



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of High Education and Scientific Research
Dr. MOULAY TAHAR University of SAIDA
Faculty of Letters, Languages and Arts
Department of Literature and English Language

USA aide to Ukrain Background and Conflict with Russia

Thesis submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of *Master* in Literature and civilization.

Submitted by:

HACHEMAOUI Abderrahmane

Supervised by:

Dr. SELMI ZAKARIA

Board of Examiners

Prof. M. RAHMANI

President

University of Saida

Dr. Z. SELMI

Supervisor

University of Saida

Dr. H. MOKKADEM

Examiner

University of Saida

Academic Year: 2022/2023

Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that this submission under the title “US Aide to Ukraine background and conflict with Russia” is my work and that it contains no unreferenced material previously published or written by another person, nor this material has been accepted for the qualification of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution.

Name: Abderrahmane HACHEMAOUI

Date :

Signature :

Dedications

I dedicate this humble work to my esteemed parents, my lovely sisters Khaoula & Sara.

To my Exceptional friends: Mostafa, Mahdi, Rafik, Amine, Cheikh, Nessrine and Rofeida.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to ALLAH for guiding me doing this work and my sincere thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Z. SELMI who has done amazing efforts to help accomplish this work I would also like to thank the members of the committee, Dr. H. MOKKADEM and Prof. RAHMANI who have given their time to read and evaluate this humble work

Abstract

In the context of international relations, the profound historical significance lies in the complex interplay of cooperation and conflict that characterizes the relationship between the United States and Russia. This research endeavors to delve into the motivations and interests underpinning U.S. assistance to Russia, a relationship fraught with historical complexities and geopolitical implications.

The study unfolds through a comprehensive exploration of the U.S.-Russia relationship from the Cold War era till now. Providing and highlighting how historical and geopolitical influences have molded this intricate bond. A turning point occurred with the Soviet Union's dissolution in 1991 and the subsequent rise of the independent Russian Federation, ushering in a new era with both prospects for enhanced relations and associated difficulties."A focal point of this investigation is the Ukraine conflict, which has become a significant flashpoint in U.S.-Russia relations. The annexation of Crimea by Russia and its support for separatist movements in Eastern Ukraine have strained the ties between Washington and Moscow. The U.S. response, encompassing sanctions, diplomatic pressure, and military assistance to Ukraine, further underscores the complex and dynamic nature of this relationship.

This research poses significant research inquiries. These include understanding the impact of historical and geopolitical elements on the relationship between the United States and Russia, the changing nature of American aid to Ukraine, and the motivating factors and interests behind such support. Additionally, it explores how events such as the Soviet Union's dissolution and the Ukraine conflict have shaped U.S. policies and aid delivery. Furthermore, it delves into the perceived advantages and possible drawbacks of U.S. assistance to Ukraine, from both domestic and global view points. The study proposes hypotheses, suggesting that U.S. aid to Ukraine serves as a tool for promoting stability in the post-Cold War era and deterring aggressive Russian expansionism. It posits that U.S. assistance is driven by strategic interests, encompassing nuclear non-proliferation, economic ties, and diplomatic influence. The research also contends that U.S. aid policies are subject to fluctuations influenced by shifting political dynamics and global events.

In summary, this research seeks to contribute to a nuanced understanding of U.S. interests behind aiding Ukraine, a topic of utmost importance in contemporary international relations. By exploring the historical context, evolving dynamics, and underlying motivations, it offers

valuable insights into the intricate web of U.S.-Russia relations and their broader implications for global geopolitics.

Keywords: Aide, Ukraine, Conflict, Cold war.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Originality	I
Dedication	II
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract	IV
General Introduction	1
<i>Chapter 01 : Us Russian Competition and Conflict In the Cold War</i>	
1.1. Introduction	4
1.2. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of American-Russian Competition	4
1.2.1. Conceptual Boundaries of the Term "Competition" in International Relations	4
1.2.2. The concept of Conflict in International Relations	5
1.2.3. The Concept of Struggle in International Relations	6
1.2.4. The Concept Of War In International Relations	7
1.2.5. The Concept of Tension In International Relations	8
1.2.6. The Concept Of Crisis In International Relations	9
1.3. The Cold War	10
1.3.1. Introduction To The Cold War	10
1.3.2. Cold War Stages	11
1.3.3. Cold War Causes	13
1.4. Conclusion	15
<i>Chapter 02 : Post Cold War Atmosphere</i>	
2.1. Introduction	17
2.2. The Collaps of the Soviet Union	17
2.2.1. Causes of the Soviet Union Collapse	17
2.2.2. Results of the Collapse of the Soviet Union	20
2.3. Us Russian Relations Post Cold War	21
2.3.1 Course of relations	21
2.3.2. US Policy vs Russia	24
2.4. NATO Expansion: Toward or in Opposition to Russia?	25
2.5. Conclusion	29
<i>Chapter 03 : Us Aide to Ukraine New Conflict with Russia</i>	
3.1. Introduction	31
3.2. The Ukrainian-Russian Crisis and Its Evolution	31
3.2.1. The American Perspective on the Strategic Significance of Ukraine	32
3.2.2. American Policy Towards the Russo-Ukrainian War	35
3.3. Us Interests Behind Aiding Russia	39
3.4. Conclusion	41
General Conclusion	43
References	45

General Introduction

Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, the United States and Russia, both global superpowers, have maintained a multifaceted and often contentious relationship. This dynamic has featured periods of fierce competition, conflict, and collaboration, with pivotal junctures occurring during the Cold War, the post-Cold War era, and more recently, amid resurging tensions connected to the Ukraine conflict.

The Cold War, which spanned roughly from the conclusion of World War II in 1945 to the early 1990s, was defined by ideological, political, and military rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, the precursor to contemporary Russia. This rivalry stemmed from opposing ideologies – capitalism and democracy in the U.S. versus communism in the Soviet Union – and manifested across various domains, including nuclear arms races, proxy conflicts in various regions, and extensive espionage operations. The Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 and the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 epitomized moments of heightened Cold War tension, underscoring the immense stakes in this global geopolitical struggle.

With the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, the world transitioned into a new era. The dissolution of the USSR resulted in the emergence of the Russian Federation as an independent nation-state. This Post Cold War period initially held the promise of improved U.S.-Russia relations, as both nations sought to redefine their roles in a rapidly changing world. However, challenges persisted as issues like NATO expansion, the expansion of Western influence into former Soviet territories, and disagreements over missile defense systems strained the relationship.

One of the most significant flashpoints in the post-Cold War era, a significant aspect of U.S.-Russia relations has been the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. This conflict commenced in 2014 with Russia's annexation of Crimea, and its support for separatist movements in Eastern Ukraine led to a serious deterioration of relations between Washington and Moscow. The U.S. responded with sanctions and diplomatic pressure, while providing military assistance to Ukraine to help counter Russian aggression.

This research seeks to explore the underlying motivations and interests behind U.S. aid to Russia, a relationship characterized by its historical complexities and geopolitical significance.

Research Questions:

1. What are The reasons for Russia's invasion of Ukraine?
2. What is the relationship between the cold war and what is happening between Russia and Ukraine?
3. How did The U.S deal with the war and what aid did it provide?

Hypotheses:

1. Putin believes that Ukraine is still a part of Russia and therefore should keep a pro-Russian policy.
2. The cold war maybe over, but after the emergence of Russia as a powerful country again, the US aims to remove the old enemy and remove Russia from the political scene.
3. America has always considered Russia as an adversary, and it is no secret that the US and its allies rushed to support Ukraine because the victory of Ukraine matters to the US interests.

This study is a historical research. It depended on articles, e-books, open-source materials and academic writings which tackled the idea of the US support to Ukraine and the different documents which referred to events of The Russo-Ukrainian Conflict and The NATO Expansion.

This work has been conducted in three chapters , chapter 1 dealt with set of concepts' definitions shedding light on the causes /effects of The Cold War .

The second chapter discusses the world's atmosphere after the cold war between Russia and The United States Of America in addition to their inter-relationship .

the final chapter examined the start and development of the conflict, underlining the strategic significance of Ukraine to the United States and Russia.

Chapter 01

Us Russian Competition and Conflict In the Cold War

1.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to define important terms in international Relations and conceptualize the Cold War. It also highlights causes and consequences circulating the conflict . It finally demonstrates the different stages that this important event went through and its development throughout time .

1.2. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of American-Russian Competition

Concepts form the basis of all research. Therefore, this section will focus on defining and distinguishing the term “competition” from similar concepts in the field of international relations in order to distinguish it from other concepts.

We will begin by presenting the important definitions of each term among the concepts similar to competition and conflict, and then we will identify the key differences as follows:

1.2.1. Conceptual Boundaries of the Term "Competition" in International Relations

There are many definitions of international competition and competition in international relations. International competition means that imbalances in the international community will escalate and develop into conflicts if left unchecked. States try to maximize their interests according to the concept of national interest, but this may conflict with the interests of other states and lead to competition. Competition can cover a specific area or spread across different areas such as economic, political and cultural competition, especially when it involves states with different ideologies and economic and political approaches.

