

The Political Effects of the Russian–Ukraine War on International Trade		Vol. 2, No. 1, 2024 (Hal. 54-66) https://journal.upy.ac.id/index.php/qrobss https://doi.org/10.31316/qrobss.v2i1.7164 E ISSN: 3031 4968
<p>Jerry Akpomedaye <i>Department of Political Science, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria</i></p> <p>A. E. Orhero <i>Department of Political Science, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria</i></p> <p>Corresponding author: jerry4great@gmail.com</p>		
<p>Received: Oktober 2023 Revised: Oktober 2023 Accepted: Oktober 2023 Online: November 2023</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>The Russian-Ukrainian war, an unprecedented geopolitical event, has triggered profound and far-reaching consequences for international trade. This paper examines the political effects of the conflict on global trade, focusing on how political decisions, economic sanctions, and realignments among nations are reshaping trade flows and policies. This study adopted a historical and content analysis. It concerns an in-depth examination of the documented data, from which relevant materials were drawn. The data collected for this study were synthesized and analyzed using trend analysis techniques. This study revealed that the Russian-Ukrainian war had significant impacts on global trade flows, including disruptions to supply chains, rising commodity prices, changes in trade relationships, economic consequences for agricultural markets and food security, reorientation of global trade, international trade and sanctions, and energy market dynamics. This study found that sanctions reshape trade dynamics, reconfigure partnerships, drive the development of covert economies, and affect long-term global trade structures. The study also showed that the most significant impacts of long-term consequences of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade policies were the shift from globalization to regionalization, the rise of economic blocs and fragmentation, the impact on global supply chains and resource security, growth of alternative financial and payment systems, sanctions as a tool of foreign policy, challenges to multilateral trade governance and the emergence of resilience and self-sufficiency policies. This study concluded that the political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war serve as a critical reminder of the intricate interplay between politics and trade.</p>	
<p>Keywords: <i>Russian-Ukrainian war, International trade, Political effects, Sanctions</i></p>		

1. Introduction

The Russian-Ukrainian war has significantly disrupted global supply chains, particularly in energy, agriculture, and raw materials. Ukraine is a major supplier of wheat, corn, and sunflower oil, while Russia is a dominant player in the global energy market, especially in oil and natural gas. The war has resulted in blockades of Ukrainian ports, destruction of infrastructure, and sanctions on Russian exports, all of which have led to shortages and increased prices globally. According to the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the war has exacerbated food insecurity, particularly in developing countries heavily dependent on grain imports from Ukraine and Russia ([International Food Policy Research Institute, 2022](#)).

Western sanctions imposed on Russia, including restrictions on its energy exports, financial transactions, and technological access, have altered international trade dynamics. These sanctions have led to a sharp decline in trade between Russia and Western countries, forcing Russia to seek alternative markets in Asia and the Middle East. The European Union, which has historically relied heavily on Russian gas, has been particularly affected, leading to energy shortages and increased consumer costs. As a result, the war has highlighted the

Energy-exporting countries like Russia have political leverage over global markets, underscoring the need for diversification of energy sources (European Commission, 2023).

According to the World Trade Organization (2023), The war has triggered geopolitical realignments, with countries re-evaluating their trade relationships and strategic alliances. Russia's growing economic ties with China, India, and Turkey demonstrate the shifting global trade order. These countries have maintained or expanded their trade with Russia despite Western sanctions, underscoring the growing influence of non-Western powers in the global economy. At the same time, the conflict has strained relationships within traditional trade blocs such as the European Union, where member states have had differing responses to the energy crisis and sanctions regimes. This geopolitical shift raises concerns about the future of multilateral trade agreements and the potential fragmentation of the global trading system.

The war has exposed limitations in global economic governance, particularly in institutions like the WTO. As political tensions between major powers rise, the ability of international organizations to mediate trade disputes and enforce trade rules has been called into question. The WTO, for example, has struggled to address the economic consequences of the conflict, as member states prioritize national security and geopolitical interests over multilateral cooperation. This raises critical questions about the future role of global trade institutions in managing disputes and ensuring stable international trade (World Trade Organization, 2023).

