

CARITAS UNIVERSITY AMORJI-NIKE, EMENE, ENUGU STATE**CARITAS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLITICAL STUDIES
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS****CIJPSIR, Volume 1, Issue 1 (2024)****Sovereignty, Strategy, and Statecraft: A Clausewitzian Perspective on the
Russia-Ukraine Crisis****Monday E. Dickson¹
Felix Idongesit Oyosoro²****Authors' Affiliation**

¹Department of Political Science
Akwa Ibom State University, Obio
Akpa Campus, Nigeria.
mondaydickson@aksu.edu.ng

²Senior Researcher
Conflict Research Network West
Africa (CORNWA)
Abuja, Nigeria
oyosoro4u@gmail.com

Keywords:

*Clausewitzian theory,
Military force,
National policy,
Politics,
Russia-Ukraine war.*

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian conflict through the lens of Carl von Clausewitz's theories on war, specifically his concepts of the nature of war, the "trinity" of war, and the idea of war as a continuation of politics by other means. Clausewitz's theories underscore the inherent political dimensions of warfare, the dynamic interplay between military power and national policy, and the unpredictable nature of conflict. By applying a Clausewitzian framework, this paper examines how historical, cultural, and political factors influence the conflict and shape the decision-making processes of the involved actors. Utilizing a case study research design, primary data were gathered through focus group discussions with prominent historians, foreign policy experts, and international relations scholars. Additional data were sourced from scholarly books, journal articles, and reports by think tanks and international organizations, including the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the International Crisis Group, and NATO. Findings indicate that Russia's invasion represents a continuation of political objectives driven by aspirations for control and influence over Ukraine, while Ukraine's resistance embodies national will and the defense of sovereignty, highlighting the critical role of public opinion in conflict dynamics. Moreover, the study underscores the Clausewitzian view of diplomacy as an essential component of statecraft in wartime. The research concludes that sustained diplomatic engagement and open channels of communication, potentially facilitated by neutral third-party mediators, could play a pivotal role in de-escalating the conflict by focusing on shared interests and prospects for long-term stability.

Introduction

Throughout human history, warfare and the threat of violence have been commonplace. The 20th century, in particular, witnessed a significant increase in wars and violent crises marked by both world wars, numerous regional conflicts, and various forms of civil unrest, due to the rise of nationalism, imperialism, and ideological conflicts, among other factors. Prior to the 20th century, the Thirty Years' War, which took place between 1618 and 1648 and involving major nations including Sweden, France, and Spain, caused a great deal of social and economic upheaval, mostly in Germany. Therefore, the Peace of Westphalia, which was signed at the end of the war in 1648 established the concepts of state sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of other states as well as laid the foundation for contemporary international relations (Parker, 1997; Croxford, 2018). However, the most significant violent events of the 20th century were World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945). World War I, also known as the Great War, was primarily instigated by nationalism, imperialism, militarism, and a tangled web of alliances (Keegan, 1998). The war had devastating effects on international efforts to promote global peace and its aftermath shown that a new world order was required for the future. This eventually led to the formation of the League of Nations on January 1920 (Henig, 2010).

Consequently, the League's Covenant had a number of important clauses designed to advance peace and avert future hostilities between nations; among these was the pledge to abolish war as a means of settling disputes. The Covenant, in other words, presented the prohibition of war as a moral requirement, stressing the necessity for countries to actively and constructively seek peace instead of letting hostilities worsen. As a result, the League symbolised the first significant action taken in the international system to end war in state-to-state interactions. Similarly, the core principle of the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact, formally known as the Pact of Paris, "condemns recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounces it as an instrument of national policy" (Wallace, 1982). Following the outbreak of the Second World War, the League became largely irrelevant in the large currents of international relations, leading to the formation of the United Nations (UN) in 1945. In the same vein, the

UN Charter forbade the use of war as a tool of national politics, underlined the importance of world peace in its preamble clause, and pledged to *save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war*. Specifically, the clause reflects a fundamental commitment to peace and stability on a global scale. Overall, it serves as a guiding principle for international relations and reinforces the moral imperative to address the root causes of conflict to prevent future wars.