Competition is also defined as a political concept that describes a state in which opinions between nations do not lead to conflict. Economic or political aspects are necessary to achieve gains and status at the international or regional level.

Moreover, competition is defined as a situation in which two or more parties disagree over real or perceived conflicting goals or limited resources. This may also include mutually conscious attitudes in which each participant anticipates conflicting future positions and

compels each participant to take positions that are inconsistent with the perceived interests of the other party

1.2.2. The concept of Conflict in International Relations

The closest and most closely related term to the term "competition" is "conflict". The term is generally used to refer to a situation in which a particular group of people, tribal, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, religious, social, economic, political or otherwise, is in conflict and in conflict with another individual's group or group. used for purposes. group. Both groups strive to achieve conflicting goals, real or perceived.

Conflict is also defined as a conflict between two or more parties, forces, or persons, real or imagined, seeks to achieve objectives , directly or indirectly, impeding the achievement of the other party's objectives in various ways. Peaceful or armed, explicit or covert.

Conflict is also understood as a struggle for national interests, arising from differences in reality, decisions, goals, aspirations, resources and capabilities of nations leading to the decision-making. determine or pursue policies that differ more than consensus. However, conflicts can still be resolved before reaching the level of armed conflict.

Some researchers consider conflict as a form of competition, similar to Louis Coser's perspective, where conflict involves competition over values, power, and resources. The aim among competitors is to neutralize, liquidate, or harm opponents.(2014)

There is a tendency to focus on the competitive aspect of the definition of conflict, seeing it as a form of competitive behavior between individuals or groups that arises when parties are in conflict for incompatible goals. In this view, conflict is a potentially competitive process between two or more parties involved in a particular phenomenon.

✓ Note:

Competition can escalate into conflict when parties try to strengthen their position to the detriment of others, employ tactics that prevent others from achieving their goals, remove them from the game, or even destroy them. Surname. conflict can be violent or nonviolent (in the psychological sense of violence), continuous or intermittent, controllable or uncontrollable, and it can be resolved or unresolvable in many different cases.

1.2.3. The Concept of Struggle in International Relations

International struggle is a conflict between the wills and interests of nations. This conflict arises from differences in motivations, perceptions, goals, resources and capacities of countries, leading to more divergent actions and policies than convergence. Even so, most conflicts have yet to reach the stage of war.

Many opinions emphasize that struggle is a natural phenomenon rooted in the international system. The difficulty in predicting the commencement of the international system stems from the competitive nature of the system and the self-serving tendencies of human beings within it. The beginning of the conflict becomes difficult and complicated.

“We found the definition of Aron Raymond (2006), who defined war as follows:

“It is not a creation of the present time but has existed since time immemorial and is the result of conflicts of interest.

The definition of Vergison Allen(2007) is that struggle begins when a state takes an action that imposes a high cost on another state, Simultaneously, the other state holds the belief that it can reduce its losses by responding to the initial action taken by the first state. Consequently, the scenario portrays a situation where two states or a coalition of states are striving to achieve their objectives concurrently.

Kamal Haddad defines struggle as a sharp and historical dispute over specific interests, such as borders and water between two states, with their subject being one of the vital interests. The struggle may escalate or diminish due to external intervention.(1997)

Many thinkers see two conceptions of struggle

Objective conception: struggle is considered a competitive situation in which parties are aware of the conflicting positions they want to achieve.

Subjective conception: It means perceiving the objective situation with a distorted and erroneous perception, as it arises from subjectivity and privacy:

That is In its objective conception, struggle is based on realistic and perceived considerations from the conflicting parties, as they defend their interests. However, struggle becomes internal

when it is believed to stem from self-interested interpretations rather than from what is actually present and perceived on the ground.

A definition of struggling can be presented as follows:

Conflicts of interest, often devastating between two or more parties, lead to an escalation in order to protect interests at stake. This involves the preparation and effective use of varying degrees of pressure, whether political, economic or military. .

1.2.4. The Concept Of War In International Relations

War is one of the most widespread and well-known forms of violence in international conflicts throughout history. Therefore, multiple definitions of war can be presented:

According to Carl von Clausewitz (2008), war is not fundamentally different from joint combat. He saw war as a powerful act in the strategic sphere, aimed at forcing the adversary to do our will. Similarly, Clausewitz sees war as an extension of politics by other means, an act of violence aimed at forcing opponents into submission. According to Clausewitz, war represents the use of force and coercion as a means to protect interests, expand influence, or resolve conflicts of interest between parties through violence - extreme measures in human methods of war management.

Another definition comes from Gaston Bouthoul, who defines war as "barbaric and organized violence characterized by the sacred". It is a bloody clash between national or international groups for political purposes, often resulting in a high death toll due to massacres. Rousseau defines war as "an armed conflict that occurs between states for the purpose of imposing political orientations". This is done using methods organized under international law. "Syria: Dar T/S for Studies, Translation, and Publishing, 1984, p. 2."

There is another definition of war as follows: "Actual confrontation through armed violence to resolve fundamental contradictions that can no longer be addressed using milder or less extreme methods.

Some scholars such as Sun Tzu, Smuts and Clausewitz argue that the outbreak of war requires three conditions:

- ✓ At least one thousand people died in armed conflict.
- ✓ Prepare for conflict through the mobilization, recruitment, training and deployment of armed forces.
- ✓ The existence of legal cover, which means that the State considers such actions not as a crime but as an obligation to serve essential and legitimate purposes.

Proponents of the positive view see war as a manifestation of complex human nature, including ambitions, desires, goals, hatred, and sometimes irrationality. They believe that war arises from certain situations:

- ✓ Situations where leaders or governments are forced to choose between struggle or loss of existence, leading to a struggle based on necessity. • Situations in which leaders or governments struggle against pressing influences, making war an inevitable response.
- ✓ Situations in which leaders and governments struggle to achieve specific goals such as wealth or power, or to strengthen national unity when other means seem less effective.
- ✓ Situations where leaders and governments struggle with feelings of frustration or wanting to relieve themselves from psychological pressures and stress.

It should be noted that the view of war, its definition and types, has become more complex over time. It has become multidimensional, occurring between countries and groups of countries."In various contexts, these interactions can take shape as alliances and terrorist organizations (as observed in the context of the war on international terrorism) or through latent demilitarization, regional partnerships, and international conferences."

1.2.5. The Concept of Tension In International Relations

Is a state of anxiety, mutual distrust between two or more countries. Tensions may precede and lead to international conflicts and crises or may arise from these conflicts. This intensity of tension can escalate to the point where the crisis escalates into armed conflict (war) if not resolved peacefully. In general, the cause of stress is often associated with the cause of the conflict.

Abdul Aziz Gerrad defines it as the first phase of a conflict and as "the state of something threatening disruption". According to Marcel Merle, tensions are situations of conflict that, at least, do not lead to the immediate use of force. Stress also indicates hostility, fear, suspicion, competing interests, or possibly a desire for control or revenge. However, it remains within this

framework without extending to an actual and apparent conflict, representing a mutual exchange of threats aimed at influencing each other. Here, stress is the precursor to conflict.

The tension is seen as the beginning of a conflict situation and is not necessarily in conflict with the existence of instances of cooperation, as in current Algeria-Moroccan relations. As a precursor to conflict, stress does not necessarily lead to conflict. It depends on the tendency to use or show confrontational behavior of the parties. In other words, the suspicion and lack of trust between the parties are not enough to create conflict between them; rather, it was the conflicting views of the parties that led to the conflict. Holsti goes on to say that antagonism, suspicion and suspicion are not sufficient conditions for conflict or crisis to arise. Therefore, tensions cannot turn into conflict if the parties seek to reduce the intensity of the conflicting positions.

The tension is seen as the beginning of a conflict situation and is not necessarily in conflict with the existence of instances of cooperation, as in current Algeria-Moroccan relations. As a precursor to conflict, stress does not necessarily lead to conflict. It depends on the tendency to use or show confrontational behavior of the parties. In other words, the suspicion and lack of trust between the parties are not enough to create conflict between them; rather, it was the conflicting views of the parties that led to the conflict. Holsti goes on to say that antagonism, suspicion and suspicion are not sufficient conditions for conflict or crisis to arise. Therefore, tensions cannot turn into conflict if the parties seek to reduce the intensity of the conflicting positions.

1.2.6. The Concept Of Crisis In International Relations

The word "crisis" is derived from the Greek word "Krino", which means method of handling important decisions or decisions. important. However, the term is often used to refer to a situation characterized by danger, anticipation, and anxiety.

“In a conflict, it represents the will of one party to put an end to the dispute in its favor by adopting a sudden and unexpected behavior that the other party considers a direct threat to the its existence. This is likely to exacerbate the existing confrontation, leading to a growing awareness of the possibility of war.

During a crisis, it goes through several stages of varying intensity and duration. Each stage is characterized by the following specific characteristics:

✓ **Escalation step:**

This is where the crisis escalates, reaching a dangerous level.

