

A Conflict between Powerhouses

Alexandra Sierra

Department of Political Science, Diablo Valley College

POLSC 250: International Relations

Professor John Kropf

November 15, 2023

Abstract

The beginning of the conflict between the United States and Russia can be traced to the end of World War II when the two nations were left at the front of the global stage. But the Cold War is what cemented the idea of the capitalist west and communist USSR, solidifying the tensions between the U.S. and the USSR. However, the use of this idea was to paint the standoff and competitive nature of the Cold War as a war of defending from communism rather than the protection of the political and economic national interests of the United States. But what ended the war was the transition from the USSR to Russia and the release of surrounding nations. The use of political culture theory can best explain how the resulting cultural tensions left from the Cold War have affected foreign policy and other actions in the crisis. In addition to this, the use of the class system theory can show how Russia's economic demands to regain its former glory have led to Putin's justification. Also, the defense of U.S. economic interests arising from both the government and gas and oil enterprises in negotiation between the U.S. and Ukraine serves to justify U.S. interference in the conflict. Highlighting how both Russia and the U.S. are to blame for the arrival and current state of conflict in the crisis in Ukraine.

A Conflict Between Powerhouses

Ukraine has become the tragic center of renewal for colliding historical political issues between the United States and Russia. The seizure of Ukraine's territory by Russia in 2014 has been one of the first between European states since World War II (Masters, 2023). Since then, the combative messages of such actions have only escalated, and the clashes between Ukraine and Russia have only magnified due to neither showing signs of ceding.

However, the historical political issues between the United States and Russia have origins in the Soviet Union and the Cold War. Since then, in both the political and cultural sectors of both independent states, such conflicts have been ingrained into each nation and affected how political control is advertised or gained. This conflict between The United States and Russia has further led to the war in Ukraine, to become a political statement to show the global stage the true power of the United States and Russia in gaining a more advantageous political position to further individual influence economically and politically. Thus, political culture theory has the best opportunity to explain how political pride can affect the global stage. Along with this, class system theory can best explain how the economic elite is interested in war to maintain their economic position. The factors of political pride and the economic interest in war that can be derived from political culture theory and class system theory can, therefore, rationally explain the role of the United States and Russia in the crisis in Ukraine.

Origin of the Cold War

Historically, the relationship between the United States and Russia has been one of each attempting to surpass the other in technological, economic, and political sectors for many years. Subsequently, the relationship between the two nations has been very fragile, dysfunctional, and borderline combative. Near the end of World War II, the alliances made by the Allies, who were

composed of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain, began to fall apart. The unraveling of the wartime alliances depicts the beginning of the political frictions between the powerhouse nations. When under threat, the United States and Russia had worked together, but the results of the war put the United States and Russia at the forefront of the global stage. As such, by the end of World War II, the countries liberated by the Soviet Union had instituted a Soviet-based communist party. The institution of these Soviet-based communist parties illustrates that when the Soviet Union was put at the front of the Global Stage, the initial reaction was to maintain control. However, to maintain the Soviet Union's newly gained control of Eastern Europe, the method they had chosen was to spread the communist ideology to maintain influence within the country, highlighting the deep connection the Soviet Union's identity has with its own ideology. The United States and Great Britain's realization of the Soviet Union plan created fear for the newly appointed democracies in Western Europe. (Cold War, 2023)

The clear divisions between Western Europe as Democratic and Eastern Europe as Communist are the spark that ignites the open political frictions between the newly appointed powerhouse nations. But what pushed the political friction further was in 1946, the further development of nuclear power caused a huge investment in both nations towards the research and development of nuclear power and weapons to further compete with the potential threat the United States and the Soviet Union posed to each other. But when the United States proposed to the Soviet Union regulation of nuclear Power, the Soviets completely rejected the proposal out of the fear that the United States wanted to control a monopoly on the development of nuclear technology (The Cold War, 2021). The Soviet Union's denial of the proposed regulations underlines the competitive nature of both the Soviet Union and the United States. And therefore, portrays how high pride is placed on the political stage, where the Soviet Union denied a

proposal that would do a majority of good out of the fear of being outdone. The doubt and fears that arose from the two different nations' technological, political, and economic advancements led to the initiation of a race between the powerful Soviet Union and the United States.