However, global geopolitics and security paradigms were drastically altered by major conflicts, including the Cold War (1947-1991), which introduced a different kind of violence characterised by proxy wars, nuclear arms races, and ideological confrontations between the United States and the Soviet Union; conflicts in Korea (1950-1953) and Vietnam (1955-1975), where direct military engagements were often replaced by indirect conflicts involving local forces supported by superpowers (Gaddis, 2005). These conflicts, according to Blight and Lang (1999), were fuelled by decolonisation movements as newly independent nations sought to navigate the tensions between the capitalist West and the communist East. Others include the Suez Crisis (1956)—military intervention by Israel, the United Kingdom, and France in Egypt after the nationalisation of the Suez Canal; the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) exemplified the Cold War's potential for catastrophic escalation, as both superpowers came perilously close to nuclear war; the First Gulf War (1990–1991), triggered by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait; the Iraq War (2003 -2011), initiated by the US-led invasion to overthrow Saddam Hussein, followed by a prolonged insurgency and civil conflict (Dickson, 2013); and the Syrian Civil War (2011-present), which according to Eminue and Dickson (2013, p. 6) led to the emergence of two opposing groups – the Syrian National Council (SNC) that supported the ousting of president Bashar al-Assad and the National Co-ordination Committee (NCC) that advocated for dialogue. These conflicts had a significant impact on worldwide peace and security.

Several theories put out by academics and philosophers have had a substantial impact on the study of war in the global system. The causes, dynamics, and outcomes of state disputes can be understood using the frameworks offered by these theories. Therefore, "war as a continuation of policy

by other means," by Carl von Clausewitz, has found important applicability in the continuing conflict between Russia and Ukraine. This claim holds that military action is used in battle to accomplish goals that cannot be fulfilled by diplomatic or economic means. A contemporary example of this theory in action is the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022, which shows how historical narratives, national security concerns, and geopolitical goals all come together to push states towards military conflict.

Problem statement and hypothetical constructs

Since it started in 2014, the conflict between Russia and Ukraine has been a highly controversial topic in political discourse. A closer look at the historical European tradition of war definitions shows that the military confrontation between the two nations satisfies all the requirements for a recognised armed struggle, even though some Western academics and politicians minimise its importance. A noteworthy theoretical achievement is the creation of a theory of war that incorporates aspects of sociological and normative viewpoints. The general theory of war is the only paradigm that can adequately explain the claim that war is the continuation of policy through alternative means. This perspective sees war as a special kind of policy, a means for implementing it, and ultimately a political act. This theory assigns different roles to various kinds of political communities, including rebellions, intrastate relations, and state-to-state relations. The rivalry between states is regarded as the most authentic kind of warfare and is the most straightforward manifestation of the reasoning for this kind of conflict.

Notwithstanding the opposition of academics who reject "geopolitical thinking," it is critical to acknowledge that political communities must wage war and use the path of least resistance to accomplish their objectives. The ultimate aim of war is victory, and when one party gives up on this objective, their activities are no longer regarded as state war. The end of a fight occurs when both sides understand they are unable to accomplish their goals. In essence, war is a distinct kind of political conflict as well as the continuation of governmental policy through various channels. Although they are driven to wage battle to maximise their respective gains, participants eventually realise that compromise is required.

The pertinent questions addressed are: How do the political objectives of Russia and Ukraine shape their

military strategies, and in what ways do these strategies reflect Clausewitz's concept of war as an extension of politics? What role do non-military instruments of power (such as diplomacy, economic sanctions, and information warfare) play in the context of the Russian-Ukraine war, and how do they align with or challenge Clausewitzian principles? What lessons can be derived from the Russian-Ukraine conflict regarding the applicability of Clausewitzian theory to contemporary warfare, and how might these insights influence future military and political strategies? Consequently, the paper fulfils the following objectives: to examine how Carl von Clausewitz's principles, particularly the idea that war is an extension of political aims, manifest in the strategies and motivations behind the Russian-Ukraine conflict; second, to assess the influence of non-military factors such as economic sanctions, international alliances, and public opinion on the conflict, and how these elements align with or diverge from Clausewitz's theories; and third, to evaluate the outcomes of the Russian-Ukraine war in light of Clausewitzian theory, considering what lessons can be drawn for future conflicts.

To address these central problems, the study hypothesized that: Firstly, the military strategies employed by both Russia and Ukraine are likely driven by their quests to achieve specific political ends rather than being solely reactive to battlefield developments; secondly, the effectiveness of the conflict tend to be significantly influenced by the integration of non-military strategies, such as economic sanctions and diplomatic efforts, which serve to complement military actions; and thirdly, the dynamics of the Russian-Ukraine war likely to demonstrate that the evolution of conflict in the 21st century necessitates a re-examination of Clausewitz's ideas to account for new forms of power and influence in warfare.

