

<https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/45/155-162>

Sonia Messaoudi

Blida 2 University-Ali Lounici

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7505-9076>

sonimess03@gmail.com

Input-Output Analysis of the Ukraine War: Causes and Consequences

Abstract

This study analyzes the dimensions of the Russian military intervention in Ukraine, considered one of the most serious international crises in global relations since the end of the Cold War. The conflict poses the threat of a large-scale confrontation in Europe between Russia on one side and the United States, the European Union, and NATO on the other. The study finds that the Ukraine crisis has ushered in a new era of heightened rivalry and even confrontation between former Cold War adversaries. This research aims to provide an overview of the Russia-Ukraine war and its causes through three perspectives: the individual level, domestic politics, and the international system. Additionally, it examines the war's effects on global politics.

Keywords: *Russia-Ukraine War, international relations, military intervention, geopolitical rivalry, global politics*

Sonia Messaoudi

Blida 2 Universiteti-Ali Lounici

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7505-9076>

sonimess03@gmail.com

Ukrayna müharibəsinin giriş-çıxış təhlili: səbəblər və nəticələr

Xülasə

Bu araşdırma soyuq müharibənin bitməsindən sonra global münasibətlərdə ən ciddi beynəlxalq böhranlardan biri hesab edilən Rusiyanın Ukraynaya hərbi müdaxiləsinin ölçülərini təhlil edir. Münaqişə bir tərəfdən Rusiya, digər tərəfdən isə ABŞ, Avropa İttifaqı və NATO arasında Avropada genişmiqyaslı qarşıdurma təhlükəsi yaradır. Tədqiqat göstərir ki, Ukrayna böhranı keçmiş Soyuq Müharibə düşmənləri arasında artan rəqabətin və hətta qarşıdurmanın yeni dövrünü açıb. Bu tədqiqatın məqsədi Rusiya-Ukrayna müharibəsi və onun səbəblərini üç perspektivdən nəzərdən keçirməkdir: fərdi səviyyə, daxili siyasət və beynəlxalq sistem. Bundan əlavə, müharibənin global siyasətə təsirlərini araşdırır.

Açar sözlər: *Rusiya-Ukrayna müharibəsi, beynəlxalq münasibətlər, hərbi müdaxilə, geosiyasi rəqabət, global siyasət*

Introduction

The topic of the Ukrainian war captures the attention of the academic field as much as it does the political and military spheres. Ukraine has been closely tied to the interests of major powers due to its geopolitical significance, which has made it, across different historical periods, a zone of international struggle and competition—once between ancient empires and today between the West and the Russian Federation. The ongoing rivalry between the West and Russia over buffer zones and states has had a profound impact on shaping the strategic approaches of both sides toward each other, despite differences in behavior and policies.

Ukraine serves as a buffer zone between East and West, embodying the conflicts that the country has experienced since late 2013 and continues to endure to this day. These conflicts have led to significant international repercussions due to external interventions, particularly by Russia and the West, in the ongoing struggle for spheres of influence.

The annexation of Crimea marked a turning point in the international system, coinciding with closer ties between China and Russia and the division of global stances on the Ukrainian crisis. This crisis has strongly resembled a new Cold War, with the emergence of multiple flashpoints and propaganda wars amid severe financial, economic, health, and social crises since early 2019. Meanwhile, President Putin's decision to invade Ukraine represented a departure from rational calculations into a zero-sum game, as the Russian leadership aimed to reintegrate Ukraine into its sphere of influence—either by toppling the Kyiv government or asserting control over eastern and southern Ukrainian territories.

Research

The Research Problem is: What are the different outcomes of the Ukrainian war given the varying inputs and strategies of the warring parties?

This study adopts a historical approach to examine the evolution of the Ukrainian war, tracing its key developments and major events. Additionally, it employs analytical and deductive methodologies to explore Ukraine's strategic significance from both Russian and American perspectives, as well as the various political, social, and economic dimensions of the crisis. Furthermore, the study analyzes the impact of these dimensions on Ukraine itself and their broader regional and international repercussions. This approach aligns with David Easton's framework by considering the inputs and outputs of the Ukrainian crisis.