Cold War

The Cold War was the result of friction caused by the United States and Russia disagreeing on what was the correct political ideology between democracy and communism to institute in the newly freed countries post World War II in Eastern Europe. What best describes the divide in Europe would be when Winston Churchill stated, “an iron curtain has descended across,” dividing the Communist nations from the non-Communist nations (The Cold War, 2021). The desire to isolate the Soviet Union’s political ideology only grew with the fear the United States and its allies had with the increasing threat of foreign interference in their government. Both the United States and the Soviet Union had put spies in each other's nations to gain intelligence and stop the other from gaining power by stealing information to affect the other’s ability to compete in the race for power (Burton, n.d.). Further, the fear caused by foreign ideology influencing the internal affairs of both the United States and the Soviet Union outlines how important political pride is to these two nations, where the fear of being bested or controlled by the other leads to foreign actions being taken.

Nevertheless, the pressure from the two politically dominating nations was prevalent, and the fear of communism led to the demand for the isolation of communism. Moreover, the fear of communism was so prevalent in the people of Western nations that they were united by fear, so much so that they organized. So, to resist the pressures of Soviet control in Europe, the United States and its other allies formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO. Yet a large turning point in the Cold War was when both the Soviet Union and the United States had access

to nuclear missiles, causing the fear and political tensions of both nations to peak. In 1962, the Soviets had been discreetly installing nuclear missiles in Cuba in preparation for nuclear attacks to be launched at the United States if necessary, marking the Cuban Missile Crisis as the turning point of nuclear power and its use. The Cuban Missile Crisis was left at a standoff, indicating that neither major political power wanted mutual annihilation and so feared using their nuclear weapons. The fear both the United States and the Soviet Union shared toward mutual annihilation describes how far the two nations were willing to go when political pride was on the line, where annihilation must be ensured for the nations to shy away from taking such drastic actions. (Cold War, 2023)

After some time in the 1980s, the Cold War began to disintegrate with leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev set into motion the democratization of the Soviet Union and later approved the unification of both the East and West parts of Europe with NATO and Soviet agreement (Cold War, 2023). The collapse of the Cold War depicted through Gorbachev's actions highlights the Soviet desire to end the cycle of fear, even if it meant the loss of some power, through the unification of Germany and the transition from the Soviet Union to Russia. Despite this, the actions of Russia to lose power for peace draw attention to the United States and their political stance, where only if Russia lost in the race for power would the United States back down. Reinforcing the idea that political pride is a consistent factor in making political decisions no matter the nation. Further marking the end of the Cold War, depicting Russia's attempt to transition into a period of political peace.

The War in Ukraine

The crisis in Ukraine today is the result of international conflicts and political tensions that have been only growing between the internationally dominating nations, the United States

