in June 2023 with the destruction of Ukraine's Kakhovka Dam, which drained a critical reservoir and rendered over 584,000 hectares of arable land infertile due to loss of irrigation. This land had produced about 4 million metric tons of grain and oilseeds annually—approximately 4% of Ukraine's total agricultural output (UNOCHA, 2023).

The consequences were immediately felt globally as food prices surged, exacerbating hunger and food insecurity, particularly in vulnerable regions of Africa, the Middle

East, and parts of Asia that relied heavily on Ukrainian grain (FAO, 2024). The conflict thus highlights the interconnectedness of energy, economic stability, and food security in an era of geopolitical upheaval.

Ukraine War and it Impacts on Environmental and Energy Security in Europe and Neighboring Regions: An Overview.

The Russia-Ukraine war has had far-reaching consequences on both environmental degradation and energy security in Europe and its neighboring regions. As the conflict escalated in February 2022, the environmental toll became immediately apparent, with significant damage to Ukraine's ecosystem and infrastructure. A preliminary assessment by the United Nations estimated the environmental costs of the war at over \$51 billion, largely due to direct conflict-related damage, including the destruction of critical infrastructure, environmental contamination, and long-term ecological harm (United Nations Environment Programme \[UNEP], 2023). Shelling has caused the burning of approximately 687,000 tons of petrochemicals, while nearly 1,600 tons of hazardous pollutants have leached into water bodies, leading to widespread water contamination. In addition, around 70 acres of fertile agricultural land have been contaminated by hazardous chemicals, severely affecting Ukraine's capacity for agricultural production and harming the broader agricultural landscape of the region (Environmental Protection Agency, 2023).

The destruction of the Kakhovka Dam in June 2023 marked a particularly devastating environmental blow. In addition to flooding vast areas of farmland, the dam's collapse unleashed decades of industrial waste that had accumulated in the Kakhovka Reservoir. This contamination included dangerous chemicals such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and lindane, which have long-term detrimental effects on both aquatic life and human health. Ukrainian officials have described the incident as "ecocide" due to the massive ecological damage it inflicted (UNEP, 2023). This catastrophic event, combined with ongoing pollution and environmental destruction, has created long-lasting environmental and public health risks, not just for Ukraine, but for neighboring countries that share the region's ecosystems.

Alongside environmental destruction, the conflict has exposed vulnerabilities in Europe's energy security, particularly its over-reliance on Russian energy supplies.

Prior to the war, Russia was the EU's largest supplier of natural gas, crude oil, and coal, providing approximately 45% of the EU's natural gas, 27% of its crude oil, and 46% of its coal imports (Siddi, 2022). However, Russia's aggressive actions and energy-related sanctions led to severe disruptions in energy flows. To mitigate the crisis, the European Union launched the REPowerEU plan, which focused on reducing dependence on Russian fossil fuels by diversifying energy sources, increasing energy efficiency, and expanding renewable energy capacities. A key component of this plan was to diversify external energy suppliers by securing deals with alternative suppliers such as Qatar, Norway, and Algeria (European Commission, 2023). By 2023, these efforts had borne fruit, reducing the EU's reliance on Russian natural gas from 45% in 2021 to just 15% (IEA, 2023). Despite this success, challenges remain in fully decoupling from Russian energy. Slovakia, for example, has been vocal about the potential economic repercussions of the EU's plan to end Russian gas imports by 2027, warning that it could have severe financial consequences (Kaufmann, 2024). Furthermore, despite EU efforts to diversify its sources, Russian liquefied natural gas (LNG) imports reached record highs in 2024, underscoring the complexity of the transition away from Russian energy (Goldthau& Westphal, 2023).

The war has also revealed how fragile European energy infrastructure is in the face of direct military threats. Ukrainian energy infrastructure, in particular, has been a primary target of Russian strikes. In January 2025, Ukraine targeted a gas compressor station along the TurkStream pipeline, which connects Russia to Turkey and, ultimately, southern Europe. While gas transport was not interrupted, this attack highlighted the ongoing vulnerability of energy infrastructure in the region and raised concerns about the broader security of Europe's energy networks (IEA, 2025). These attacks, combined with the need for rapid diversification of energy sources, emphasize the critical need for European countries to reassess their energy security strategies in the face of a more unpredictable and volatile geopolitical environment.

