



# A Dual Theoretical Analysis of the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Insights from Realism and Liberalism

Mohammed Yassin Abesha

PhD Fellow, School of International Development and Cooperation, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China; mamila643@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*The Russia-Ukraine conflict remains one of the most critical geopolitical crises of the 21st century, significantly affecting global power dynamics and international relations. This article employs a dual theoretical framework Realism and Liberalism to explore the motivations and actions of Russia and Ukraine. Realism focuses on Russia's state-centric power politics, driven by national security concerns and territorial ambitions. In contrast, Liberalism highlights Ukraine's diplomatic engagements and international cooperation through institutions like NATO and the EU. By comparing these perspectives, this paper provides a comprehensive understanding of the conflict, contributing to the broader discussion of international relations theory and conflict resolution strategies. This analysis ultimately calls for a hybrid approach that leverages both the power politics of Realism and the cooperative mechanisms of Liberalism to address modern geopolitical crises.*

**KEYWORDS:** Russia-Ukraine conflict, Realism, Liberalism, International Relations, Power Politics, Diplomacy

## INTRODUCTION

The intricate geopolitical entanglement that is the Russia-Ukraine war has captured the interest of academics and decision-makers alike, necessitating a sophisticated analysis based on the wide range of theories surrounding international relations (Wolff, H., 2023). The Russia-Ukraine conflict, which escalated in 2014 following Russia's annexation of Crimea, represents more than just a localized dispute it has become a significant issue with global ramifications. This conflict challenges traditional assumptions in international relations by illustrating how regional tensions can spiral into broader geopolitical crises. The annexation of Crimea and the ongoing hostilities in Eastern Ukraine have not only reshaped the political landscape of Eastern Europe but also strained relations between global powers. At the heart of the conflict are fundamental questions about sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the balance of power in an increasingly interconnected world. The tension between Russia's assertive actions and Ukraine's struggle to defend its sovereignty illustrates the complexities of modern state behavior in a multipolar international system (Ferguson, 2014).

To better understand the complexities of this conflict, two dominant theories in international relations, Realism and Liberalism, provide valuable analytical frameworks. Realism, with its focus on power politics and state security, explains Russia's actions as part of a broader strategy to maintain

control over its immediate geopolitical neighborhood. Russia's strategic interests, particularly its desire to protect its borders from Western encroachment through NATO expansion, are central to its military interventions. Realists argue that Russia's aggressive posture is a rational response to its declining sphere of influence and the perceived threat posed by Western powers (Bajpai, 2023). This theory posits that Russia's pursuit of power is not unique but part of a broader pattern of state behavior where security concerns drive policy decisions.

Conversely, Liberalism offers a different perspective, emphasizing the importance of international institutions, diplomacy, and cooperation in mitigating conflicts. Ukraine's diplomatic efforts to strengthen its ties with the European Union and NATO reflect Liberalism's focus on collective security and the role of global institutions in upholding international norms. Liberal theorists suggest that Ukraine's appeal to international law and reliance on multilateral organizations aim to secure its sovereignty through peaceful means, rather than through military confrontation (Raik, 2016; Mearsheimer, 2014). This dual-theoretical approach, integrating both Realism and Liberalism, provides a more comprehensive understanding of the ongoing conflict by highlighting the interplay between power politics and international cooperation.

## DEFINING THE CORE ISSUE

The Russia-Ukraine conflict presents a significant challenge



to understanding the intersection between traditional power politics and modern international diplomacy (Nychyk, A., 2022). Despite various efforts to mediate the conflict through sanctions, ceasefire agreements, and diplomatic interventions, the situation has continued to escalate, with neither side achieving a lasting resolution. At the heart of this issue is the tension between Russia's drive for regional dominance and Ukraine's push for international support, particularly through institutions like NATO and the European Union. These conflicting goals have deepened the geopolitical rift, turning the crisis into a broader international concern that stretches beyond just the two countries involved (Benedikter, 2022).

Realism and Liberalism offer divergent, yet complementary, explanations for understanding the motivations behind this ongoing crisis. Realism posits that Russia's actions are fundamentally driven by its desire to secure its geopolitical interests and prevent NATO's expansion into its sphere of influence. In contrast, Liberalism emphasizes Ukraine's attempts to integrate into the international community and uphold global norms, particularly by leveraging institutions such as NATO and the EU to garner support. While Realism frames the conflict as a zero-sum game of power politics, Liberalism highlights the potential for multilateral cooperation and diplomacy to create a path toward conflict resolution (Mearsheimer, 2014). This paper aims to bridge the gap in understanding how these competing motivations have shaped the conflict and explore how international actors can intervene more effectively.