The political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade present multifaceted challenges that require careful analysis and strategic responses from governments and international organizations. As this conflict evolves, its implications for global trade dynamics will be critical areas of study for political scientists and economists alike. Against this backdrop, this study examined the political effects of the Russian-Ukraine war on international trade. This study was anchored on Geoeconomic Power Theory (GPT). The theory as a distinct conceptual framework, has emerged from a synthesis of existing theories in international relations and political economy rather than being the work of a single individual or a specific year. The theory draws on the work of scholars who have explored the intersection of economics and geopolitics, particularly in the context of the post-Cold War era and the rise of economic statecraft as a central tool of international power.

The Geoeconomic Power Theory (GPT) posits that states use economic tools, including trade, sanctions, and market control, as a primary instrument of geopolitical influence. In contrast to traditional power theories that emphasize military strength or diplomatic persuasion, this theory argues that control over trade flows, economic sanctions, and access to resources has become the defining feature of state power in the 21st century. Under GPT, economic tools are strategically deployed for economic gain, to shape international political dynamics, and to secure geopolitical interests (Blackwill & Harris, 2016).

Edward N. Luttwak is often credited with popularizing the idea of "geoeconomics" in modern discourse through his essay *"From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce"*, published in *The National Interest* in 1990. Luttwak argued that after the Cold War, the primary mode of international competition shifted from military to economic power, where countries increasingly used economic means to achieve strategic ends. While

Luttwak did not fully develop what we now call Geoeconomic Power Theory, his work laid the foundation by introducing the concept that economic tools like trade, sanctions, and market control were becoming central to international relations (Luttwak, 1990).

The theory was further advanced by Robert D. Blackwill and Jennifer M. Harris in their 2016 book *War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft*. They explicitly framed geoeconomics as using economic tools to achieve geopolitical objectives, developing many ideas underpinning what we now understand as Geoeconomic Power Theory. Blackwill and Harris (2016) argued that economic measures such as sanctions, tariffs, infrastructure investments, and control over critical resources have become primary instruments of state power, particularly for great powers like the United States and China.

The formalization of Geoeconomic Power Theory (GPT) as a distinct theoretical framework has occurred gradually, building upon the works of scholars from geopolitics, international political economy, and economic statecraft. GPT also reflects the changing nature of global conflicts, where economic sanctions, trade restrictions, and control of strategic sectors (such as energy and technology) are used as alternatives to military power. The Russian-Ukrainian War, U.S.-China trade tensions, and the rise of economic sanctions have all illustrated the application of geoeconomic strategies in real-world geopolitics (Luttwak, 1990). The core tenets of geoeconomic power theory, according to Luttwak (1990), include:

- a. **Economic Leverage as a Tool of Power:** Economic sanctions, tariffs, trade agreements, and control over essential resources (such as energy) are tools for geopolitical power. Countries with the ability to exert economic pressure on others gain influence in the international arena.
- b. **Strategic Trade Realignments:** States reorient their trade partnerships to create or dismantle political alliances. Economic interdependence can be weaponized in conflict, leading to trade shifts that reflect political alliances rather than pure economic logic.
- c. **Sanctions and Economic Warfare:** Sanctions are a key component of geoeconomic strategy. Rather than pursuing military confrontation, states increasingly rely on economic sanctions to achieve political goals, punish adversaries, or force political concessions.
- d. **Economic Vulnerability and Resilience:** Countries that are more economically resilient (i.e., less dependent on others for critical goods, diversified trade partners) can withstand or avoid the geopolitical consequences of economic warfare.
- e. **Multilateralism vs. Bilateralism:** While some states use multilateral institutions like the World Trade Organization (WTO) to enforce trade rules, others exploit bilateral relationships to bypass multilateral constraints, creating new spheres of influence through economic partnerships.