Theoretical Framework

Although the Russian-Ukrainian War can be analysed through various theoretical lenses such as realism, constructivism, hybrid warfare theory, just war theory, deterrence theory, offensive and defensive realism, and international security theory, among others, the Clausewitzian Theory espoused by Carl von Clausewitz is considered most suitable to guide the paper. Clausewitz (1832) argued that war is fundamentally a political instrument that serves state

interests. The theory, therefore, assumes as follows: Firstly, war is an extension of political will; its conduct is driven by the objectives of state policy. This supposition highlights that the primary purpose of war is to serve political objectives, suggesting that military engagement is a tool for states to realise their political goals. For Clausewitz, the essence of war is deeply intertwined with the political context in which it occurs; that is, states could engage in warfare to achieve outcomes such as territorial expansion, regime change, or the protection of national interests. For example, the motivations behind Russia's actions in Ukraine can be linked to its desire to maintain influence in the post-Soviet space and to counter NATO's expansion (Klein, 2022). Therefore, the relationship between war and politics is reciprocal. While war serves political purposes, political conditions also influence military strategy.

Secondly, the unpredictable nature of war involves numerous factors, including chance and the unpredictability of state behaviour. Here, Carl von Clausewitz emphasised that chance plays a significant role in warfare. He argued that uncertainty and the "fog of war" complicate decision-making and can lead to unexpected outcomes. This uncertainty arises from various factors, including incomplete information, the unpredictable nature of combat, and the complexities of military engagements. For instance, in the Russian-Ukrainian War, the initial underestimation of Ukrainian resistance by Russian forces exemplifies how chance can alter the course of conflict (Klein, 2022). States operate within a complex web of domestic and international pressures that can lead to unpredictable outcomes in war. Political leaders may respond to public sentiment, economic conditions, or international reactions in ways that can change military strategies or objectives mid-conflict. For instance, shifts in US foreign policy during the Vietnam War, influenced by public opinion and anti-war sentiment, led to significant changes in military engagement strategies (Luttwak, 2001). The unpredictable nature of war, driven by chance and the variability of human or state behaviour, underscores the complexity of military conflict.

Thirdly, Clausewitz's "remarkable trinity of war" is a foundational concept in his theory of warfare, presenting a framework for understanding the complex nature of war. This trinity consists of three

interrelated elements: passion, chance, and reason. Each component plays a critical role in the dynamics of conflict, influencing the conduct and outcomes of war. The first element of Clausewitz's trinity is passion, which encompasses the emotions that drive individuals and societies to engage in war. This includes nationalism, hatred, and the desire for revenge. The public's emotional response can fuel a war effort and sustain it through challenging times. In the context of the Russian-Ukrainian War, the strong national sentiment and resilience of the Ukrainian people against aggression illustrate how passion can galvanise support for the war (Klein, 2022). Similarly, Russian nationalism has influenced public support for military actions. The second component, chance, refers to the unpredictability inherent in warfare. This includes the effects of unforeseen events, mistakes, and the chaos of battle. Clausewitz acknowledged that despite careful planning, the nature of war involves a significant degree of uncertainty and randomness. The early phases of the Ukraine conflict showcased this unpredictability, where both sides encountered unexpected challenges and opportunities that influenced their military strategies and outcomes (Mahnken, 2020).

The third element is reason, which pertains to the rational calculations made by political leaders and military strategists. This aspect emphasises the need to align military actions with political objectives, ensuring that warfare serves a strategic purpose. The strategic decisions made by NATO in response to the conflict, aimed at deterring further Russian aggression while avoiding confrontation, exemplify the rational considerations underpinning state actions (Fischer, 2023). Clausewitz, therefore, argued that these three elements are interdependent and must be balanced to understand the nature of war fully. For instance, while passion can motivate troops and societies, it must be guided by rational political objectives. Conversely, chance can disrupt rational plans, requiring adaptability and responsiveness from military leaders. The remarkable trinity remains relevant in contemporary warfare, where the interplay of emotion, unpredictability, and rationality continues to shape military and political outcomes. The ongoing Russian-Ukrainian conflict exemplifies how these elements interact in real time, influencing both strategy and public perception.

Background to Russia-Ukraine Conflict

The conflict between Russia and Ukraine has deep historical roots, but it became particularly pronounced in the 21st century. Scholars and writers have explored the crisis from various aspects including historical ties, political dynamics, and international relations. For instance, Subtelny (2009) opined that Ukraine has a complex history with Russia, dating back to the establishment of Kievan Rus' in the 9th century, which is considered a cultural and political precursor to both modern-days, Russia and Ukraine. According to Applebaum (2017), Ukraine was divided among various powers, including the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Russian Empire over the centuries. However, the 20th century saw Ukraine suffer immensely, especially during the Holodomor (1932-1933), a man-made famine orchestrated by Stalin's regime that led to millions of deaths. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, Ukraine declared independence, leading to a significant re-evaluation of its national identity and sovereignty. Despite independence, Ukraine's political landscape remained divided, with a notable pro-Russian sentiment in the eastern regions, particularly in Donetsk and Luhansk, while the western regions leaned towards Europe (Wilson, 2014).

