

THE 2022 RUSSIAN INVASION OF UKRAINE: ANALYSING COLLECTIVE SECURITY DEBATE IN THE POST-PANDEMIC ERA

Muhammad Sazzad Hossain Siddiqui¹
Md. Abidur Rahaman²

Abstract

The 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine has had profound implications for global peace and security. This explorative paper aims to delve into the collective security debate to analyse the violent conflict between Russia and Ukraine, particularly considering the role of NATO's expansion in shaping this crisis. By examining the potential for nuclear escalation and its wider impact on global dynamics, this paper highlights the grave threat posed by the deployment of nuclear weapons, emphasizing the urgency of taking immediate action to avert catastrophic consequences. It also explores the far-reaching consequences of the conflict, encompassing disruptions in the movement of people and goods, economic ramifications such as escalating oil prices and inflation, and the pressing concerns surrounding global food security. By leveraging diverse secondary sources with the authors' introspective criticalities, this paper discusses the importance of diplomatic efforts, multilateral cooperation, and nuclear disarmament as crucial elements in resolving the conflict and preserving international stability.

Keywords: Russia, Ukraine, NATO, Collective Security, Nuclear War

Introduction

The eruption of the Russia-Ukraine violent conflict in early 2022, characterized by Russia's attack on Ukraine initiated by President Vladimir Putin, has deepened the world's division into two blocs: The Western bloc, consisting of the United States, NATO, and Europe, and the Russian informal alliance with China, Saudi Arabia, and North Korea. This conflict has reignited a new Cold War between these blocs, as evidenced by the West's inability to effectively deter Russia through sanctions (Gioe & Styles, 2022). The spectre of a potential nuclear war

¹ Muhammad Sazzad Hossain Siddiqui, Associate Professor, Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-100, Bangladesh. Email: sazzadhsiddiqui@du.ac.bd

² Md. Abidur Rahaman, Freelance Researcher, Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-100, Bangladesh. Email: 112609abidurrahman@gmail.com

reminiscent of Hiroshima and Nagasaki looms, causing concern and uncertainty worldwide. In response to various blockades imposed on Russia, the country's threat to cut off gas supplies has added to the energy crisis and raised concerns about a cold winter (Smith, 2022; BBC, 2022). The ramifications of this war extend beyond the immediate warring parties, encompassing broader geopolitical considerations and the actions of global leaders. The West perceives the conflict in Ukraine as a matter of prestige, as its failure would jeopardize its hegemony and global control. Notably, Ukraine's military capabilities significantly lag behind Russia's (Global Firepower, 2022). Despite shared linguistic, religious, and cultural elements between Russia and Ukraine, the relationship between the two countries has experienced fluctuations over time. Russia has consistently objected to NATO's expansion, particularly Ukraine's potential membership, citing threats to its internal security as a result. Conversely, Ukraine argues that joining NATO is necessary to safeguard its sovereignty and territory against Russia's perceived and unforeseen threats.

In recent developments, Russia-backed referendums were held in four regions of Ukraine—Donetsk, Luhansk, Kherson, and Zaporizhia—resulting in declarations of annexation with Russia. These territories, constituting nearly 15% of Ukraine's landmass, garnered international indignation (Trevelyan, 2022). The complexity of the conflict and the responsibility assigned to both parties have intensified, especially following this incident (Kalb, 2015). The stability of the world order hinges on interactions among major powers, which can be categorized into two constellations: balancing power and collective security. With the end of the Cold War, security architecture in Europe requires examination to comprehend the underlying causes of the Ukrainian crisis—an expression of a larger confrontation between major powers or power blocs. The West's adherence to NATO, rather than integrating Russia into a collective security framework on equal terms, has strained relations with Russia. Despite repeated cautions from Moscow, NATO extended an invitation to Ukraine, opening discussions for an association agreement with the European Union. Consequently, Russia's bilateral relationship with the West has reverted to a traditional balance of power with zones of influence (Sauer, 2017).

In global politics, misunderstandings and misjudgements are not uncommon, and some power constellations are more susceptible to these flaws than others. The current balance of power system between the West and Russia, as opposed to a security community, presents numerous opportunities for miscommunication, missed opportunities, and poor decision-making. The shortcomings of the European Union's neighbourhood policy is not limited to its relations with Ukraine

and Russia but extend to the Middle East and North Africa. Consequently, a fundamental re-evaluation of the EU's Neighbourhood Policy is warranted. While there are instances of shared interests between the United States and Europe within NATO, there is also a pattern of American pressure on European allies to adopt American viewpoints, such as the expansion of NATO in 2008 and the issue of missile defence. This article argues obliquely that European NATO members should be less inclined to unquestioningly support US perspectives if they run counter to their interests (Sauer, 2017).

Russia's invasion of Ukraine was triggered by its certainty that Ukraine's NATO membership would grant the alliance easy access to Russia's internal affairs and territory. NATO's principle of collective survival, wherein an attack on one member is viewed as an attack on all, further amplified Russia's concerns. The world is now visibly divided into two blocs, with the West seemingly aligning with Ukraine and providing military support. NATO's role in this context is undeniable, particularly given the possession of nuclear weapons by Russia and its main rivals. Historical precedents have demonstrated how minor disputes can escalate into large-scale wars. Thus, this paper emphasizes on exploring the role of NATO especially its expansionism in the name of collective security in the Russia-Ukraine conflict, considering the potential consequences of this war for global stability and the applicability of collective security theory.