Another significant area of concern arising from the war has been the destruction of Ukraine's water infrastructure. As of July 2023, the Ukrainian Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources reported the destruction of over 700 hydraulic structures, including 71 water pumping stations and 64 sewage pumping

stations (Ukrainian Government, 2023). These attacks have had a severe impact on Ukraine's ability to provide clean and safe drinking water to its citizens. Moreover, the damage to water treatment facilities has led to the discharge of approximately 20.7 billion cubic meters of untreated wastewater into surface waters, further exacerbating the region's environmental and public health crisis. The discharge of untreated wastewater has not only compromised the availability of clean drinking water for millions of Ukrainians but also created a significant risk of waterborne diseases (World Bank, 2024). This damage to water infrastructure extends beyond Ukraine's borders, affecting shared river systems and creating regional challenges for neighboring countries that rely on the same water resources.

The long-term impacts of these environmental and energy security challenges are far-reaching and will require significant reconstruction efforts. The EU's REPowerEU plan, while an important step toward energy diversification, highlights the complexities and trade-offs involved in transitioning away from Russian energy. The war has underscored the need for urgent action to protect both environmental and energy security in the region. As Europe and Ukraine continue to grapple with the aftermath of the conflict, a comprehensive approach to rebuilding infrastructure and securing sustainable energy sources will be essential for long-term stability and resilience.

The Russia-Ukraine war and the rise of refugee displacement across Europe and neighboring regions

The warhas caused one of the most profound refugee crises in modern history. As of early 2024, more than 8.2 million Ukrainians have fled the country, making it one of the largest refugee movements since World War II. This unprecedented displacement has been accompanied by the swift and overwhelming response of European countries, which have seen millions of refugees cross their borders in search of safety. By March 2024, over 1.6 million Ukrainian refugees had arrived in Poland alone, which, along with neighboring Romania, Hungary, and Slovakia, became the first destinations for people fleeing the conflict (UNHCR, 2024). The scale of the displacement is not only a result of the ongoing hostilities but also of the destruction of critical civilian infrastructure, including homes, hospitals, schools, and utilities. These attacks have exacerbated the humanitarian crisis, creating widespread

devastation in cities such as Mariupol, Kharkiv, and Kyiv, and pushing many people to seek refuge in neighboring countries (IOM, 2024).

The demographic makeup of the refugee population is heavily skewed towards women, children, and the elderly, who account for over 80% of the displaced population. This distribution is due in part to Ukraine's martial law, which prohibits men aged 18 to 60 from leaving the country, compelling women, children, and the elderly to bear the brunt of displacement (Eurostat, 2023). This demographic shift presents unique challenges in host countries, particularly in the provision of gender-sensitive services such as education, healthcare, and psychosocial support. With the influx of refugees, many host countries, especially those at the border like Poland, have seen significant pressure on public services such as schools, hospitals, and social welfare systems. These countries have also experienced overcrowding in housing and increased demand for social services, leading to concerns about the long-term sustainability of these provisions (OECD, 2023).

Despite the challenges, the arrival of refugees has provided some positive socio-economic impacts, particularly in alleviating labor shortages in certain sectors. Countries like Germany and the Czech Republic have benefited from the influx of Ukrainian refugees, who have been employed in sectors like agriculture and healthcare, helping to address labor shortages exacerbated by the pandemic and the war (World Bank, 2023). However, the integration of refugees into the labor market has raised significant challenges. Many host countries have struggled to provide adequate housing, employment, and social services, and rising public costs related to accommodating refugees have sparked political tensions. Initially, European public sentiment was largely supportive, but over time, there has been growing political fatigue and backlash, particularly from far-right political factions, as the economic costs of accommodation and integration rise (Mackenzie & D'Angelo, 2024). This has created a complex political landscape, with divisions emerging over how to handle refugee admissions, the provision of resources, and long-term integration strategies.