## RESEARCH AIMS AND SCOPE

### General Objective

To explore and critically analyze the Russia-Ukraine conflict through the dual theoretical lenses of Realism and Liberalism to provide a comprehensive understanding of the conflict's motivations, dynamics, and implications for global international relations.

### Specific Objectives

1. To analyze Russia's motivations and actions in the conflict from a Realist perspective, focusing on state security, territorial ambitions, and power politics.
2. To examine Ukraine's response to the conflict through the lens of Liberalism, emphasizing its diplomatic efforts, international cooperation, and reliance on global institutions such as NATO and the European Union.
3. To compare and contrast how both Realism and Liberalism provide different yet complementary insights into the behavior of states in the international system during conflict.
4. To provide recommendations on how international actors can approach conflict resolution by integrating both Realist and Liberalist strategies to ensure a balanced approach that addresses both security and diplomatic concerns.

## CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS AND ANALYTICAL LENS

### Realism

Realism, a theory deeply rooted in the works of classical thinkers like Thucydides and Thomas Hobbes, posits that the international system is anarchic, meaning there is no overarching authority to regulate the behavior of states. In this system, states are primarily motivated by self-interest, seeking to maximize their power and security to ensure survival in a competitive international environment. Thucydides' reflections on the Peloponnesian War illustrate how power struggles often lead to conflict, while Hobbes' notion of the "state of nature" highlights the constant fear and mistrust between actors in an anarchic system (Thucydides, 1972; Hobbes, 1996). These foundational ideas of Realism continue to inform contemporary analyses of state behavior, particularly in conflict situations like the Russia-Ukraine crisis.

Russia's actions in the Ukraine conflict closely follow the Realist framework. The annexation of Crimea in 2014 and Russia's military involvement in Eastern Ukraine are seen as strategic moves aimed at securing key geopolitical assets, such as control over the Black Sea (Kumar, A., 2023). From a Realist perspective, these actions are designed to bolster Russia's position against NATO's eastward expansion, which Russia perceives as a direct threat to its regional dominance and security. According to Realist thought, when a state feels that its sphere of influence is under threat, it will often resort to aggressive measures to reassert control and protect its interests (Ferguson, 2014).

Realists further argue that Russia's aggressive foreign policy is motivated by a fear of losing influence over former Soviet states and the increasing presence of Western powers near its borders. The expansion of NATO towards Russia's periphery has heightened Moscow's sense of vulnerability, prompting it to take assertive steps to prevent further encroachment. By engaging militarily in Ukraine, Russia seeks to restore its status as a dominant regional power and maintain a strategic buffer zone between itself and the West (Ezzeldin, 2015; Kumar, 2023). In this view, Russia's actions are not merely reactive but part of a broader strategy to protect its long-term geopolitical interests in an anarchic international system where power and security are paramount.

### Liberalism

Liberalism, in contrast to Realism, offers a fundamentally different interpretation of state behavior by emphasizing the importance of cooperation, international institutions, and global norms (Donaldson, & Nadkarni, 2018). Unlike Realism, which views the international system as a self-help arena dominated by power politics, Liberalism believes that the anarchic nature of international relations can be mitigated through institutions such as the United Nations, NATO, and the European Union. These organizations,

according to Liberal theory, play a critical role in promoting diplomacy, fostering peace, and ensuring collective security among states. Liberalists argue that through cooperation and adherence to international norms, states can avoid conflict and build long-lasting peace (Raik, 2016).

Ukraine's efforts to align itself with Western institutions are a clear example of Liberalist thinking. Ukraine has positioned itself as a cooperative state that values multilateral diplomacy by seeking membership in NATO and deeper integration with the European Union. This strategy reflects Ukraine's reliance on international institutions for security guarantees and broader political and economic stability. Through cooperation with these institutions, Ukraine aims to counterbalance the threat posed by Russian aggression and integrate itself into the global community, ensuring its sovereignty and long-term security (Benedikter, 2022). This approach underscores the Liberal belief that diplomacy and international partnerships are more effective than unilateral actions or military force.