Background and Literature Review

Russia and Ukraine are contiguous nations with significant cultural, linguistic, and lifestyle similarities. The main languages spoken in cities such as Luhansk, Odesa, Mariupol, Donetsk, Crimea, and Sevastopol are predominantly Russian. However, despite these shared characteristics, the bilateral relations between these two countries have undergone significant transformations and complexities since the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution.

The establishment of the Soviet Union in 1922 formalized a union between the two countries, but tensions and power struggles persisted as they both sought influence within the Soviet system. Ukraine's pursuit of greater autonomy clashed with Russia's desire for a central authority, leading to historical grievances and territorial disputes (Toal, 2017). The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked a turning point, as Ukraine declared independence and aimed to establish its identity separate from Russian influence. This process led to challenges and tensions, particularly concerning language, economy, and political alignment (Sasse, 2001). Finally,

the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 and the ongoing conflict in eastern Ukraine have further strained the relationship, eroding trust, and cooperation. These events have underscored the historical legacy and contemporary dynamics of Ukraine-Russia relations, shaping the geopolitical landscape regionally and globally (Forsberg, & Patomäki, 2022). Moreover, an examination of the historical contexts and current developments will aid in understanding how they have shaped the bilateral relations between Ukraine and Russia and how they continue to impact regional stability and international affairs.

Orange Revolution background and post-Soviet era

Following the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, Ukraine and Russia remained dedicated to preserving their amicable relationship, evident in the ratification of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty in 1994. Following the Budapest Declaration on Security Assurances, signed by Moscow, the UK, and the USA, these countries pledged to safeguard Ukraine's preservation of territorial integrity and the maintenance of political independence. In 1999, several European heads of state agreed to sign the Charter on European Security, reiterating the rights of Participating States to adapt their Security Arrangements, including Treaties of Alliance. Among the signatories was Russia, alongside other nations (Kvakhadze, 2021).

Following the Soviet Union's dissolution, NATO witnessed the inclusion of the Eastern Bloc nations from the former Soviet Union in response to regional security concerns amid the challenges posed by Russia. These challenges encompassed conflicts such as the Battle in Abkhazia (1992-1993) and the First Chechen War (Kvakhadze, 2021). The Russian constitutional crisis of 1993 also contributed to the perception among Russian officials that unwritten agreements between Western nations and Russia, stipulating that NATO would not expand eastward, had been violated, leading to a sense of betrayal (1994-1996).

The controversial presidential election in Ukraine in 2004 revealed that opposition candidate Viktor Yushchenko had been poisoned with TCDD dioxin during the campaign, an act he attributed to Russia. Despite allegations of vote tampering, Viktor Yanukovich was initially declared the winner. However, widespread nonviolent protests, known as the Orange Revolution, unfolded over two months, and ultimately succeeded in challenging the election outcome. Russian President Vladimir Putin criticized these demonstrations, raised concerns about the spread of the Orange Revolution to Russia, and implicated former advisors to Yushchenko as organizers of the movement. Concurrently, anti-Orange protests, expressing support for Putin, emerged (Kvakhadze, 2021).

During the 2008 Bucharest summit, both Ukraine and Georgia campaigned for NATO membership. However, Western European countries, wary of provoking Russia, voted against granting Membership Action Plans (MAP) to Ukraine and Georgia, despite the endorsement of their membership by US President George W. Bush (Gallis, 2008). Consequently, tensions escalated within NATO, and although the statement “These countries will join NATO” was made, MAPs were ultimately not issued to Ukraine and Georgia. Putin had vocally opposed the idea of Ukraine and Georgia joining NATO (Kvakhadze, 2021; Wong & Jake, 2022).

Euromaidan, dignity revolution, pro-Russian riots

In 2009, President Yanukovich of Ukraine declared his candidacy for re-election in the upcoming presidential election (Newnham, 2013). However, when Yanukovich unexpectedly decided not to sign the EU-Ukraine Cooperation Agreements in November 2013, widespread pro-EU demonstrations erupted throughout the country. Yanukovich’s choice was driven by a desire for closer ties with Russia and the Eurasian Economic Union (Libman & Obydenkova, 2018). Despite the overwhelming approval of the Ukrainian legislative, pressure from Russia led to the rejection of the EU agreement.

Following months of protests during the Euromaidan movement, Yanukovich and opposition leaders in parliament signed a peace pact on February 21, 2014, which called for early elections (Traynor & Walker, 2014). Subsequently, Yanukovich fled the capital, leading to his impeachment and loss of presidential power. On February 23, the statute that had made Russian an official language in 2012 was overturned, even though it failed to pass in parliament (Traynor & Walker, 2014). However, this decision was opposed by the residents of Russian-speaking regions in Ukraine. Reports in Russian media claiming that the lives of ethnic Russians in Ukraine were at risk further fuelled this opposition.