Additionally, the refugee crisis has exacerbated the risks of human trafficking, especially among unaccompanied minors and women. Vulnerabilities in refugee protection mechanisms have made it easier for criminal networks to exploit displaced

individuals for forced labor and sexual exploitation. According to Europol (2023), there has been a documented increase in human trafficking cases within the refugee population, further underscoring the importance of enhanced monitoring and protection mechanisms. Host countries have faced significant challenges in addressing these issues, with the need for comprehensive strategies to combat trafficking and provide adequate protection for vulnerable refugees.

Another dimension of the crisis is the ongoing displacement within Ukraine itself. As of 2024, over 3.7 million people remain internally displaced, a situation that complicates both humanitarian efforts and future recovery. The internal displacement crisis exacerbates the strain on Ukraine's already overstretched resources and has implications for the country's long-term stability and reconstruction efforts (IOM, 2024). The internal displacement issue remains a critical part of the broader refugee crisis, with millions of Ukrainians unable to return to their homes due to ongoing conflict and destruction.

The war's impact on migration patterns is not only seen in the immediate displacement of people but also in the broader demographic shifts occurring across Europe. The presence of millions of refugees in Europe is reshaping labor markets, social cohesion frameworks, and public policy. The need for long-term, sustainable solutions to refugee integration, including access to housing, employment, healthcare, and education, has never been more urgent. To address these challenges, host countries must adopt inclusive, gender-sensitive, and comprehensive refugee response strategies that promote social integration while protecting vulnerable populations.

The war has had profound implications for both Ukraine and the European countries hosting refugees. It has not only caused an immediate refugee crisis but also reshaped migration patterns, affected labor markets, and strained social systems. The refugee crisis requires coordinated international responses, including enhanced protection mechanisms, gender-sensitive policies, and long-term integration strategies to mitigate the challenges posed by the displacement and ensure the well-being of refugees. Moreover, diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict are essential to reduce further humanitarian fallout and stabilize the region.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts Hans J. Morgenthau's theory of **Classical Realism** as the central theoretical framework to analyze the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Classical Realism, as outlined in Morgenthau's seminal text *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948), is grounded in the belief that international politics is governed by objective laws rooted in unchanging human nature. Morgenthau posits that political behavior is driven by the pursuit of power, which he defines as the control of man over man (Morgenthau, 1948, p. 13). Accordingly, states, like individuals, act in ways that maximize their power and ensure survival in an anarchic international system devoid of a central governing authority.

Two central postulates of Realism are especially relevant in this context. The first is the state-centric assumption, which asserts that states are the primary actors in international relations, each pursuing its national interest often defined in terms of power (Waltz, 1979). The second is the concept of the security dilemma, where the actions taken by one state to increase its security such as military buildup or alliance formation are perceived as threatening by others, thereby fueling an arms race or conflict (Jervis, 1978).

In the case of the Russia-Ukraine war, Realism provides a lens to understand Russia's behavior as a rational and strategic pursuit of national interest. Russia's invasion in 2022 can be viewed as a direct reaction to Ukraine's growing ties with Western institutions such as NATO and the European Union, which Moscow perceives as a geopolitical threat to its traditional sphere of influence (Mearsheimer, 2014; Tsygankov, 2015). According to John Mearsheimer, a leading proponent of structural Realism, "the United States and its European allies are principally responsible for the crisis in Ukraine" because of NATO's eastward expansion, which Russia interprets as an existential threat (Mearsheimer, 2014, p. 1). Thus, Russia's military aggression, though condemnable from a moral standpoint, can be seen as a rational move within the realist paradigm. Realism also explains the calculated restraint shown by Western powers in their responses. While the West has provided economic sanctions and military aid to Ukraine, it has refrained from direct military confrontation with Russia. This aligns with the realist view that states seek to avoid escalations that could jeopardize their own national security, particularly in a nuclear

context (Walt, 2018). In Realist terms, the objective is to **balance power** through containment and deterrence rather than risk a larger conflagration.