and Russia. Today, Ukraine has become a field for the politically powerful to display their political prowess. However, the origins of the crisis can be traced back to the elected president of Ukraine, Victor Yanukovich. In 2010, Yanukovich was elected as the president of Ukraine with the support of NATO and Russia. A few years later, in 2013, Yanukovich, who's known to align politically close to Russia, chose to reject alignment with the European Union and instead partner with Russia for an economic deal. Yanukovich's choice marks the beginning of many political conflicts in the crisis in Ukraine, such as protests in Ukraine's capital of Kyiv, with protesters demanding that Yanukovich resign (Sullivan, 2022). The protests were backed by the United States due to Yanukovich's failure to align with the European Union. The protests eventually became increasingly violent, causing Yanukovich to flee to Russia. With Ukraine having no government, an emergency government was put into place. However, the installation of the emergency government in Kyiv was believed to be unconstitutional, and as a result, Crimeans voted to join Russia (Lauria, 2023). The results of the Crimean's vote to join Russia are disputed but often portrayed within Western media as a Russian invasion. But within the eastern regions of Ukraine under Russia's control, troops were brought in 2014 to support the decision of the Crimeans. With the collection of troops at the eastern border in Ukraine, conflict arose from the different political positions of the people at the eastern border who are either backed by the Ukraine or Russian military (War in Ukraine..., 2023). The conflict of the divided Ukrainian people was violent, and an attempt to mitigate the violence between the Ukrainian-backed people and Russian-backed people was the Minsk agreement, a cease-fire. However, the Minsk agreement between Russia and Ukraine failed, and the conflicts continued. In 2015, another attempt at a cease-fire was the Minsk II agreement, but similarly to the first one, it was a

failure, and since the attempts of the Minsk agreements, the death tolls have only grown throughout the years.

Within the United States in 2016, a political hoax arose in the presidential elections, accusing Russia of attempting to interfere and alter the votes to get Donald Trump elected. The political scandal of Russia interfering in the United States' 2016 presidential election portrays Russia as a power-hungry nation, elevating the political tensions between the already stressed nations. The United States, as a response in Romania, activated a missile system for defense purposes. The already delicate political ties the United States had with Russia continued to thin as old political suspicions between the United States and Russia grew. The month after the activation of missile systems in Romania, NATO launched 31,000 troops near Russian borders. The political responses of both Russia and the United States to each other have been only escalating as the political field in Ukraine has revived old tensions. (Lauria, 2023)

In 2021, Russia attempted to compromise with the United States and NATO to disable the Romanian missile system and pull-out NATO troops from Eastern Europe (Lauria, 2023). Despite Russia's attempts at compromise, with the lack of discussion, Russia responded with military movement back at the border between Russia and Ukraine. Even so, the conflict between Russia and Ukraine has continued today, where both sides attempt to advance or protect their military fronts. And with no signs of either side backing down, the death tolls are only expected to grow.

Political Culture Theory: Explained

Political culture is a state-level theory commonly viewed as a large internal influence in a nation. The internal political beliefs and ideas of said nation can, therefore, affect political actions on the international stage. As political culture suggests, it is the commonly shared

political values, ideas, and beliefs towards a nation's political system. But this political culture stems from the overall united identity of a nation, and this identity can be explained through political Socialization (Longley, 2023). Political socialization is a natural procedure the people of any nation can go through where unity occurs from integrating a political position into the nation's identity. Political culture results from unity combining different factors, such as class, country, or region, to arrive at an identity (Winkler, 2023). Consequently, events or beliefs that unite a country can be assumed to be attributed to the arrival of a collective political culture.

Class System Theory: Explained

Class system theory is the idea that the economically dominant class controls large amounts of influence in government. The control of influences then leads the dominant class to pressure the government for decisions that prioritize their economic benefit. The theory of class systems in international relations stems from Marxism. Karl Marx's concerns in international relations were based on the Industrial Revolution he was living through and seeing the potential for conflict growing as societies became more class based. Marx reasoned that as inequalities grow, the larger divisions that are created through class would, in turn, result in international instability. The instability would result from the constant economic poverty and abuse of the lower classes, leading them to continually desire change. It was argued by Marx that the bourgeois would use the state to protect their private interests by inspiring the people through nationalism to pursue and protect the same interests of the bourgeois, economically elevating the dominant class. The ideas of Marx can be seen influencing the more modern class system theory, where in the global political field, it is argued that a nation's political agenda and position stem from the economically dominant class and that the decisions that we see today in international politics root from their desire to expand their power and further their own private economic

interests through the sacrifice of the politically smaller and less economically dominant nations. (Khan, 2022)

