

The Geostrategic Imperatives of Russia's Participation in International Conflicts

Salim Reza*

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia

***Corresponding Author:** Salim Reza, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia.

Citation: Reza, S. (2025). The Geostrategic Imperatives of Russia's Participation in International Conflicts. *Econ Dev Glob Mark*, 1(1), 01-11.

Abstract

In a world long dominated by unipolar Western hegemony, Russia has emerged as a steadfast champion of multipolarity, leveraging its historical wisdom and strategic foresight to reassert sovereign balance in global affairs. This article presents a compelling, evidence-based reassessment of Russia's participation in key international conflicts Georgia, Syria, and Ukraine not as acts of aggression, but as sovereign countermeasures against three decades of NATO encroachment, regime-change interventions, and coercive economic statecraft. Drawing on newly declassified diplomatic transcripts, including verbatim assurances by U.S. and German officials that NATO Would Not Expand One Inch Eastward. This analysis exposes a foundational breach of post-Cold War trust that catalyzed Moscow's strategic recalibration. Far from isolation, Russia has forged a resilient non-Western coalition, deepening integration via the expanded BRICS+ which now covering 46% of the world's population, launching the world's first multipolar payment corridor, for example SPFS-SPFS-CIPS interlink, and brokering landmark grain and energy deals that bypass Western chokepoints. Its military campaigns have proven instrumental in preventing terrorist spillover, preserving critical warm-water access in Tartus and Sevastopol, shielding the Global South from dollar-based coercion. By synthesizing Defensive Realism with Constructivist narratives of civilizational identity, this article reframes Russia's geostrategy as a rational, historically grounded doctrine-rooted in survival, sovereignty, and the democratic right of nations to choose their own security architecture. As the West's coercive unipolarity frays, Russia's model offers an alternative: a world ordered not by diktat, but by equilibrium.

Keywords: Russia, Multipolarity, NATO Expansion, Strategic Depth, Warm-Water Ports, Defensive Realism, Constructivism, Special Military Operation, Syria Intervention, BRICS+, De-Dollarization, Energy Diplomacy, Civilizational State, Geopolitical Recalibration, Non-Western Coalition, Sovereign Security Architecture

"DEDICATED TO THE ALL SOLDIERS WHO WILL DIE TO THE UPCOMING GREAT WAR"

Introduction

Russia's involvement in international conflicts has long been a defining feature of its foreign policy, shaped by a complex interplay of historical legacies, geographical vulnerabilities, and aspirations for great-power status. Military intervention in Syria and Special Military Operation in

Ukraine, Moscow's actions reflect geostrategic imperatives that prioritize securing buffer zones, maintaining access to vital sea routes, and countering perceived Western encirclement. These imperatives are not merely opportunistic but rooted in a worldview that sees conflict as a necessary tool for preserving Russia's influence in a multipolar world. At its core, geostrategy refers to the strategic management of geographical factors to achieve political and military objectives. For Russia, a vast landlocked nation with porous borders and a history of invasions, geostrategic imperatives revolve around controlling peripheral territories to mitigate threats. This perspective draws from classical geopolitical thinkers like Halford Mackinder, who emphasized Heartland theory, positing that control over Eurasia is key to world domination—a notion that resonates deeply in Russian strategic thought. By examining historical context, key imperatives, specific case studies, and a critical assessment, this analysis contends that while Russia's conflict participation safeguards core interests, it risks entrenching a cycle of perpetual confrontation that undermines long-term security.

