

The Test of Nuclear Deterrence " A Case Study of the Ukrainian Crisis"

Lecturer Dr. Ayad Hilal Hussien Al-Knany

Faculty of Law and Political Science Al bayan University / Iraq-Baghdad

Email : ayad.h@albayan.edu.iq

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2026-5923>

Received	Accepted	Published
09/06/2026	15/06/2026	30/06/2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63939/JSMS.2026-Vol8.N31.152-168>

Ayad Hilal Hussien Al-Knany. (2026). The Test of Nuclear Deterrence ; A Case Study of Ukrainian Crisis. *Journal of Strategic and Military Studies*, volume8 (issue 31), pp 152 – 168.

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence in contemporary international politics by analyzing the Ukrainian crisis as a case study. It begins with the premise that nuclear deterrence remains a cornerstone of global security strategies and plays a crucial role in preventing direct military confrontation between major nuclear powers. However, its effectiveness is not absolute or unconditional; rather, it is influenced by a range of political, strategic, and technological factors.

The study's findings indicate that nuclear deterrence has contributed to preventing a direct conflict between Russia and NATO, but it has not prevented the continuation of conventional warfare or the provision of widespread external support to Ukraine. Furthermore, the study reveals that nuclear threats are increasingly serving as tools for strategic signaling and political influence, rather than actual indicators of imminent nuclear use. The study also demonstrates that recent technological advancements, including precision weapons, drones, and cyber capabilities, have posed new challenges to traditional deterrence theories, enabling weaker actors to impose significant costs on stronger powers without crossing the nuclear threshold. The study concludes that nuclear deterrence will remain a central element of the international security system for the foreseeable future, but its continued effectiveness depends on its ability to adapt to geopolitical shifts, technological advancements, and evolving patterns of strategic competition. Therefore, traditional deterrence theories require continuous review and development to align with the increasingly complex security environment of the 21st century.

Keywords: Nuclear Deterrence- Ukrainian Crisis - Nuclear Arsenal- Russian Nuclear Rhetoric- NATO- International Security- Deterrence Effectiveness- Strategic Balance

© 2026, Al-Knany, licensee Democratic Arab Center. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0), which permits non-commercial use of the material, appropriate credit, and indication if changes in the material were made. You can copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format as well as remix, transform, and build upon the material, provided the original work is properly cited.

1-Introduction

Since the Cold War, nuclear deterrence has been considered a central mechanism for strategic stability in international politics. It has played a crucial role in preventing direct military confrontation between major powers by establishing what is known as the "balance of terror." However, the transformation of the international system after the Cold War, particularly with the rise of multipolarity and the increasing complexity of regional conflicts, has raised fundamental questions about the continued effectiveness of nuclear deterrence.

Although deterrence has contributed to establishing a global strategic balance, and made the cost of a large-scale nuclear war extremely high, and consequently reduced the likelihood of using these weapons despite possessing them, the transformations of the international system and the changing nature of wars, their tools, and the technology of weapons used have led to an evolution in deterrence that has become more than just reliant on military arsenals, and has become dependent on the integration of military capabilities, political strategy, and advanced technology within a comprehensive framework for managing conflicts and preventing their escalation.

However, the Ukrainian crisis has reopened the debate in a more urgent and practical way. Nuclear threats have been widely used without being translated into actual use, raising the question of whether nuclear deterrence remains an effective mechanism for preventing escalation, or whether it has become primarily a tool for political signaling and coercion.

The Russian -Ukrainian war represents one of the most significant geopolitical confrontations in the contemporary international system, not only because of its military and political dimensions, but also because of the prominent role of nuclear rhetoric in shaping the behavior of both Russia and Western actors. Repeated references from the Russian leadership to nuclear capabilities have added a new dimension to the conflict, demonstrating that deterrence is not limited to preventing nuclear war, but extends to influencing conventional military and political decisions.

Despite extensive research on nuclear deterrence, a gap remains in assessing its effectiveness in contemporary regional warfare, where nuclear weapons are primarily used as tools for signaling, coercion, and escalation management, rather than for actual use on the battlefield.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence in the context of the Ukrainian crisis and analyze how nuclear threats influence strategic calculations, particularly among NATO and Western states.

1-1- Significance of Research

The significance of this research lies in its focus on testing nuclear deterrence within a contemporary conflict serving as a live model for the challenges facing international security namely the Russian Ukrainian crisis. It provides insights into the role of nuclear deterrence and its impact on the policies of major powers such as Russia and NATO while assessing the effectiveness of nuclear threats in preventing escalation or achieving political gains. Furthermore, the study clarifies the limitations of nuclear deterrence in regional conflicts compared to the role it played during the Cold War thereby enhancing the capacity of policymakers to make informed strategic decisions in crisis management.