United States Foreign Policy: Russia and Ukraine

The Foreign policies the United States had implemented in the delicate relationship between Russia and Ukraine fluctuated during the Trump and Biden administrations. In 2016, Trump won the United States presidential election, but a scandal surrounding Russian interference arose (Lauria, 2023). The political reaction to the alleged interference was not expected of the Trump administration but was not surprising. The peculiar perspective of President Trump on foreign policy sets the tone for the entirety of his term. President Trump's lack of background, knowledge, and desire to learn politics led to messy diplomacy and foreign policy (Deyermond, 2023). The chaotic foreign policy of the Trump administration was brought to attention when Trump, despite the scandal surrounding his election, chose to continue openly praising Russia. Displaying an obsession President Trump had with the political position Putin had taken on the international stage despite the crisis in Ukraine.

Even so, with the unsteady start of the Trump administration, a disconnection between the expressions used by Trump and the overall actions of his administration was prevalent. After Trump's election, he began an attempt to reverse foreign policies. Foreign policy change began with Trump's vocal criticisms of long-time ally NATO, who he described as "obsolete" for their lack of action. However, after Trump's negative comments surrounding NATO, the comments were swiftly denied, and both allies and U.S. Congress members were quickly reassured that the United States would continue to support NATO (Pothier & Vershbow, 2017). However, the actions of the United States government contradicting Trump created fear that the unified NATO would begin to crumble. The potential for NATO to break down was frequently suspected and

mentioned but denied by the United States. However, throughout the rest of Trump's administration, the disconnect between the administration's actions and the personal thoughts of Trump continued to rise as he praised Putin for his strong nation and actions.

The attempt at a realignment between the United States and NATO paved a clear path for the United States to follow for the crisis in Ukraine, to ultimately squash suspicions and display a front of unity to strengthen foreign policy. Yet, President Trump denied this path by being unwilling to send military assistance to Ukraine until it was mentioned that doing so would reinforce and aid United States business. The use of private economic interests as a main motivator for action to be taken displays the priorities of Trump. Where supporting the U.S. agreement with NATO and Ukraine falls behind the economic interests of those in power. In addition, in 2019, the foreign policies that had already been deteriorating between the United States and Ukraine had been exacerbated. Trump was falsely informed by sources such as his personal lawyer that Ukraine had impeded his election by protecting Hunter Biden, the son of Joe Biden, the Democrat's primary candidate during the 2016 elections (Deyermond, 2023). The result of Trump learning misinformation was the halt of military aid worth \$400 million. Trump insisted that for Ukraine sabotaging his election, help and aid would not be sent. Trump's political attitude at the time led to a political scandal where Trump set up a quid pro quo with Ukraine for information. Trump had asked Ukraine for a "favor" with two parts: the first part was to determine if Ukraine was connected to the U.S. Democratic party in 2016, and the second part was to determine if Joe Biden had obstructed the investigation of his son, Hunter Biden's actions in Ukraine (Pifer, 2019). Trump's actions aligned with his consistent pattern of praising Russia, more specifically, praising Putin for his strong nation and style of government. The political scandal surrounding the United States asking for favors from Ukraine was not done in

the interest of the United States but rather for the personal interests of Trump. Trump's interest in obtaining information was to specifically address his political pride and desire to continue supporting Russia by attempting to illuminate Ukraine as part of a political conspiracy surrounding the 2016 elections to help Biden win. This ultimately leads to the conclusion that the foreign policy the United States originally had with NATO and Ukraine before the Trump administration had become argumentative about supporting Ukraine and began distancing from NATO.