However, to strengthen theoretical reflexivity and ensure a comprehensive understanding, it is important to briefly contrast Realism with other prominent international relations theories. **Liberalism**, for example, argues that international institutions, economic interdependence, and democratic values can foster cooperation and peace among states (Keohane & Nye, 2001). From a liberal perspective, Russia's actions undermine global norms and institutions such as the United Nations, and the emphasis would be on promoting multilateral diplomacy, rule of law, and sanctions to restore peace. Yet, Liberalism fails to fully account for power politics in an environment where major powers disregard institutional constraints in pursuit of strategic interests.

Constructivism, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of identity, norms, and historical narratives in shaping state behavior. It would focus on how Russia's historical identity, post-Soviet grievances, and nationalistic narratives inform its perception of NATO as a threat (Wendt, 1999; Hopf, 2002). While this approach offers valuable insight into the social construction of state interests, it lacks the predictive power that Realism offers in understanding recurring patterns of conflict driven by material capabilities and strategic calculations.

In conclusion, while Liberal and Constructivist approaches offer supplementary perspectives, Morgenthau's Realism provides the most coherent and empirically supported framework for analyzing the Russia-Ukraine conflict. It explains not only Russia's aggressive pursuit of strategic depth and power consolidation but also the pragmatic responses of Western actors aimed at maintaining balance and avoiding systemic instability. Thus, Realism captures the enduring relevance of power politics in shaping contemporary international relations.

Research Methodology

This study adopted a descriptive and qualitative research design to examine the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Given the complexity of international relations and the multidimensional nature of the war, a qualitative approach was considered appropriate for uncovering the intricate interactions among political, economic, and

geographic factors. Data were obtained exclusively from secondary sources, which were selected through a systematic search strategy to ensure both relevance and credibility. The analysis was conducted using content analysis, guided by a thematic coding framework. The literature search was carried out using academic databases such as JSTOR, Google Scholar, and ProQuest.

Discussion of Findings

The Russia-Ukraine war emerges from a multifaceted convergence of historical grievances, geopolitical realignments, economic interests, and socio-cultural antagonisms. Ukraine's post-Soviet orientation toward NATO and the European Union intensified friction with Russia, which perceives such integration efforts as a direct challenge to its regional dominance (Mearsheimer, 2024; Sasse, 2017). Landmark events such as the Orange Revolution in 2004, the Euromaidan protests in 2014, and the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement reflected Kyiv's Western aspirations, eliciting increasingly assertive responses from Moscow (Wilson, 2014; Lough, 2019). The strategic importance of Crimea and the Donbas region lies not only in their military and economic value but also in their symbolic significance. Russia's annexation of Crimea and its backing of separatist factions in Eastern Ukraine were framed domestically as protective measures for ethnic Russians, though broadly condemned as breaches of international law (Giles, 2019; Menon & Rumer, 2015). NATO's potential expansion into Ukraine was construed by Russia as a critical security threat, prompting its 2022 invasion under the guise of a "special military operation" (Gould-Davies, 2022).

Economic repercussions have been severe on both sides. Western sanctions have impaired key sectors of the Russian economy, while Moscow's manipulation of energy exports has disrupted European energy stability and triggered inflation across global markets (Kalinowski, 2023; Pirani et al., 2010). These shocks have accelerated energy diversification policies in Europe, notably the REPowerEU initiative aimed at reducing dependence on Russian hydrocarbons (European Commission, 2023). The cultural and ideological dimensions of the conflict are equally pronounced. Language, historical memory, and national identity have been instrumentalized to mobilize domestic and international support, exacerbating polarization and nationalist sentiment (Wilson, 2014; Snyder, 2014). Russia's

narrative of protecting Russian-speaking populations was strategically deployed to justify territorial claims and military intervention.