1-2- Research Problem

While nuclear deterrence is generally perceived as a tool to prevent the use of force or escalation, the crisis demonstrates that a nuclear arsenal has not stopped the continuation of conventional military operations. This raises critical questions regarding the credibility of nuclear threats, the limits of their influence on Western actors and NATO in preventing direct military intervention, and their ability to deter continued Western military and financial support to Ukraine.

Thus, the core issue of this research revolves around the central question: to what extent can nuclear deterrence be effective in preventing escalation and shaping strategic behavior in regional conflicts, particularly in the case of the Ukrainian crisis? In addition, it raises the question of how nuclear signaling influences risk perception and strategic decision-making among major powers.

1-3- Research Objectives

1. To clarify the concept of nuclear deterrence and its strategic and theoretical dimensions in contemporary international politics.
2. Studying the evolution of nuclear deterrence and its applications in modern regional conflicts with a particular focus on the Ukrainian crisis.
3. Assessing the impact of Russian nuclear signaling has constrained direct Western military intervention in conflict.
4. Identifying the limits of nuclear deterrence effectiveness in regional conflicts and anticipating its implications for the global nuclear security framework.

1-4-Research Methodology

This research relies on a descriptive and analytical methodology to understand the nature of nuclear deterrence and its impact on the Ukrainian crisis. The descriptive approach aims to provide an accurate account of concepts and strategies related to nuclear deterrence including the theoretical framework, the evolution of deterrence theories and its roles in contemporary international politics. The analytical methodology is applied to the case study of the Russian Ukrainian crisis by examining Russian nuclear rhetoric Western policies NATO's response and the implications for the global nuclear security framework.

The study draws on recent primary and secondary sources including official statements policy documents published academic research and analytical reports from international research centers. Data are collected and analyzed objectively and systematically to understand the relationship between nuclear deterrence and the practical developments in the conflict. This methodology enables the derivation of accurate findings and the formulation of practical recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence and improve crisis management in the future.

2- The Theoretical Framework of Nuclear Deterrence

The theoretical study of nuclear deterrence requires moving beyond the general historical description towards a more accurate understanding and analysis of how deterrence operates in different strategic contexts. Deterrence has constituted a fundamental pillar in achieving a form of relative stability within the international system by creating a state of “balance of terror that prevented the outbreak of large-scale wars between major powers. Over time nuclear deterrence ceased to be merely a policy based on the possession of nuclear weapons rather it evolved into an integrated framework that combines military strength advanced technology and politics as well as strategic doctrine in the management of international conflicts.

Furthermore, the concept of nuclear deterrence has acquired new dimensions amid current geopolitical transformations and the increasing number of nuclear-armed states, rendering it a complex instrument for maintaining international balance regulating interactions among major powers and a fertile subject for analysis in contemporary security and strategic studies (Freedman: 2023, p.15-18).

2-1- The Essence of Nuclear Deterrence

This section analyzes the theoretical nature of nuclear deterrence as a concept that has shaped the global security order since the mid twentieth century. It is not limited to the possession of destructive weapons but represents a political and psychological mechanism that relies on perception, credibility, and the ability to influence an adversary’s decision-making process.

Accordingly, understanding nuclear deterrence today requires distinguishing between its classical formulations during the Cold War and its contemporary transformations in an increasingly complex and multipolar international system.

Understanding nuclear deterrence today requires examining its strategic and humanitarian dimensions and its adaptation to geopolitical shifts. The analysis also highlights the evolution of deterrence theories from classical formulations to broader perspectives reflecting the new balance of power. Ultimately nuclear deterrence rests not only on weapons but on the mutual perception of risk among states.

2-1-1- The Concept and Strategic Dimensions of Nuclear Deterrence

This subsection addresses the general concept of nuclear deterrence defining its strategic and psychological dimensions and its role in shaping the international behavior of major powers.

Nuclear deterrence can be defined as a strategic approach that seeks to prevent an adversary from taking a specific action by threatening severe and unacceptable consequences, particularly through the potential use of nuclear weapons. According to nuclear deterrence, nuclear weapons are capable of enormous destruction far exceeding that of conventional weapons. Thus, nuclear weapons can produce a huge social and psychological reaction, and they have a unique deterrent effect. The core of nuclear deterrence theory is to 'use the non-use' of nuclear power as a means to force an enemy to abandon the launching of a nuclear offensive or other warlike action, and thus achieve a nation's political, security, and military objectives (Deal: 2014, p. 358). Nuclear deterrence does not have its immediate effect—preventing an adversary from attacking—simply by possessing the deterrent weapon. It is closely linked to the concepts of credibility, capability, and communication, as the effectiveness of deterrence depends not only on possessing nuclear weapons but also on the adversary's belief in the willingness to use them if necessary. In this context, nuclear deterrence operates through two main forms:

- Direct Nuclear Deterrence: where a state deters attacks against itself.
- Extended Nuclear Deterrence: where a state extends its nuclear protection to allies, as seen in NATO's security framework (Binnendijk & Gompert: 2019, pp. 113-123)

In contemporary international politics nuclear deterrence remains one of the fundamental pillars of the balance of power among major nuclear states such as the United States, Russia, and China. After the Cold War these powers maintained their large nuclear arsenals not only to avoid direct conflict among themselves but also to expand their strategic influence in conflict-prone regions. Nuclear deterrence functions as a tool for strategic stability by creating a high cost for any nuclear or conventional escalation thereby reducing the likelihood of a full-scale conflict among the great powers (Kroenig: 2024, p. 23).