✓ **De-escalation step:**

Here, the intensity of the crisis diminishes and its intensity also diminishes.

✓ **Stabilization stage :**

The crisis stabilized at some point without further complications, pending resolution.

Dispersion or conclusion stage:

The crisis ends with a peaceful resolution or with war. »

1.3. The Cold War

After the second World War America and Russia were in opposition of ideas, principles and policies which led to a long period of conflict represented in what is called the cold war.

1.3.1. Introduction To The Cold War

The concept of cold war refers to the nature of the confrontation between two countries on the political, economic and media fronts. The term was first used by Bernard Baruch, an adviser to In 1947, during his congressional debates, the President of the United States discussed the conflict between the two countries.. The leader of the Soviet Union, Stalin, emphasized the need to fight against the capitalist powers in his February 1946 speech, calling for vigilance and no concessions after the war. This marked the beginning of a conflict to which the United States responded with President Truman's policy of containment. Until 1991, the Cold War persisted, culminating in the collapse of the Soviet Union. This occurred despite the establishment of the United Nations with the aspiration of achieving what the League of Nations could not in terms of world peace and conflict prevention, the world split into two blocs after World War II. Each side seeks to control as much of the world as possible and attract as many nations to its side as possible. The conflict between the principles upheld by these two powers shapes their policies and economies. This rivalry has spurred a competition between the two blocs, particularly in the domains of nuclear weapons and satellites. Consequently, the relationship between the

United States (Western bloc) and the Soviet Union (Eastern bloc) then entered the so-called Cold War. Both sides have spent millions of dollars to expand their influence to as many countries as possible. This conflict and these spheres of influence have spread to different continents of the world, posing a greater threat than previous world-shaping wars.

1.3.2. Cold War Stages

When discussing the Cold War, it is more appropriate to discuss the stages it went through:

- ✓ The confrontation scene 1947-1953.
- ✓ The period of peaceful coexistence 1956-1969.
- ✓ The period of the Agreement 1969-1976.
- ✓ The reverse phase of the 1976-1985 Agreement.
- ✓ The end of the war 1985-1991.
- ✓ **The confrontation period 1947-1953:**

During the confrontation period from 1947 to 1953, bitter disagreements, tensions, and conflicts characterized the first years after World War II. This marked the most acute phase in the history of East-West conflict, solidifying the onset of the Cold War and becoming a defining aspect of contemporary international relations. The conflict's origins can be traced to Europe, with the Truman Doctrine and later the Marshall Plan playing pivotal roles. The division of Europe became evident as Germany split into two entities: the German Democratic Republic, supported by the Soviet Union but unrecognized by the West, and the Federal Republic of Germany, which the West did not acknowledge. This era also saw the resolution of internal unrest in Turkey, a civil war in Greece with communist support, and a communist coup in Czechoslovakia.

Furthermore, significant military alliances were formed, including the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 and the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955. The conflict's scope extended beyond Europe into Asia, with communist revolutions succeeding in China and Korea. This led to the spread of communism in regions like Vietnam, Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, prompting the United States to establish the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SETO) in 1955.

✓ **The period of peaceful coexistence 1956-1969:**

This period, especially in the late 1950s and early 1960s, marked a transitional period in the East-West conflict. Regarded as one of the most fervent phases of the Cold War, this era witnessed a complex relationship between the two superpowers. Sides have fluctuated, from moments of fiery confrontation that almost escalated into nuclear war, such as the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, to the relative state of affairs. Quiet. Soviet-American relations were relatively calm, especially in mid-1958. Signs of commercial cooperation appeared as both sides realized their considerable economic strength. Mutual understanding was evident in the exchange of messages between Soviet Premier Khrushchev and American President Eisenhower.

✓ **International Agreements for the period 1969-1976 :**

This phase began with Richard Nixon assuming the presidency of the United States and Henry Kissinger becoming national security adviser. The purpose of this agreement is to establish a strategic approach to achieve peace, create new interests in cooperation, reduce tensions between giants and create an international environment capable of solving problems, resolve and redress their differences. The goal is to move from a state of competition to a state of cooperation, fostering positive relationships for the management of international affairs. Several motivating factors in favor of the resumption of international relations between the two blocks emerged :

- The death of Soviet leader Stalin.
- The stockpile of nuclear weapons is growing, and the possibility of nuclear war is increasing. The growing spending of an all-out arms race.
- The Soviet Union needed Western technology to complete its development and modernization.
- The ineffectiveness of the US-led containment policy towards the Soviet Union.
- The rise of China as a real power parallels the closer China-US rapprochement and the Soviet desire to lessen or limit the consequences of this rapprochement.

✓ **The reverse period of the 1976-1985 Agreement:**

The period of harmony or détente was short-lived, as both before the late 1970s, the East and the West swiftly reverted to a state resembling the Cold War, with some labeling it as the Second Cold War. Consequently, this resurgence reignited the longstanding rivalry between the two sides, marked by ideological and military conflicts. This highlights a tendency for tensions to escalate, with the emergence of anti-

Soviet governments sympathetic to the West. In Britain, the Conservative Party led by Margaret Thatcher won; In Germany, the party favoring opening to the East was defeated. France, under François Mitterrand, is moving closer to the West and NATO. In Japan, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone completely separated himself from the Soviet Union and aligned himself with the United States. These governments all pursued policies that were antagonistic to the Soviet Union and executed strategies against détente. The deterioration in East-West relations ushered in a new phase of the Cold War..

✓ **End of Cold War 1985-1991 :**

During that period, the world did not anticipate the impending conclusion of the Cold War, as the conflict's dynamics, whether moving toward escalation or de-escalation, continued to exhibit characteristics of drawing closer and disagreement that had been prevalent throughout the Cold War.. A series of summits began, especially after the departure of Soviet leader Yury Andropov and the rise to power of Mikhail Gorbachev, such as the 1985 Geneva summit and the Washington summit in 1987. The world viewed these summits as merely a revival of the détente policy in Gorbachev. In fact, they were aimed at solving lingering global problems, stopping the proliferation of nuclear missiles, reducing weapons stockpiling, withdrawing Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and ending the Iran War. - Iraq. This era ended with a quasi-global war to expel Iraq from Kuwait, followed by the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the commencement of a new phase or a step towards what the United States referred to as the "new international order," signaling the start of a potentially transformative era.

1.3.3. Cold War Causes

The start of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union was instigated by a series of events, among the most noteworthy:, with some of the most significant ones being:

✓ **Ideological Contradiction :**

A primary source of conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States stemmed from their ideological disparities, a division rooted in the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, which stands as one of the pivotal events of the 20th century. This revolution unleashed immense energy and sparked political and cultural struggles that played a significant role in shaping the modern world. The emergence of the Soviet Union as the world's first socialist state further accentuated the divide between East and West, as it aimed to

construct a socialist society in contrast to the prevailing capitalist order.. During this period, fundamental inconsistencies between the strategic and ideological aims of capitalist and communist regimes were exposed.as both sides represented different ideologies and aimed to enhance their dominance and superiority in the world.

✓ **Struggle for Interests :**

The two factions' ideological differences and disagreements were accompanied by a conflict over important political, strategic, and strategic objectives. These competing interests widened the gap between the two opposing ideological camps that currently exist in the world. The conflicting interests reinforced the separation of the world into the East and the West.

And this division is also a direct result of the outcomes of World War II, as the contemporary world's division into these two camps became a historical and political inevitability manifested in the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. The purpose of these meetings was to rearrange the political and geographic situations in Europe in the post-World War II period and to establish a new international equilibrium that corresponds to the capabilities and desires of both the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

✓ **Misunderstanding and Distrust Between the Blocs :**

The initial years following World War II were rife with disagreements, tensions, and international conflicts. These years marked one of the most dangerous phases in the history of East-West conflict, giving birth to the Cold War in contemporary international relations. Europe was the central arena for these conflicts. In its early years, the conflict appeared more as a European phenomenon than a global reality. Issues such as the German question (the Berlin issue), geographic borders, the division of Europe into spheres of influence, and the reduction of forces in Europe were among the most important issues for the major powers. However, communication and mutual understanding between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on these matters were virtually impossible. Instead, misunderstandings, skepticism about intentions, lack of trust, and the inclination towards confrontation and competition prevailed. These factors led to policies that deepened the gap and animosity between these two nations.

1.4. Conclusion

This chapter points to characterize vital terms in worldwide Relations and conceptualize the Cold War. It moreover highlights causes and results circulating the struggle. It at last illustrates the distinctive stages that this vital occasion went through and its improvement throughout time and it points that Cold War shaped the current conflict as an important historical factor.

Chapter 02

Post Cold War Atmosphere

2.1. Introduction

This chapter sheds light on the sequence of events that unfolded following the end of the Cold War, encompassing the collapse of the Soviet Union and its repercussions, as well as the analysis of Russian-American relations. It delves into U.S. foreign policy in relation to Russia and addresses the topic of NATO expansion. Additionally, it explores the aftermath of the Soviet Union's disintegration.