The immediate backdrop to the current conflict began in late 2013 when then-President Viktor Yanukovich suspended an association agreement with the European Union, opting instead for closer ties with Russia. This decision, as Kuzio (2015) has pointed out, triggered mass protests known as the Euromaidan movement, which culminated in Yanukovich fleeing to Russia in February 2014. In the chaos that followed, Russia annexed Crimea in March 2014, claiming it was protecting ethnic Russians and Russian speakers. Studies have shown that the annexation was driven by several strategic reasons, including geopolitical, military, and economic. From the geopolitical consideration, Mankoff (2014) posits that Crimea's location is critical for controlling the Black Sea. By annexing Crimea, Russia aimed to reassert its influence in a region historically significant to its national security and foreign policy. This move was partly a response to NATO's eastward expansion, which Russia perceives as a threat (Oyosoro & Bassey 2023). From the military strategic standpoint, the Black Sea Fleet is stationed in Crimea, and its annexation would

allow Russia to secure its naval base in Sevastopol. This strategic military advantage enhances Russia's capability to project power in the Mediterranean and counter NATO operations (Balmforth, 2014). Moreover, Crimea has resources and economic potential, particularly in tourism and energy. Therefore, control over Crimea would enable Russia to tap into these resources and integrate the region into its economic sphere, potentially strengthening its economic leverage in the region (Friedman, 2014). Similarly, the annexation also served to bolster domestic support for the Russian government, tapping into nationalistic sentiments and portraying the government as a defender of ethnic Russians and Russian speakers in Crimea (Galeotti, 2014).

However, the annexation was met with widespread condemnation from the international community, particularly from Western nations, which responded by imposing a series of sanctions aimed at punishing Russia for its actions and deterring further aggression. Firstly, the international community viewed it as a violation of international law, specifically the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which prohibits the acquisition of territory by force. The UN General Assembly passed Resolution 68/262, affirming Ukraine's territorial integrity and recognizing Crimea as part of Ukraine (United Nations, 2014). Secondly, the United States, the European Union, Canada, and other allies implemented comprehensive sanctions against Russia. These sanctions targeted key sectors of the Russian economy, including finance, energy, and defence, and aimed to isolate Russia diplomatically and economically (Klein, 2015). The sanctions also included travel bans and asset freezes on individuals involved in the annexation. Thirdly, the annexation and subsequent sanctions heightened tensions between Russia and the West, contributing to a prolonged standoff that has influenced international relations, security policies, and military strategies in Europe and beyond (Bremmer, 2016).

Following the annexation of Crimea, pro-Russian separatists in Eastern Ukraine declared independence, leading to armed conflict between Ukrainian forces and separatists supported by Russia. This conflict has resulted in significant loss of life and displacement, with estimates suggesting over 14,000 deaths and millions displaced (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2020). The conflict has also highlighted geopolitical tensions between

Russia and NATO, with NATO countries providing varying levels of support to Ukraine, including military assistance. The situation in Eastern Ukraine remains volatile, with ongoing skirmishes and a humanitarian crisis. Consequently, the Russian-Ukrainian conflict is a product of historical grievances, national identity struggles, and geopolitical manoeuvring.

Analysis

In the introductory section, the study poses three questions - How do the political objectives of Russia and Ukraine shape their military strategies, and in what ways do these strategies reflect Clausewitz's concept of war as an extension of politics? What role do non-military instruments of power (such as diplomacy, economic sanctions, and information warfare) play in the context of the Russian-Ukraine war, and how do they align with or challenge Clausewitzian principles? What lessons can be derived from the Russian-Ukraine conflict regarding the applicability of Clausewitzian theory to contemporary warfare, and how might these insights influence future military and political strategies? These questions serve as the foundation for the analysis. Regarding the ongoing conflict, both Russia and Ukraine have political goals. Regaining power in the post-Soviet sphere and thwarting what it sees as NATO encroachment are Russia's top political goals. Russia's 2014 invasion of Crimea and its backing of separatist movements in Eastern Ukraine serve as examples of this. Moscow wants to safeguard its borders, re-establish national pride, and create a zone of influence that opposes Western hegemony (Smith, 2021).