In practical terms, the importance of nuclear deterrence is evident in strengthening military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) where member states rely on US and European nuclear arsenals to ensure collective security against conventional and near-nuclear threats from adversaries such as Russia. This extended deterrence demonstrates how nuclear weapons can be part of a multilateral security assurance network enhancing the deterrence capabilities of each member (Heuser: 2024, p. 50).

At the same time, nuclear deterrence acts as a balancing factor among rising powers for example China seeks to expand its nuclear capabilities to improve its strategic position in

Asia while the United States and Russia continue to modernize their arsenals to prevent any decisive advantage by another party. Thus, nuclear deterrence remains a central element in managing international competition without resorting to full scale war (Freedman: 2023,p.115).

Based on what has been explained previously, there is no doubt that that nuclear deterrence in contemporary international politics has an essential role in enhancing the stability of relations between the major military powers in the world by creating a kind of strategic balance that makes the cost of waging a large scale war largely unacceptable to all parties concerned.

2-1-2-The Evolution of Deterrence Theories in Military and Political Thought

This subsection examines the historical development of deterrence theories from the Cold War to the present with a focus on the intellectual and political shifts in understanding the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence.

The theory of nuclear deterrence has undergone significant development since its emergence during the Cold War where the primary objective was to prevent war among the great powers by creating a balance of terror that would deter any party from using its nuclear weapons. At the outset of the Cold War, deterrence theories such as those proposed by Thomas Schelling focused on the concept of stability through credible threat that is the adversary's response would be catastrophic thereby preventing the initiation of any large scale nuclear or conventional attack (Acton: 2023, p,15).

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the expansion of international fragmentation, deterrence concepts were further developed to include sanctions extended deterrence and international alliances. In this context nuclear deterrence is no longer viewed merely as a second strike capability but as part of a broader framework encompassing comprehensive strategic deterrence which incorporates the use of non-nuclear force military support for allies and international security cooperation (Morgan: 2024, p.90).

Despite the continued strength of these theories some scholars emphasize that the limits of nuclear deterrence have become evident in contemporary regional conflicts particularly when non-nuclear states face threats from nuclear powers. This has prompted academics to reconsider the effectiveness of traditional deterrence and to develop new concepts that extend beyond mere nuclear arsenals (Futter & Zala:2024, p. 170).

Based on what was previously the theory of nuclear deterrence has maintained its strategic importance while at the same time facing complex analytical challenges amid the current transformations in international politics.

2-2- Nuclear Deterrence in Contemporary International Politics

The modern international system is witnessing rapid shifts in the balance of power making the study of nuclear deterrence vital to understanding global security. No longer limited to major powers it has become part of international relations shaping alliances and regional stability. Emerging during the Cold War it prevents large-scale wars through a balance of terror. Today nuclear deterrence remains a key instrument of strategic stability and conflict management among nuclear states.

2-2-1-The Role of Nuclear Deterrence in Achieving the Balance of Power among Great Powers.

This subsection focuses on analyzing how nuclear deterrence contributes to maintaining the balance among major powers and preventing the outbreak of large-scale wars.

In contemporary international politics nuclear deterrence remains one of the fundamental pillars of the balance of power among major nuclear armed states such as the United States, Russia, and China. After the Cold War these powers maintained their vast nuclear arsenals not only to avoid direct confrontation among themselves but also to expand their strategic influence in conflict-prone regions. Nuclear deterrence functions as an instrument of strategic stability by imposing high costs on any potential nuclear or conventional escalation, thereby reducing the likelihood of a full-scale conflict among the great powers (Acton: 2023.p.15). Thus, nuclear deterrence imposes strategic constraints on escalation, ensuring that conflicts remain below the threshold of total war, But it does not eliminate geopolitical competition among major powers, Hence deterrence contributes to what can be described as controlled instability, where rivalry persists but is regulated by the fear of catastrophic escalation (Freedman: 2023,p. 15).

In practical terms the importance of nuclear deterrence is evident in the strengthening of military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) where member states rely on U.S. and European nuclear arsenals to ensure collective security against conventional and semi nuclear threats posed by adversaries like Russia. This form of extended deterrence illustrates how nuclear weapons operate as part of a multilateral network of security guarantees enhancing the deterrent capabilities of each member state.