2.2. The Collaps of the Soviet Union

The 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union stands as a momentous and far-reaching historical occurrence with global ramifications. It signified the conclusion of the Cold War epoch and the dissolution of a substantial Soviet empire that had left its imprint on numerous nations and populations for over seven decades. This juncture in history is widely regarded as one of the most substantial geopolitical transformations of the 20th century, and its enduring impacts continue to shape the contemporary global landscape.

2.2.1. Causes of the Soviet Union Collapse

The foremost factor that warrants elaboration concerning the collapse of the Soviet Union is its centralized economy and the structural issues and challenges it encountered. A more comprehensive examination of this factor should encompass the establishment of the economic system and its repercussions on the long-term economic viability of the Soviet state, and the challenges it encountered in achieving balance between different industries and economic sectors.

The Soviet state adopted a centralized economic model based on five-year planning. This means that the government used to determine economic plans for consecutive five-year periods and allocate industries, production, investments, and distribution according to these plans. This economic model, initially, might have been beneficial for transitioning from an underdeveloped economic state to a strong industrialized country. However, over time, this economic approach revealed a set of structural problems and challenges.

One of the most prominent problems was the lack of economic diversity. The Soviet economy heavily relied on specific sectors such as heavy industries and agriculture, and there was underdevelopment in modern service and technological industries. This overemphasis on

traditional industries led to a reduction in innovation and the economy's inability to keep up with global developments.

Additionally, there was a severe shortage in resource allocation and production management. Economic decision-making processes were centralized without considering real demand and efficient resource distribution. This resulted in accumulation of low-value products and scarcity of high-value products.

As time passed, structural challenges became increasingly evident. The gap between perceived successes and economic reality widened. The infrastructure suffered from deterioration, and environmental problems exacerbated due to the excessive focus on heavy industries without environmental considerations.

Limited economic reforms carried out by leaders like Mikhail Gorbachev couldn't adequately address these structural problems. Furthermore, the global movement towards market economies and globalization further distanced the Soviet Union from global economic developments.

In brief, the collapse of the Soviet Union can be attributed to two major factors. Firstly, the issues stemming from the centralized economy and its structural challenges played a pivotal role. Secondly, national and religious pressures added substantial strain to the Union. These pressures encompassed a range of factors, including the national aspirations of various ethnic groups within the Union and religious and cultural conflicts that eroded the state's unity.

✓ **National Aspirations :**

Within the Soviet Union, there were various republics formed, each consisting of diverse peoples, languages, and cultures. These peoples began to desire to strengthen their national identities and aspirations. Language, culture, and history were strong unifying factors among these groups, but they also impacted the national cohesion within the Union.

✓ **Religious Conflicts:**

There was also a rise in religious conflicts within the Soviet Union. While the Union ruled forcefully against religious practitioners and suppressed religious activities, many communities and individuals were determined to practice their faiths and maintain their

religious identities. Several populations were influenced by religious values and began seeking religious freedom and expression.

✓ **Escalation of Conflicts:**

National and religious conflicts escalated in some regions within the Union. For instance, areas like the Caucasus, Ukraine, and Afghanistan witnessed violent conflicts between different ethnic groups and with the central government. These conflicts weakened internal unity and further undermined the authority of the Soviet government.

✓ **Legitimacy Crisis:**

The Soviet government's legitimacy weakened due to its failure to meet the aspirations and needs of diverse populations. Lack of transparency and participation in decision-making processes led to frustration and discontent within the state.

✓ **Border Complexities:**

Certain regions faced complexities of tribal and border issues that extended beyond the defined national boundaries. These complexities affected relationships among peoples and states in those regions, sometimes leading to armed conflicts.

These national and religious pressures, along with the deteriorating economic conditions and political transformations, contributed to increased tensions within the Soviet Union and the erosion of its authority. These factors were interconnected and mutually influenced each other, ultimately affecting the state's capacity to preserve its cohesion and stability. Additionally, the third pivotal factor that played a substantial role in the Soviet Union's collapse was the authoritarian policies and the inability to adapt to evolving political dynamics. This factor is closely tied to the concentration of power among a select few and the inadequacy of avenues for public expression and participation in the decision-making process.

✓ **The Absence of a Democratic System:**

Centralized in the Soviet Union were power within the party leadership and a handful of political figures. This lack of democracy resulted in heightened frustration and societal unrest, as citizens were denied the freedom to express their opinions or participate effectively in political affairs.

✓ **Unmet Expectations:**

The Soviet authorities did not adequately respond to societal aspirations. As protests escalated, the government did not provide effective answers or implement significant reforms to meet the growing demands.

✓ **Repression and Persecution:**

The government resorted to repression and persecution to suppress undesirable political and social movements. Basic freedoms, the right to assemble and express, were curtailed, and the voices of dissenters and activists were silenced.

✓ **Inability to Adapt:**

With changing global circumstances and the shifts of the 20th century, The Soviet system proved unable to adjust and stay abreast of evolving circumstances. For example, following the conclusion of the Cold War, the government struggled to effectively address emerging geopolitical and economic changes.

✓ **Corruption and Moral Decay:**

The Soviet system witnessed the spread of corruption and a collapse of moral values. There were abuses and corruption within leadership and government bodies, eroding public trust in the system.

✓ **Failure to Meet Basic Needs:**

- ✓ Many suffered from shortages in basic services and livelihoods, affecting overall well-being and increasing anger and dissatisfaction. These factors summarize a collection of political mistakes that exacerbated crises and eroded trust between the government and the people.

The inability to meet expectations, responding with repression, inadequate response to political and economic changes, all contributed to increased internal tensions and rebellions, greatly influencing the collapse of the Soviet Union.

2.2.2. Results of the Collapse of the Soviet Union

The results of the Collapse of the Soviet Union were the Following :

✓ **New States Formation:**

The collapse of the Soviet Union led to the emergence of multiple independent states. This resulted in the formation of new republics such as Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and

others. These countries faced challenges in terms of infrastructure and the development of economic policies.

✓ **Transition to Market Economies:**

Following the collapse, many states transitioned to market economies primarily. These countries encountered challenges in striking a balance between the transition and maintaining economic stability.

✓ **Geopolitical Changes:**

- ✓ The collapse of the Soviet Union triggered significant geopolitical changes. The Cold War ended, and the existing political structure dissolved, leading to a reshaping of global power dynamics.

2.3. Us Russian Relations Post Cold War

US Russian relations is a very important era to analyse in which we can understand how the two develop their policies and here are relations stages according to the US Government statistics 2011.

2.3.1 Course of relations

US Russian relations post cold war went through 5 stages .

✓ **Early 1990s :**

This period was marked by the disintegration and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Russia, under the leadership of Boris Yeltsin, faced significant challenges in terms of its economy, domestic politics, and ensuring a successful democratic transition.

E. Rumer, R. Sokolsky It truly represented a hopeful era in the Washington-Moscow relationship, characterized by substantial achievements and positive prospects for the future. In a brief timeframe, the two former Cold War foes successfully discussed a treaty aimed at reducing strategic nuclear weapons (START II), endorsed a multilateral agreement regarding conventional forces in Europe, and hammered out arrangements for German reunification, including the unified Germany's inclusion in the North Atlantic.

post cold war what went wrong

✓ **Mid-1990s Transformations:**

Amid internal and external complexities, relations experienced both escalation in certain aspects and deterioration in others. Tensions heightened over the expansion of NATO towards Eastern Europe and terrorist attacks, impacting bilateral understandings.

As Eugene Rumer and Richard Sokolsky stated that The initial phase of the relationship faces its first challenges. In the period spanning from late September to In the early days of October 1993, a critical point was reached in the tensions between Russia's executive and legislative authorities. This led to street clashes in Moscow as the constitutional crisis between President

Yeltsin and the rebellious parliament escalated. Following a period of settling, Yeltsin effectively maneuvered the adoption of a novel constitution that notably fortified the authority of the executive branch, elevating the presidency above all other government divisions. Concurrently, during the same autumn season, Russian officials vehemently expressed their resistance to the expansion of NATO, which seemed to be a foundational element of U.S. policy in Europe.

✓ **Era of Détente and Temporary Cooperation (Late 1990s - Early 21st Century):**

Relations witnessed a period of détente and cooperation during the administrations of Bill Clinton and Vladimir Putin. Agreements were signed to limit nuclear weapons and enhance economic cooperation.

Eugene Rumer explains that, perception has changed and become more optimistic, particularly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks This transformation was bolstered by the U.S. interest in Russia's proposal for cooperation in Afghanistan during the war. In November 2001, a joint statement by Bush and Putin heralded the arrival of "a new 21st-century-appropriate relationship." These connections are founded on a shared dedication to democratic principles, a free-market economy, and the rule of law. The statement concludes with a mutual commitment to advance common values, safeguard human rights, foster tolerance, preserve religious freedom, support freedom of expression and independent media, create economic opportunities, and uphold the rule of law. Doubts regarding Russia have given way to a "new strategic relationship" characterized by a collaborative spirit...