In response to the rapidly evolving situation, the date of the presidential elections was moved forward, and an interim government was established on February 27. Yanukovich returned to Russia the day after Russia publicly invaded Crimea and announced his intention to remain the interim president of Ukraine at a press conference (Figus & de Serio, 2020). These events coincided with Russia’s occupation of Crimea. Simultaneously, pro-Russian riots erupted in Ukraine in 2014 as leaders in the country’s Russian-speaking eastern regions expressed unwavering support for Yanukovich (Figus & de Serio, 2020).

The stationing of Russian troops in Crimea

At the outset of the conflict, the Russian Black Sea Fleet had a significant presence in Crimea, with approximately 120,000 troops stationed across various cities on the Crimean Peninsula, including Sevastopol, Kacha, Hvardiiske, Simferopol Raion, and Sarich (Gressel, 2021). These cities were strategically located in Crimea. In 2005, disputes arose concerning the management of several lighthouses, one of which was the Sarich Cape lighthouse near Yalta (Stephen, 2006). The agreement on basing and routing in Ukraine provided Russia with the opportunity to maintain a military presence in Crimea. However, the number of Russian military personnel allowed to be stationed in Crimea was limited to 25,000, and they were required to possess “military identification cards” when crossing into Ukraine or involving themselves in the country’s internal affairs (Kimball, 2014).

Russia gained an early advantage in Crimea by swiftly deploying special forces and other essential assets, citing security concerns as a pretext (Kimball, 2014). This enabled Russia to execute its mission in Crimea effectively. Furthermore, as per the 1997 agreement that divided the Soviet Black Sea Fleet, Russia was authorized to maintain its military installations in Crimea until 2017. According to the terms outlined in the 1997 agreement, known as the Kharkiv Pact. After 2017, it was obliged to withdraw all military assets, including its share of the Black Sea Fleet, from Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (Kimball, 2014). However, on April 21, 2010, Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich extended the Kharkiv Pact, which allowed for potential indefinite renewals until 2042 (Kimball, 2014).

Declaring war on something

The Russo-Ukrainian crisis, which has been ongoing, has not been officially declared as a war. In early 2022, when reports emerged about Russia’s planned invasion of Ukraine, the Kremlin strategically avoided issuing a formal declaration of war by referring to it as a “special military operation” (Mardones, 2022). By framing it as such, they circumvented the requirement for a formal declaration. However, the Ukrainian government interpreted this announcement as a declaration of war, and numerous international news outlets also reported it as such. Notably, in January 2022, the likelihood of Ukraine becoming a member of NATO significantly intensified the crisis. Despite condemning Russia as a “terrorist state” for its military interventions in Ukraine, the Ukrainian parliament has not officially declared war on Russia (Pullen & Frost, 2022).

Moreover, the Wagner Group, a Russian private military contractor, has come under scrutiny for its involvement in conflicts worldwide, particularly in the war in Ukraine. Accusations of war crimes, torture, and summary executions have led to UN-imposed sanctions on this group in 2017 due to “serious human rights abuses” (Blockmans, 2023). Operating as a proxy for Moscow, its close ties to the Russian government raise concerns about potential war crimes committed on behalf of the state. Moreover, its activities have destabilized the region, increased the risk of further conflict, and contributed to the rise of far-right extremism in Europe (Eguegu, 2022). Holding the Wagner Group accountable is vital for regional and global peace and security.

Theoretical Underpinning and Research Question

The notion of collective security has been a source of discussion for centuries, and so far, we have not found any unanimously accepted definition of the concept. However, most scholars consider it as an agreement where nation-states agree to cooperate to prevent aggression and to punish any state that violates the peace. There are several key differences between collective security and alliances. First, alliances are typically formed between two or more states that share a common enemy, while collective security arrangements are supposed to be universal in scope. Secondly, alliances are often based on the principle of “self-help,” meaning that each member state is responsible for its own defence. In contrast, collective security arrangements rely on the principle of “collective action,” meaning that all member states are obligated to come to the aid of any state that is attacked (Kupchan, & Kupchan, 1995).

Currently, collective security is thought to be the most promising strategy for achieving world peace and is recognized as an effective tool for managing crises in international relations. Every state in the globe is protected by some sort of collective security preparedness from any war or aggression that might be launched by one state against another (Betts, 1992). It is like an insurance system where every country is required to defend the victim of an attack or war by neutralizing the attack or war against the victim. Collective security, therefore, can be defined as a security arrangement in which all states work together to provide security for all by acting collectively against any states within the groups that might use force to challenge the existing order (Ebegbulem, 2011). According to Van Dyke (1957), collective security refers to a system in which several states are required to work together to promote each other’s security. Collective security is defined by Chaturvedi (2006) as an arrangement reached by some nations to preserve their

critical interests, safety, or integrity, against a plausible threat or hazard over a particular period, by combining their powers.

Onyemaechi Eke (2007) defines collective security as “an idealist one that rests on the development of an overwhelming military force by member states to deter aggression or, by implication, to launch a retribution attack capable of defeating the recalcitrant member” in his conceptual clarification. Collective security, in his words, “means the institutionalization of a worldwide police force against abuse of the law and violations, which might result in insecurity”. It is an agreement wherein all states work together to provide security for all through collective actions taken against any state within the groups that would use force to threaten the current order.