Moreover, Liberalism emphasizes that Ukraine's pursuit of international support is not solely about safeguarding its security; it is also about upholding the broader international order. Liberal theorists argue that respect for sovereignty, adherence to international law, and the protection of global norms are essential components of a stable and peaceful world (Mearsheimer, 2014). Ukraine's use of diplomatic channels, including its appeals to international organizations and its efforts to rally international sanctions against Russia, underscores the Liberal belief that shared values and cooperation can help resolve conflicts. This reliance on institutions highlights the conviction within Liberal theory that peace can be achieved through collaboration, international law, and collective security mechanisms.

### **QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

This study employs a comparative theoretical framework to analyze the Russia-Ukraine conflict, utilizing the lenses of Realism and Liberalism to uncover the underlying motivations and actions of the key actors. The methodology is qualitative, relying on an extensive review of literature, including academic articles, policy papers, and official reports from international organizations. The Realist analysis focuses on Russia's military interventions, strategic objectives, and geopolitical maneuvers. Primary sources such as governmental statements, historical data on Russia-NATO relations, and scholarly works on Russian foreign policy are examined to provide insight into how Russia's actions align with Realist principles of power, security, and territorial dominance (Ferguson, 2014). This approach helps clarify how Russia's fear of NATO encroachment and desire to maintain regional hegemony drive its involvement in Ukraine.

On the Liberal side, the analysis centers on Ukraine's diplomatic initiatives and its reliance on international

institutions like NATO and the European Union. The study draws from policy reports, international law documents, and Ukraine's engagement with multilateral organizations to explore how liberal ideals such as cooperation, collective security, and adherence to global norms inform Ukraine's strategy. Sources include reports from the EU and NATO on Ukraine's integration efforts, as well as analyses of international responses to the conflict (Raik, 2016). By integrating both Realism and Liberalism, this dual-theoretical approach provides a holistic understanding of the conflict's evolution and sheds light on potential pathways toward resolution, combining the security-focused framework of Realism with the institutional and cooperative mechanisms emphasized by Liberalism.

### **CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND INSIGHTS**

#### **Application of Realism to the Russia-Ukraine Conflict**

From a Realist perspective, Russia's actions in the Ukraine conflict are driven by a fundamental concern for its national security and geopolitical interests (Mamlyuk, 2015). Realism posits that states operate in an anarchic international system where self-preservation and power maximization are paramount. Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 is viewed through this lens as a strategic, preemptive measure aimed at securing vital military assets, particularly the naval base at Sevastopol, which is crucial for Russia's power projection in the Black Sea and beyond. The Black Sea region, historically significant for Russia's maritime capabilities, plays a key role in maintaining its influence over Eastern Europe. By controlling Crimea, Russia not only strengthens its military presence but also safeguards a vital access point that is central to its strategic interests (Ferguson, 2014). In Realist terms, this move was motivated by the need to prevent NATO from encroaching further into Russia's traditional sphere of influence.

Moreover, Realist scholars argue that Russia's continued involvement in Eastern Ukraine serves a similar strategic purpose acting as a buffer zone between itself and NATO. From Moscow's viewpoint, allowing Ukraine to fall under Western influence represents a direct threat to its security and its regional dominance. Realism explains Russia's actions as an attempt to prevent Ukraine from becoming a Western outpost on its border, thereby maintaining a critical geopolitical balance. The conflict, therefore, exemplifies power politics in action, where states seek to preserve their dominance and security in a zero-sum game of international relations (Kumar, 2023; Bajpai, 2023). By intervening in Ukraine, Russia is reasserting its role as a regional power and signaling to the West that it will not tolerate any further encroachment into its sphere of influence.

#### **Application of Liberalism to the Russia-Ukraine Conflict**

From a Liberalist perspective, Ukraine's response to the

Russia-Ukraine conflict is firmly rooted in principles of international cooperation and multilateralism. Liberalism emphasizes the role of international institutions and the importance of upholding global norms to maintain peace and security (BEREBON, 2023). In line with this view, Ukraine has actively sought to strengthen its relationships with Western institutions, particularly NATO and the European Union, framing its struggle not merely as a regional defense but as a larger battle to protect the international order. By appealing to international law and the collective security mechanisms provided by these organizations, Ukraine has presented itself as a defender of the Liberal values of sovereignty, democracy, and self-determination (Raik, 2016). This strategy reflects Ukraine's understanding that aligning itself with global institutions offers both security and legitimacy in its conflict with Russia, which is portrayed as an aggressor challenging international norms.