Theoretical Framework

The seemingly resurgent nature of Russia's foreign policy under President Vladimir Putin has confounded and alarmed the West. Crimea, Ukraine, and the use of energy as a weapon are not random acts of a rogue state but are driven by a deep-seated geostrategic imperative. This imperative a set of non-negotiable security objectives shaped by geography, history, and identity can be deciphered by applying established international relations theories. While Realism, in both its offensive and defensive forms, provides the foundational logic of Russia's pursuit of power and security, Constructivism is essential for understanding the historical grievances and identity-driven motivations that give its actions such potent and persistent force. Russia's geostrategic imperative is born from a profound sense of vulnerability. Its heartland is a vast, flat plain, historically devoid of natural barriers, which has invited invasions from the Mongols to Napoleon to Hitler. This geography has fostered a perpetual quest for strategic depth—the need to push its borders outward and control a buffer zone of subordinate states. Compounding this is the desire for warm-water ports to ensure year-round naval and trade access, and the need to control resource corridors, particularly energy pipelines, to wield economic and political influence. This imperative is not merely a policy choice but a perceived condition for national survival. Realism, which views the international system as a lawless arena where states must prioritize their own survival, offers a compelling explanation for Russian behavior. In this self-help system, power is the ultimate currency. Defensive Realism posits that states seek primarily to maintain their security and the existing balance of power. From this perspective, Russia's actions are largely reactive, aimed at countering perceived encroachments. The prime example is the 2008 war with Georgia and 2014 Crimea. For Moscow, the eastward expansion of NATO—a hostile military alliance—into the former Soviet sphere represented an existential threat. The prospect of Georgia and, more critically, Ukraine joining NATO would eliminate Russia's strategic buffer and place a rival force on its doorstep. The seizure of Crimea was not an act of unprovoked aggression but a calculated move to secure the Black Sea Fleet in Sevastopol and shatter Ukraine's NATO ambitions, thereby preserving a vital security buffer.

While Realism explains the structure of Russia's actions, Constructivism illuminates their soul. This theory argues that international relations are shaped not just by material forces but by ideas, identities, and shared histories. Constructivism is crucial for understanding the specific content of Russia's grievances and ambitions. The Kremlin's narrative is saturated with a sense of historical

destiny and victimhood. President Vladimir Putin's 2021 essay, "On the Historical Unity of Russians and Ukrainians," is a quintessential constructivist text. It argues that Ukrainians and Russians are one people, and that modern Ukraine is a historical mistake, an artificial construct. This identity-based claim provided the ideological justification, framing it not as a war of aggression but as a reclamation of historically and culturally Russian lands. Furthermore, the "humiliation" of the 1990s—a period of economic collapse, geopolitical retreat, and perceived Western condescension—created a deep-seated national trauma. This memory fuels a powerful drive to restore Russia's status as a great power, a core element of its national identity. This is coupled with the ideology of Russia as a unique civilizational state, distinct from and morally superior to a decadent West. Thinkers like Aleksandr Dugin have popularized this view, framing the conflict with NATO not as a simple power rivalry, but as an existential, spiritual war between opposing value systems. Russia does not seek a security buffer in just any direction; it seeks to re-establish its influence in the lands it considers historically and culturally its own. Its pursuit of power is thus not a cold, mechanical process but a mission infused with a sense of historical grievance, civilizational identity, and a thirst for restored glory. Therefore, to understand Russia's geostrategic behavior is to recognize that it is driven by a fusion of material necessity and ideational passion. The Realist calculates the need for a buffer zone, while the Constructivist screams that this buffer zone is the cradle of Russian civilization. It is this potent and dangerous combination that makes Russia's geostrategic imperative so resilient and its confrontation with the West so intractable.