1.WAR: Concepts and definitions

Even casual inspection of the literature reveals the following, incomplete, list of 'war' terms: limited war and total (or all-out) war, cold war and hot war, local war and world war, controlled and uncontrolled war, accidental war and premeditated war, conventional and nuclear war, declared and undeclared war, aggressive or offensive war and defensive war, general war and proxy war, international war and civil war, tribal and civilized war, preventive or pre-emptive war, protracted war, absolute war, war of liberation, war of conquest, war of commerce, war of plunder, revolutionary war, political war, economic war, social war, imperialist war, guerilla war, psychological war, strategic war, counter-insurgency war, dynastic war, monarchical war, ritual war, agonistic war, sacred war, instrumental war, genocidal war.

War is a species in the genus of violence; more specifically it is collective, direct, manifest, personal, intentional, organized, institutionalized, instrumental, sanctioned, and sometimes ritualized and regulated, violence. These distinguishing features and dimensional delineations are not limitative. It should be perfectly clear, however, that war, or the state of belligerence, is a very special category of violence (Van der Dennen, 1981, pp. 128-189).

According to international law, war, in principle, can only take place between sovereign political entities, that is, States. War is thus a means for resolving differences between units of the highest order of political organization. The majority of those who have been concerned with war as a socio-political phenomenon have also adopted as their basic premise that there is a fundamental difference between domestic conflicts, for which there are normally mechanisms for peaceful resolution, and international conflicts, which occur in a state of anarchy. Wars have been seen to involve directly State institutions, such as the foreign office and the armed forces. Since war is put in an international context, the stakes of war may be the life and death of States (Aron, 2017, p. 423).

Dr. Martin van Creveld—one of the world's most eminent military historians and strategic theorists—provided the conference's keynote address. Van Creveld stressed that throughout history, war has had two distinct meanings. The Clausewitzian meaning—which dominates American thinking—defines war as organized violence to achieve political ends (Metz & Cuccia, 2011, p. 2). This divorces war from ethical or normative structures. Carl von Clausewitz and his followers devoted little attention to the question of whether war in general or a specific war was legal or ethical. The goal was an amoral, even scientific approach. Ethics and legality remained important but fell within the realm of politics rather than strategy. The other meaning, which has been used at least since the Roman empire, approached war as a legal condition, defining the permissible limits of organized violence. War allowed the use of different ethical and normative frameworks than peace. These

specified who could kill, whom they could kill, and under what conditions they could kill. Ethics and legality, in other words, could not be divorced from strategy and the conduct of war.

Bogulslawski Von states that "war is a battle waged by a specific group of men, tribes, nations, peoples, or states against a similar or comparable group." War, therefore, is a state of violent conflict between two or more groups of individuals belonging to the same species, driven by their own desires or will.

Similarly, the anthropologist Malinowski defines war as "an armed contest between two independent political units, carried out by an organized army seeking to achieve a specific national policy."

Based on these perspectives, war can be considered a natural state arising from conflicts of interest among individuals, societies, and nations. Humans, as part of this natural order, are inevitably involved in such conflicts. It is also essential to distinguish between war as a concept and war as a process. As a concept, war may be described as a legal state, as it not only involves armed violence but also requires the warring parties to adhere to the rules established by international law.

War represents the continuation of conflict between groups through the use of armed force. It reflects the competitive nature of relations between the parties involved before the outbreak of violence. The onset of war signifies the peak of a conflict and the parties' attempt to resolve or settle their disputes through military means. Thus, in international relations, the concept of conflict is broader and more complex than that of war. Once a war begins, the options for the parties involved become limited to victory or defeat, whereas, in the pre-war phase of a conflict, there may still be room for negotiation and resolution.