At the same time nuclear deterrence serves as a balancing factor among rising powers for instance China seeks to expand its nuclear capabilities to improve its strategic standing in Asia while the United States and Russia continue to modernize their arsenals to prevent any side from gaining a decisive advantage. Thus nuclear deterrence remains a central element in managing international competition without resorting to total war (Acton: 2023.p.17). The researcher believes that nuclear deterrence in contemporary international politics plays a pivotal role in establishing the stability of relations between the world's

major military powers by establishing a strategic balance that makes the cost of any large-scale war extremely high and largely unacceptable to all parties concerned.

2-2-2-Challenges of Nuclear Deterrence within a Multipolar International System.

It has become clear that the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence faces many challenges in a world characterized by multiple centers of power and an evolving nature of security threats. Deterrence today is radically different from what it was during the Cold War. Traditional nuclear deterrence was built on clear adversaries, stable escalation protocols, and predictable outcomes, all of which have become increasingly outdated in the face of modern realities (Wang :2025, p.29). The proliferation of nuclear weapons to include additional countries, as well as the possibility of non-state actors acquiring nuclear technology, introduced new complications to the strategic balance and global security (Aria:2024 ,p.167).Furthermore, technological advancements further complicate the concept of deterrence by providing states with new technological weapons that raise the possibility of nuclear war. Technological developments in warheads and advanced delivery systems have limited the effectiveness of traditional deterrence models, challenging the assumptions underlying Cold War strategies (Kang & Kugler, 2022).

Compounding these challenges, technological developments such as cyber warfare and precision-guided munitions have introduced new vulnerabilities to traditional deterrence models. Studies confirm the disruptive potential of cyber capabilities to undermine nuclear deterrence by targeting nuclear command and control systems, creating a new level of risk. The rise of precision-guided munitions also challenges traditional defense mechanisms and complicates strategic deterrence calculations. These developments necessitate an updated understanding of how deterrence operates in an era where threats are no longer confined to states or large nuclear arsenals (Aria: 2024, p. 167). Hypersonic weapons threaten deterrence stability because they reduce the warning and decision-making time available to commanders. Their maneuverability and speed also complicate missile defense systems and create uncertainty about whether an incoming strike will be conventional or nuclear. This ambiguity increases the potential for rapid escalation and miscalculation (Wang:2025, p.65). Meanwhile, artificial intelligence introduces both opportunities and instability into nuclear deterrence. While AI-enhanced systems can improve threat detection and response times, they also increase the risks of automated bias, false alarms, and machine-driven escalation. These risks become even more pronounced if states delegate critical launch or response functions to autonomous systems (Wang:2025, p.66).

Despite these challenges, which make nuclear deterrence among major nuclear powers fraught with the risks of escalation and miscalculation, the most significant challenge now lies in the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence in regional conflicts involving major nuclear powers against non-nuclear states or regional powers with limited capabilities. Technological advancements in conventional weapons have enabled non-nuclear states to

acquire means of warfare capable of inflicting significant damage on major nuclear powers without reaching a level that would justify the use of nuclear weapons. Drones, precision-guided missiles, cyber warfare technologies, and modern targeting systems have provided low-cost, highly effective offensive capabilities, enabling weaker actors to drain the resources of major powers, disrupt their military, economic, and technological capabilities, and prevent them from achieving a decisive victory in regional conflicts (Goddy U. Osimen, Oluwakemi Fulani, and Nesochi Mogbolu : 2025, pp.1-18).

In this context, nuclear power becomes politically and strategically constrained, as its use against a non-nuclear adversary carries a high political, moral, and international cost, in addition to the risk of uncontrolled escalation. Thus, nuclear deterrence, while retaining its effectiveness in preventing a full-scale nuclear war between major powers, appears less capable of resolving asymmetric regional conflicts, where non-nuclear states can employ modern technology to impose equations of attrition and counter-deterrence that limit the freedom of movement of nuclear power and reduce its ability to translate its strategic superiority into an actual victory on the ground.

Perhaps the most significant of these challenges lies in the practical effectiveness of deterrence in conflicts involving a nuclear power and a non-nuclear state, as demonstrated by the Ukrainian crisis where questions arise regarding the extent to which Russia's nuclear arsenal can prevent Ukrainian military advances or influence Kiev's strategic decisions. Several recent studies indicate that nuclear deterrence has not proven to be fully effective as a regional deterrent tool when the adversary lacks a similar nuclear capability thus complicating contemporary understandings of deterrence (Tannenwald:2024, pp.9-38). Furthermore, there has been an erosion of trust in international security commitments and guarantees as illustrated by the case of Ukraine following its signing of the Budapest Memorandum under which it relinquished its nuclear arsenal in exchange for security assurances that ultimately failed to prevent Russian intervention. This situation has led some analysts to argue that traditional deterrence is facing a crisis of confidence and that international legal guarantees alone cannot substitute for robust deterrent capabilities.