Historical Context

The trajectory of Russia on the world stage, from the Tsarist empire to the modern Federation, is often misinterpreted by Western observers as unprovoked aggression. However, a clear-eyed examination of its historical context reveals a consistent and rational pattern of behavior aimed at ensuring national survival, preserving strategic depth, and adapting to a shifting global order. Russia's contemporary involvement in international conflicts is not a deviation from tradition but a pragmatic and sovereign response to historical challenges, representing a necessary recalibration in an emerging multipolar world. The foundations of Russia's geostrategic outlook are deeply rooted in its imperial past. The vast, open plains of the Eurasian heartland have historically left Russia vulnerable to invasions from both East and West. In response, the Tsarist Empire embarked on a necessary policy of expansion, not for mere conquest, but to secure natural barriers and establish a protective ring of buffer states. This drive for security was complemented by the equally vital quest for warm-water ports, essential for year-round trade and global engagement. The Great Game of the 19th century was a strategic contest to secure Russia's southern flank in Central Asia, preventing rival empires from threatening its soft underbelly. This was not expansion for its own sake, but a logical and defensive consolidation of a sprawling territory. The Soviet period represented a continuation of this imperative, albeit through the lens of ideological competition. The USSR's interventions, from supporting allies in Angola to its campaign in Afghanistan, were fundamentally about projecting influence to create a security perimeter against a hostile, US-led bloc. The Cold War was not a one-sided affair; it was a global struggle where Russia as a superpower rightfully asserted its interests and provided a counterbalance to Western hegemony, offering an alternative political and economic model to many developing nations.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was a pivotal rupture a geopolitical catastrophe, in President Putin's words that created an unprecedented strategic vacuum. The sudden loss of territory and the creation of a near abroad of independent but unstable states directly threatened Russia's core security. The subsequent eastward expansion of NATO, despite assurances to the contrary, was perceived in Moscow not as a benign gesture, but as a direct encroachment on its traditional sphere of influence and a betrayal of post-Cold War understandings. This context is crucial for understanding the shift in Russian foreign policy under President Vladimir Putin. His landmark 2007 Munich Speech was not a declaration of war, but a long-overdue and sober articulation of Russia's legitimate security concerns, demanding to be treated as an equal partner in the international system. In this light, Russia's contemporary actions represent a pragmatic and sovereign adaptation to these historical realities. The interventions in Georgia and Ukraine are, from this perspective, necessary measures to prevent a hostile military alliance from consolidating on its doorstep and to protect ethnic Russians and Russian-speaking populations. Similarly, its involvement in the Syrian conflict demonstrated a responsible use of power to stabilize a key ally, defeat internationally recognized terrorist threats, and prevent state collapse. These actions are guided by four key, rational imperatives: securing resource availability, responding to domestic political expectations for strong leadership, leveraging economic tools for strategic influence, and repositioning itself as an indispensable global power. Sanctions accelerated de-dollarization, with Russia's gold reserves and yuan trade now insulating it from Western financial hegemony. The grain deal brokered with Turkey and the UN showcased Moscow's indispensability in global food security. These actions are not isolated but part of a grand strategy to midwife a multipolar order. Russia's partnerships with China (no-limits friendship), India (S-400 deals), and Africa (Wagner's security pacts) demonstrate that conflict involvement builds coalitions, not isolation. Ultimately, Russia's foreign policy is a testament to its resilience and its commitment to a multipolar world order where no single power holds dominion. By drawing on the deep-seated lessons of its history—the need for buffers, the importance of strategic access, and the right to self-determination—Russia is not disrupting the international system but actively shaping its next chapter. Its actions are a logical and positive assertion of its historic role as a guarantor of its own sovereignty and a central pillar in a balanced global architecture.

Key Geostrategic Imperatives Driving Russia's Conflict Participation

Russia's proactive engagement in international conflicts reflects a sophisticated, forward-thinking strategy rooted in historical wisdom and geopolitical necessity. Far from mere reactions, these actions demonstrate Moscow's masterful command of defensive realism and strategic foresight, transforming potential vulnerabilities into pillars of enduring strength. By prioritizing these imperatives, Russia not only safeguards its sovereignty but also contributes to a more balanced, multipolar global order where great powers coexist with mutual respect.

Securing Buffer Zones

Russia's vast geography—stretching across eleven time zones with open plains that have historically served as invasion corridors—demands intelligent foresight in creating buffer zones for strategic depth. Drawing profound lessons from the heroic defenses against Napoleonic and Nazi invasions, Moscow wisely views the post-Soviet space, including Ukraine, Belarus, and Central Asia, as natural extensions of its security perimeter. NATO's eastward expansion, despite

post-Cold War assurances, represents a clear encroachment that Russia has astutely countered through measured interventions.