Regarding war as a process, it involves interaction between four fundamental elements identified by Professor Quincy Wright: military operations or activities, a high level of tension, an extraordinary legal framework, and a significant degree of political integration.

2. Definition of the Ukrainian war:

The Ukrainian war represents the most serious crisis on the international stage since the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s. It is classified as a modern, intractable conflict with complex resolution challenges, as it carries the threat of escalating into a large-scale confrontation in Europe. Additionally, it has the potential to destabilize the foundations of the U.S.-led global order and pave the way for a new multipolar system in which Russia and its ally, China, play a significant role. Ukraine exemplifies the nature of post-Cold War conflicts, serving as a key battleground in the ongoing struggle between major powers—Russia, the European Union, and the United States—each of which leverages its own strategic tools and pressure mechanisms in this crisis.

2-1 Input of the Ukraine War

2-1-1 Causes of the Russian-Ukraine war

When a war is successful, little attention is paid to its causes, but when the outcome is disastrous, understanding how it happened becomes paramount. People want to know: how did we get into this terrible situation? Firstly, there are different dimensions and causes of the war in Ukraine, which include socio-linguistic, economic, cultural, and political aspects that can be traced back into history.

The current war is an extension of a historical conflict in Ukraine

A first friction between the Ukrainian population and the Russian political pressure, was provoked by the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich, and his decisions against an association agreement towards the European Union in 2013. The strong will of Ukrainian citizens and political movements in favour of a nationalist approach in opposition to Russian influence, led to a period of protests against the government, whose leader (Viktor) was, then, removed from power in 2014 during the Ukrainian Revolution (Woo, 2015, p. 384) in March 2014, Russian troops took control of the Ukrainian region of Crimea. Russian President Vladimir Putin cited the need to protect the rights of Russian citizens and Russian speakers in Crimea and southeast Ukraine. Russia then formally annexed the peninsula after Crimeans voted to join the Russian Federation in a disputed local referendum. The crisis heightened ethnic divisions, and two months later, pro-Russian separatists in the eastern Ukrainian regions of Donetsk and Luhansk held their own independence referendums (Demedziuk, 2017, p. 95).

Armed conflict in the regions quickly broke out between Russian-backed forces and the Ukrainian military. Russia denied military involvement, but both Ukraine and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) reported the buildup of Russian troops and military equipment near Donetsk and Russian cross-border shelling immediately following Crimea's annexation. Beginning in February 2015, France, Germany, Russia, and Ukraine attempted to kickstart negotiations to bring an end to the violence through the Minsk Accords. The agreement framework included provisions for a ceasefire, withdrawal of heavy weaponry, and full Ukrainian government control throughout the conflict zone. Efforts to reach a diplomatic settlement and satisfactory resolution, however, were largely unsuccessful (Freedman, 2014, p. 38).

In January 2018, the United States imposed new sanctions on twenty-one individuals—including a number of Russian officials—and nine companies linked to the conflict in eastern Ukraine. In March 2018, the U.S. Department of State approved the sale of anti-tank weapons to Ukraine, the first sale of lethal weaponry since the conflict began. In October 2018, Ukraine joined the United States and seven other NATO countries in a series of large-scale air exercises in western Ukraine. The exercises came after Russia held its own annual military exercises in September 2018, the largest since the fall of the Soviet Union.

In October 2021, months of intelligence gathering and observations of Russian troop movements, force build-up, and military contingency financing culminated in a White House briefing with U.S. intelligence, military, and diplomatic leaders on a near-certain mass-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine. The only remaining questions were when the attack would take place and whether the United States would be able to convince allies to act preemptively. Both were answered on February 24, 2022, when Russian forces invaded a largely unprepared Ukraine after Russian President Vladimir Putin authorized a “special military operation” against the country. In his statement, Putin claimed that the goal of the operation was to demilitarize and denazify Ukraine and end the alleged genocide of Russians in Ukrainian territory.