Geoeconomic Power Theory (GPT) provides a robust framework for understanding the political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade. By emphasizing the strategic use of economic tools, including sanctions, trade shifts, and control over resources, GPT allows us to see how geopolitical tensions reshape trade policies and global economic relationships. The long-term impact of these geoeconomic strategies will likely define global trade patterns and international relations for years to come. The Russian-Ukrainian war

demonstrates the centrality of economic power and geoeconomics in modern conflicts. The war has not only redefined the political landscape of Eastern Europe but has had profound and long-term effects on international trade. Applying GPT to this context allows us to understand the conflict's broader political and economic consequences.

1.1. Use of Economic Sanctions as a Tool of Power

Since the invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, Western nations, particularly the United States and the European Union, have applied severe economic sanctions on Russia. These sanctions targeted key sectors of the Russian economy, such as energy exports, banking, and technology. Under GPT, these sanctions are seen as strategic tools to diminish Russia's economic capabilities and, by extension, its geopolitical influence. The sanctions have profoundly affected Russia's ability to participate in global trade, particularly with Western nations. In 2023, Russia's exports to Europe declined by over 50%, forcing the country to shift its trade focus to Asia, especially China and India. The shift shows the practical application of geoeconomic power, where sanctions create a reordering of international trade relationships.

1.2. Weaponization of Energy as Economic Leverage

Russia's dominance in global energy markets (particularly oil and natural gas) is another aspect of GPT. Russia has historically used energy exports to Europe as a tool of influence. When sanctions were imposed on Russia, it responded by reducing gas supplies to Europe, weaponizing its energy dominance as a retaliatory measure. This led to energy crises across Europe in 2022 and 2023, forcing European countries to diversify their energy sources, particularly by increasing imports from the U.S., Middle Eastern nations, and Africa. Under GPT, economic resources, especially critical ones like energy, can be deployed as tools in geopolitical conflicts. The power dynamic shifted as Europe, pursuing energy resilience, developed new policies to secure long-term energy independence.

1.3. Realignment of Global Trade Relationships

The Russian-Ukrainian war catalyzed significant changes in global trade flows. As Western nations severed trade ties with Russia, countries like China, India, and Turkey stepped in to fill the void. This shift reflects GPT's core tenet: trade realignments often result from geopolitical strategies rather than purely economic incentives. Russia's deepening economic ties with China are particularly noteworthy. By 2023, bilateral trade between Russia and China had increased 36%, and China became Russia's largest trading partner. This realignment shows how states can recalibrate their trade partnerships to secure their geopolitical positions, further validating GPT.

1.4. Multilateralism and Bilateralism in Geoeconomic Strategy

The Russian-Ukrainian conflict also underscores the strategic deployment of bilateral and multilateral economic engagements. While the U.S. and its allies relied on multilateral frameworks like NATO and the EU to implement sanctions, Russia countered by strengthening bilateral ties with non-Western nations, including India, Turkey, and China. This duality of multilateral versus bilateral strategies aligns with GPT's perspective that states will pursue multiple avenues to secure their geoeconomic interests, especially during conflict. The

relevance of geoeconomic power theory to understanding the political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade include:

- a. **Strategic Trade Realignments:** GPT helps explain the significant reshuffling of global trade partnerships triggered by the war. It frames the Russian-Chinese trade surge and Europe's diversification efforts as strategic maneuvers rooted in political rather than purely economic considerations. This perspective highlights that international trade, particularly in conflict zones, is increasingly governed by geopolitical calculations.
- b. **Sanctions as a Persistent Tool of Statecraft:** The widespread and continuing use of sanctions in the context of the war fits neatly into GPT's framework, which posits that economic warfare is an increasingly favored alternative to direct military engagement. These sanctions reshape not just the economies of the targeted country (Russia) but also global trade networks, leading to long-term shifts.
- c. **Economic Warfare in Global Conflicts:** GPT is particularly relevant in analyzing how economic tools, from sanctions to control over natural resources, have become the dominant form of warfare in the modern geopolitical arena. The Russian-Ukrainian war is a case study of how states weaponize trade and economic policy to advance their geopolitical goals without necessarily engaging in direct military conflict.