✓ **Escalating Tensions and Conflict Resurgence (Late 21st Century):**

In the late 21st century, tensions escalated, and conflicts resurged in the relations between Russia and other countries. This escalation in tensions resulted from the rise of regional conflicts and tensions related to Russia's stances on specific issues in various regions.

Among these tensions, one can point to Russian interventions in countries like Ukraine and Syria. In Ukraine, conflicts arose due to events that led to the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula by Russia in 2014, causing international outcry and resulting in deteriorating relations between Russia and numerous countries. Russia entered into supporting the Syrian government and getting involved in the ongoing conflict, actions that led to criticisms and tensions with nations supporting the Syrian opposition. These strains were also observable in Russia's relations with Western countries, including the United States, and its allies.

Disagreements regarding interventions and positions in regional affairs impacted bilateral relations and heightened the level of tension among the involved parties.

In general, we can perceive how regional tensions and conflicts have resulted in renewed tensions in Russia's relations with the rest of the world in the late 21st century.

✓ **The Period of Mutual Accusations and Sanctions (Current Era):**

In recent years, relations have been characterized by mutual accusations of election interference and human rights violations. The situation has worsened with the imposition of economic sanctions on both sides.

"During this period, tensions escalated around various issues, including election interference and cyberattacks, as well as regional conflicts such as the Ukraine crisis and the Syrian crisis. Several key points need to be considered to understand this period:

✓ **Election Interference and Cyberattacks:**

Starting from 2016, Accusations of mutual interference in the U.S. presidential elections arose between Russia and the United States..

Russia was accused of launching cyberattacks to influence the democratic process and sow chaos.

✓ **Regional Interventions:**

Ukraine Conflict The United States leveled accusations against Russia, alleging its involvement in eastern Ukraine and the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula, leading to the imposition of economic sanctions on Russia. In the case of the Syrian crisis, the two nations held strongly contrasting positions. The United States accused Russia of supporting the Assad regime and committing human rights violations.

2.3.2. US Policy vs Russia

Following the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the world witnessed a period of unipolar leadership, with the United States at the helm. The United States promoted a policy of peace and democracy, particularly after some former Soviet Union nations joined NATO, and the Atlantic Alliance expanded eastward towards Russia. Despite transitions in American administrations, a consistent policy prevailed.

Since the end of the Cold War, American policy towards Russia has largely remained unchanged, with various administrations pursuing similar objectives. Two primary sources of friction in the bilateral relationship stand out: the United States' refusal to accept Russia as it is, evident in repeated reform and redesign initiatives targeting its political system, and the expansion of the Euro-Atlantic security framework into the Eurasian region surrounding Russia.. These two ambitious goals have been accomplished many times and unsuccessful, but these two elements remain the foundation of official US policy towards Russia. In retrospect, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the less ambitious US approach to the problem

Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union could have laid a better foundation for a less difficult situation.

Economic and Diplomatic Sanctions:

In response to mutual accusations and regional events, both the United States and Russia imposed economic sanctions on each other.

These sanctions included asset freezes, trade restrictions, and diplomatic constraints, significantly impacting economic relations between the two countries.

Bilateral Summits and Negotiations:

Despite the tensions, bilateral summits between Russian and American leaders continued in an attempt to ease relations and discuss pressing issues. However, some efforts failed to achieve substantial improvement in relations.

✓ **Outcomes and Challenges:**

The period of mutual accusations and sanctions witnessed an increase in tensions and deterioration in relations between Russia and the United States. These tensions affected global stability and collaborative efforts to address international challenges. Additionally, the economic sanctions impacted the economic sectors of both countries. Russian-American relations remain under the pressure of multiple challenges, posing difficulties in achieving sustainable solutions and fostering cooperation in the future."

(Edward. L, *The New Cold War. Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West* . 2016,p.45)

2.4. NATO Expansion: Toward or in Opposition to Russia?

Another enduring aspect of U.S. policy concerning Russia has been the importance attributed to NATO as the cornerstone of the post-Cold War security framework in Europe, including its expansion into specific former Soviet states. Since the end of the Cold War, the enlargement of NATO has been the primary instrument of U.S. security strategy in Europe and Eurasia. This underscores the U.S. commitment to a unified, democratic, and peaceful Europe, along with the conviction that the alliance should facilitate the continent's transformation in the post-Cold War era. Largely disregarded were Moscow's warnings, starting in 1994, asserting that an expanding NATO was inconsistent with the concept of a "whole Europe" and would perpetually exclude Russia.

While NATO's expansion may not have been explicitly aimed at Russia, it has adversely impacted how the Kremlin perceives U.S. motives and intentions. This expansion has encountered strong opposition from individuals across a diverse range of political ideologies in Russia. Moreover, Perceptions of its own security needs have significantly influenced East-West relations. The question at hand is whether the U.S. commitment to the transatlantic partnership requires the ongoing expansion of the alliance to the east and the maintenance of the Open Door policy.

While Graham. T explains that the Clinton administration initiated NATO expansion in 1997 by offering memberships to Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, a policy subsequently

embraced by the George W. Bush and Obama administrations. Beyond providing a security umbrella to former Soviet bloc nations, NATO membership promoted their transition to democracy during the post-communist period. NATO is fundamentally an alliance grounded in shared democratic values. As Clinton stated in his 1994 State of the Union address, "democracies do not attack each other," and the democratic transformations of new NATO members would enhance European security. In this manner, NATO also became a tool for advancing democracy.

In contrast, Russia has consistently opposed NATO's expansion since it was first proposed in the early 1990s. The Kremlin has maintained that NATO's eastward expansion posed a threat to Russian security and that the alliance's prominent role in Europe's security framework marginalized Russia as a non-member. Nonetheless, Russia's objections did not halt NATO's enlargement. Many Western officials and observers viewed these objections as remnants of the old Soviet ideology that Russia was expected to abandon as it transitioned to a free-market system and liberal democracy.. For those who doubted Russia's ability to transition in this manner, NATO's expansion appeared even more reasonable as a safeguard against the prospect of Russia reemerging as a threat to Europe. This possibility gained traction as Russia regained a substantial portion of its economic strength, displayed more authoritarian domestic politics, and demonstrated geopolitical ambitions.

In 2007, Putin directly conveyed a cautionary message to NATO, urging against further expansion to the east. Yet, In the West, Putin's warning was widely perceived as an antiquated holdover from the Cold War era. Even though the alliance's dual role, serving both as a defense organization and a tool for democracy promotion, had become a significant source of tension in U.S.-Russia relations, Putin's caution was largely dismissed.

In 2008, NATO made a commitment to extend Extending membership to Ukraine and Georgia represented a significant step, crossing the red line previously set by Putin concerning the territories of former Soviet states.. According to U.S. policymakers, NATO was essentially the sole legitimate and practical security overseer for both Europe and Eurasia. Expanding the alliance was considered the most logical course of action for the entire regionPutin's reaction materialized in the 2008 conflict with Georgia, solidifying his position regarding the boundaries of the former Soviet space. This conflict put a stop to NATO's eastward expansion and represented a critical juncture in both European security and the Russia-NATO relationship. By 2014, the annexation of Crimea and Russia's unacknowledged military actions in Ukraine

signaled the end of the post-Cold War era and ushered in a new divide between Eastern and Western Europe.

NATO enlargement provided advantages to numerous nations in Central and Eastern Europe, offering the region a much-needed security framework in the aftermath of the Cold War's aftermath.. It also played a vital role in assisting these nations, once part of the Soviet bloc, in transitioning from communism. However, the principle of one size fitting all does not apply universally. Factors like political culture, historical context, geography, cultural distinctions, and economic ties are significantly influential in shaping the trajectory of individual countries. The dynamics involving Georgia, Ukraine, and Russia, as well as Moscow's staunch opposition to NATO membership for these former Soviet republics, did not carry significant influence within the George W. Bush administration. The president purportedly pushed for both countries to become NATO members, even though many member countries within the alliance had substantial reservations.

According to Rojansky.M, the commitment to offer membership to Ukraine and Georgia—without specifying a date or a well-defined accession strategy—was the result of a compromise between Bush and several other NATO leaders, including German Chancellor Angela Merkel. being a prominent figure in opposition to the notion. Although the commitment lacked precision and specific details, it held significance as a symbol of both U.S. and NATO's determination to pursue the policy of expanding the alliance to the east, regardless of any constraints set by Putin. When Putin referred to the dissolution of the Soviet Union as the most significant geopolitical catastrophe of the twentieth century, his message strongly resonated with the intended domestic audience, reflecting widely held sentiments among average Russians. Regrettably, this aspect was overlooked by Western policymakers. In retrospect, these warning signals foretold future conflicts. However, due to the prevailing atmosphere of Western post-Cold War triumphalism, these warnings were often dismissed as Russia's sentimental attachment to a bygone era, rather than an indication of its future aspirations.