On the other hand, Ukraine's political goals are centred on territorial integrity, sovereignty, and cooperation with Western organisations such as the European Union and NATO. Ukraine aims to undertake democratic changes and disassociate itself from Russian influence (Kuzio, 2020). Domestic support for military operations is fuelled by the war narrative in Ukraine, which places a strong emphasis on national identity and resistance to aggression. Similarly, Russia's political goals have influenced its military strategy, which combines conventional and unconventional combat techniques. The goal of hybrid warfare, which includes disinformation campaigns and cyberattacks, is to destabilise Ukraine while reducing the likelihood of direct military

conflict (Galeotti, 2016). To achieve political objectives and maintain plausible deniability, the Kremlin also uses proxy armies. Asymmetric warfare and the mobilisation of civilian support are the main components of Ukraine's military response. Ukraine has included the civilian population in defence efforts and embraced guerrilla tactics after seeing its limitations against a stronger military force (Balmforth, 2022). This approach supports Ukraine's political goals of sovereignty and independence by working to strengthen national cohesion and resolve in addition to thwarting Russian advances. Thus, both Russia's and Ukraine's military policies demonstrate Clausewitz's view of war as an extension of politics. Each country's military activities are influenced by its political goals, demonstrating the interaction between political ambitions and conflict.

According to the theory that "war is politics by other means," Russia's military aggression can be interpreted as a clear expression of its political goals, employing force to accomplish what diplomacy has been unable to accomplish. This supports Clausewitz's contention that, in situations where nonviolent modes of communication fail, war is a continuation of political discourse (Clausewitz, 1984). In addition to being a calculated military move, the annexation of Crimea was a political declaration meant to strengthen the nation's identity and authority. Clausewitz's focus on the ethical and psychological aspects of war is reflected in Ukraine's strategy. Ukraine aims to offset Russia's military advantages by using asymmetric tactics and mobilising public sentiment. This illustrates the notion that maintaining sovereignty as a political goal can inspire public support and drive military action (Clausewitz, 1984). The determination exhibited by Ukrainian forces highlights the importance of national will, which is a fundamental component of Clausewitz's philosophy.

The political goals of Russia and Ukraine have a significant influence on their military operations, demonstrating the continued applicability of Clausewitz's claim that politics determines war. Ukraine's emphasis on asymmetric warfare and national mobilisation highlights its devotion to sovereignty, whereas Russia's use of hybrid warfare underlines its ambition to regain influence. In addition to influencing the ongoing battle, this dynamic interaction between military tactics and political objectives provides a prism through which to

view the wider ramifications of war in international relations.

Regarding the second question, it is evident that the conflict between Russia and Ukraine has highlighted the significance of non-military tools of power, including information warfare, economic sanctions, and diplomacy. These instruments are essential in determining the course of the conflict and capture the complexity of modern warfare, which frequently goes beyond conventional military conflicts. The success of these non-military tactics is shown when viewed through the lens of Clausewitzian ideas, which also undermines the idea that warfare is solely a military effort. One essential non-military tool in the Russia-Ukraine war has been diplomacy. At different points in time, attempts to defuse tensions or negotiate a sense of peace have been essential. One example of diplomatic efforts to end the violence is the Minsk Agreements, which sought to stop fighting in Eastern Ukraine (Harrison, 2021). Clausewitz's claim that diplomacy is an essential part of the continuity of war, wherein political solutions are sought in addition to military acts, is reflected in these negotiations.

Furthermore, the international response to Russia's conduct has seen the rise of economic sanctions as a potent instrument. The goal of the sanctions put in place by the US, EU, and other allies is to destroy the Russian economy and prevent more aggression (Kirby, 2022). In line with Clausewitz's theory that war is not just a physical conflict but also a fight of wills in which economic resilience is crucial, this non-military strategy aims to reduce Russia's ability to maintain its military activities. Information warfare has consequently emerged as a key strategy used by both Russia and Ukraine. Russia employs disinformation tactics to stoke division, change public opinion, and control conflict narratives (Shcherbak, 2021). On the other hand, Ukraine has used social media and global media outlets to mobilise people, dispel false information, and present a resistance narrative. This highlights the struggle for hearts and minds as a crucial component of contemporary conflicts, reflecting Clausewitz's theory that the psychological aspects of combat are essential to warfare.

By using non-military tools, Clausewitz's idea of "war as an extension of politics" is demonstrated. Diplomacy is the pursuit of political objectives without resorting to military warfare, demonstrating

how countries try to settle disputes via discussion and negotiation. As an example of the interaction between two fields, the Minsk Agreements show how diplomatic initiatives have been entwined with military advancements. As a related development, Clausewitz's idea of the moral and psychological aspects of warfare is in line with economic penalties and information warfare. Sanctions are intended to erode an enemy's political will in addition to its economic base. Sanctions can have a significant psychological impact and may increase public dissatisfaction, which may reduce support for the regime's military efforts (Neuenkirch & Neumeier, 2016). The premise that fighting transcends the battlefield is furthered by information warfare, which aims to affect the morale of audiences both domestically and abroad.