In the 2020 presidential elections, candidate Joe Biden won, marking the end of the chaotic Trump administration. A goal of the Biden administration with U.S. foreign policy was to mend the mess caused by the prior Trump administration. Biden aimed to repair the relationship with allies such as NATO by restoring the United States as lead military support (Bennett, 2022). Biden strove to convey unity between his opinion and his administration using nationalism. Biden began to promote the message that Putin is leading an aggressive front against Ukraine and is attempting to strip all Ukrainians of their freedom, and it is the duty of Americans to prevent such actions through negotiations (Taylor, 2022). However, this message conveyed to Russia that the United States is truly in opposition, souring foreign relations with Russia, but, as a result, the United States regains trust with NATO and Ukraine. However, Biden's intentions did not result in the diffusion of the crisis but an escalation. In 2021, Russia began to amass troops near Ukraine's border. With troops at the border, tensions grew between Russia and Ukraine. Russia, as a response, on February 24, 2022, sent a "special military operation" authorized by Putin to advance their forces in Ukraine since Putin had claimed that within Ukrainian territory, there was the slaughtering of Russians and that the point of the operation was to stop the massacre (War in ..., 2023). The movement of Russian Troops into

Ukraine is evidence of a challenge in the Biden administration's goal of attempting to end the aggressive Russian movement. The challenge is that the War has changed into one orientated around Russia and the United States, where the U.S. is no longer only supporting Ukraine but using it as a field to settle conflicts and political tensions with Russia. In response to the "Special military operations," the Western allies declared new sanctions that limited Russian central banks, cutting them off from the global payment system (Timeline: the events..., 2022). The sequence of events that occurred in 2022 depicts an escalation of conflict. When either the United States or Russia made a political decision surrounding the crisis in Ukraine, the other nation swiftly settled on a decision that would be to the detriment of the other in the war. This further represents a growing tension from both the United States under the Biden administration and Russia that is only expected to increase since neither nation shows signs of backing down in Ukraine.

Economic Benefit of the Crisis

Capitalism is a system of economics focused on the distribution of production and resources, but because it is not controlled by the government, it has a decentralized and, therefore, competitive nature (Liberto, 2023). However, the economic system of capitalism relies on the organization of manufacturing, such as the use of resources or raw materials to make products, to be controlled by business owners. But as competition is common, businesses attempt to be as profitable as possible in an attempt to survive the constant wave of other businesses attempting to enter different markets. Profitability allows businesses to fund expansion and control a larger portion of a specific market. But as everybody attempts to expand, the resources that are required for a business to both expand and thrive increase as manufacturing demands increase due to this. However, as expansion is common within capitalistic nations, it is

unavoidable that businesses expand past the boundaries of their own nation, but the reason for international expansion is to obtain international sources of resources necessary for manufacturing, such as natural resources. In today's day and age, the majority of the world uses capitalism as their primary economic system. So, the competition for different sources of resources becomes global, and the demand for governments to help expand control beyond their border's increases (Wolff, 2022). Over time, this demand has built a symbiotic relationship between corporations and politicians. Corporations and politicians share the benefits of each other's support through campaign financing, guaranteeing the politician's loyalty and support towards the best interests of a company, which then can continue their financial support. Blending both government and enterprise interests for expansion.

Russia has argued that Ukraine is a piece missing from Russia's true and whole identity, whether it be economic, political, or cultural, Ukraine is part of the future Russia has pictured for itself (Masters, 2023). As the crisis in Ukraine has continued, many have questioned the motives of Putin, as though his actions of attempting to take over Ukraine, Putin has been escalating the already delicate relations with the United States and NATO. However, the reason for such an escalation of the crisis in Ukraine can be attributed to some of the already strained ties that Russia has had with the United States and NATO, originating from the Cold War. The USSR posed a potential threat to the capitalist empire the U.S. had built from World War II, this threat was brought about through the USSR's survival past 1917, victories, and the development of nuclear weapons; the U.S. decided to portray the USSR as a monster for its belief in communism, depicting it to be against the freedom and democracy that the U.S. holds dear, creating an ideological war, the Cold War (Wolff, 2022). The actions of the United States to demonize the USSR to rally the support of the people illustrate the competitive nature of the