3. Research Method

Research design refers to the way and manner of investigation open to a researcher. It is a plan of action and guides the researcher through the research exercises. The research design can be qualitative and quantitative, depending on the problem investigated. The main research design adopted in this study was historical and content analysis. It is concerned with an in-depth examination of documented data based on which relevant materials were drawn. This design does not require any form of scientific or statistical measurement and analysis. It analyzed the form, content, and experience of social action. It is not subjected to mathematic transformation analysis. Due to this study's historical and qualitative nature, the researcher used secondary data. A secondary data source refers to materials that are not originally from the researcher but from existing literature. The secondary data was gathered from textbooks, journal publications, dailies and periodicals, government official documents, and internet materials. The data for this study was synthesized and analyzed using trend analysis instruments/techniques. This made it possible to demonstrate the relationship pattern between the variables under investigation and in a fruitful manner that permits generalization in the study. In other words, this study analysis adopted the historical method, which is qualitative and explorative in nature.

4. Related Work and Discussion

As the war between Russia and Ukraine continues, its relevance to international trade remains critical. Trade is a fundamental component of global economic stability and development. It facilitates economic growth, enhances consumer welfare, promotes investment and innovation, fosters global integration, contributes to political stability, addresses global challenges, and provides resilience against economic shocks. The interconnectedness created by trade plays a crucial role in maintaining the health and stability of the global economy. Through economic integration, access to larger markets, technology diffusion, shock

absorption, political stability, multilateral cooperation, and resilience to global challenges, trade serves as a stabilizing force. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, the importance of robust trade relationships in promoting global economic stability cannot be overstated (Baldwin, 2016). According to Anderson and Van Wincoop (2004), Trade stimulates foreign direct investment (FDI) as companies seek to enter new markets and capitalize on trade opportunities. Increased investment leads to technological advancements and innovation, critical for long-term economic development. Countries open to trade often attract more FDI due to the larger market potential and the benefits of technology transfer.

Trade allows countries to specialize in producing goods and services where they have a comparative advantage. This specialization enhances productivity and efficiency, contributing to economic growth. Countries engaging in trade can access a larger market, increasing production and investment. International trade expands the variety of goods and services available to consumers, often at lower prices due to competition. This access to a wider array of products improves consumer welfare and living standards. Trade fosters innovation as companies strive to meet global standards and preferences (Krugman & Obstfeld, 2009).

The Russian-Ukrainian war has reshaped global trade dynamics, influencing economic policies, supply chains, and geopolitical relationships. The political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade are multifaceted and complex. As countries navigate the disruptions caused by the war, the realignment of trade relationships, and the implications of economic sanctions, it is evident that the global trading system is undergoing a significant transformation. The Russian-Ukrainian war has catalyzed profound changes in the global trading system, affecting trade flows, trade relationships, and international trade policies. Below is an in-depth explanation:

4.1. The Russian-Ukrainian War and Global Trade Flows

The Russian-Ukrainian War has far-reaching implications for global trade flows, influencing energy prices, food security, and supply chain dynamics (Young, 2024). As we move into 2024, the conflict's persistence shapes the global geopolitical landscape and economic conditions. Understanding these trends is crucial for policymakers and businesses as they navigate the complexities of a changing trade environment. The conflict has escalated tensions between Russia and Western nations, leading to unprecedented sanctions against Russia and significant shifts in trade flows. The key events and developments from 2023-2024 include:

a. Continuation of Hostilities:

As of 2023, the war remains ongoing, with Ukraine's counteroffensive efforts and Russia's military strategies continuing to evolve. High-profile battles, especially in eastern Ukraine, have persisted, leading to significant casualties on both sides. By 2024, analysts predict that the conflict will either reach a stalemate or escalate further, impacting international diplomatic relations and trade negotiations (Hamza et al., 2024).

b. Sanctions and Economic Isolation:

In response to Russia's actions, Western countries have imposed extensive sanctions targeting Russian banks, energy exports, and key industries. These measures have

aimed to cripple the Russian economy but have also created ripple effects in global markets. The European Union and the United States have continuously updated their sanctions in 2023, with discussions ongoing about expanding measures to include sectors like technology and luxury goods (Rockson *et al.*, 2024).

c. Energy Market Disruptions:

The war has significantly disrupted global energy supplies. Russia has historically been a major supplier of oil and gas, mainly to Europe. However, sanctions and supply chain disruptions have led to soaring energy prices and a search for alternative suppliers (Xin & Zhang, 2023). By 2024, Europe aims to reduce its dependency on Russian energy further, leading to investments in renewable energy and increased imports from alternative sources such as the U.S. and the Middle East (Al-Saidi, 2023).

d. Grain Exports and Food Security:

Ukraine, often called the "breadbasket of Europe," has faced severe disruptions in its agricultural exports due to the conflict. The Black Sea region has been a hotspot for military engagements, affecting shipping routes (Young, 2024). The grain deal brokered by Turkey and the UN in 2022 allowed some exports to resume, but ongoing hostilities have continued to threaten these supplies. In 2023, Ukraine's grain exports remained below pre-war levels, impacting global food prices and security, especially in developing countries (Lee, 2023).

e. Shifts in Trade Partnerships:

The conflict has prompted many countries to reassess their trade partnerships. Nations in Asia and Africa have sought to diversify their imports, reshuffling trade flows. Emerging economies have shown increased interest in developing stronger ties with Russia and Ukraine, navigating the complexities of sanctions and international relations (Hamza *et al.*, 2024).

Global trade implications include:

a. Supply Chain Resilience:

The war has highlighted vulnerabilities in global supply chains, prompting companies to rethink their logistics and sourcing strategies. Many firms are shifting away from single-source suppliers in conflict-affected regions. Businesses are increasingly focusing on building resilience by diversifying suppliers and investing in local production capabilities.

b. Commodity Prices and Inflation:

The conflict has contributed to rising prices for various commodities, including energy and agricultural products, leading to inflationary pressures worldwide. Analysts predict that while some prices may stabilize in 2024, the long-term impacts of the war will continue to influence global inflation trends and economic recovery (Hamza *et al.*, 2024).

c. Emerging Trade Agreements:

As countries adjust to the new trade environment, new agreements are forming. For instance, Southeast Asian and African countries are exploring trade deals that bypass traditional trade routes impacted by the conflict. The rise of alternative trade blocs may reshape international trade norms in the coming years.

4.2. Economic Sanctions and Trade Relationships

Economic sanctions are tools employed by governments to influence the behavior of other nations, often in response to violations of international norms, aggression, or human rights abuses. Here's a detailed exploration of this connection, supported by references. Countries facing sanctions often seek alternative trade partners to mitigate the economic impact. For instance, after being subjected to sanctions, Russia increased its trade with countries like China and India. 2023 Russia's exports to China surged 36%, reflecting a strategic pivot towards non-Western markets to offset lost trade with Europe and the United States (Reuters, 2023).

The effects of economic sanctions on trade relationships are multifaceted and can significantly alter the dynamics of international commerce. Economic sanctions are typically imposed by one or more countries to influence the behavior of a targeted nation, often in response to political or military actions deemed unacceptable. This overview explores the impacts of such sanctions on trade relationships, drawing from recent journal articles and empirical studies (Ikyase & Timi, 2024). Economic sanctions are punitive measures to exert economic pressure on a targeted nation to induce policy changes or compliance with international norms. They can take various forms, including trade restrictions, asset freezes, and financial penalties (Tookitaki, 2024). Sanctions often lead to significant shifts in trade flows, affecting both the sanctioned country and those imposing the sanctions.

The political connection between economic sanctions and trade relationships is deeply intertwined with issues of foreign policy, domestic politics, international alliances, and ethical considerations. While sanctions serve as tools for political leverage, their effectiveness, and implications vary widely depending on the context and implementation. Understanding this connection is essential for comprehending the complexities of international relations in an era marked by geopolitical tensions and shifting power dynamics. The political dynamics at play include:

a. Sanctions as Instruments of Foreign Policy

Countries use economic sanctions to achieve foreign policy objectives without military intervention. By imposing sanctions, governments aim to coerce targeted nations into changing undesirable behaviors, such as human rights violations, military aggression, or nuclear proliferation. This connection is deeply rooted in the political motivations behind sanctions (Tookitaki, 2024).