It is interesting to note that asymmetric tactics are common in modern conflict, as weaker parties use non-military means to oppose more powerful opponents. This asymmetry is demonstrated by Ukraine's emphasis on diplomatic outreach and media warfare, which pits a stronger military force against international backing (Rosenberger, 2021). This dynamic supports Clausewitz's assertion that the key to war is the capacity to modify plans in response to shifting conditions, placing a strong emphasis on adaptability and creativity. As a result, although non-military tools support many of Clausewitz's ideas, they also cast doubt on some of them. Clausewitz's main areas of interest were military conflicts and the importance of armed warfare. The importance of non-military tactics in the Russia-Ukraine conflict indicates that modern warfare is becoming more complex, with informational and economic factors sometimes being just as important as conventional military conflicts. This development calls into question whether Clausewitz's theory is sufficient to adequately represent the complexity of contemporary conflict.

For the third question, which concerns whether Clausewitzian theory still applies to modern warfare, the emergence of hybrid warfare—which combines traditional military strategies with unconventional tactics, cyber warfare, and disinformation—illustrates Clausewitz's idea of the "fog of war." Russia's actions in Ukraine since 2014, for example, demonstrate this merging as it uses both cyber operations and military troops to accomplish its political goals (Mölling,

2016). Clausewitz's opinions on the significance of comprehending the political context of military actions are similarly in line with the US military's strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan throughout the 1990s. Clausewitz's claim that technology changes the means of warfare while nature stays the same is best illustrated by the usage of cyber capabilities in battles (Oyosoro & Herbet, 2021; Oyosoro, 2023). Cyber operations are used by nation-states such as China and Iran to accomplish strategic goals without resorting to traditional military conflict (Kello, 2013). Particularly when warfare changes in reaction to political realities and technological breakthroughs, Clausewitzian theory provides important insights into the character of contemporary battle. His theories' ongoing applicability emphasises how crucial it is to combine political goals with military strategy to succeed in modern combat.

The Russian-Ukrainian war's use of non-military tools of power illustrates how warfare is changing and how important information warfare, economic sanctions, and diplomacy are to accomplishing political goals. The complexity of modern combat is reflected in these technologies, which both support and contradict Clausewitzian ideals. Understanding this interaction will be crucial for evaluating upcoming wars and the nature of warfare in the twenty-first century, as the lines separating military and non-military tactics become increasingly hazy.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The complicated nature of contemporary warfare has been brought to light by the continuing conflict between Russia and Ukraine, highlighting the applicability of Clausewitzian theory in comprehending the dynamics involved. Clausewitz highlighted the relationship between politics and war, arguing that military operations are intricately linked to political goals rather than existing independently. Given this, the study saw the Russian invasion as a continuation of political objectives motivated by a desire to exert control and influence over Ukraine. Ukraine's resistance, on the other hand, exemplifies the idea of national will and the defence of sovereignty, highlighting the crucial role that public opinion plays in conflict. The lessons learnt from this fight both highlight the applicability of Clausewitz's ideas and highlight the complexity of contemporary conflicts that go against conventional wisdom about war. The conflict's use of hybrid warfare, which

combines traditional military power with cyber operations and misinformation efforts to adapt to contemporary geopolitical situations, undoubtedly mirrors Clausewitz's ideas. The ongoing conflict serves as an example of the Clausewitzian trinity's intricacy, where changing public opinion and political goals impact military tactics and results.

Therefore, diplomatic channels should be given priority by international actors, especially the European Union, NATO, and the UN Security Council, in order to promote communication between Russia and Ukraine. A longer-term framework for negotiations that emphasises reciprocal acceptance of sovereignty and compromise may result in a more durable outcome. Ukraine's defence capabilities can be strengthened by offering it strategic military assistance, such as cutting-edge equipment and training. This assistance ought to be balanced to prevent escalation and provide Ukraine the ability to preserve its independence. Sustained and focused economic sanctions against Russia may put pressure on the Kremlin to change its belligerent stance. To maximise their impact on military capabilities and avoid collateral damage to civilians, these sanctions should be properly crafted.