United States, which did not want to share control over the global economic field with the USSR. This led to the Cold War, a race and rivalry between the United States and the USSR. However, the USSR was outmatched by the United States, and as a result, the USSR turned into Russia and gave up control of Eastern Europe, NATO, and the European Union, integrating capitalistic ideals into the region (Wolff, 2022). At the time, Russian President Gorbachev had given up power and control in an attempt at peace with the West. However, in today's world, Putin sees the relinquishment and dismemberment of the USSR as a sign of weakness and a lack of Russia's strength and pride. More specifically, the USSR losing Ukraine was seen as Russia losing its position as a great power, but to lose it to the West would depict Russia as fragile to the demands of the U.S. or NATO, causing Putin to argue that the crisis in Ukraine is only a field for the United States and Russia to continue the tensions from the Cold War (Masters, 2023).

As the culturally ingrained rivalry between Russia and the United States originated from the Cold War, it has only evolved to play out in political conflicts such as the crisis in Ukraine. However, Ukraine is not just the location of war but is the location of a possible economic advantage for Russia in the global economy. Ukraine, in comparison to all of Europe except the gas reserves in Asia that are owned by Russia, holds the second largest known gas reserves, and in 2019, it was recorded that Ukraine had 1.09 trillion cubic meters of gas. Making Ukraine an ideal hotspot for conflict because whether Russia gains control or Ukraine joins NATO, Ukraine has oil reserves that could boost and level the global economic and political field for Russia, and the crisis can be seen as an age-old attempt at being on economic par with the United States to show that Russia has regained its former power prior to United States interference. Along with this, it was reported in 2020 that the annual reserve usage rate in Ukraine was as low as 2 percent, despite this, Ukraine relies on gas imports, as its energy sector has remained

underdeveloped (Amelin et al., 2020). The low annual reserve usage rate highlights that the majority of the reserves have never been touched, so either Russia or NATO's allies can develop Ukraine's energy infrastructure for the guaranteed resources available. Developing Ukraine into an export nation would, in turn, earn large profits as the demand for raw materials such as natural oil in capitalistic nations is high. So, Russia's attempt to integrate Ukraine, which aims to boost its economic position to regain former glory, highlights that the rivalry between the U.S. and Russia never died but transformed into one of economic control and dominance, driven by corporate demand rather than one focused on ideology and fear.

Within the global field of politics, money can be power and control. As such, the United States consistently attempts to protect its economic-political interests, not to stabilize nations such as Ukraine but to regulate its own position in global economics. Such as, creating an alliance with Ukraine through NATO would produce favorable imports of fossil fuels. Despite the Biden administration's claims to move away from the oil industry, Biden has been reinforcing foreign oil industries (Sheffield, 2022). The economic demands of the United States have been on the rise and attempts at energy reforms under the Biden administration have been disappointing. When Biden came into the presidency, he announced that the United States would be reducing the dependence the U.S. has on the oil industry but has instead only moved or expanded the U.S. economy from the domestic oil industry to a foreign oil industry. This, in turn, has led the United States to realize and acknowledge the value and potential Ukraine has to affect the gas industry. This realization has led Biden to request the assistance of large gas corporations. So, the Biden administration on December 5, 2022, held a meeting with executives in the gas and oil industries to examine the possible ways to support the energy infrastructure in Ukraine (White House to..., 2022). Displaying the idea that the United States government and

domestic enterprises are aligned in support of Ukraine. This means that the development of foreign policy between the U.S. and Ukraine can be done through the support of gas corporations. Along with this, the idea of Ukraine's gas industry being developed by U.S. corporations is a sentiment that has been reciprocated by Ukraine. In early 2023, Naftogaz, a state-owned Ukrainian gas and oil company, had begun discussing the development of their gas and oil industry with major U.S. gas and oil companies Chevron, ExxonMobil, and Halliburton (Norton, 2023). The Discussions between the two nations highlight that Ukraine, in the recent years of the crisis, has become more economically motivated. Through the negotiations for U.S. corporations to invest and develop the Gas and Oil industry in Ukraine to reduce the economic pressures of Russia, hurting Ukraine's economy. Further, it depicts the control that gas and oil corporations have over the crisis in Ukraine, where the stabilization of the U.S. economic position and the profits of companies are controlled by the economically dominant class, and how both the U.S. government and corporations prioritize economic benefit and expansionist interests.