The United Nations seeks to deter any member state from acting in a way that could endanger peace by utilizing a system of collective security, thereby preventing violence. According to the definitions provided above by these renowned academics, collective security is a strategy for preserving peace through a group of independent governments that agree to defend one another in the event of an invasion. The phrase “security for individual nation via collective means” best describes the idea, which refers to joining a global alliance of nations that have vowed to defend one another in the event of an attack. The concept of collective security was heavily debated during World War One, and it was further developed in the League of Nations Covenant of 1919 and the United Nations Charter that followed World War II. Collective security can be understood from the perspective of everyone in a group against everyone else, instead of the unilateral idea of some versus specific others (Andreatta, 1996, p. xx). Alliances and collective security differ from one another in various ways. Collective security is founded on the viewpoint of everyone as a group against anyone, as opposed to the unilateral idea of some against specific others, according to Andreatta’s doctoral dissertation.

Alliances take the form of two groups opposing each other, such as A+B+C States and Y+Z States. Collective security, however, takes the form of an agreement between A+B+C+Y+Z and runs against any of them. Collective security also differs from alliances in that it focuses on internal regulation that requires universal membership, whereas alliances serve as exclusive institutions to deter or mitigate external threats. It helps in alliances; nations see allies as absolute interests and enemies as relative interests without legal obligations. Collective security, on the other hand, follows the case of neutrality. Because the whole group must punish the aggressor not out of self-interest, but in the hope that he will not go beyond the

control of the state and violate the prevailing norms. Collective security tends to harness universal interests for world peace, as opposed to short-term interests in which allies combat common threats (Andreatta, 1996).

Effendi Shoghi (1991), Michael Joseph Savage (1961), Martin Wight (2002), Immanuel Kant (1993), and Woodrow Wilson (1956) all contributed to the development of the idea of “collective security,” which was viewed as applying security interests broadly to “avoid grouping powers into opposing camps and refusing to draw dividing lines that would leave anyone out” (Yost, 1998). The phrase, ‘collective security’ was also mentioned as a fundamental tenet of the United Nations and, earlier, the League of Nations. The United Nations seeks to deter any member state from acting in a way that would endanger another member state and avert a conflict by utilizing a system of collective security.

Based on the above discussion, we can say that NATO is an ideal example of collective security where Article 5 highlights the collective security arrangement. In fact, in line with the principles of collective security arrangement, this principle stipulates that an attack against any ally is regarded as an attack against all allies (NATO, 2023). Therefore, it is possible to argue that the biggest reason for the Russia-Ukraine war is the call for expansion of NATO. Russia has repeatedly advocated against NATO expansion and was fiercely opposed to such a decision by NATO. Russia perceives NATO as a significant threat to its security, primarily due to NATO’s historical application of Article 5. Here in this paper, we use collective security debate to explain the Russia-Ukraine War. We try to show how the expansionism of the USA-headed NATO in the name of collective security has influenced the Russia-Ukraine war. In the course of this study, the central research questions are formulated as follows:

1. To what extent can expansionism in the name of collective security explain the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine?
2. What are the consequences of the war, and how does it impact the global political and economic orders?

Methodological Notes

This study conducts a thorough examination of relevant literature concerning the Russia-Ukraine War and collective security between July and December 2022. The primary objective of this paper is to analyse the relationships between war and collective security preparedness, utilizing predominantly secondary resources

and data. The research process involves an extensive review of diverse sources, including books, newspaper articles, and published research papers. Through rigorous analysis, we sought to comprehend the viewpoints and arguments presented by various authors regarding the Russia-Ukraine War. The literature reviewed has been instrumental in elucidating the role of NATO expansionism in triggering the conflict and its potential implications for global security, including the risk of a broader world war and its impact on our daily lives. We have encountered various challenges arising from the flow of misinformation, disinformation, and propaganda warfare. By employing multiple verification methods and cross-referencing information from reputable sources, we have ensured the accuracy and reliability of the data and references we ultimately utilized in our study.

Findings and Analysis

This section presents an analysis of the dominant themes identified in the relevant literature. The main argument put forth is that the ongoing Russia-Ukraine war has significant implications for global dynamics, particularly in terms of economic insecurity. Some of these implications have already begun to manifest. The current global landscape seems to be characterized by a division into two distinct factions, with Russia aligned with one group and the United States of America (or the West) aligned with the other. The potential use of nuclear weapons by Russia against Ukraine raises concerns about a retaliatory nuclear response from the West, which may escalate into a global conflict. Furthermore, the prospect of China potentially siding with Russia against Ukraine raises concerns about the escalation of conflict, potentially leading to broader hostilities. This situation could prompt alliances to form between the United States and Europe, while on the other side, alliances may emerge among Russia, China, Pakistan, and Iran. The presence of multiple nuclear powers further adds to the risk and potential consequences of a global war. Instances of Russian aggression, including blackmail, territorial acquisition, troop deployments, and disruption of gas pipelines, are cited as evidence of escalating tensions. Vice President Joe Biden's consistent stance in supporting Ukraine while aiming to avoid a third world war is acknowledged, but it is uncertain how these dual objectives can be effectively pursued given Putin's manipulative tactics. Recent events, such as disputed referenda and Russia's assertion that Ukraine's NATO membership would lead to a global conflict, further highlight the intensifying nature of the Ukrainian crisis. Overall, the analysis suggests that the Russia-Ukraine war has profound implications for global security and economic stability.