b. Political Legitimacy and Domestic Politics

Sanctions can also be a reflection of domestic political pressures. Governments may impose sanctions to respond to public opinion or political demands, enhancing their legitimacy. For instance, the U.S. sanctions against Russia following its annexation of Crimea were partly driven by domestic pressure to take a strong stance against perceived aggression. Political leaders often leverage sanctions to demonstrate their commitment to national values and international norms.

c. Impact on International Alliances and Relations

The imposition of economic sanctions can reshape international alliances and trade relationships. Countries may find themselves aligning with or against the sanctioning state based on shared political interests. For example, when the U.S. imposed sanctions on Iran, it not only affected U.S.-Iran relations but also influenced Iran's ties with other nations, including Russia and China, who sought to maintain trade with Tehran (Tookitaki, 2024).

d. Global Power Dynamics and Strategic Interests

Economic sanctions often reflect broader global power dynamics and strategic interests. Major powers may use sanctions to influence weaker nations or counter rival states. The imposition of sanctions against North Korea by the U.S. and its allies is an example of leveraging economic tools to address security concerns related to nuclear proliferation (Bechtol, 2018).

e. Political Efficacy and Outcomes

The effectiveness of sanctions in achieving political goals is widely debated. While sanctions can create economic hardship and political pressure, they do not consistently achieve the desired outcomes. For instance, sanctions against Venezuela have not resulted in the ousting of the Maduro regime but have contributed to humanitarian crises and regional instability (Bull & Rosales, 2020). This raises questions about the political efficacy of sanctions as tools of statecraft.

f. Ethical Considerations and Humanitarian Impact

The political use of sanctions raises ethical considerations, particularly regarding their humanitarian impact. Sanctions can disproportionately affect civilian populations, leading to calls for more targeted or smart sanctions that minimize collateral damage. The debate over the ethical implications of sanctions is increasingly prominent in international relations as scholars and policymakers seek to balance political objectives with humanitarian concerns (Pape, 1997).

g. International Law and Norms

Economic sanctions must navigate complex international legal frameworks and norms. The legitimacy of sanctions is often debated in international forums, such as the United Nations. Political actors may use the threat or imposition of sanctions to reinforce international norms against certain behaviors, thus shaping global standards of conduct (Drezner, 2011).

4.3. Long-term Consequences of the Conflict on International Trade Policies

The long-term consequences of conflicts on international trade policies are wide-ranging and complex. Conflicts disrupt immediate trade flows and lead to structural changes in global trade networks, with nations realigning partnerships, adjusting supply chains, and revising their trade strategies. As geopolitical tensions continue to influence global trade, understanding these long-term shifts is crucial for policymakers and businesses aiming to navigate the evolving landscape of international trade. The long-term consequences of major conflicts, such as the Russian-Ukrainian War, on international trade policies are profound and multifaceted. These impacts go beyond immediate disruptions, often leading to structural

changes in the global trade system, new alliances emerge, and policy-making shifts to ensure economic resilience. The long-term consequences of conflicts in international trade policies include:

a. Realignment of Global Trade Relationships

One of the most significant long-term impacts of conflicts on trade policies is the realignment of trade relationships. Nations directly involved in or affected by the conflict may reduce trade with the warring countries and instead seek new trading partners. For instance, the sanctions imposed on Russia after its 2022 invasion of Ukraine prompted Russia to shift its trade focus from Europe to Asia, particularly China and India. This has long-term implications for trade policies as countries adjust to new geopolitical realities (Moskalenko *et al.*, 2024; Struye de Swielande, 2023).

b. Decoupling and Fragmentation of Global Supply Chains

Conflicts often lead to a decoupling of economies and a fragmentation of global supply chains. Countries affected by the conflict may pursue policies to reduce dependence on hostile or unstable regions. For example, the Russian-Ukrainian war disrupted global energy and agricultural markets, pushing European countries to reduce their reliance on Russian oil and gas. This shift toward energy diversification and self-reliance has led to the reconfiguration of supply chains, with long-term effects on international trade policies.