Conclusion

The results of World War II sparked the development of an unstable and tension-filled relationship between Russia and the United States. These tensions came to light with the initiation of the Cold War, where, after World War II, both the United States and Russia were left at the forefront of the global stage. But to the displeasure of the United States, Russia was seen as a political threat as they had won vital victories in World War II and had been developing nuclear weapons. So, to combat this threat, the United States used nationalistic rhetoric to paint the conflict as one between the capitalist West and the communist USSR. However, even at the end of the Cold War, when the USSR turned into Russia and relinquished Eastern Europe to the

capitalist West, the rhetoric, which had been told for so long, continued the trend of tensions between the United States and Russia. Even when attempts at peace were made, the political culture that has continued and evolved has affected and determined foreign policy today.

Highlighting how Political culture theory can best explain how the perception of the United States and Russia, having evolved into rhetoric surrounding the United States as the Savior and Russia as an abusive tyrant, has led to competitive and tension-filled foreign policies between the two nations.

As the continual use of nationalistic rhetoric incited and continued cultural conflicts that developed from the Cold War, the economic results of the Cold War have helped develop the crisis in Ukraine. At the end of the Cold War, Russia relinquished its control over Eastern Europe. The capitalist West, over time, influenced and spread its democratic ideology to these newly freed nations. This, however, is seen by some as a failure and disgrace to Russia, leading to Putin's current mentality towards the crisis, that the restoration of the former glory and economic status of Russia must be achieved through controlling Ukraine, a nation filled with the potential in the gas and oil industry to bring Russia back to an economic level that is potentially equal to or above the economic position of the United States. However, the United States is a nation that prioritizes its political and economic interests. These interests are the ideas advocated by both the government and the economic elite. This is seen through U.S. corporations having control over policy decisions between the United States and Ukraine through the discussions surrounding both the U.S. and Ukrainian governments' plea for major energy sector companies to develop Ukraine's gas and oil industry with their investment and help.

Therefore, the crisis in Ukraine is the result of a combination of old political and cultural tensions left over from the Cold War and economic pressures and demands from both Russia's

and the United States' desire to control Ukraine's gas and oil industry. However, the crisis in Ukraine is a conflict between Russia and Ukraine but is played out between United States support and Russia, meaning it is not directly between the two nations. Yet it would be reasonable to assume that a true war between the United States and Russia is likely to occur, as both nations share a competitive nature and desire to protect national interests. However, as seen with the Cuban missile crisis, this put into perspective the fear both nations felt about mutually assured destruction. Therefore, it would be reasonable to believe that today, if the possibility of a war between Russia and the United States became a reality, it would be more of a standoff rather than a war fought with troops as both nations have nuclear technology and neither would back down, similarly to the Cold War. Despite this, a war between Russia and the United States would however be unnecessary as, by today's standards, the political tensions have already been playing out, such as in the crisis in Ukraine, where today it is a field for indirect conflict between the United States and Russia. Consequently, as neither is likely to back down and admit defeat as political pride on the line, a war between the two nations would have no true winner, only those who concede.