With the 2008 commitment to offer membership to Georgia and Ukraine, the United States led NATO across an unspoken yet distinct boundary. Unlike other former Soviet bloc nations that joined NATO after the Cold War, Ukraine and Georgia had ties to Russia that were unparalleled. Countries in Central Europe had historical affiliations with the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Poland regained its independence after World War I, despite a tumultuous relationship with the Soviet Union until it was dominated by Joseph Stalin and Adolf Hitler.

The Baltic states had historical connections to the Russian Empire but stronger affiliations with the German world. After enjoying decades of autonomy, they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1939, perceiving Russia as an occupying force. This sentiment endured through the Soviet occupation, propelling them toward freedom in the late 1980s and contributing to the dissolution of the USSR.

In contrast, Ukraine and Georgia had distinctive historical relationships with Russia. Until 1991, Ukraine had been part of imperial and subsequently Soviet Russia for over three centuries. It was the heartland of the empire's industry, defense production, and agriculture, serving as a gateway to the global stage. Georgia's status evolved as it became a Russian protectorate in 1783 and eventually joined the Russian Empire officially in 1801. In contrast to the Baltic nations, both Ukraine and Georgia held essential positions within the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union. Even after giving rise to significant independence movements and playing pivotal roles in the USSR's disintegration, many of these connections persisted to the present day, even after Russia engaged in conflicts with both countries to maintain its influence.

As "outdated" failed to acknowledge Russian sensitivities. In response, Russia outright rejected several key assumptions that initially underpinned arguments for expansion, such as the notion that Russia would gradually shift its stance, align with the alliance's values, and ultimately embrace NATO's eastward expansion as intended by its advocates. In other words, Moscow was expected to view expansion as a step towards cooperation, rather than opposition.

Russia's opposition to NATO's eastward expansion aligned with the expectations of those who advocated for enlargement as a precaution against a resurgent Russia with territorial ambitions. However, the architects of this expansion had not fully assessed the potential consequences of this scenario. While they had pledged membership to Georgia and Ukraine and encouraged their NATO aspirations, the alliance did not formulate a plan to defend them and did not provide support when both countries faced Russian aggression. The alliance had offered a political commitment but not a legal one to ensure their security. Essentially, NATO chose to prioritize its narrow legal obligations to member states over the broader political commitments articulated in official declarations and leaders' speeches. This decision implied that NATO wasn't fully committed to ensuring the security of Georgia and Ukraine. The conflicts involving Russia, Georgia, and Ukraine highlighted the role of interests in motivating the actions of these parties. Russia had substantial interests in Georgia and Ukraine, which it

was willing to protect through warfare. In contrast, the United States and NATO didn't see their interests or shared values as compelling enough to justify military confrontation with Russia.

Additionally, NATO's leaders seemed to overlook the geographical challenges posed by offering Georgia and Ukraine potential NATO membership. Their close proximity to Russia provided Russia with a significant military advantage, making it difficult for NATO to defend these countries in case of conflict.

Lastly, the geopolitical landscape has changed significantly since the early 1990s. Europe, once envisioned as united, free, and peaceful after the Cold War, is now divided between Russia and NATO. Some countries remain unaligned, hesitant to join either side. Moreover, NATO's focus has shifted from expansion beyond Europe to defending its member territories against potential conflicts, especially with Russia. As a result, the prospects of Georgia and Ukraine becoming NATO members have become distant and uncertain.

2.5. Conclusion

This chapter illuminates the sequence of occurrences that unfolded in the wake of the Cold War, commencing with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and its ensuing ramifications. It explores the dynamics of Russian-American relations, delves into the United States' foreign policy in connection with Russia, and addresses the expansion of NATO. Additionally, it scrutinizes the repercussions stemming from the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Chapter 03

Us Aide to Ukraine New Conflict with Russia

3.1. Introduction

This chapter delves into the origins of the Ukrainian-Russian crisis and its progression. It further emphasizes Ukraine's strategic significance to the United States. Lastly, it examines the U.S. approach to the crisis and explores the motivations driving its involvement in the conflict.

3.2. The Ukrainian-Russian Crisis and Its Evolution

The origins of the Ukrainian crisis can be traced back to NATO's expansion into regions that had previously been promised to remain outside the alliance's reach, a commitment made after the collapse of the Soviet Union and Germany's reunification. Russia had received assurances that NATO would not extend eastward into Eastern and Central Europe.

In 2008, a situation similar to the current Ukrainian crisis unfolded when Georgia, a country bordering Russia, expressed its desire to join the European Union and NATO. This led to clashes between Georgian forces and Russian-backed separatists in South Ossetia in August 2008. Russian forces entered the region, citing the need to protect Russian citizens holding Russian passports. They quickly gained control of South Ossetia, pushed Georgian forces out, and launched attacks on the outskirts of Tbilisi, Georgia's capital. A ceasefire was negotiated, resulting in Russia recognizing the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Although Georgia did not formally join NATO, it signed an association agreement with the European Union in 2014.

The current Ukrainian crisis began in November 2013 when the Ukrainian government, aligned with Moscow, announced it would not sign an association agreement with the European Union. This decision triggered massive protests in Kyiv, with demonstrators advocating for EU membership. On February 22, 2014, Ukraine's parliament removed President Viktor Yanukovich amid the protests, known as the Euromaidan or the Ukrainian Revolution of Dignity. On February 28, 2014, Russian special forces seized Crimea, which had been transferred to Ukraine by Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev in 1954. A referendum on March 16, 2014, showed that the majority of Crimean residents, mainly Russian-speaking, favored joining Russia.

NATO suspended civil and military cooperation with Russia, and Western countries imposed economic sanctions. Supporters of Russia declared the self-proclaimed Donetsk and

Luhansk People's Republics in the Donbas region. In September 2014, an agreement was reached in Minsk, Belarus, involving Russia, Ukraine, separatist forces, and the OSCE, aiming to end the conflict in eastern Ukraine. However, the provisions of the agreement were largely unimplemented, leading to a protracted civil war with casualties and renewed Cold War tensions.

Tensions escalated in 2021 when Washington expressed concerns about Russia's troop movements near the Ukrainian border. Talks between Russians and Americans in Geneva and discussions between Russian and NATO representatives failed to yield results. Moscow began deploying its army units in Belarus, signaling the need for a political agreement aligned with Russia's interests.

After Vladimir Putin's speech on February 21, 2022, the United Nations Security Council condemned Russia's recognition of the self-proclaimed republics in eastern Ukraine. The United States and the European Union imposed sanctions on Russia, while Germany halted work on the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline, and the UK announced a substantial package of sanctions.

In conclusion, Ukraine's strategic importance has made it a focal point in the ongoing crisis between Russia and the Western world.

3.2.1. The American Perspective on the Strategic Significance of Ukraine

From an American perspective, Ukraine's strategic importance can be broken down into several key aspects:

✓ **Geopolitical Significance:**

Ukraine, which gained independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, holds a strategically important geographical position situated between Russia and NATO member states. This geographic location renders it of utmost importance. The United States and Europe both consider Ukraine's independence as a crucial element in achieving a united, free, and secure Europe. The pursuit of this vision has involved an ongoing effort to secure Europe, a process initiated in the 1990s through the expansion of institutions such as NATO and the European Union. The overarching objective has been to reduce Russia's influence in European regions and its neighboring territories. Consequently, the integration of Ukraine into economic and security frameworks is

perceived as a means for the Western world to exert substantial influence over the Eastern gateway

✓ **Geostrategic Importance:**

Ukraine's geographical location is of paramount geopolitical significance, and it plays a crucial role in the United States' vital political and geostrategic interests. For the U.S., Ukraine is essential in terms of containing Russia's sphere of influence. Moreover, Ukraine's ports are strategically valuable to NATO as they provide access to the Black Sea.

✓ **Resource Export:**

Ukraine is a key player in the global export of various commodities, including oil, natural gas, coal, wheat, and other essential goods. Both Russia and Ukraine have significant roles in global markets. Reports indicate that These two nations collectively manufacture more than 2/3 of the globe's neon, a crucial element in semiconductor fabrication. This has led to a crisis in sectors such as automotive production, which is already facing a scarcity of computer chips. Furthermore, Russia and Ukraine contribute over 10% of the world's titanium production, a vital material in aircraft manufacturing. In analyzing the motivations behind Western and Russian actions and their current complex situation, one can closely examine the current political dynamics in the pivotal region that separates them and the competition for influence within it. The following key points can be observed:

A. Integration of Eastern and Central Europe:

Many significant countries in Eastern and Central Europe, including Poland, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, and Bulgaria, have achieved full membership in both the European Union and NATO. Their deep integration into the Western system has solidified as their economic interests have become closely intertwined with the Western Atlantic framework. As a result, these nations are no longer politically, economically, or militarily susceptible to challenges from Russia in the Central European region.

B. Remaining Western Influence Targets :

Currently, only two countries, Ukraine and Belarus, offer opportunities for the West to further expand its influence and counter Russia's presence in the broader Eastern European region. The West has made efforts to extend its influence in Ukraine, particularly through the European Union's association agreement in March 2014. Ukraine is of significant importance

due to its substantial population, extensive territory, and its border with Russia. It occupies a substantial portion of the Eastern European gateway, making it one of the pivotal countries in this context.