Global security concern

In a broader context, the ongoing conflict in Ukraine has far-reaching consequences, undermining the established security framework that has been carefully constructed over the years, including recent international treaties. As highlighted by the head of the British armed forces, it would be unwise to perceive the conflict as a localized battle. Rather, it can be seen as a critical juncture akin to the events preceding the onset of the Second World War. Consequently, immediate measures must be taken to halt territorial expansion using force and prevent a conflict reminiscent of the devastating war that engulfed Europe eight decades ago. Mobilizing available resources is of utmost importance.

During the early stages of the conflict, NATO, and the European Union (EU) have demonstrated effective responses. The leadership of the United States has played a pivotal role in garnering global solidarity, particularly through the provision of military aid to Ukraine. NATO's approach to the conflict, which aimed to strike a delicate balance between avoiding direct confrontation with Russia while garnering international sympathy for Ukraine, can be considered appropriate. Most European nations rely on NATO's robust security architecture, reinforced by American military strength. Moreover, the EU and G7 have implemented flexible sanctions to exert pressure. However, as Russian aggression persists, with a focus on gaining control of eastern and southern Ukraine through attrition warfare, the unity of the Western alliance is being tested. This challenge is exemplified by divergent interpretations of sanctions pertaining to the transit of illicit goods to Kaliningrad.

The use of Russia's veto power in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has hindered the formulation of viable solutions to the crisis by both the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the United Nations. Furthermore, not all UN member states have unequivocally expressed support for Ukraine. The global security ramifications of Russia's invasion are significant, posing a direct challenge to the security system established by democratic countries in the aftermath of World War II. This system encompasses the establishment of NATO and the expansion of the European Union following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. President Vladimir Putin of Russia seeks to be part of discussions on European security as an equal participant alongside Western democracies, with the intent of undermining NATO and the European Union to advance Russian economic and security interests.

Putin's calculations assumed that the West, having refrained from responding decisively to Russian aggression in the past, would not react forcefully to Russian aggression against a non-NATO state like Ukraine. However, except for a few primarily autocratic regimes such as China, Russia's miscalculations have isolated the country from the rest of the world. This has, in turn, galvanized the Western alliance and resulted in severe economic sanctions against the Russian economy. Encouragingly, Finland and Sweden, traditionally neutral throughout the Cold War, have expressed their desire to join NATO in response to Putin's aggression. Additionally, every European NATO member state, alongside the United States, has witnessed a substantial increase in military spending. Germany, breaking from its longstanding policy of refraining from arming conflict parties, is now fulfilling its NATO obligation to allocate 2% of its gross domestic product to defense expenditures and has provided military support to Ukraine, following the lead of other NATO countries.

War against the West

The ongoing conflict against the West has inflicted significant and escalating damage, with no signs of abating. Ukrainian lives, including both military personnel and civilians, are being unjustly taken solely based on their nationality. The destruction of entire cities, such as Mariupol, is currently unfolding, accompanied by atrocities that unequivocally meet the criteria for war crimes. Disturbingly, Russian state television has even aired commentary advocating for genocide. Forced deportations to Russia, involving hundreds of thousands of individuals, including children, have been carried out. At the time of writing this article, nearly six million people have been displaced from Ukraine, with many more internally displaced.

The devastation extends to various aspects of society, as hospitals, infrastructure, cultural sites, private residences, and industrial facilities are being either looted or destroyed. Stolen goods are routinely smuggled into Russia, exacerbating the pillaging of resources. It is worth noting that these actions, which contradict the interests of Russia itself, have been authorized by the government of Vladimir Putin in its pursuit of confrontation with the "collective West." In the face of such brute force, existing efforts aimed at security, confidence-building, and maintaining peace prove alarmingly feeble. The trust in Moscow has been shattered due to months of false negotiations and blatant deception perpetrated against numerous countries and organizations, including NATO and the OSCE.

Furthermore, Russia's actions have led to economic shocks in energy markets and the weaponization of malnutrition, both of which contribute to the widespread global repercussions stemming from its involvement in the conflict. These tactics not only perpetuate the suffering within Ukraine but also have far-reaching consequences beyond its borders, further entrenching the ramifications of the ongoing struggle.

Food insecurity

The ongoing conflict in Ukraine has precipitated a range of detrimental repercussions, encompassing the displacement of populations and civil disruptions that impede the movement of people and goods, thereby obstructing farmers from attending to their agricultural activities such as field maintenance, crop harvesting, and marketing of produce. Additionally, critical public services like banking, markets, transportation, and the distribution of water and energy have been severely disrupted. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) has expressed apprehension regarding various issues, including insufficient grain storage facilities, the closure of Black Sea ports, and a lack of adequate capacity on alternative export routes. It is anticipated that the production shortfalls experienced in Ukraine during the 2022-2023 marketing season may only be partially mitigated through alternative measures (FAO, 2022).