At the geopolitical level, the conflict represents a broader contest between competing worldviews, with renewed confrontation between Russia and Western powers. This antagonism mirrors Cold War dynamics and is manifested in ideological, technological, and economic domains (Pomerantsev, 2023; Trenin, 2022). Ukraine has effectively become a site of strategic competition, revealing deep fault lines in the post-Cold War international order. Humanitarian consequences are staggering. Massive displacement, civilian casualties, and widespread destruction have strained international aid systems and highlighted weaknesses in regional security frameworks (UNHCR, 2023; Götz, 2021). Simultaneously, the environmental toll has been profound. The destruction of critical infrastructure—such as the Kakhovka Dam—has caused ecological degradation with long-term implications for public health, agriculture, and regional biodiversity (UNEP, 2023).

The global economic system has not been immune. Disruptions to the export of grain, fertilizers, and energy commodities from Ukraine and Russia have intensified food insecurity and inflation, particularly in developing nations (World Bank, 2023; FAO, 2023). These structural shocks reveal the interconnectedness and fragility of global supply chains and underline the need for diversified sourcing and strategic reserves. Collectively, these findings suggest that the Russia-Ukraine war transcends bilateral enmity and exemplifies deeper systemic tensions in the international order. Ukraine's contested position between East and West, combined with unresolved questions of sovereignty, identity, and security architecture, has rendered it the epicenter of a broader geopolitical recalibration. The conflict underscores the limitations of existing deterrence frameworks and demands a holistic international response—one that integrates military preparedness, economic resilience, environmental safeguarding, and sustained humanitarian support.

Conclusion

The Russia-Ukraine war has exposed the fragility of global peace and the vulnerabilities in international economic, environmental, and institutional frameworks. The study identified key triggers of the conflict, including geopolitical

rivalries, NATO's expansion, and historical tensions, which have collectively undermined international peace and stability. Economically, the war has led to soaring oil and gas prices, disrupted global trade, and worsened food insecurity in developing nations, particularly in Africa. Environmentally, the destruction of infrastructure has led to severe ecological damage, displaced populations, and increased pressure on energy and water systems across Europe. Furthermore, international institutions like the UN and regional powers have struggled to respond decisively, often hampered by political interests and structural limitations. Overall, the war reflects a critical moment for the global order, demanding coordinated action to address its multifaceted implications.

Recommendations

1. Foster Preventive Diplomacy and Dialogue to Address Root Causes of Conflict

To reduce the risk of similar conflicts and protect global peace, the international community—particularly major powers—should strengthen diplomatic engagements that address underlying geopolitical grievances. Initiatives should include confidence-building measures, security guarantees for neutral states, and reinforcement of international laws governing sovereignty and territorial integrity.

2. Diversify Global Supply Chains and Invest in Resilient Energy and Food Systems

To mitigate the economic fallout from the war, especially rising energy prices and food insecurity, nations—especially in the developing world—should diversify their sources of oil, gas, and grains. Investment in renewable energy, regional food production, and intra-African trade partnerships under frameworks like AfCFTA will enhance resilience against external shocks.

3. Integrate Environmental Protection into Peace and Security Strategies

Given the environmental damage resulting from the war, peacebuilding strategies should incorporate environmental sustainability and protection of critical infrastructure. International organizations and donor agencies should support Ukraine and affected regions in rebuilding damaged energy, water, and sanitation systems, while planning for climate-resilient infrastructure to avoid future humanitarian crises.

4. Reform and Strengthen the Capacity of International Institutions
The inability of global institutions to prevent or resolve the conflict underscores the need for institutional reform. The UN, EU, and other bodies must adopt more robust mechanisms for conflict mediation, enforce accountability for violations of international law, and reduce the influence of veto powers that hinder timely action. Support should also be given to empower regional institutions in peacekeeping and conflict resolution roles.