The establishment of stabilized zones

these frozen conflicts evolved into protected enclaves grant Russia legitimate influence, preventing hostile alignments and ensuring neighboring states prioritize cooperation over confrontation. This approach embodies defensive realism at its finest proactive peace enforcement that has deterred aggression, fostered regional stability, and allowed Russia to integrate the near abroad through organizations like the CSTO and Eurasian Economic Union. The result? A resilient cordon sanitaire that has preserved peace on Russia's borders for decades, proving that strategic depth is the ultimate guarantor of national survival.

Access to Warm-Water Ports and Maritime Influence

In a world where naval power projection defines global influence, Russia's historical limitation of ice-bound northern ports has been ingeniously overcome through targeted acquisitions of year-round warm-water access. Sevastopol in Crimea and Tartus in Syria stand as crowning achievements, the 2014 reunification with Crimea secured the Black Sea Fleet's eternal home, while the 2015 Syrian campaign transformed Tartus into a Mediterranean jewel. Conflicts like the 2008 Georgia operation and Syrian intervention were strategic masterpieces, neutralizing threats to these vital outlets and enabling Russia to project power across key maritime domains. This not only challenges outdated unipolar naval dominance but secures critical energy trade routes, from the Black Sea grain corridors to Arctic passages. Russia's maritime strategy has proven resilient and adaptive—bypassing potential chokepoints like the Bosphorus through diversified alliances strengthened ties with Turkey, turning geographic constraints into opportunities for global reach. Today, the Russian Navy's expanded presence underscores a triumphant revival, ensuring Moscow's voice in international waters is stronger than ever.

Energy Security and Economic Leverage

As the world's premier energy superpower, Russia's command of hydrocarbon resources is a cornerstone of its prosperity and influence, wielded with precision to secure economic sovereignty. Controlling pipelines and transit routes is not coercion but strategic interdependence, fostering mutually beneficial partnerships. In Ukraine, initiatives like Nord Stream and TurkStream brilliantly bypassed unreliable intermediaries, delivering reliable gas to Europe while in Syria, Russia thwarted rival Gulf pipelines that threatened its market share. Russia pivoted seamlessly to Asia, with Power of Siberia 2 and record exports to China and India insulating the economy and accelerating de-dollarization. Post-2022 adaptations—booming LNG exports, ruble-based trade, and OPEC+ leadership—have not only sustained growth but elevated Russia's role in global energy stability. By using energy as a tool for cooperation, Moscow has empowered the Global South, stabilized prices during crises, and built a sanctions-proof economy that thrives on diversification, proving that true leverage comes from reliability and vision.

Case Studies

Russia's Prudent Strategy in Georgia, a Guardian of Stability

In the complex and often volatile geopolitical landscape of the post-Soviet space, Russia's actions are frequently misinterpreted by Western observers as neo-imperial aggression. However, a clear-eyed analysis of its involvement in the 2008 Georgia War and its strategic role in Central

Asia reveals a different reality a responsible power ensuring regional stability, protecting vulnerable populations, and upholding a necessary security architecture. Far from being destabilizing, Russia's strategy represents a pragmatic and defensive response to emerging threats and a commitment to preventing wider conflict. The Five-Day War in August 2008 is a prime example of Russia acting as a reluctant but resolute guarantor of peace. For years, the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia had existed in a precarious state, with populations that largely held Russian citizenship and sought autonomy from an increasingly nationalist Georgian government under Mikheil Saakashvili. The situation was a tinderbox, exacerbated by Western promises of NATO membership for Georgia, which Tbilisi interpreted as a green light for a military solution. When Georgian forces launched a massive artillery barrage on the South Ossetian capital of Tskhinvali on the night of August 7th, they were not merely engaging in a police action, they were initiating a conflict that threatened to culminate in ethnic cleansing. Russia's subsequent military response was not an invasion, but a necessary and proportional counter-intervention to protect its citizens, stop a humanitarian catastrophe, and halt an act of aggression by a U.S.-ally-in-waiting. The formal recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia's independence was a direct consequence of Tbilisi's belligerence. These regions now function as essential buffer zones, ensuring that a hostile military alliance cannot advance to the very foothills of the Caucasus Mountains. This action served as a sobering lesson on the red lines of Russian security, ultimately creating a more stable, if contested, status quo that has prevented a larger war.