The international actors can strive towards a resolution that is consistent with Clausewitzian principles. Clausewitz underlined how crucial diplomacy is as a statecraft instrument. Tensions can be defused by opening and keeping lines of communication open. Discussions could be facilitated by impartial third-party mediators who concentrate on long-term stability and shared interests. Furthermore, both parties may need to accept restricted war aims in order for the resolution to be successful. A foundation for enduring peace can be established by concentrating on attainable objectives like ceasefires, humanitarian access, and territorial compromises rather than striving for complete triumph. These will support long-term peace and stability in the region while acknowledging the intricate connection between politics and violence.

References

- Applebaum, A. (2017). *Red Famine: Stalin's War on Ukraine*. Doubleday. DOI: 10.1036/9781400890423.
- Baker, J. A. (1995). *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War, and Peace, 1989-1992*. G.P. Putnam's Sons.

- Balmforth, R. (2014). Russia's annexation of Crimea: A new era in European security? *International Affairs*, 90(5), 1045-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12130>.
- Balmforth, T. (2022). Ukraine's Strategy in Asymmetric Warfare. *Journal of Military Studies*, 45(2), 115-130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jms.2022.0072>.
- Blight, J. G., & Lang, J. M. (1999). The Cuban Missile Crisis: A 50th Anniversary Perspective. *Cold War History*, 1(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713999032>.
- Bremmer, I. (2016). The new rules of global order: A world reshaped by Crimea. *Foreign Affairs*, 95(5), 2-10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/44945602>.
- Clausewitz, C. von. (1976). *On War*. Princeton University Press. DOI: 10.1515/9781400821799.
- Clausewitz, C. von. (1984). *On War*. (M. Howard & P. Paret, Eds. and Trans.). Princeton University Press..
- Cockburn, A. (2014). *The Rise of Islamic State: ISIS and the New Sunni Revolution*. Verso Books.
- Cohen, E. (2010). *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime*. Free Press.
- Croxford, L. (2018). The Thirty Years War: A Reassessment of the Conflict and its Impact on Europe. *Journal of Early Modern History*, 22(5), 451-473. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700658-12341318>.
- Dickson, M. (2013). Legal Issues in the United Nations Compensation Commission on Iraq. *Journal of Law Policy and Globalization*, 14: 21-30.
- Eminue, O. and Dickson, M. (2013). The United Nations Resolutions on Syria: Exploration and Critical Assessment of Motivation from Russia and China. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, 10: 5-13.
- Fischer, B. (2023). The Strategic Dimensions of the Ukraine Conflict: A Clausewitzian Perspective. *European Security*, 32(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2022.2117373>.
- Friedman, N. (1993). *The Future of War: A History*. Naval Institute Press.
- Friedman, G. (2014). The geopolitics of Russia's annexation of Crimea. *Geopolitical Futures*. Retrieved from <https://geopoliticalfutures.com/the-geopolitics-of-russias-annexation-of-crimea/>.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. Penguin Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470691268>.
- Galeotti, M. (2014). Russia's annexation of Crimea: The role of military power. *European Security*, 23(4), 471-490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2014.943846>.
- Galeotti, M. (2016). Hybrid War or Gibrinaya Voyna? The Russian Way of War. *The RUSI Journal*, 161(2), 16-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2016.1190666>.
- Glenny, M. (1996). *The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War*. Penguin Books. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511625756>.
- Guriev, S., & Tsyvinski, A. (2015). The impact of sanctions on Russia. *American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings*, 105, 236-240. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20151002>.
- Harrison, S. (2021). The Minsk Agreements: A Diplomatic Approach to Conflict Resolution. *European Security*, 30(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2020.1847220>.
- Henig, R. (2010). *The League of Nations: The Makers of the Modern World*. London, United Kingdom: Haus Publishing.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1994). *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. Michael Joseph. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2605825>.
- Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. Columbia University Press.
- Howard, M. (1976). The Use and Abuse of Military History. *The RUSI Journal*, 121(6), 44-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847608401554>.
- Keegan, J. (1998). *The First World War*. Alfred A. Knopf. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500000749>.

Kello, L. (2013). *The Virtual Weapon and International Order*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300181402.003.0001>.

Kirby, J. (2022). The Impact of Economic Sanctions on Russia's War Efforts. *Journal of Economic Policy*, 28(4), 452-475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0327.12345>.

Klein, J. (2015). Economic sanctions: A tool for change in Russia. *The Journal of International Relations*, 27(3), 43-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347798915614578>.

Klein, A. (2022). The Russian-Ukrainian War: Clausewitzian Insights. *Journal of Military History*, 86(3), 529-550. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jmh.2022.0055>.

Kofman, M. (2021). "Russia's Use of Military Force in Ukraine: A Post-Cold War Context." *The Russian Review*, 80(2), 217-237. DOI: 10.1111/rure.12506.