References

1. Anderson, J. (2022). Economic collapse and war: Ukraine's disrupted development. London: Routledge.
2. Annan, K. (1999). *Interventions: A life in war and peace*. Penguin Books.
3. Archibugi, D. (2008). *The global commonwealth of citizens: Toward cosmopolitan democracy*. Princeton University Press.
4. Bachmann, S.-D., Sidortsov, R., & Giegerich, B. (2022). *What if? The economic effects for Germany of a stop of energy imports from Russia*. Centre for European Policy Studies.
5. Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), 5–26.
6. Barnett, M. (2001). *Dialogues in security studies*. Routledge.
7. Baylis, J. (2005). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.
8. Becker, T., Gerschel, E., & Moritz, M. (2022). *A blueprint for the reconstruction of Ukraine*. German Institute for Economic Research.
9. Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse University Press.
10. Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An agenda for peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*. United Nations.
11. Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
12. Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge University Press.

13. Charap, S., & Colton, T. J. (2018). Everyone loses: The Ukraine crisis and the ruinous contest for post-Soviet Eurasia. London: Routledge.

14. Chepeliev, M., & van der Mensbrugghe, D. (2022). Implications of the Russia–Ukraine war for the global economy: A general equilibrium analysis. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Discussion Paper No. 02133. https://doi.org/10.2499/p15738coll2.134658

15. Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. Metropolitan Books.

16. Collins, A. (2010). *Contemporary security studies*. Oxford University Press.

17. Darfour, B., & Rosenthal, L. (2023). Geopolitical conflicts and food security: Lessons from the Russia-Ukraine war. Journal of Global Food Policy, 11(2), 101–118.

18. Douglas, A., & Michake, E. (2022). Great power competition and the Russian invasion of Ukraine. *Journal of Strategic Security Studies*, 10(3), 55–78.

19. Doyle, M. (1997). *Ways of war and peace: Realism, liberalism, and socialism*. W.W. Norton.

20. Drezner, D. (2007). *All politics is global: Explaining international regulatory regimes*. Princeton University Press.

21. Elias, N. (2007). *The civilizing process*. Blackwell Publishing.

22. Environmental Protection Agency. (2023). Environmental impact of the Russia-Ukraine conflict: Immediate effects on air, water, and soil contamination. Washington, DC: EPA.

23. European Commission. (2023). *REPowerEU Plan*. Retrieved from https://commission.europa.eu

24. European Commission. (2023). *REPowerEU Plan*. https://energy.ec.europa.eu

25. European Commission. (2023). REPowerEU: A European plan to reduce dependence on Russian energy. Brussels: European Commission.

26. Europol. (2023). Situation Report on Trafficking in Human Beings in the Context of the Ukraine Conflict. Europol Intelligence Brief.

27. Eurostat. (2023). Ukrainian refugees in the EU: Demographic breakdown and policy response. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat

28. Eurostat. (2024). *Energy production and imports – Statistics explained*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php

29. FAO. (2023). *The importance of Ukraine and the Russian Federation for global agricultural markets and the risks associated with the current conflict*. https://www.fao.org

30. FAO. (2023). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. Rome: FAO.

31. FAO. (2024). The state of food security and nutrition in the world*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

32. FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights). (2023). Vulnerabilities of Ukrainian refugees in the EU: Risks and protection mechanisms. Retrieved from https://fra.europa.eu/en

33. Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.

34. Gegeshidze, A. (2022). Russia's strategic interests and Ukraine's Euro-Atlantic trajectory. Journal of Eurasian Studies, 13(1), 45–59.

35. Giles, K. (2019). Moscow rules: What drives Russia to confront the West. London: Chatham House.

36. Giles, K. (2019). *Moscow Rules: What Drives Russia to Confront the West*. Brookings Institution Press.

37. Giles, K. (2019). Moscow Rules: What Drives Russia to Confront the West. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

38. Global Peace Index. (2023). *Measuring peace in a complex world*. Institute for Economics & Peace. https://www.visionofhumanity.org

39. Goldthau, A., & Westphal, K. (2023). Crisis and transformation: European energy security after Ukraine. Energy Policy, 175, 113–127.

40. Götz, E. (2021). Russia, the West, and the Ukraine crisis: Three contending perspectives. *Contemporary Politics, 27*(1), 1–17.