c. Increased Use of Trade Barriers and Protectionism

Conflicts can lead to a rise in protectionist measures as governments seek to protect their industries and secure critical resources. In the long term, this protectionism may persist as part of national security strategies, altering trade policies. For instance, following the disruptions caused by the war in Ukraine, several countries increased tariffs on certain imports to protect domestic industries from volatile global markets, particularly in the food and energy sectors.

d. Regionalism and Trade Bloc Formation

Long-term conflict can accelerate the formation of regional trade blocs and trade agreements. In response to the fragmentation of global trade networks, countries may form or strengthen regional trade alliances to promote economic stability. For instance, the European Union's deepened economic cooperation in response to the war in Ukraine highlights how regional integration can be a long-term consequence of conflict, with trade policies increasingly focused on securing intra-regional trade.

e. Energy Security and Trade Policies

Conflicts, especially those involving major energy producers, have long-term implications for global energy trade policies. The Russian-Ukrainian war, which disrupted global energy markets, has led to a worldwide reevaluation of energy security policies. Countries in Europe and beyond are increasingly prioritizing energy independence, renewable energy sources, and diversifying energy suppliers. These shifts are leading to long-term changes in trade policies related to energy imports and exports.

f. Sanctions and Trade Policy Adjustments

Economic sanctions, as a result of conflict, have long-term effects on trade policies. Sanctions disrupt established trade relationships and create new trade dynamics. In the long term, sanctioned countries may develop parallel trade networks or seek alternative markets to circumvent restrictions. As a result, trade policies in both the sanctioned and sanctioning countries evolve to address these new realities, often leading to permanent shifts in trade strategies.

g. Resilience and Diversification Strategies in Trade Policies

Conflicts expose vulnerabilities in global trade systems, prompting long-term policy shifts toward resilience and diversification. Countries and businesses, having experienced severe disruptions, are increasingly embedding resilience measures into their trade policies. This includes diversifying trade partners, investing in strategic reserves, and promoting the development of domestic industries for critical goods like semiconductors, food, and energy. These policy shifts aim to reduce the risks of future conflicts or global crises on trade.

h. Technological Innovation and Trade Policy Evolution

Conflicts often accelerate technological innovation, leading to new trade policies related to technology transfer, intellectual property, and export controls. For example, the Ukrainian conflict has spurred technological advancements in military and cyber technologies, influencing trade policies related to arms exports, technology sharing, and cybersecurity. The long-term impact of these innovations will reshape global trade regulations and the flow of strategic goods and technologies.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war on international trade are profound and far-reaching, reshaping the global market landscape in ways that will likely endure for years to come. The war has catalyzed a decisive shift from a model of globalization characterized by interdependence and cooperative trade relations to one marked by fragmentation and regionalization. This evolution reflects not only the immediate impacts of the war but also a broader re-evaluation of the geopolitical underpinnings of trade. The imposition of sanctions on Russia has demonstrated the significant role that economic measures can play in foreign policy. Yet, it has also highlighted their limitations as countries explore alternative trade partnerships and financial systems. As nations seek to insulate themselves from the disruptions caused by geopolitical tensions, there is a clear movement towards building resilience through diversified supply chains and increased domestic production. This trend signifies a growing priority for national security and resource independence over traditional economic considerations.

Moreover, the rise of economic blocs and the reconfiguration of trade relationships underscore a world increasingly divided along political lines, where trade is used not just for economic exchange but also for asserting influence and power. The implications of this shift are profound, potentially leading to a more polarized global economy where cooperation and multilateral governance are increasingly challenged. In conclusion, the political effects of the Russian-Ukrainian war serve as a critical reminder of the intricate interplay between politics

and trade. Understanding these dynamics will be essential for policymakers, businesses, and scholars as nations navigate this new reality. The evolving landscape of international trade will require a nuanced approach that considers economic imperatives and geopolitical realities, ensuring that future trade policies adapt to the complexities of an increasingly interconnected yet fragmented world. Based on the findings of this study findings and conclusion, the following recommendations for policy-making are made:

- a. Global policymakers should develop a real-time trade monitoring system that tracks fluctuations in trade volumes and routes affected by the Russian-Ukrainian war. This system should leverage advanced data analytics to identify and predict shifts in global trade flows, enabling businesses to respond proactively to emerging trends.
- b. Global policy-makers should conduct an in-depth impact assessment of existing economic sanctions to allow for the identification of unintended consequences and potential adjustments to sanctions policy that better align with individual country business strategic objectives.
- c. Policy-makers, trade experts, and business leaders should develop adaptive policy frameworks that address the long-term implications of the war, fostering collaboration and innovation in trade policy formulation.