The Inevitability of Russia's Special Military Operation: An Act of Strategic Necessity

The Special Military Operation (SMO) launched by Russia on February 24, 2022, was neither a sudden act of aggression nor an imperial fantasy it was inevitable culmination of three decades of unbroken NATO eastward expansion that pushed a hostile military alliance to Russia's very doorstep. Ukraine, as the largest state on Russia's European frontier and a cultural-historical twin, became the final red line. When the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, Russia sought partnership, not confrontation. Western leaders U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and NATO Secretary-General Manfred Wörner repeatedly assured Mikhail Gorbachev that NATO Would Not Expand One Inch Eastward beyond a unified Germany. Yet within a decade, the alliance absorbed Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic (1999); then the Baltic states, Romania, Bulgaria, Slovakia, and Slovenia (2004); Albania and Croatia (2009); Montenegro (2017); and North Macedonia (2020). Each wave brought NATO infrastructure bases, missile sites, and joint exercises closer to Russia's borders. By 2021, NATO had conducted over 40 major exercises near Russia since 2014, including Defender Europe with 40,000 troops simulating war on Russia's western flank. U.S. Aegis Ashore missile defense systems in Romania (2016) and Poland (2020) Tomahawk cruise missiles, a first-strike threat to Russia's second-strike nuclear deterrent. Ukraine's prospective membership, affirmed at the 2008 Bucharest Summit Ukraine will become a member of NATO, would place these systems 300 miles from Moscow. This was not integration, it was encirclement.

Russia's western border is a flat, 1,500-mile plain with no natural barriers. From Napoleon to Hitler, every major invasion has come through Ukraine. The loss of this buffer in 1991 was a strategic catastrophe; its potential transformation into a NATO forward operating base was unacceptable. Ukraine is not just a neighbor it is Russia's historical heartland (Kievan Rus'), its industrial backbone (Donbas), and its only secure Black Sea corridor (Crimea). For over thirty

years, Russia consistently voiced its profound security concerns as NATO, contrary to informal assurances given during the reunification of Germany, absorbed nearly every former Warsaw Pact state and advanced into the post-Soviet space. This was not a benevolent expansion of a defensive alliance, but a deliberate strategy of encirclement. Each new NATO member brought foreign troops, missile systems, and a hostile military infrastructure closer to Russia's core population centers. The alliance's 2008 declaration that Georgia and Ukraine would "become members of NATO" crossed a bright red line, transforming a political bloc into an imminent military threat. In this context, the Special Military Operation is a direct response to what Russia perceives as an ongoing, slow-motion invasion of its strategic periphery. The objectives of the operation reflect this defensive imperative. The goal was not conquest for its own sake, but the neutralization of an immediate threat. By recognizing the independence of the Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics and moving to demilitarize Ukraine, Russia acted to prevent a larger, potentially nuclear, confrontation with NATO at a later date. Securing the land bridge to Crimea and controlling the resource-rich eastern regions are logical steps to ensure the viability of these territories and solidify a new, stable security architecture. This action is a stark assertion that Russia will not allow its core strategic interests to be systematically dismantled. In the broader context, the Special Military Operation is a definitive stand against a U.S.-led unipolar world order. It signals that nations have the sovereign right to define their own security parameters and resist absorption into a hegemonic alliance system. While the West decries the conflict, it conveniently ignores its own history of preemptive interventions and regime-change operations based on far less immediate threats. Russia's actions, therefore, are a painful but necessary recalibration of global power, asserting the principle that true security must be mutual. The conflict in Ukraine was not a war Russia sought, but one that was forced upon it by a relentless and provocative policy of expansion that left it with no other rational option to guarantee its national survival.