C. Russia's Stakes in Ukraine :

For Russia, preventing the consolidation of Western interests and influence in Ukraine is crucial, as it would entail limiting Russian influence in the entire Black Sea region, including the strategically and historically significant Crimean Peninsula. With Western-aligned countries like Turkey along the southern coast, Romania and Bulgaria on the western coast, and Georgia on parts of the eastern coast of the Black Sea, Russia's presence in the Black Sea would be confined to only a portion of the eastern coastline. If a major power's strategic interests revolve around ensuring the safety and unhindered movement of its naval fleets, the Black Sea would lose much of its strategic importance for Russia if the West were to successfully integrate all of Ukraine, including the Crimea Peninsula, into its economic and security partnerships, it could explain why Russia is displaying assertive behavior despite the anticipated negative consequences from Western reactions.

D. In the event that the Western efforts to incorporate

Ukraine into Western economic and security frameworks prove successful, Belarus would become the sole remaining buffer between the West and Russia. Belarus would find itself encircled by Western allies to the north and south, essentially positioning it as the sole pro-Russia entity within the Eastern European gateway to Europe.

Based on the analysis presented, it can be inferred that should the process of integrating Ukraine into the broader European-Atlantic economic and security integration succeed, the West would have effectively deprived Russia of the strategic advantage it once held in the Central region, which provided the Russian land force with a significant edge.

3.2.2. American Policy Towards the Russo-Ukrainian War

The features and elements of US policy towards the Ukraine crisis are as follows:

✓ **Providing political and military support to Ukraine:**

Due to the government's own "red lines" authority set by Biden, does not allow any direct action to be taken. military intervention Due to its commitment to Russia and the deployment of US military forces on the ground, the US government has attempted to provide alternative forms of support to Kiev. This includes the political mobilization of European allies, continuous coordination with European countries and other major countries such as Canada and Japan .In response to the situation, various nations and organizations have shown strong support for Ukraine. They have expressed solidarity with the Ukrainian government and its people, with some countries even providing immediate shipments of modern weaponry to bolster the Ukrainian army. This support intensified in January 2022. Additionally, certain NATO member states, in collaboration with the United States, have supplied Ukraine with anti-tank missiles and other weaponry.

In line with the mentioned efforts, the United States and its allies have extended assistance to Ukraine on multiple fronts, including:

A. Intelligence Collaboration:

The United States has engaged in intelligence sharing with Ukraine, furnishing critical information that has played a pivotal role in guiding several major offensives against Russian forces. This cooperation has led to Russia accusing the United States of direct involvement in the conflict, sparking concerns about the potential for a direct military clash between these two nuclear-armed nations. Although Russia has a huge strategic nuclear arsenal capable of hitting targets around the world, including the United States, Russia's military doctrine restricts the use of nuclear weapons to existential threats against the state.

*Intelligence from the United States helped Ukraine effectively identify and target Russian targets.

In addition, available information indicates that Ukrainian forces, thanks to this intelligence, were able to destroy 12 Russian generals and attack one of the most important parts of the Russian fleet, the cruiser Moskva, in the Black Sea in April 2022.

B. Militarily:

The Biden Administration has pledged to make any Russian military action in Ukraine costly. This commitment has been demonstrated through military aid programs to the Ukrainians. In a virtual summit held in December 2021, Putin issued a warning that if Russia were to initiate an invasion of Ukraine, significant military assistance, including advanced offensive weaponry, would be supplied by the United States and its allies. However, it appears that the Russian leadership may have underestimated President Biden's determination and the specific role these weapons could play in the conflict in Ukraine..

The large-scale arming of Ukrainian forces by the West and the United States has changed the balance of power on the ground. Add to that the shortcomings of Russia's military plans, supply lines and logistics, lack of air support for ground forces, and the failure to secure an advanced communication system to prevent the invasion. interception, and all of these factors resulted in significant losses for Russian forces.

Since the commencement of the invasion, the United States, its European allies, and countries beyond these coalitions, like South Korea and Japan, have delivered military assistance valued at billions of dollars.. This support includes light missile launchers, attack drones, Stinger and Javelin missiles, radar and jamming systems and surveillance equipment. The statement of US officials begins to show that the US goal in supporting Ukraine is not only to ensure Russia's defeat, but also to weaken it "to the point where it can no longer deal with Ukraine". Ukraine is no longer confined to the perimeter of the Pentagon; Washington has supported much of Ukraine, especially in 2021, in response to the Russian invasion. Ukraine has received approximately \$400 million in military aid. The cumulative military support from the United States to Ukraine since 2014 has surpassed \$2.5 billion.

C. From an economic perspective:

Along with other nations, the United States and its European allies have enacted a succession of diplomatic, economic, financial, technological, military, and technical sanctions. Russian banks, financial institutions, and state-run organizations were the targets of these sanctions.

Even the Russian energy sector, which is a major artery of the country's economy, was not spared from these sanctions. Due to the dependency of many of its member states on Russian oil and gas imports, the Kremlin expected the European Union to avoid from enacting such penalties.

However, Western sanctions went further, targeting key figures within the Russian government, with the aim of undermining the structure of President Vladimir Putin's regime and eroding support for him from within. These sanctions were effective in isolating Russia in the global economic arena."It took a toll on it. These sanctions, proven to be effective, managed to isolate Russia on a global scale and inflict severe economic damage on the Russian economy, which is the largest, boasting a value of 7.1 trillion dollars. The U.S. administration sees this as a strong signal to Russia that it cannot endure the full economic repercussions of fully annexing Ukraine."

D. Affirmation of NATO Backing :

The current administration divides its strategy into two tiers: the first pertains to Ukraine, and the second involves the United States' strategic evaluation of its actions. Concerning the NATO alliance and its member nations, particularly those in the eastern flank of the alliance, the Biden administration has committed to reconfirming support for the alliance. In this context, President Biden authorized the deployment of 3,000 American troops to Poland, Germany, and Romania in February 2022, with the aim of strengthening NATO countries in Eastern Europe. During the same month, he also consented to send 7,000 troops to Germany. These actions, coupled with ongoing coordination and communication with NATO, primarily serve to reassure allies and convey a clear message that Washington will take a firm stance if any NATO member faces an attack.

E. Enforcement of Western Sanctions Against Russia :

In an effort to dissuade Russia from pursuing military actions against Ukraine, President Biden issued threats of imposing "paralyzing" economic sanctions on Russia and providing military assistance to Ukraine, incorporating cutting-edge weapons. It was clear that Washington had made a significant effort, working with its NATO allies, the European Union, as well as other nations like Japan, Australia, South Korea, and New Zealand. These initiatives aimed to hold Russia accountable for its deeds.

The following actions are included in the sanctions put in place against Russia by the US and its allies:

- ✓ **Sanctions on a Major Russian Bank:** The United States and its allies enacted sanctions against one of Russia's biggest banks, which is crucial for funding Russian infrastructure and defense initiatives. This action was conducted in retaliation for Moscow's formal backing of the separatist organizations in Eastern Ukraine, Donetsk and Luhansk, as well as the movement of armed soldiers and supplies within their borders.
- ✓ **Deprivation of Funding Access :** Moscow was cut off from accessing funds from American and European financial institutions. These new sanctions were strategically designed to target critical sectors of the Russian economy, including technology, the military, and the aerospace industry.
- ✓ **Halt of Nord Stream 2 Pipeline :** Sanctions were applied to block the construction of the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline, which was intended to connect Russia and Germany through the Baltic Sea. This action followed Germany's announcement of suspending its involvement in the project.
- ✓ **Prohibition on Russian Sovereign Debt Trading :** Trading of Russian sovereign debt in Western financial markets was prohibited. Additionally, sanctions were imposed on wealthy Russians closely associated with the Kremlin, as well as their family members.
- ✓ **Sanctions Targeting High-Level Russian Officials :** Sanctions were directed at the Russian President and his Foreign Minister, Sergei Lavrov. This made Vladimir Putin the first leader of a major state to be subjected to such sanctions.
- ✓ **Exclusion of Russian Banks from SWIFT :** The SWIFT system, a vital global network for banking and financial transactions, was cut off from several Russian banks and financial organizations.
- ✓ **Restrictions on Russian Foreign Currency Reserves :** Measures were taken to limit the Central Bank of Russia's access to its foreign currency reserves, which were estimated to be around \$630 billion. Sanctions were also applied to the Russian Sovereign Wealth Fund and one of its subsidiary companies.

These sanctions were imposed as a response to Russia's actions in Eastern Ukraine and were designed to have a significant impact on various sectors of the Russian economy and target influential figures within the Russian government.

3.3. Us Interests Behind Aiding Russia

In order to investigate the US objectives behind the aid to Ukraine against Russia we should take into consideration the historical background, the political context, many other factors that can change by time plus statements and declarations of political figures and critics.