Academic discourse also suggests that technological developments such as automated command and control systems and precision guided weapons affect the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence by increasing the risks of unintended escalation and unpredictable battlefield dynamics. These factors make nuclear deterrence today far more complex than it was during the Cold War requiring integrated strategies that combine conventional nuclear and cyber deterrence measures (Al-Suwaidi: 2014, p.183).

In light of the foregoing analysis, the researcher believes that nuclear deterrence in the international system is multipolar and is subject to real tests that require re-evaluating and updating traditional deterrence theories to align them with the dynamic nature of international competition and technological progress.

3-Testing Nuclear Deterrence in the Ukrainian Crisis

Since 2022 the Russia Ukraine crisis has been a real test of long-established nuclear deterrence concepts originally formulated during the Cold War. Moscow has relied heavily on pointing to its nuclear capabilities as a strategic tool to deter any direct Western intervention in the conflict using nuclear rhetoric as a military and political tool to influence adversaries' decision-making processes. In response Western countries and Ukraine have sought to balance this position by strengthening conventional deterrence strengthening defense cooperation and leveraging strong collective security frameworks such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Lewis: 2023, p.7).

Throughout the crisis, fundamental questions have emerged regarding the actual effectiveness of nuclear arsenals in preventing escalation or achieving political and strategic goals without the physical use of nuclear weapons. It has also become clear that recurring nuclear threats may lose credibility over time if they are not backed by concrete and consistent policy action. The crisis thus highlights a critical dimension of deterrence theory the delicate balance between credibility, restraint and escalation control in nuclear signals (Roberts: 2023, p.23).

Given these mechanisms, it becomes necessary to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Russian nuclear threat posture and its impact on NATO and Western security policies as well as to explore the future path of nuclear deterrence in light of ongoing geopolitical shifts technological advances and emerging challenges to global strategic stability.

3-1- The Russian Nuclear Threat " Between Reality and Strategy"

This section examines Russia's nuclear threat within the context of the war in Ukraine analyzing how strategic tactics and actions have reflected Moscow's attempt to establish an effective nuclear deterrent. The analysis focuses on determining whether Russian discourse constitutes a genuine actionable threat or serves primarily as a political instrument for tactical and strategic advantage. It also explores the impact of these threats on Western and NATO policies toward the conflict particularly considering increased military cooperation and joint exercises. Furthermore, the section discusses how nuclear threats have influenced the management of disputes among major powers and whether they have strengthened or weakened Moscow's strategic credibility. It also considers the international responses including the strengthening of European and American defensive preparedness in the face of what is perceived as a complex threat. Ultimately the section evaluates the extent to which nuclear rhetoric has contributed to containing the war or conversely endangered regional and global strategic balances.

3-1-1-Russian Nuclear Discourse since the Outbreak of the War in Ukraine

Since February 2022 Russian nuclear rhetoric has been a key element of Moscow's military and political strategy in the war in Ukraine. President Vladimir Putin and state

institutions have repeatedly issued implicit threats toward the West and Ukraine asserting that any direct intervention attack on Russian territory or provision of advanced military assistance to Kiev could lead to nuclear escalation thus maintaining a constant threat element throughout the conflict. Data and analysis indicate that these threats may serve as a political pressure tool rather than a real intention to carry out nuclear strikes because the use of nuclear weapons in a geographically complex conventional conflict such as Ukraine could lead to uncontrollable consequences (Lewis: 2023, p.4).

Russian discourse aimed to convince the West that any strong military support for Ukraine might escalate into a broader confrontation. This reflects the logic of deterrence by threat rather than actual action while simultaneously prompting Ukraine's allies to reassess the limits of their support. These threats also heightened strategic uncertainty within Western decision-making circles as policymakers balanced the necessity of supporting Ukraine against the risk of potential nuclear escalation underscoring the psychological and political dimensions of nuclear rhetoric compared to its operational capacity.

Over time however the credibility of some threats has eroded repeated warnings without concrete actions or significant changes on the battlefield led some analysts to question their seriousness suggesting that excessive ambiguity could turn deterrence from a tool of pressure into a psychological burden on Russian decision makers potentially causing hesitation in critical decisions due to fear of catastrophic outcomes (Roberts : 2023.p.40). Furthermore analyses indicate that certain Russian nuclear threats may serve as tactics for political negotiation often employed to enhance Russia's bargaining position or exaggerate its strategic capabilities in response to shortcomings on the ground. This reflects a shift in understanding nuclear deterrence from a genuine threat to a political strategic negotiation tool within the context of ongoing conflict.

The foregoing analysis suggests that the Russian nuclear discourse represents a combination of tactical and strategic threats, but it faces major challenges in maintaining credibility and avoiding becoming an ineffective pressure mechanism or psychological burden within the decision-making apparatus.