Compounding these challenges is the backdrop of high inflation, surging prices of vital commodities, and an economy in a fragile state due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Escalating manufacturing and input costs may impede the capacity of numerous exporting nations to expand their outputs and shipments. Consequently, a global supply gap may arise, exerting upward pressure on food and feed prices in the international market. If the conflict persists, maintaining elevated crude oil prices and limiting exports beyond the 2022-2023 season, a significant supply imbalance is expected to afflict global grain and sunflower seed markets, even if other exporting nations augment their production in response to escalating demand.

The current global food insecurity situation is not an isolated event. Food prices have been on the rise since mid-2020 and are currently at record highs due to the COVID-19 outbreak, disruptions in supply chains, and surging inflation. In 36 nations, food inflation exceeds 15%, posing significant challenges for low-income families who allocate over 50% of their income to food expenditures. Presently, 60% of low-income countries face a substantial risk of or are already experiencing financial hardship, a sharp increase from 30% in 2015. Additionally, petrol prices have reached a seven-year high.

The conflict in Ukraine is disrupting global food supply, with profound implications for many impoverished nations. Russia and Ukraine are significant manufacturers of fertilizer ingredients and exporters of food. However, the impacts of the conflict will vary across nations. Some countries heavily rely on supplies originating from Ukraine and Russia, while others depend more on fertilizer imports from these nations than on food imports. Meanwhile, other nations, particularly in the long term (within the next three years), will primarily experience the broader global price hikes resulting from the conflict (Ben Hassen and El Bilali, 2022).

Unrest in the oil market

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has dealt a significant blow to the already robust economic recovery, particularly impacting investment in the oil-producing industry. Consequently, there has been a surge in oil prices, resulting in consumers bearing the burden through higher gas prices. To address this issue and potentially reduce gasoline costs soon, several avenues could be explored (Kolaczowski, 2022).

The price of gasoline has now reached an all-time high, driven by the continuous rise in oil and gas prices and growing concerns about the potential economic impact of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. According to the Automobile Association (AA), the average national price of gasoline in the UK has reached 155 pence per litre, as reported by the AA. The market turmoil further exacerbates worries regarding the prices of essential goods and services, including food, gasoline, and heating, which are already experiencing the fastest rate of increase in the past three decades. Analysts have previously warned that the surge in oil and gas prices could lead to annual energy bill increases in the UK of up to three thousand pounds.

Russia holds the position of the world's second-largest crude oil producer, catering to the needs of approximately one-third of Europe's consumer base. Saudi Arabia holds the position of the largest producer. Concerns over potential reductions in Russian supply have caused the price of Brent crude to surge by more than a fifth in the past week. The financial crisis continues to impact stock markets, with major exchanges in France and Germany initially experiencing declines of over 4% before recovering some losses to close the day down 1.3% and 2% respectively. The FTSE 100 index in London also saw a drop of over two percent before recovering to conclude the day with a modest decline of 0.4 percent (BBC, 2022).

Effect on the US and NATO: Risk of Nuclear War

The potential military confrontation involving Russia and Western allies has raised one of the most pressing concerns in international relations - the spectre of

nuclear escalation. With only a small group of nuclear-armed nations, including the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, and France, the gravity of this threat cannot be underestimated. Putin's invasion of Ukraine has further intensified security apprehensions for Western nations and extended its ramifications beyond Ukraine's borders. The open assertion of the possibility of using nuclear weapons by Putin has brought about a significant shift in how states perceive the potential use of such devastating weapons, creating a genuine and grave threat.

Putin's nuclear force threat carries two major implications. Firstly, his statement that Russia can employ nuclear weapons offensively against Ukraine or any NATO member has fundamentally altered the discourse surrounding their potential use (Ciciora, 2022). This pronouncement has far-reaching consequences, reshaping discussions on nuclear armament. Secondly, the outcome of a scenario where Putin deploys nuclear weapons remains uncertain, leaving us with an unsettling sense of unpredictability. The horrors of Hiroshima serve as a chilling reminder of the devastation caused by a nuclear bomb. Considering the magnitude of destruction that a weapon many times more powerful could inflict, the fate of Ukraine, and potentially the entire world, hangs in the balance (Tuosheng, 2022; Ciciora, 2022). This doomsday scenario, brought to the forefront by Putin, poses an existential threat to Western civilization and the entirety of human existence on our planet.

Considering Vladimir Putin's recent declaration to use "all available means" to safeguard Russia's interests, there has been increased speculation regarding the potential deployment of nuclear weapons by the Russian president. In response, NATO has initiated nuclear drills simulating the release of "tactical" B61 bombs over Europe (Hudson, 2022). Despite being termed routine exercises, their occurrence alongside Russian military manoeuvres raise concerns. With grave warnings issued by UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres in August, stating that the world is "one mistake away from nuclear annihilation" (Hudson, 2022), the urgency to deescalate nuclear tensions becomes ever more apparent. The devastating consequences of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II serve as a stark reminder of the catastrophic impact nuclear warfare can have on humanity. The contemporary policies allowing for the use of nuclear weapons in conventional conflicts, even against non-nuclear nations, no longer preserve the taboo against their utilization, posing an existential threat to all life forms. The global community must confront this reality and work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

As Russia carries out strikes on energy installations and civilian targets in Kyiv, retaliating against Ukraine's destruction of the Kerch Bridge, concerns over the situation's deterioration and the possibility of nuclear war continue to grow. Observers and commentators ponder the probability of such an event, and assessments of its likelihood have multiplied. Former CIA director and retired four-star army general, David Petraeus, has cautioned that in the event of Russia's use of nuclear weapons, the United States and its allies would respond by neutralizing Russia's troops and equipment in Ukraine while sinking its Black Sea fleet (Helmore, 2022). However, efforts to establish communication with Moscow and clarify the potential US response to a nuclear escalation by Russia have been met with uncertainty, according to administration sources (Helmore, 2022).