Joshua Shiffrin believes that the Biden administration and supporters of the current U.S. policy have so far failed to provide strategic justifications that justify the high costs and risks that America is incurring in the Russo-Ukrainian war. One of the main arguments or arguments is that the US cannot accept Russian aggression in Ukraine because it would give Moscow the confidence to further up its aggression in a way that threatens US interests. Some proponents of this position contend that if the response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine is insufficient, it may give Moscow a chance to advance its expansionist goals, jeopardizing the security of both America's NATO members and all of Europe.

It seems that there are many other justifications for American aid and its goals beyond maintaining security and peace. While America could have heeded Putin's warnings and committed to staying behind the red line, it chose instead to ignore those warnings and opt for the harder path to resolve the conflict by supporting Ukraine. This is what ultimately led it into the war against Russia.

The commitment to aid Ukraine aims to affirm America's policy and credibility in assisting European nations and supporting their security. America aims to position itself as the leading supporter of democracy, as emphasized by Joshua Shiffrin, who argued that failure to support Ukraine would lead to doubt about the sincerity of American support for democracy worldwide. Biden articulated this idea in a speech where he stated that Ukraine is an integral part of the ongoing battle between democracy and tyranny, freedom and oppression.

Stephen Hadley, the former National Security Advisor, also emphasized the strong American interest in deterring President Vladimir Putin from repeating actions like the invasion of Ukraine in the coming years. He argued that if there is no significant cost for such actions, it would send a message to other potential aggressors that they can also seize territory and impose their will.

Furthermore, Luk Kovay, in an article for the Kabul Institute, argued that America's geopolitical goals extend beyond merely supporting Ukraine. America views Russia as a significant geopolitical adversary. For Americans who believe in strong and secure national borders, national sovereignty, and the right to self-defense, supporting Ukraine against Russian aggression is seen as a natural step. Additionally, given America's other geopolitical concerns, such as the rise of China and healthy economic ties with Europe benefiting the American workforce, support for Ukraine is deemed necessary.

However, journalist George Packer went even further, suggesting that the true strategic objectives behind continuous American support for Zelensky are clear from the start: it's about "exhausting" Russia militarily and economically. Europe's nations have their role to play as well. Fighting Russia is Ukraine's task, and supporting democracy in Ukraine is a farcical story that neither Ukrainians nor the Americans believe in themselves. Moreover, the goal from the beginning was to provoke Russia into entering a war with Ukraine. Europe, without hesitation, sought refuge in the American embrace, testing Russia's actual military capabilities and experimenting with various new weapons.....Many of these objectives have already been achieved:

- ✓ Ukrainians are fighting Russia by proxy.
- ✓ American arms deals to Europe are on the rise.....

Even those who justified American support for Ukraine in terms of democracy promotion did not deny America's global peace and democracy-spreading ambitions, while casting Russia as a symbol of injustice and oppression. America's policy towards Russia remains consistent despite changes in successive administrations.

However, incorporating historical context into the analysis provides deeper and sometimes more credible justifications. American steadfastness in protecting its interests and its tense relationship with Russia, even after the Cold War, and its attempts at reform, are measures to ensure the containment of a communist entity that is seen as an undesirable competitor by the United States, not just militarily but also ideologically. Therefore, the most realistic approach is one that emphasizes America's primary interest in these aids is to exhaust Russia indirectly, much like the Cold War, but this time, Russia faces a well-armed and equipped adversary.

Returning to the crisis dimensions, it began with Ukraine's desire to join NATO, which is part of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan's original goals, primarily aimed at countering and encircling the Communist threat.

The second aspect lies in understanding Ukraine's geopolitical significance and America's view of it as a source of power for Russia, its last defense line, and its first gateway to Europe. It's natural for America to support a country that wants to break free from Russian dominance and is one of the key sources of Russia's strength. In all scenarios and war scenarios, it appears that America has guaranteed interests through this assistance. The continuation of the war means the continuation of Russia's exhaustion and the exhaustion of its key state. Ukraine's victory would be America's greatest gain, marking the beginning of the end for a powerful Russia. Even in the unlikely event of Russia's victory, it still exhausts Russia and tightens the noose around it. In the case of Ukraine's division and the integration of its western part into NATO, America remains the biggest beneficiary, as it essentially shares one of the competitor's sources of power in the conflict.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter delves into the origins of the Ukraine-Russia crisis and how it developed. It after that underscores Ukraine's strategic significance to the United States. Finally, it observes US policy concerning the conflict and investigates america's interests behind its contribution to the conflict mainly in exhausting Russia as the study pointed

General Conclusion

The relationship between the United States and Russia, two global superpowers whose interactions helped shape much of the 20th and 21st centuries, has been thoroughly examined in this thesis. This persistent dynamic has gone through several stages, each characterized by times of strong competition, conflict, and cooperation. Critical turning points have been the focus of the research, with the Cold War, the post-Cold War era, and the renewal of tensions in the context of the Ukraine war receiving particular attention.

Our voyage was launched by Chapter 1, which provided crucial concepts and conceptualizations in the field of international relations while shedding light on the reasons, causes, and effects of the Cold War. It emphasized how important this historical occurrence was in forming the world we live in today.

Chapter 2 carried on our investigation by tracking the Cold War's aftermath, beginning with the collapse of the Soviet Union and its significant ramifications. It explored the complex dynamics of Russian-American ties, deconstructed American foreign policy toward Russia, looked at NATO expansion, and evaluated the effects of the fall of the Soviet Union.

The Ukraine-Russia crisis, one of the most significant flashpoints in current U.S.-Russian relations, was explored in Chapter 3. This chapter examined the start and development of the conflict, underlining the strategic significance of Ukraine to the United States. It also looked closely at American policy responses to the crisis and exposed the motivations for America's involvement, including a concerted effort to thwart Russian expansionism.

In conclusion, our research has shed light on the historical intricacies, geopolitical elements, and strategic considerations that support the relationship between the United States and Russia. This link has been shown to be dynamically interacted with by historical legacies, governmental decisions, and changing global circumstances. Our predictions that U.S. assistance to Ukraine would be used to stop Russian expansionism have come true, illuminating the complex web of interests that shape global politics. The U.S.-Russia connection continues to be crucial in the arena of international relations today. We gain invaluable understanding of the intricate web of global politics by comprehending its historical development and the forces that have influenced it. As we conclude this thesis, we do so with a deeper comprehension of the ongoing interplay between these two global superpowers and the enduring relevance of their interactions in the 21st century.

References

References

- Abderrazek, B. (2015). US Russian Competition in The middle East Study The syrian Crises case [Master's thesis]. http://thesis.univ-biskra.dz/1417/1/Scien_po_m6_2015.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2jTSNigpEYGrbIU_k1v_yCrI3UzTwk4qK9hfcKKzuSmHcIXpQpR6yoDB0
- Abdou, A. J. (2022, October). US Policy towards the Russian Military Intervention in Ukraine and its Repercussions on NATO. "Journal of the Faculty of Politics and Economics.", 16, 33.
https://jocu.journals.ekb.eg/article_264002_7a821e1fe08ee3e6e3d12acd9bddd93a.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3DMujTSNUyRZdoOZTBmCpg8krWWHQE_W0M0K3wNUnzFnoVqrYEO26mXk
- Bloomberg. (2021, December 23). For China, USSR's 1991 Collapse is Still News It Can Use. Bloomberg.com. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-12-23/for-china-ussr-s-1991-collapse-is-still-news-it-can-use>
- Cox, M. (2016). Introduction To International Relations. University of London.
<https://we.hse.ru/data/2018/01/26/1162935811/program-1828007360-s0CdPasVeE.pdf>
- Darios, B. (2006). Theories of international relations (2nd ed.).
- Hanson, P. (2008). The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Economy.
Routeldj.http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31799147/Syrian_Conflict
- Immell, M. (2010). The Dissolution of the Soviet Union .
- Jakub, G. J. (2006). Great Powers and Geopolitical Change. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Paul, W. (2007). International Relations A Very Short Introduction (1st ed.). Oxford University Press Inc.
- Rumer, E., & Sokolsky, R. (2019). Thirty Years of U.S. Policy Toward Russia: Can the Vicious Circle Be Broken? <https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/06/20/thirty-years-of-u.s.-policy-toward-russia-can-vicious-circle-be-broken-pub-79323>
- Rumer, E., & Sokolsky, R. (n.d.). Post–Cold War U.S.-Russian Relations—What Went Wrong? jstore.
https://www.jstor.org/tc/accept?origin=%2Fstable%2Fpdf%2Fresrep21005.6.pdf%3Ffbclid%3DIwAR2Qrg3kCjIUlaFcM_flABbHQjtAQtAcQfbSSRGUWzNc16vK6M3IDhGFjDw&is_image=False
- Sedhain; P,R .(2001). Syrian Conflict: The Key International Interests".e_Key_International_Interests-libre.pdf.
- Zaineib, B. T. (2018). the Cold war [Master's thesis]. http://thesis.baghdad_university.ir