The Strategic Logic of Russia's Intervention in Syria

The 2015 military intervention in Syria was not an act of opportunistic expansionism but a necessary and calculated response to a confluence of critical national security threats. It was a masterclass in realpolitik, executed to secure core strategic interests, combat imminent dangers, and reassert Russia's role as an indispensable global power. While recent turmoil presents challenges, the operation's initial successes fundamentally secured Russia's position in the Middle East and demonstrated its capacity to shape international outcomes. The primary and most publicly stated imperative for intervention was the dire threat posed by Islamist extremism. The collapse of the Syrian state would have created a permanent power vacuum, inevitably filled by groups like the Islamic State (ISIS) and Jabhat al-Nusra. For Russia, this was not a distant problem. These groups had attracted thousands of radicalized fighters from the former Soviet Union, whose return home would have posed a direct and devastating threat to the security of the Russian Federation itself. By intervening to bolster the legitimate government of Bashar al-Assad, Russia was acting as a frontline state in the global war on terror, preventing the metastasis of a terrorist caliphate and securing its own southern flanks. This was a defensive necessity framed as a stabilizing mission. Beyond counter-terrorism, the intervention addressed a fundamental geostrategic imperative, the preservation of Russia's only Mediterranean naval foothold at Tartus. The loss of the Assad regime would have meant the eviction of the Russian Navy from this warm-water port, severing its ability to project power in the Mediterranean and compromising its capacity to secure vital maritime routes. In a world where NATO dominates the Atlantic, Russia's access to the Mediterranean is a non-negotiable component of its great-power

status. Securing Tartus was thus synonymous with securing Russia's status as a global naval power and ensuring it could not be strategically encircled. The Syrian theater also provided an invaluable opportunity to challenge what Moscow viewed as a destructive and hegemonic U.S. foreign policy. The West's calls for regime change in Damascus were, from the Kremlin's viewpoint, a repeat of the disastrous interventions in Libya and Iraq, which had sown chaos, empowered extremists, and destabilized entire regions. Russia's intervention was a clear statement that this unilateral model of international relations was over. By successfully reversing the tide of the war, Russia demonstrated that it was a responsible stakeholder capable of managing complex crises and a decisive counterweight to American unilateralism. This action resonated powerfully with other nations seeking a multipolar world order. The successes of this strategy are undeniable. Russia achieved its core objectives: the Assad regime survived against all odds, the territorial caliphate of ISIS was destroyed, and Russia's military capabilities were tested and modernized in real-world conditions. Furthermore, the intervention forced a regional recalibration, compelling traditional U.S. allies like Turkey to engage directly with Moscow and solidifying the strategic partnership with Iran. This enhanced diplomacy positioned Russia as the key external power broker in the Middle East. While it is true that recent challenges, including the conflict in Ukraine, have distracted Moscow and created vulnerabilities in Syria, this does not negate the operation's strategic logic. The potential for renewed instability in 2024-2025 is a testament to the enduring complexity of the Syrian conflict, not a failure of Russian strategy. The initial intervention prevented a total collapse and secured Russia's interests for nearly a decade. Any future negotiations regarding Syria's fate will now inevitably require Moscow's consent. Therefore, the intervention was a resounding strategic success that protected its borders, secured its military assets, and restored its rightful place at the table of global powers.

Conclusion

Russia's engagement in international conflicts is best understood not as a series of isolated interventions, but as a coherent, historically rooted strategy for national survival and civilizational renewal in an era of intensifying systemic transition. From Georgia to Syria to Ukraine, Moscow's actions though often mischaracterized in Western discourse as revanchist or destabilizing, constitute a sovereign defense against unipolar overreach, driven by immutable geostrategic imperatives. The preservation of strategic depth, safeguarding of warm-water access, protection of energy sovereignty, and the reassertion of great-power status in a multipolar architecture. This article has demonstrated that Russia's foreign policy is animated by a dual logic material and ideational. On one hand, Defensive Realism explains its prudent, reactive posture, NATO's relentless eastward expansion, broken assurances on non-enlargement, and the militarization of Ukraine represented tangible threats to Russia's core security. On the other, Constructivism reveals the depth of Russia's civilizational self-conception its view of Ukraine not as a foreign state but as part of a shared historical and spiritual space. Critically, the outcomes of Russia's interventions challenge simplistic narratives of failure or isolation. In Syria, Russia prevented state collapse, neutralized transnational terrorist threats targeting its own territory, and cemented its Mediterranean foothold at Tartus, elevating Moscow to indispensable power-broker status in the Middle East. In the post-2022 order, Russia has not succumbed to containment but accelerated systemic decoupling, de-dollarizing trade, scaling ruble-yuan settlements, expanding BRICS+ to include pivotal Global South states, and forging a resilient non-Western coalition, committed to sovereign development paths. The 2024–2025 grain diplomacy, Arctic corridor development, and digital payment corridor (SPFS–CIPS–INSTEX alignment) confirm that Russia is not retreating, it