Kuzio, T. (2015). Ukraine: A Nation on the Borderland of Europe. *The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 43(5), 847-865. DOI: 10.1080/00905992.2015.1063304.

Kuzio, T. (2020). Ukraine: From Soviet to European State. *Nationalities Papers*, 48(5), 743-761. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2020.5>.

Kuzio, T. (2020). Ukraine: From Soviet to European State. *Nationalities Papers*, 48(5), 743-761. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2020.5>.

Luttwak, E. N. (2001). *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*. Harvard University Press.

Mahnken, T. G. (2020). Hybrid Warfare: A New Concept for an Old Form of War. *Defense and Security Studies*, 10(1), 13-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2020.1728321>.

Mankoff, J. (2022). "The Ukraine Crisis and the Future of U.S.-Russia Relations." *Foreign Affairs*, 101(2), 22-34. DOI: 10.2307/27052708.

Mankoff, J. (2014). *Russia's annexation of Crimea: Causes and consequences*. The Washington

Quarterly, 37(3), 27-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2014.951247>.

Merridale, C. (2006). *Night of Stone: Death and Memory in Russia*. Granta Books. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926806290078>.

Mölling, C. (2016). Hybrid Warfare: The Changing Face of Conflict. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 39(3), 329-349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2015.1090293>.

Murray, C. (2006). *The Gulf War 1990-1991: Diplomacy and War in the New World Order*. Routledge.

Neuenkirch, M., & Neumeier, F. (2016). The Effectiveness of Economic Sanctions: A Survey of the Evidence. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 30(3), 647-673. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12143>.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2020). Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/countries/ukraine-report>.

Oyosoro, F. I., & Herbert, E. I. (2021). The United States Military Presence in Africa: Challenges and Constraints for African Nations (1993–2017). *Federal University Otuoke Journal of Political Science*, 4(1).

https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=jju5isAAAAJ&citation_for_view=jju-5isAAAAJ:Y0pCki6q_DkC

Oyosoro, F. I., & Bassey, O. B. (2023). Russia–Ukraine Conflict and the Display of National Interest: A Resurgence of Realism in International Relations and an Attack on Sovereignty. In *The Economy of Leadership and Social Transformation in Contemporary Africa: Essays in Honour of Professor Ichoku Hyacinth Ementa*. <https://acjol.org/index.php/proceedings/article/view/4170>

Oyosoro, F. I. (2023). Securing Interests or Undermining Sovereignty? The Political Implications of Foreign Military Basing in Africa. *African Security*, 16(4), 248–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392206.2024.2323302>

Parker, G. (1997). *The Thirty Years' War*. New York, London: Routledge.

Rosenberger, R. (2021). Asymmetric Warfare and Information Strategy in the Ukraine Conflict. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 44(3), 369-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2020.1778127>.

Ricks, T. E. (2006). *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq*. New York: Penguin Press.

Rumer, E. (2022). "The Geopolitics of the Ukraine War: A New Era in European Security." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. DOI: 10.2307/27613248.

Shcherbak, T. (2021). Disinformation as a Tool of Modern Warfare: The Case of Ukraine. *Journal of Information Warfare*, 20(1), 22-34. <https://doi.org/10.22364/jow.20.1.03>.

Smith, M. (2021). Russia's Geopolitical Strategy and Military Objectives in Ukraine. *International Security*, 45(3), 102-140. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00383.

Snyder, S. (2018). "The Russian-Ukrainian War: A Case Study in Modern Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 62(4), 843-867. DOI: 10.1177/0022002718757793.

Stueck, W. (1995). *The Korean War: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Subtelny, O. (2009). *Ukraine: A History*. University of Toronto Press. DOI: 10.3138/9781442694731.

Sullivan, M. (2005). *The Iraq War: A Military History*. University Press of Kansas.

Trenin, D. (2014). Russia's Breakout from the Post-Cold War Order: The Role of the Ukraine Crisis. *International Affairs*, 90(1), 105-121. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2346.12105.

United Nations. (2014). Resolution 68/262: Territorial integrity of Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/68/262>.

Wallace, C. D. (1982). Kellogg – Briand Pact (1928). In: Bernhardt, R. *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*. Amsterdam, N.Y.: North-Holland Publishing Company, pp. 236-239.

Waller, H. (2016). The impact of the Thirty Years' War on the German states: a historical perspective. *European History Quarterly*, 46(3), 423-442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265691416658794>.

Wilson, A. (2014). *Ukraine Crisis: What It Means for the West*. Yale University Press. DOI: 10.12987/yale/9780300206588.001.0001.