41. Gould-Davies, N. (2022). Putin's War in Ukraine: The Risks of Escalation. Survival, 64(3), 7–28.

42. Gould-Davies, N. (2022). Putin's war: The causes, consequences, and prospects. *Survival, 64*(3), 7–26.

43. Gould-Davies, N. (2022). The new age of global security. London: IISS Publications.

44. Guriev, S., &Melikhov, D. (2022). Economic Impact of the Ukraine War on Russia and the World. VoprosyEkonomiki, 8, 5–24.

45. Hobbes, T. (1985). *Leviathan* (C. B. Macpherson, Ed.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1651)

46. Hopf, T. (2002). Social construction of international politics: Identities and foreign policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

47. Hoskins, A., & O'Loughlin, B. (2022). War and media: Framing the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Media, War & Conflict, 15(3), 412–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352221108716

48. Hough, P. (2008). *Understanding global security*. Routledge.

49. Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.

50. IEA. (2023). World Energy Outlook 2023. Paris: International Energy Agency.

51. International Monetary Fund. (2023). Global Fiscal Monitor: Energy subsidies and public spending. Washington, DC: IMF.

52. IOM (International Organization for Migration). (2024). Displacement Tracking Matrix: Ukraine Internal Displacement Report Round 16. Retrieved from https://www.iom.int

53. Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. World Politics, 30(2), 167–214. https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958

54. Kaldor, M. (2007). *New and old wars: Organized violence in a global era* (2nd ed.). Stanford University Press.

55. Kaldor, M. (2012). *New and old wars* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.

56. Kalinowski, T. (2023). Economic Warfare and the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Sanctions and Their Global Repercussions. Review of International Political Economy, 30(1), 120–141.

57. Kalinowski, T. (2023). The geopolitical economy of sanctions and energy in the Russia–Ukraine conflict. *Review of International Political Economy, 30*(2), 187–210.

58. Kant, I. (2006). *Perpetual peace and other essays* (T. Humphrey, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published 1795)

59. Kaufmann, R. (2024). Energy transitions and political dynamics in Central Europe: Slovakia's opposition to the REPowerEU plan. Journal of European Energy Policy, 18(4), 345–359.

60. Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2001). Power and interdependence (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

61. Krahmann, E. (2005). American hegemony or global governance? Competing visions of international security. *International Studies Review*, 7(4), 531–545.

62. Krasner, S. D. (2023). Power, Interests, and the Annexation of Crimea: An Economic Perspective. Journal of International Affairs, 76(2), 43–58.

63. Kriesberg, L. (1998). *Constructive conflicts: From escalation to resolution*. Rowman & Littlefield.

64. Kuehn, U. (2022). NATO's evolving strategy after Ukraine. Contemporary Security Policy, 43(4), 513–532.

65. Kuzio, T. (2015). Ukraine: Democratization, corruption, and the new Russian imperialism. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

66. Lough, J. (2019). Ukraine's Future: European Integration and Russia's Response. Chatham House Report, London.

67. Mackenzie, C., & D'Angelo, A. (2024). Gender, War and Displacement: The Case of Ukrainian Refugees in Europe. Journal of Migration Studies, 38(1), 66–89.

68. Mearsheimer, J. (2024). Why the West Is Principally Responsible for the Ukrainian Crisis. International Security, 48(2), 56–89.

69. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: The liberal delusions that provoked Putin. Foreign Affairs, 93(5), 77–89.

70. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2023). The great delusion: Liberal dreams and international realities. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

71. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2024). NATO expansion and the roots of war in Ukraine. Foreign Affairs, 103(1), 10–24.

72. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2024). *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities* (Updated Ed.). Yale University Press.

73. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2024). The tragedy of great power politics (Updated ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

74. Menkiszak, M. (2022). Humanitarian costs of Russian aggression in Ukraine. Centre for Eastern Studies Bulletin, July 2022.

75. Menon, R., & Rumer, E. B. (2015). Conflict in Ukraine: The unwinding of the post–Cold War order. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

76. Miller, C. (2022). The war came to us: Life and death in Ukraine. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

77. Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

78. OECD. (2023). Responding to the Ukrainian refugee crisis: Integration, housing and labor market challenges. OECD Publishing.