Furthermore, Ukraine's reliance on diplomatic negotiations, sanctions, and international pressure against Russia highlights Liberalism's belief that global cooperation can effectively manage state behavior and reduce the risk of violent conflict (Allison, 2022). By leveraging multilateral diplomacy and seeking widespread international condemnation of Russia's actions, Ukraine has been able to gather economic and political support from the global community. Liberalism views Ukraine's strategy as a way to foster international solidarity, positioning the conflict as part of a broader ideological struggle between autocratic governance (represented by Russia) and democratic values (embodied by Ukraine and its Western allies) (Benedikter, 2022). This approach underscores the Liberal notion that international institutions and frameworks are crucial for ensuring collective security and promoting peaceful conflict resolution.

### **CROSS-THEORETICAL EVALUATION**

The Realist and Liberalist frameworks provide distinct, yet complementary, interpretations of the Russia-Ukraine conflict, each offering valuable insights into the motivations and behaviors of the involved states. Realism, with its emphasis on power politics and security concerns, explains Russia's actions as calculated moves aimed at reasserting its dominance and protecting its national interests. Realists argue that Russia's annexation of Crimea and involvement in Eastern Ukraine are logical responses to perceived external threats, particularly the eastward expansion of NATO, which Russia views as a direct challenge to its sphere of influence. By reasserting control over these regions, Russia seeks to secure its strategic assets and maintain its regional power (Mearsheimer, 2014). This Realist interpretation underscores how state behavior is driven by the desire to preserve security and territorial control in an anarchic international system.

In contrast, Liberalism focuses on Ukraine's diplomatic efforts and its reliance on international institutions to resolve

the conflict (Grieco, 1988). From a Liberalist perspective, Ukraine's strategy has been to engage the international community through multilateral cooperation, aligning itself with institutions such as NATO and the European Union. Liberalism emphasizes the role of international norms and legal frameworks, highlighting Ukraine's appeals to global institutions for support, sanctions against Russia, and diplomatic solutions. Ukraine's actions reflect a broader commitment to uphold international law, defend sovereignty, and promote collective security (Raik, 2016). In this view, cooperation, rather than confrontation, is key to conflict resolution, and Ukraine's diplomatic engagement demonstrates how international institutions can manage state behavior and mitigate conflict.

Together, these theories illustrate the multifaceted nature of the Russia-Ukraine conflict. While Realism highlights the centrality of power politics and security concerns, Liberalism points to the potential for diplomacy and multilateral cooperation to shape the outcome. The combination of these perspectives suggests that any resolution of the conflict will likely require a hybrid approach—one that incorporates elements of both power politics and institutional cooperation. A successful strategy may need to balance the Realist imperatives of maintaining security and territorial control with the liberal vision of resolving disputes through diplomacy and adherence to international norms (Bajpai, 2023). Ultimately, understanding the conflict through both lenses provides a more comprehensive framework for addressing the complex dynamics at play.

### **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

**Enhanced Multilateral Diplomacy:** International actors should ramp up their diplomatic efforts to mediate the conflict. This means going beyond sanctions and actively pursuing structured negotiations that bring key global players, such as the United Nations, the European Union, and regional organizations, into the fold. Creating formal diplomatic platforms that offer Russia a seat at the table, alongside Ukraine, ensures all parties' concerns are addressed. This approach should focus on balancing Ukraine's sovereignty with Russia's security concerns, fostering compromise through ongoing dialogue.

**Strengthening Collective Security while Addressing Russia's Concerns:** NATO and the European Union must continue to provide security assurances to Ukraine, ensuring it can defend itself against aggression. However, this military support must be complemented by diplomatic efforts to address Russia's concerns about NATO's expansion. Establishing new regional security arrangements and introducing confidence-building measures, such as arms control or military transparency, could help ease tensions while maintaining Ukraine's right to self-defense.

**Hybrid Conflict Resolution Strategy:** A hybrid approach

that combines power balancing with cooperative diplomacy is necessary for sustainable conflict resolution. Realist concerns, such as the need for regional security and buffer zones, should be acknowledged while leveraging Liberalist mechanisms such as international institutions, diplomatic negotiations, and adherence to global norms. This dual approach offers a path to de-escalation by addressing both the immediate security threats and the broader international principles at stake.