Conclusion

The ongoing conflict between Russia and Ukraine holds far-reaching consequences that transcend national boundaries. With the spectre of nuclear escalation looming, the situation demands urgent attention and decisive action from the international community. Addressing the potential risk of nuclear weapon deployment is paramount to avoiding catastrophic outcomes. Moreover, the conflict's impacts on global stability are significant and multifaceted. Disruptions in trade and transportation have led to population relocations and economic setbacks, particularly in the oil-producing industry. The resulting surge in oil prices has affected consumers worldwide, exacerbating inflationary pressures in an already vulnerable global economy. Additionally, concerns arise about global food security and rising prices as critical public services are interrupted, and Ukraine's grain and food exports face uncertainty. Given the geopolitical complexities, a coordinated and robust response is crucial to managing risks associated with the conflict. Diplomatic efforts, multilateral cooperation, and effective communication channels must be employed to prevent further escalation and achieve a peaceful resolution. International organizations, especially the United Nations, must play an active role in fostering dialogue and building trust among all involved parties including an urgency of global nuclear disarmament. The international community must collaborate, learning from historical lessons, to address underlying conflicts, foster dialogue, and bolster peace-building endeavours.

References

- Andreatta, M., & Wiśniewski, J. A. (1996). On contractions of smooth varieties. *arXiv preprint alg-geom/9605013*.
- BBC (2022). Nord Stream 1: How Russia is cutting gas supplies to Europe.

- BBC (2022). Ukraine conflict: Petrol at fresh record as oil and gas prices soar. Retrieved November 1, 2022, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-60642786>
- BBC (2022). Putin: Nuclear risk is rising, but we are not mad. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-63893316>
- Ben Hassen, T., & El Bilali, H. (2022). Impacts of the Russia-Ukraine war on global food security: towards more sustainable and resilient food systems? *Foods*, 11(15), 2301
- Betts, R. K. (1992). Systems for peace or causes of war? Collective security, arms control, and the new Europe. *International Security*, 17(1), 5-43.
- Blockmans, S. (2023). The EU's Magnitsky Act: Obsolete in the Face of Russia's Crimes in Ukraine? *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 28(2).
- Chaturvedi, A. K. (2006). *Dictionary of Political Science*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ciciora, P. (2022, June 15). What are the Global Security Implications of Russia's invasion of Ukraine? Retrieved on 30 October 2022 from <https://news.illinois.edu/view/6367/794522705>
- D'Anieri, P. (2019). *Ukraine and Russia: From civilized divorce to uncivil war*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dyke, V. N. (1957). *International politics*. New York: Meredith Corporation.
- Ebegbulem, J. C. (2011). The failure of collective security in the Post World Wars I and II international system.
- Effendi, S. (1995). *The world order of Bahá'u'lláh*. Institute for Bahá'í Studies in Persian.
- Eguegu, O. (2022). Russia's private military diplomacy in Africa: High risk, low reward, limited impact. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 29(4), 445-462.
- Eke, O. (2007). *Strategic Studies: Logical Focus in the 21st Century*. Abakaliki: Willy- Rose and Appleseed Publishing Coy.
- FAO. (2022). Ukraine: Note on the impact of the war on food security in Ukraine, 20 July 2022. Rome. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc1025en>
- Figus, A., Alberti, A., & de Serio, L. (2020). Ukraine a country in crisis between Europe, Russia, and a complex electoral process. *Geopolitical, Social Security and Freedom Journal*, 3(1), 87-119.
- Fleming, D. F. (1956). Woodrow Wilson and Collective Security Today. *The Journal of Politics*, 18(4), 611-624.
- Forsberg, T., & Patomäki, H. (2022). Debating the war in Ukraine: counterfactual histories and future possibilities. Taylor & Francis.
- Gabruk, U. (2022). Russia-Ukraine War: 2022 Russian Invasion of Ukraine. Independently published. <https://www.amazon.com/Russia-Ukraine-War-Russian-Invasion-%D0%A1hronicles/dp/B09TZBWC1F>
- Gallis, P. (2008, March). The NATO summit at Bucharest, 2008. Library of congress Washington dc congressional research service.
- Global Firepower (2022). 2022 Military Strength Ranking. <https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing.php>
- Gioe, D. V., & Styles, W. (2022). Vladimir Putin's Russian World Turned Upside Down. *Armed Forces & Society*, 0095327X221121778.