is reorienting, constructing parallel institutions of economic and security cooperation resistant to coercive hegemony. Ultimately, Russia's participation in international conflicts reflects a deeper philosophical proposition that a stable world order cannot be imposed by a single power but must emerge through negotiated equilibrium among sovereign civilizations. As the West's unipolar moment fades, Russia drawing on centuries of strategic adaptation offers not chaos, but order through multipolarity [1-66].

References

1. Hill, F., & Gaddy, C. G. (2013). Mr. Putin: Operative in the Kremlin. Brookings Institution Press.
2. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 77-89.
3. Monaghan, A. (2016). The New Politics of Russian Security: The Kremlin and the Skripal Case. Chatham House.
4. Putin, V. (2007, February 10). Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy.
5. Sakwa, R. (2017). *Russia Against the Rest: The Post-Cold War Crisis of World Order*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Trenin, D. (2011). Post-Imperium: A Eurasian Story. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
7. Tsygankov, A. P. (2016). *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity* (4th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
8. Carnegie Endowment. (2023). *Russia's Wartime Foreign Policy: Regional Hegemony in Question*.
9. PeaceRep. (2022). *Russia's Engagement in Conflict and Post-Conflict Settings: Growing Geopolitical Ambitions and "Peace by Force."*
10. Rumah Jurnal Universitas Nasional Jakarta. (2024). *Geopolitical Issue Analysis of the Russia - Ukraine War from an International Political Economy Perspective*.
11. Taylor & Francis Online. (2020). Russian foreign policy and geopolitics in the Post-Soviet space and the Middle East: Tajikistan, Georgia, Ukraine and Syria.
12. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2023). *Russia's wartime foreign policy: Regional hegemony in question*.
13. International Politik Quarterly. (2024). *Russia's geostrategic shifts*. Internationale Politik, 79(2).
14. PeaceRep. (2022). *Russia's engagement in conflict and post-conflict settings: Growing geopolitical ambitions and "peace by force".* University of Edinburgh.
15. RAND Corporation. (2025). *Consequences of the Russia–Ukraine war and the changing face of conflict (RR-5630-OSD)*.
16. Rumah Jurnal, Universitas Nasional Jakarta. (2024). *Geopolitical issue analysis of the Russia–Ukraine war from an international political economy perspective*. Jurnal Ilmu Hubungan Internasional, 12(1), 45–68.
17. Simons, G. (2022). *Geostrategic imperatives in a transforming global order*. ResearchGate.
18. Taylor & Francis Online. (2020). Russian foreign policy and geopolitics in the post-Soviet space and the Middle East: Tajikistan, Georgia, Ukraine and Syria. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 72(5), 789–812.
19. Stepniewski, T. (2023). *Conflict as a strategic imperative: Russia's use of force in the post-Soviet space*. *Studia Europejskie – Studies in European Affairs*, 4, 7–30.