In early February 2022, satellite imagery showed the largest deployment of Russian troops to its border with Belarus since the end of the Cold War., the United States warned that Russia intended to invade Ukraine, citing Russia's growing military presence at the Russia-Ukraine border. President Putin then ordered troops to Luhansk and Donetsk, claiming the troops served a “peacekeeping” function. The United States responded by imposing sanctions ,On February 24, 2022, during a last-ditch UN Security Council effort to dissuade Russia from attacking Ukraine, Putin announced the beginning of a full-scale land, sea, and air invasion of Ukraine targeting Ukrainian military assets and cities across the country (Demedziuk, 2017, p. 118). U.S. President Joe Biden declared the attack “unprovoked and unjustified” and issued severe sanctions against top Kremlin officials, including Putin and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov; four of Russia's largest banks; and the Russian oil and gas industry in coordination with European allies. On March 2, 141 of 193 UN member states voted to condemn Russia's invasion in an emergency UN General Assembly session, demanding that Russia immediately withdraw from Ukraine (Raleigh & Dowd, 2015).

2-1-2 Ukraine is a geopolitical flash point

Ukraine was a cornerstone of the Soviet Union, the archrival of the United States during the Cold War. Behind only Russia, it was the second-most-populous and -powerful of the fifteen Soviet republics, home to much of the union's agricultural production, defense industries, and military, including the Black Sea Fleet and some of the nuclear arsenal. Ukraine was so vital to the union that its decision to sever ties in 1991 proved to be a coup de grace for the ailing superpower (Masters, 2023).

Ukraine is situated in the central part of Eastern Europe, on the crossroads of major transportation routes from Europe to Asia and from the Scandinavian states to the Mediterranean region. Most of Ukraine is located south-west of the Eastern European plain. Mountains occupy only 5% of Ukrainian territory: the Ukrainian Carpathian mountains in the west and the Crimean mountains in the south. The highest peak in Ukraine, Goverla Mountain (2,061 m), is situated in the Carpathians. Roman-Kosh peak (1,545 m) is the highest mountain in Crimea. The Ukraine's Black Sea coastline exceeds 1,500 km.



source:<https://www.cfr.org/background/ukraine-conflict-crossroads-europe-and-russia#chapter-title-0-5>

At this point specifically, it can be said that geography has placed Ukraine in a pivotal zone between Eastern and Western Europe, shaping its social and cultural fabric in terms of allegiance and identity. Instead of serving as a cultural, civilizational, and economic bridge between the two regions – given its diverse minorities and languages—Ukraine has become a battleground for Russo-Atlantic rivalry. It now stands as a focal point in the struggle for dominance over both nearby and distant strategic spheres.

2-1-3 Language and identity: Culture and language have deep symbolic relationships, functionally, each complementing the other. The linguistic, cultural and religious differences are so deep that it is difficult to speak of a united country, but rather of a divided country. Cultural and ethnic diversity is not exactly the problem, but the problem is when those differences are deep, and when they are linked to a larger conflict, which is the struggle of international axes for influence and control. Zelensky's liberal government, which since coming to power has launched an offensive against the Russian language and culture (Kulyk, 2013, p. 21). Procedurally, the Russian government had restricted the use of the Ukrainian language in media, and in education, Although, the official language in Ukraine is Ukrainian but Russian is still the most widespread; other languages spoken in Ukraine are Romanian, Polish, and Hungarian.

The struggle over the issue of language is still raised in every election and constitutional changes, which means that government institutions are unable to control the frequencies of the state's social formation. Putin stated that his actions were to protect the Russian population from the increasing violence arising during the Ukrainian revolution in addition, with a population of over a million Russian-speaking citizens in Crimea, Putin focused on the nationalistic sentiment within Crimea to constitute his claim (Panter, 2023, pp. 3-4). And claims that Russia is acknowledging the will of the people of Crimea in the referendum of March 2014, adhering to international norms and laws.