- Giridharadas, A. (2022, March 3). *Russia-ukraine war: It's time for western media to shed its bias*. The Quint. Retrieved on 20 November 2022 from <https://www.thequint.com/voices/opinion/russia-ukraine-war-its-time-for-western-media-to-shed-its-bias#read-more>
- Gressel, G. (2021). Waves of ambition: Russia's military build-up in Crimea and the Black Sea. Retrieved on 20 November 2022 from European Council on Foreign Relations: <https://ecfr.eu/publication/waves-of-ambition-russias-military-build-up-in-crimea-and-the-black-sea>.
- Helmores, E. (2022, October 02). Petraeus: US would destroy Russia's troops if Putin uses nuclear weapons in Ukraine. Retrieved on 31 October 2022 from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/oct/02/us-russia-putin-ukraine-war-david-petraeus>
- Hudson, K. (2022). NATO, Russia War games are making nuclear risks worse. Retrieved on 30 October 2022 from <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2022/10/24/biden-is-making-putins-nuclear-threat-worse>
- Islam, F. (2022). Ukraine conflict: Petrol at fresh record as oil and gas prices soar. Retrieved on 1 November 2022 from <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-60642786>
- Johnson, J. (2006). Virtual politics: Faking democracy in the post-Soviet world. *Political Science Quarterly*, 121(2), 359-361.
- Kalb, M. (2015). *Imperial gamble: Putin, Ukraine, and the new cold war*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Kimball, S. (2014). Bound by treaty: Russia, Ukraine and Crimea. *Deutsche Welle*, 11. Retrieved On 17 December 2020 from <https://www.dw.com/en/bound-by-treaty-russia-ukraine-and-crimea/a-17487632>.
- Kolaczkowski, M. (n.d.). How does the war in Ukraine affect oil prices? Retrieved on 1 November 2022 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/03/how-does-the-war-in-ukraine-affect-oil-prices/>
- Kupchan, C. A., & Kupchan, C. A. (1995). The promise of collective security. *International security*, 20(1), 52-61.
- Kvakhadze, A. (2021). Transnational coalition building: The case of volunteers in the conflict in Abkhazia. *Caucasus Survey*, 9(2), 159-179.
- Libman, A., & Obydenkova, A. V. (2018). Regional international organizations as a strategy of autocracy: The Eurasian Economic Union and Russian foreign policy. *International Affairs*, 94(5), 1037-1058.
- Mandelbaum, M. (2016). *Mission failure: America and the world in the post-cold war era*. Oxford University Press.
- Mardones, C. (2022). Economic effects of isolating Russia from international trade due to its 'Special military operation' in Ukraine. *European Planning Studies*, 1-16.
- NATO (2023). Collective defence and Article 5. Retrieved on 2 August 2023 from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm#:~:text=Collective%20defence%20means%20that%20an,of%20the%20North%20Atlantic%20Treaty.
- Negretto, G. L. (1993). Kant and the illusion of collective security. *Journal of international affairs*, 501-523.

- Newnham, R. E. (2013). Pipeline politics: Russian energy sanctions and the 2010 Ukrainian elections. *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 4(2), 115-122.
- Pullen, K. & Frost, C. (2022). Putin's Ukraine invasion: Do declarations of war still exist? Retrieved on 2 October 2022 from <https://theconversation.com/putins-ukraine-invasion-do-declarations-of-war-still-exist-177880>
- Sauer, T. (2017). The origins of the Ukraine crisis and the need for collective security between Russia and the West. *Global policy*, 8(1), 82-91.
- Savage, M. J (1961). Michael Joseph Savage. *Labour*.
- Smith, C. M. (2022). *Ukraine's Revolt, Russia's Revenge*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Sasse, G. (2001). The 'New' Ukraine: A state of regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 11(3), 69- 100.
- Stephen, C. (2006). Russian anger as Ukraine seizes lighthouse. Retrieved on 2 October 2022 from <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/russian-anger-as-ukraine-seizes-lighthouse-1.1002176>
- Toal, G. (2017). *Near abroad: Putin, the West and the contest over Ukraine and the Caucasus*. Oxford University Press.
- Trevelyan, M. (2022) Moscow's proxies in occupied Ukraine regions report big votes to join Russia. <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/moscows-proxies-occupied-ukraine-regions-report-big-votes-join-russia-2022-09-27/>
- Tuosheng, Z. (2022). Russia-Ukraine War's impact on Taiwan. Retrieved on 31 October 2022 from <https://www.chinausfocus.com/peace-security/russia-ukraine-wars-impact-on-taiwan>
- Walker, C. J., Traynor, D. P., Rand, D. T., Froy, T. S., & Lloyd, S. L. (2014, June). Optimising network transfers to and from Queen Mary University of London, a large WLCG tier-2 grid site. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 513, No. 6, p. 062048). IOP Publishing.
- Wiegrefe, K. (2022). Newly Released Documents Shed Fresh Light on NATO's Eastward Expansion. *Spiegel International*.
- Wilson, A. (2005). *Virtual politics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wong, E. and Jakes, L. (2022). NATO Won't Let Ukraine Join Soon. Here's Why. *Nytimes.com*. Retrieved on 2 October 2022 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/13/us/politics/nato-ukraine.html>.
- Wight, M. (2002). *Power politics*. A&C Black. Yost, D. S. (1998). NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security. *United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington*, 102.