3-1-2-The Impact of Russian Deterrence on NATO and Western Policies

The Russian nuclear threat has had a significant impact on the defense and strategic policies of NATO and the West since the outbreak of war in Ukraine. These threats have prompted NATO to strengthen deterrence exercises and joint military cooperation among its members including continued investment in the concept of extended nuclear deterrence and strengthening European military readiness to respond to any potential escalation in the conflict.

In practical terms the nuclear threat posed by Moscow has prompted NATO to focus more on the strategic balance in Europe, expanding exercises and troop deployments in the alliance's eastern countries. This represents a concrete response to concerns about nuclear escalation with the aim of strengthening conventional deterrence alongside nuclear capabilities.

Russian deterrence and the nuclear threat rhetoric of Russian leaders have led NATO members to refrain from issuing direct deterrent threats involving actual intervention or the deployment of troops to defend Ukrainian territory, for fear of Russian retaliation. Western officials, such as German Chancellor Scholz, have emphasized that NATO must avoid direct military confrontation with Russia, making it clear that such deterrent threats will not be issued. NATO members have even refrained from making explicit attempts to deter Russia from using nuclear weapons against Ukraine, instead issuing deterrent threats aimed at preventing any attack on NATO countries or, more generally, preventing Russia from invading the Alliance's territory. The threat to continue supplying Ukraine with weapons to deny Russia its objectives has provided a practical compromise. It has allowed NATO to support Ukraine and maintain the deterrent rhetoric, which is crucial to the existential security needs of the Alliance's members, while simultaneously allowing NATO to avoid direct confrontation with Russia in the face of Russian deterrent threats (Lupovici :2023, pp.631-632). Furthermore, these threats have sparked debates within the United States and Europe regarding the limits of military assistance to Ukraine, especially regarding long-range weapons and advanced systems in an attempt to avoid perceived) red lines (that could lead to widespread escalation. Over time, some Western countries have revised their policies to provide greater support to Ukraine as they seek to avoid nuclear escalation that reflects the influence of Russian deterrence on decision-making mechanisms (Gamal El-Din: 2023, p.195). In addition, the Russian nuclear threat has strengthened intelligence sharing and defensive coordination among European states recognizing that Russia's nuclear deterrence could be employed as a tool for political coercion or to undermine Western alliances. Consequently, emphasis has been placed on integrated deterrence combining nuclear conventional and defensive capabilities rather than relying solely on nuclear arsenals (Tannenwald: 2024, p.4).

From above analysis, it becomes evident that the Russian nuclear deterrence It can be described as offensive deterrence, as it enabled Russia to launch an attack on Ukraine and occupy a large part of its territory without NATO being able to deter Russia or force it to end the fighting. On the other hand, led to the reshaping of Western policies which led to an increased focus on strengthening defense capabilities and alliances providing diverse military support to Ukraine and seeking to avoid direct confrontations that could escalate into a large-scale nuclear conflict.

3-2-The Future of Nuclear Deterrence in Light of the Ukrainian War

The Ukrainian crisis has revived global debate over the future of nuclear deterrence and its effectiveness in managing contemporary conflicts. In this context, this section examines the potential implications of the Ukrainian crisis for the future of the nuclear deterrence framework and how this conflict may reshape the rules governing international power balances. The analysis focuses on the limitations of nuclear deterrence effectiveness in regional conflicts and considers whether it can remain a reliable tool against evolving and unconventional threats. It also explores the crisis's impact on confidence in security commitments and international cooperation, particularly in light of the erosion of confidence in the security assurances provided to Ukraine in the 1990s. Additionally, the section addresses the prospects for nuclear proliferation or the reinforcement of non-proliferation treaties as a consequence of the lessons drawn from the crisis. The discussion further considers how the conflict may establish a new benchmark for understanding nuclear deterrence in a multipolar global context, as well as the extent to which nuclear deterrence can continue to serve as an effective strategic instrument in the twenty-first century.

3-2-1 The Limits of Nuclear Deterrence Effectiveness in Regional Conflicts

The Ukrainian crisis reveals important limitations in the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence, while nuclear deterrence may be effective in preventing direct escalation between nuclear powers, but it is less effective in controlling indirect forms of conflict, particularly when nuclear deterrence intersects with other geopolitical challenges. The Ukrainian crisis demonstrates that possessing a nuclear arsenal does not necessarily prevent the use of conventional force or guarantee the full achievement of political objectives. Despite Russia's substantial nuclear capabilities, the conflict has persisted for years without the use of nuclear weapons raising questions about the effectiveness of nuclear deterrence in preventing prolonged conventional escalation (Kroenig and Massa: 2023, p.8).