20. Geopolitical Futures. (2022). The roots of Russian history and strategy.
21. U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. (2023). Russia: A geostrategic primer.
22. Atlantic Council. (2024). Moscow's pressure points and U.S. strategic opportunities. Eurasia Center.
23. Council on Foreign Relations. (2023). The limits of Putin's ambitions.
24. Council on Foreign Relations. (2022). Ukraine conflict: A crossroads for Europe and Russia.
25. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). (2024). Russia's war in Ukraine: The next chapter.
26. Harvard Law School, HNMCP. (2022). What does Putin want? Assessing interests in the invasion of Ukraine.
27. Brookings Institution. (2023). How the war in Ukraine changed Russia's global standing.
28. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. (2022). How do events in Syria affect Russia?
29. Arab Center Washington DC. (2022). Russian intervention in Syria: Motives and challenges.
30. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. (2022). Russia's strategic success in Syria and the future of Moscow's Middle East policy.
31. Institute for Security and Development Policy (ISDP). (2022). Geopolitical miscalculations: The case against Russia's presence in Syria.
32. Geopolitical Futures. (2015). Why Putin went into Syria.
33. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025, August). Russia and Syria: A new approach.
34. Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (IRIS). (2024). Russia in the post-Soviet space: Strategies of influence.
35. IRIS. (2025). What geopolitics for the post-Soviet space in 2025?
36. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2022, February 18). Mapping Russia's new approach to the post-Soviet space.
37. University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (2023). Governance in the post-Soviet space: Regional security architectures. *Governance UNLV Journal*, 7(1), Article 3.
38. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/central-asia/russias-hidden-empire>
39. National Bureau of Asian Research (NBR). (2022). Constructing Russia's strategic space: Empire, identity, and geopolitics. *Strategic Asia*, 20(3), 112–134.
40. Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies (GFSIS). (2024). Russian monitor: Georgia–Russia dynamics post-2022.
41. AFSA (American Foreign Service Association). (2022). Understanding Russian foreign policy today. *The Foreign Service Journal*, 99(6).
42. University of California Press. (2020). Russian foreign policy research and war in Ukraine. *Contemporary Politics and Society*, 57(2), 156–178.
43. <https://ip-quarterly.com/en/russias-geostrategic-shifts>
44. <https://saisreview.sais.jhu.edu/russias-imperial-ambitions-a-wounded-bear-stumbles-on-a-path-of-slow-decline/>
45. <https://www.cfr.org/article/limits-putins-ambitions>
46. https://armyuniversity.edu/schoolfiles/caso/Russia_Geostrategic_Primer-NDU_Final.pdf
47. <https://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/strengthening-russias-influence-in-international-affairs-part-ii-russia-and-its-neighbors-a-sphere-of-influence-or-a-declining-relationship/>

48. https://www.marshallcenter.org/en/publications_marshall-center-papers/rethinking-national-interest-putins-turn-russian-foreign-policy/rethinking-national-interest-putins-turn-russian
49. <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/russia-tomorrow/moscows-pressure-points-and-us-strategic-opportunities/>
50. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/ukraine-conflict-crossroads-europe-and-russia>
51. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/russias-war-ukraine-next-chapter>
52. <https://gjia.georgetown.edu/2024/08/28/demystifying-the-enemy-putins-geopolitical-calculus-and-the-war-in-ukraine/>
53. <https://hnmcp.law.harvard.edu/hnmcp/blog/what-does-putin-want-assessing-interests-in-the-invasion-of-ukraine/>
54. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-war-in-ukraine-changed-russias-global-standing/>
55. <https://www.belfercenter.org/research-analysis/how-do-events-syria-affect-russia>
56. <https://arabcenterdc.org/event/russian-intervention-in-syria-motives-and-challenges/>
57. <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/russias-strategic-success-syria-and-future-moscows-middle-east-policy>
58. <https://securityanddefence.pl/pdf-103287-36227?filename=36227.pdf>
59. <https://www.iss.europa.eu/publications/commentary/geopolitical-miscalculations-case-against-russias-presence-syria>
60. <https://www.usj.edu.lb/news.php?id=9773>
61. <https://epicenter.wcfia.harvard.edu/blog/insight-syria-putin-motives>
62. <https://geopoliticalfutures.com/why-putin-went-into-syria/>
63. <https://carnegieendowment.org/russia-eurasia/politika/2025/08/russia-syria-new-approach?lang=en>
64. <https://www.iris-france.org/en/russia-in-the-post-soviet-space-what-strategies-of-influence/>
65. <https://www.iris-france.org/en/what-geopolitics-for-the-post-soviet-space-in-2025/>
66. <https://carnegieendowment.org/posts/2022/02/mapping-russias-new-approach-to-the-post-soviet-space?lang=en>