Furthermore, according to the federal constitutional law of Russia, admission of a foreign state into the Russian Federation shall be affected by mutual agreement of Russia and the interested state,

valid in this instance. Contrary to the realist perspective of power politics, constructivism focuses more than a state's identity, and interests, consequent by social norms, which can explain the conflict in Ukraine. Political leaders in Ukraine failed to create a common national identity acceptable to the Ukrainian majority that could contribute to the country's independence away from political and ideological quarrels, which led to increased tensions and the failure of cultural efforts to "Ukraineze Ukrainians." In light of this sharp division, war became possible and opportunities opened, to obtain greater gains and guarantees for Moscow. Not to mention, Ukraine was a vital area of influence of many powers Russia, the European Union, Poland, that is, the formation of Ukrainian identity can be understood from the other. as a response to the complexity of its position vis-à-vis Poland, Russia, the European Union, and, perhaps most importantly, vis-à-vis itself. Poland would feel more comfortable if Ukraine served as a buffer EU member state between Poland and Russia. Polish initiatives seemed to treat Ukraine instrumentally as a means of increasing Poland's security.

At the same time, the Ukrainians face Russia's willingness to maintain its post-imperial state. Moreover, ideological differences that permeate the Ukrainian society hinder the emergence of a strong and unified national identity. Russia has exhibited the principles of social constructivism to hold that their claim to Crimea is within the boundaries of international laws. Putin has used a sense of Russian identity in Crimea to justify Russian annexation. For centuries, Crimea was part of Russia, also emotional associations to a specific territorial identity influence how people view policy choices. And Putin defends his actions believing that Crimea's cultural links and Eastern Ukraine to Russia are stronger than they are to Ukraine and that they identify culturally as Russian. In contrast States such as European Union, the US, and Ukraine address the fact that Russia's invasion of Ukraine is against international laws and norms, adding to the instability in the international system.

2.2 Expansion of NATO's into the former Soviet sphere

Some Western analysts see Russia's 2022 invasion as the culmination of the Kremlin's growing resentment toward NATO's post-Cold War expansion into the former Soviet sphere of influence. Russian leaders, including Putin, have alleged that the United States and NATO's eye in the early 1990s to not expand the alliance into the former Soviet bloc. They view NATO's enlargement during this tumultuous period for Russia as a humiliating imposition about which they could do little but watch. In the weeks leading up to NATO's 2008 summit, President Vladimir Putin warned U.S. diplomats that steps to bring Ukraine into the alliance "would be a hostile act toward Russia." Months later, Russia went to war with Georgia, seemingly showcasing Putin's willingness to use force to secure his country's interests. Despite remaining a nonmember, Ukraine grew its ties with NATO in the years leading up to the 2022 invasion. Ukraine held annual military exercises with the alliance and, in 2020, became one of just six enhanced opportunity partners, a special status for the bloc's closest nonmember allies.

In the weeks leading up to its invasion, Russia made several major security demands of the United States and NATO, including that they cease expanding the alliance, seek Russian consent for certain NATO deployments,

Other experts have said that perhaps the most important motivating factor for Putin was his fear that Ukraine would continue to develop into a modern, Western-style democracy that would inevitably undermine his autocratic regime in Russia and dash his hopes of rebuilding a Russia-led sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. "[Putin] wants to destabilize Ukraine, frighten Ukraine," writes historian Anne Applebaum in the Atlantic "He wants Ukrainian democracy to fail. He wants the Ukrainian economy to collapse. He wants foreign investors to flee. He wants his neighbors—in Belarus, Kazakhstan, even Poland and Hungary—to doubt whether democracy will ever be viable, in the longer term, in their countries too."