As for Russian deterrence, the Ukrainian crisis confirmed that deterrence is less effective in controlling indirect forms of conflict, as the United States and the West were able to prevent Russia from achieving a quick and decisive victory in the war through various forms of military and intelligence support provided to Ukraine (Lubovici: 2023, pp. 631-632) However, concerns remain that if Putin feels cornered and his strategy in Ukraine is failing, he might resort to tactical nuclear weapons as a "game-changer" to break the stalemate or avoid defeat. This necessitates the development of a Western deterrence strategy to counter this type of attack (Kroenig and Massa: 2022, pp.8-9).

The limited effectiveness of nuclear deterrence in this context can be attributed to several key factors. First , Russia's nuclear deterrence doctrine is ambiguous regarding the use of nuclear weapons in a regional war with a non-nuclear power;(Russia's Nuclear Weapons: Doctrine, Forces, and Modernization: 2022, pp.7-9) this ambiguity extends to

the seriousness of nuclear threats makes it difficult for other actors such as Ukraine and its allies to determine whether these threats are actionable or merely political pressure thereby reducing the deterrent effect. Second, the operational realities in Europe indicate that effective deterrence requires a combination of nuclear deterrence and conventional defensive cooperation to repel aggression emphasizing non-nuclear military capabilities such as air power air defense and electronic warfare as integral components of a comprehensive deterrence system. Moreover, the changing regional environment including enhanced NATO defense coordination and expanded European military cooperation poses a challenge to the traditional model of nuclear deterrence. Thus, the conflict evolves from a pure nuclear threat to a broader security confrontation that includes traditional deterrence strategies and regional alliances. (Mahfuzah: 2004, p.110)

As a result, it can be observed that the Ukrainian crisis highlights the limitations of relying solely on nuclear deterrence to achieve stability in complex conflicts stressing that effective crisis management and preventing unwanted escalation requires a multi-dimensional approach that combines nuclear deterrence military alliances, and traditional defense capabilities.

3-2-2- Implications of the Crisis for the Global Nuclear Security System

The Ukrainian crisis has had profound implications for the global nuclear security framework particularly regarding confidence in security agreements and nuclear non-proliferation. Since the signing of the Budapest Memorandum in the 1990s, under which Ukraine relinquished its nuclear arsenal in exchange for security assurances from Russia the United States and the United Kingdom events have demonstrated that such guarantees may be insufficient to protect states from threats raising questions about the viability of nuclear disarmament within the non-proliferation framework (El-Azab: 2022,p. 118). This reality has influenced international commitments to non-proliferation treaties as some non-nuclear states may reconsider their security policies and contemplate developing their own nuclear capabilities as a means of strengthening national security in a world where traditional international guarantees may be perceived as ineffective. Moreover, the conflict highlights that global nuclear deterrence requires modernization considering new regional dynamics interactions among major powers and even the rise of unconventional threats to ensure that nuclear deterrence remains an effective tool for maintaining stability and preventing uncontrolled nuclear proliferation.

More broadly, the crisis indicates that global nuclear security no longer depends solely on nuclear arsenals but also on the strength of international institutions the level of cooperation among major powers and the existence of effective mechanisms to reduce the risks of nuclear escalation such as communication channels between nuclear powers and initiatives aimed at managing complex nuclear crises.



In this context, the Ukrainian crisis provides a practical example of the complexities and limitations surrounding contemporary nuclear deterrence. While it is unlikely that Russia would use nuclear weapons against Ukraine, the reality is far more complex. Russia might resort to nuclear weapons in its war with Ukraine if its ability to decisively win the war diminishes, or if the West strengthens Ukraine's capabilities to the point where they could threaten Russian national security, or if Ukraine achieves a military victory, such as the recapture of Crimea, or other developments that are unacceptable to Russia. In such a scenario, Russia might be tempted to use tactical nuclear weapons or a combination of conventional and non-conventional weapons, either to attack Ukrainian forces or to conduct a warning demonstration in an empty area (over the Black Sea, for example) in order to halt the escalation or intimidate Ukrainian forces and prevent their advance. This strategy is often referred to as escalate to de-escalate. However, such tactics carry grave consequences, as the West would not allow Russia to use nuclear weapons to achieve a decisive victory without a substantial response. Regardless of the anticipated response scenarios, a direct nuclear confrontation between Russia and the West in such a situation remains highly (Betts: 2022).

In light of these developments, the researcher concludes that the Ukrainian crisis serves as a critical test for existing nuclear deterrence frameworks underscoring the need to review and adapt these frameworks to a new international strategic reality that requires a more integrated and effective approach to preventing nuclear escalation and preserving global peace.