79. Pirani, S., Stern, J., & Yafimava, K. (2010). The Russo-Ukrainian gas dispute of 2009: A comprehensive assessment. Oxford: Oxford Institute for Energy Studies.

80. Pirani, S., Stern, J., &Yafimava, K. (2010). The Russo-Ukrainian Gas Dispute of January 2009: A Comprehensive Assessment. Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, NG27.

81. Plokhy, S. (2015). The gates of Europe: A history of Ukraine. New York: Basic Books.

82. Pomerantsev, P. (2023). The Geopolitical War in Ukraine: Disinformation and Strategic Competition. Journal of Democracy, 34(2), 15–29.

83. Prier, J. (2017). Commanding the trend: Social media as information warfare. Strategic Studies Quarterly, 11(4), 50–85.

https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/SSQ/documents/Volume-11_Issue-4/Prier.pdf

84. Sasse, G. (2017). The EU and Ukraine: Conditionality and Public Opinion. Europe-Asia Studies, 69(2), 205–225.

85. Siddi, M. (2022). The European Union's energy dependence on Russia: Origins and responses. Journal of Common Market Studies, 60(3), 651–667.

86. Snyder, T. (2014). *The battle for Ukraine: Historical perspectives and the politics of memory*. Journal of Democracy, 25(3), 35–49.

87. Snyder, T. (2018). The reconstruction of nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

88. Sylwia, M. (2017). Hybrid war or civil war? The conflict in eastern Ukraine. *International Relations Review*, 15(2), 145–164.

89. Tagliapietra, S. (2023). REPowerEU: Europe's strategy for energy independence*. Bruegel Policy Contribution, Issue 01/2023.

90. Talmon, S. (2022). The invasion of Ukraine and the international legal order. Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht (ZaöRV) / Heidelberg Journal of International Law, 82(1), 15–41. https://www.zaoerv.de/82_2022/82_2022_1_a_15_41.pdf

91. Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security*. Columbia University Press.

92. Trenin, D. (2022). The Crisis in Ukraine and the Future of Russian Geopolitics. Russia in Global Affairs, 20(1), 40–56.

93. Tsygankov, A. P. (2015). Vladimir Putin's last stand: The sources of Russia's Ukraine policy. Post-Soviet Affairs, 31(4), 279–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/1060586X.2015.1005903

94. Ukrainian Government. (2023). Report on the destruction of Ukraine's water infrastructure. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources.

95. UNEP. (2023). *Environmental impacts of the war in Ukraine*. https://www.unep.org

96. UNEP. (2023). Ukraine Conflict Environmental Damage Report. Geneva: United Nations Environment Programme.

97. UNHCR. (2023). Ukraine Emergency Situation Report. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org

98. UNHCR. (2024). Ukraine Refugee Situation – Regional Overview. Retrieved from

https://data.unhcr.org/en/situations/ukraine

99. United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). Ecocide in Ukraine: The environmental impact of the Kakhovka Dam destruction. Geneva: UNEP.

100. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA). (2023). Ukraine: Impact of the destruction of the Kakhovka Dam. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int

101. Walt, S. M. (1991). The renaissance of security studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35(2), 211–239.

102. Walt, S. M. (2018). The hell of good intentions: America's foreign policy elite and the decline of U.S. primacy. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

103. Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of international politics. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

104. Wendt, A. (1999). Social theory of international politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

105. Williams, P. D. (2008). *Security studies: An introduction*. Routledge.

106. Williams, P. D. (2013). *Understanding peacekeeping* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

107. Wilson, A. (2014). Ukraine crisis: What it means for the West. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

108. World Bank. (2023). War and Resilience: Socioeconomic Impacts of the Ukraine Conflict on Europe. World Bank Reports.

109. World Bank. (2024). The impact of the Russia-Ukraine conflict on water infrastructure and regional stability. Washington, DC: World Bank.

110. Wright, Q. (1942). *A study of war*. University of Chicago Press