References

- Amelin, A., Prokip, A., Umland, A. (2020, October 10). The forgotten potential of Ukraine's energy reserves. *Harvard International Review*. <https://hir.harvard.edu/ukraine-energy-reserves/>
- Bennett, B. (2022, February 24). Russia's invasion of Ukraine is a major test for Joe Biden's foreign policy vision. *Time*. <https://time.com/6151085/joe-biden-russia-ukraine-foreign-policy/>
- Burton, K. D. (n.d.). Cold conflict. *The National WWII Museum: New Orleans*.
<https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/cold-conflict>
- Cold War: Summary, Causes, history, years, timeline, & facts. (2023). *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War/Toward-a-new-world-order>
- Deyermond, R. (2023, July). The Trump presidency, Russia and Ukraine: Explaining incoherence. *International Affairs*, 99(4), 1595–1614. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iad120>
- Khan, H. (2022, March 14). Relevance of the Marxist international relations theory. *Paradigm Shift*. <https://www.paradigmshift.com.pk/marxist-international-relations-theory/#:~:text=The%20concepts%20of%20Marxism%20approach,with%20governance%20and%20policy%20problems.>
- Lauria, J. (2023, June 30). Ukraine timeline tells the story. *Consortium News*.
<https://consortiumnews.com/2023/06/30/ukraine-timeline-tells-the-story/>
- Liberto, D. (2023, October 26). What is capitalism: varieties, history, pros and cons, socialism. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/capitalism.asp>
- Longley, R. (2023, January 9). Understanding political culture. *ThoughtCo*.
<https://www.thoughtco.com/understanding-political-culture-6832806>

- Masters, J. (2023, February 14). Ukraine: Conflict at the crossroads of Europe and Russia. *Council on Foreign Relations*. <https://www.cfr.org/background/ukraine-conflict-crossroads-europe-and-russia#chapter-title-0-4>
- Norton, B. (2023, April 28). US corporations cash in on Ukraine's oil and gas. *Geopolitical Economy Report*. <https://geopoliticeconomy.com/2023/04/28/us-corporations-ukraine-oil-gas/>
- Pifer, S. (2019, September 30). The dueling US foreign policy approaches to Ukraine pose a risk for Kyiv. *Brookings*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-dueling-us-foreign-policy-approaches-to-ukraine-pose-a-risk-for-kyiv/>
- Pothier, F., & Vershbow, A. (2017, June 20). NATO and Trump - Europa.eu. https://espas.secure.europarl.europa.eu/orbis/system/files/generated/document/en/NATO_and_Trump_web_0623.pdf
- Sheffield, C. (2022, March 30). Opinion | Biden isn't blameless in Russia's invasion of Ukraine. *NBC News*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/biden-isnt-blameless-russias-invasion-ukraine-rcna22111>
- Silverstein, K. (2023, April 24). U.S. energy companies could help Ukraine win energy freedom and neuter Russia. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2023/04/24/us-energy-companies-could-help--ukraine-win-energy-freedom-and-neuter-russia/?sh=4062c6302a6a>
- Sullivan, B. (2022, February 24). Russia's at war with Ukraine. Here's how we got here. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2022/02/12/1080205477/history-ukraine-russia>

Taylor, W. B. (2022). The United States speaks clearly on Russia's Ukraine war. *United States Institute of Peace*. <https://www.usip.org/publications/2022/06/united-states-speaks-clearly-russias-ukraine-war>

The Cold War. (2021). *Digital History*.

https://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtid=2&psid=3401

Timeline: The events leading up to Russia's invasion of Ukraine. (2022, March 1). *Reuters*.

<https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/events-leading-up-russias-invasion-ukraine-2022-02-28/>

War in Ukraine: Global conflict tracker. (2023). *Global Conflict Tracker*.

<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/conflict-ukraine>

White House to ask oil and gas execs to support Ukraine energy infrastructure. (2022, December 5). *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/markets/europe/biden-administration-meet-with-oil-gas-execs-how-support-ukrainian-2022-12-05/>

Winkler, J. R. (2023, November 15). Political culture: Definition, features, and examples.

Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/political-culture>

Wolff, R. D. (2022, April 14). The role of capitalism in the war in Ukraine. *CounterPunch*.

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2022/04/14/the-role-of-capitalism-in-the-war-in-ukraine/>