4-Conclusion

The study demonstrates that nuclear deterrence remains a central instrument in maintaining international stability as it contributes to reducing the likelihood of large-scale wars among major powers by creating a “balance of terror” that renders the cost of war exceedingly high. However, the Ukrainian crisis highlighted the limitations of nuclear deterrence in regional conflicts where Russia’s nuclear arsenal did not prevent the continuation of conventional military operations, illustrating that nuclear deterrence alone is insufficient to achieve strategic objectives. Furthermore, the study confirms that nuclear rhetoric functions as both a political and psychological instrument in addition to being a military threat, with its credibility dependent on support from tangible military capabilities and international alliances. In addition, the crisis revealed that nuclear deterrence cannot substitute for international security commitments as Russian nuclear threats did not prevent Western intervention in Ukraine, underscoring the importance of trust in international guarantees and multilateral institutions. Consequently, the findings indicate that the future effectiveness of nuclear deterrence relies on integrating nuclear capabilities with conventional deterrence and modern technologies, ensuring effective crisis management and the prevention of escalation.

References

1. Acton, James M. (2023a). China's Expanding Nuclear Arsenal and the Future of Strategic Stability. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, p. 15.
2. Acton, James M. (2023b). Reassessing the Effectiveness of Nuclear Deterrence in Regional Conflicts. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, pp. 15–17.
3. Al-Azab, Heba Gamal El-Din. (2022). Political Science Between the Impact of Artificial Intelligence Technologies and a Review of the Pillars and Functions of the Concept of the State and the Structure of the Global System. Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science, 23(1), p. 118.
4. Al-Suwaidi, Jamal Sanad. (2014). Prospects of the American Era: Sovereignty and Influence in the World (1st ed.), p. 183.
5. Aria, Nawid. (2024). Reassessing Nuclear Deterrence: Impacts on Global Security and International Relations. Kdz Uni International Journal of Islamic Studies and Social Sciences, 1(2), p. 167.
6. Betts, Richard K. (2022). Thinking About the Unthinkable in Ukraine: What Happens if Putin Goes Nuclear? Foreign Affairs.
7. Binnendijk, Hans, & Gompert, David C. (2019). Decisive Response: A New Nuclear Strategy for NATO. Survival, 61(5), pp. 113–128.
8. Deal, Jacqueline Newmyer. (2014). The Revolution in Military Affairs with Chinese Characteristics. In Thomas G. Mahnken & Joseph A. Maiolo (Eds.), Strategic Studies: A Reader (2nd ed., p. 358). Routledge.
9. El-Din, Heba Gamal. (2023). Cybersecurity and the Transformation of the International System. Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science, 24(1), p. 195.
10. Freedman, Lawrence. (2023). The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 15–18, 115–117.
11. Futter, Andrew, & Zala, Benjamin. (2024). Strategic Deterrence Beyond the Nuclear: Understanding the Integration of Military and Non-Military Tools. The Journal of Strategic Studies, 47(2), p. 170.
12. Heuser, Beatrice. (2024). NATO's Nuclear Deterrence and Extended Deterrence in the 21st Century. Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, 66(4), p. 50.
13. Kang, K., & Kugler, Jacek. (2023). Beyond Deterrence: Uncertain Stability in the Nuclear Era. Conflict Management and Peace Science, 40(6), pp. 655–674.

14. Kroenig, Matthew. (2023). Nuclear Signaling and Coercive Diplomacy in the Ukraine War. Atlantic Council, p. 8.
15. Kroenig, Matthew. (2024). The Logic of American Nuclear Strategy: Why Strategic Superiority Matters (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press, p. 23.
16. Lewis, Jeffrey. (2023). Russia's Nuclear Threats in the Ukraine War. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, pp. 4, 7.
17. Lupovici, Amir. (2023). Deterrence by Delivery of Arms: NATO and the War in Ukraine. Contemporary Security Policy, 44(4), pp. 631–632.
18. Mahfuzah, Ali. (2004). The Arab System and Globalization. Abdul Hameed Shoman Foundation, Amman, Jordan, p. 110.
19. Morgan, Patrick M. (2024). Deterrence Now: The Evolution of Strategic Deterrence in the Post–Cold War Era. Routledge, p. 90.
20. Osimen, Goddy U., Fulani, Oluwakemi, & Mogbolu, Nesochi. (2025). The Evolving Landscape of European Security: An Assessment of NATO's Posture and Deterrence Strategies in Response to the Russia–Ukraine War. Journal of Strategic Security, 18(4), pp. 1–18.
21. Roberts, Brad. (2023). NATO's Deterrence Challenge After the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, 65(5), pp. 30–40.
22. Tannenwald, Nina. (2024). The Vanishing Nuclear Taboo? How the War in Ukraine Tests the Limits of Deterrence. International Security, 49(1), pp. 9–38.
23. U.S. Congressional Research Service. (2022). Russia's Nuclear Weapons: Doctrine, Forces, and Modernization, pp. 7–9.
24. Wang, Daniel H. (2025). Death of a Doctrine: The End of Classical Deterrence in a Complex Multipolar World (MSU Graduate Theses/Dissertations No. 4064). Missouri State University, pp. 29, 65–66.