References

- Al-Mustanyir, S. (2024). From oil reliance to financial resilience: have economic sanctions made OPEC countries' healthcare financing independent from oil?. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2331281.
- Al-Saidi, M. (2023). White knight or partner of choice? The Ukraine war and the role of the Middle East in the energy security of Europe. *Energy Strategy Reviews*, 49, 101116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2023.101116>
- Anderson, J. E., & Van Wincoop, E. (2004). Trade costs. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42(3), 691-751. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0022051042177649>
- Baldwin, R. (2016). *The great convergence: Information technology and the new globalization*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Bechtol Jr, B. E. (2018). North Korean illicit activities and sanctions: A national security dilemma. *Cornell Int'l LJ*, 51, 57.
- Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In defense of globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blackwill, R. D., & Harris, J. M. (2016). *War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft*. Harvard University Press.
- Bull, B., & Rosales, A. (2020). Into the shadows: sanctions, rentierism, and economic informalization in Venezuela. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies/Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe*, (109), 107-133.
- Drezner, D. W. (2011). Sanctions sometimes smart: Targeted sanctions in theory and practice. *International Studies Review*, 13(2), 225-240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2010.01001.x>
- European Commission. (2023). *Sanctions against Russia: Economic impact and geopolitical consequences*. United States: European Commission Publications.
- Hamza, T., Hayet B, H., Mehdi, M., & Mina, S. (2024). High inflation during Russia–Ukraine war and financial market interaction: Evidence from C-Vine Copula and SETAR models, *Research in International Business and Finance*,70(B), 102384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2024.102384>

- Ikyase, J. K.T., & Timi, A.W. (2024). Understanding the Russo-Ukrainian war and international trade. *Journal of Political Discourse*, 2(2), 211 - 212.
- International Food Policy Research Institute. (2022). *The impact of the Russia-Ukraine conflict on global food security*. New York: International Food Policy Research Institute Publications.
- Krugman, P., & Obstfeld, M. (2009). *International economics: Theory and policy*. New York: Pearson.
- Lee, T. (2023). Energy markets in turmoil: The Russian-Ukrainian conflict. *Journal of Energy Policy*, 14(3), 55 - 78.
- Luttwak, E. N. (1990). From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce. *The National Interest*, 20, 17-23.
- Moskalenko, K., Xunda, Y., & Mohammad, A, Rahaman. (2024). Russia's strategic shift from European integration to Eastern alliances after the war in Ukraine: A postcolonial Perspective. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(12), 370-388. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.1212024>
- Pape, R. A. (1997). Why economic sanctions do not work. *International Security*, 22(2), 90 - 136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539368>
- Reuters. (2023). *Russia's trade with China grows as sanctions bite*. New York: World Bank Group
- Rockson, J.K., Robert, Y, A., & Tanko, D.(2024). The geopolitics of the Russian-Ukrainian war: Implications for Africa in international relations, *European Journal of Development Studies*, 4(4), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejdevelop.2024.4.4.197>
- Tookitaki. (2024). "Economic sanctions: Definition, impact, and global dynamics. Retrieved from [Tookitaki.com](https://www.tookitaki.com) on 10th December, 2023.
- World Trade Organization. (2023). *World Trade Organization annual report: Trade, conflict, and governance in a divided world*. New York: World Trade Organization Publications.
- Young, A. (2024). Trade norms and emerging economies: A new paradigm. *International Affairs Review*, 12(2), 15 - 29.
- Xin, B., & Zhang, M. (2023). Evolutionary game on international energy trade under the Russia-Ukraine conflict. *Energy Economics*, 125, 106827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2023.106827>