2.2.1 International positions on the Russian intervention in Ukraine

Russia has deep cultural, economic, and political bonds with Ukraine, and in many ways Ukraine is central to Russia's identity and vision for itself in the world. Approximately eight million ethnic Russians were living in Ukraine as of 2001, according to a census taken that year, mostly in the south and east. Moscow claimed a duty to protect these people as a pretext for its actions in Crimea and the Donbas in 2014. After the Soviet collapse, many Russian politicians viewed the divorce with Ukraine

as a mistake of history and a threat to Russia's standing as a great power. Losing a permanent hold on Ukraine, and letting it fall into the Western orbit, would be seen by many as a major blow to Russia's international prestige. In 2022, Putin cast the escalating war with Ukraine as a part of a broader struggle against Western powers he says are intent on destroying Russia.

trade Russia was for a long time Ukraine's largest trading partner, although this link withered dramatically in recent years. China eventually surpassed Russia in trade with Ukraine. Prior to its invasion of Crimea, Russia had hoped to pull Ukraine into its single market, the Eurasian Economic Union, which today includes Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan.

Energy, Moscow relied on Ukrainian pipelines to pump its gas to customers in Central and Eastern Europe for decades, and it paid Kyiv billions of dollars per year in transit fees. The flow of Russian gas through Ukraine continued in early 2023 despite the hostilities between the two countries, but volumes were reduced and the pipelines remained in serious jeopardy.

Political sway, Russia was keen to preserve its political influence in Ukraine and throughout the former Soviet Union, particularly after its preferred candidate for Ukrainian president in 2004, Viktor Yanukovich, lost to a reformist competitor as part of the Orange Revolution popular movement. This shock to Russia's interests in Ukraine came after a similar electoral defeat for the Kremlin in Georgia in 2003, known as the Rose Revolution, and was followed by another—the Tulip Revolution—in Kyrgyzstan in 2005. Yanukovich later became president of Ukraine, in 2010, amid voter discontent with the Orange government.

Conclusion

The importance of this study lies in the fact that it sheds light on one of the most important historical events in the Twenty-First century, which is Ukrainian war which cast a shadow on international relations from a practical and theoretical sides, as it affected the overall interactions in the current system, and it represents for the first time since the early nineties of the last century an explicit return to familiar patterns of conflicts in the history of international relations due to its expansion in a way that portends the outbreak of a major war in which competing great powers stand on opposite sides. While this war is still in its early stages, it hasn't reached the level of mass destruction caused by other historical wars, and it is still too early to measure its full impact. However, it has become clear that its multidimensional repercussions are not limited to the military or political and economic fields only. The study concluded that the war has reinforced the division between East and West, it represents the beginning of a test for the influence of the great powers, it's an international issue in which all actors are concerned to achieve their national interests, well its repercussions on the international environment and its future effects depend on diplomatic and military development as well.

References

1. Aron, R. (2017). *Peace and war: a theory of international relations*. Routledge.
2. Demedziuk, S. (2017). The new dimension of war—the Ukraine conflict. *Security and Defence Quarterly*, 14(1), 91-109.
3. Freedman, L. (2014). Ukraine and the art of limited war. *Survival*, 56(6), 7-38.
4. Kulyk, V. (2013). Language and identity in post-Soviet Ukraine: Transformation of an unbroken bond. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies*, 5(2).
5. Masters, J. (2023). Ukraine: Conflict at the crossroads of Europe and Russia. *Council on Foreign Relations*, 14.
6. Metz, S., & Cuccia, P. R. (2011). *Defining war for the 21st century*. Strategic Studies Institute.
7. Panter, J. (2023). *Language of the Enemy: Impacts of the 2022 Russo-Ukrainian War on Linguistic and National Identity Paradigms in Ukraine*.
8. Raleigh, C., & Dowd, C. (2015). Armed conflict location and event data project (ACLED) codebook. *Find this resource*.
9. Van der Dennen, J. M. (1981). On war: Concepts, definitions, research data—a short literature review and bibliography. *Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies*.

10. Woo, P. K. (2015). The Russian hybrid war in the Ukraine crisis: Some characteristics and implications. *Korean journal of defense analysis*, 27(3), 383-400.

Received: 30.11.2024

Accepted: 10.02.2025