**Economic and Humanitarian Support with Accountability:** The international community must bolster Ukraine's economic resilience through targeted aid that rebuilds infrastructure, supports displaced populations, and strengthens democratic institutions. At the same time, transparent mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that humanitarian and financial aid is delivered effectively and does not exacerbate corruption or conflict. Encouraging economic cooperation between Eastern Europe and Russia through diplomatic channels could also promote longer-term stability.

**Localized Ceasefires and Gradual Peace-Building:** Implementing localized ceasefires in conflict-prone regions, such as Eastern Ukraine, could serve as an initial step toward broader peace. Confidence-building measures between Ukrainian and Russian forces, potentially overseen by neutral international peacekeepers, could create the necessary environment for future negotiations. These small-scale agreements can gradually build momentum toward comprehensive peace settlements that address the larger issues of territorial sovereignty and security.

## **SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS AND FINAL REFLECTIONS**

The Russia-Ukraine conflict highlights the complexities of modern international relations, where traditional power politics intersect with the growing importance of international cooperation and norms. By applying both Realist and Liberalist perspectives, it becomes clear that no single approach can fully address the deep-rooted issues driving this conflict. Realism explains Russia's actions as efforts to secure its sphere of influence and protect its strategic interests, particularly in response to perceived threats from NATO. Meanwhile, Liberalism underscores Ukraine's reliance on international diplomacy, law, and institutions to protect its sovereignty and align itself with the global order.

The resolution of this conflict requires a hybrid approach, combining the hard security measures that Realism emphasizes with the diplomatic and cooperative strategies advocated by Liberalism. Only through a balanced strategy that integrates both perspectives can a sustainable solution be achieved—one that addresses Russia's security concerns, reinforces Ukraine's sovereignty, and promotes broader regional stability. Furthermore, continued international

engagement, economic support, and targeted diplomatic efforts will be essential in moving from conflict to lasting peace.

In the end, the Russia-Ukraine conflict is not just about territorial disputes but about the broader dynamics of international power and cooperation. A successful resolution will not only reshape the future of Ukraine and Russia but also set a precedent for how the international community handles similar geopolitical crises moving forward.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Allison, R. (2022). Russia, Ukraine and state survival through neutrality. *International affairs*, 98(6), 1849-1872.
2. Bajpai, K. (Ed.). (2023). *How Realist Is India's National Security Policy?* Taylor & Francis.
3. Benedikter, R. (2022). The new global direction: from "one globalization" to "two globalizations"? Russia's war in Ukraine in global perspective. *New Global Studies*, 17(1), 71-104.
4. BEREON, C. (2023). Analysing the Russia-Ukraine Conflict from Liberal and Realist Perspectives. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 6(2), 87- 98.
5. Donaldson, R. H., & Nadkarni, V. (2018). *The foreign policy of Russia: changing systems, enduring interests.* Routledge.
6. Ezzeldin, M. (2015). *US-Russia relations after the crisis in Ukraine.*
7. Ferguson, I. A. (2014). *Global 'sweet enemies': the EU-Russia security dilemma* (Doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews).
8. Grieco, J.M. (1988). Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: a realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism. *International organization*, 42(3), 485-507.
9. Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, edited by Richard Tuck, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
10. Kumar, A. (2023). *An analytical study of Russia-Ukraine war in reference to the offensive realist approach in international relations.*
11. Mamlyuk, B. N. (2015). The Ukraine Crisis, Cold War II, and International Law. *German Law Journal*, 16(3), 479-522.
12. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: the liberal delusions that provoked Putin. *Foreign Aff.*, 93, 77.
13. Nychyk, A. (2022). *Strategic Decision-making in Times of War: An Analysis of EU-UkraineRussia Relations During the First Year of the Conflict in Ukraine* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester).

14. Raik, K. (2016). Liberalism and geopolitics in EU–Russia relations: rereading the “Baltic factor”. *European Security*, 25(2), 237-255.
15. Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Rex Warner, Penguin Books, 1972.
16. Wolff, H. (2023). *From the War in Ukraine to an Ever-Closer Union? German Foreign Policy as a Case Study on the Integratory Force of Crises within the European Union* (Master’s thesis).

Citation: Mohammed Yassin Abesha, “A Dual Theoretical Analysis of the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Insights from Realism and Liberalism”, *American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol 10, no. 1, 2024, pp. 103-108.

Copyright © 2024 Mohammed Yassin Abesha, This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.