

Journal of Kolkata Society for Asian Studies: Vol 11. No. 1, June 2025

Report:

Contemporary US Foreign Policy and Global
Conflicts: Case Studies of Ukraine and Palestine

Shreya Ghosh

Report:

**Contemporary US Foreign Policy and Global Conflicts:
Case Studies of Ukraine and Palestine**

Shreya Ghosh

Introduction

The foreign policy of the United States of America has been a topic of interest for analysts and researchers alike due to its significant impact on global politics and international relations. The United States of America is one of the most powerful influential countries in the world with a foreign policy that has significant global implications. The country's foreign policy is shaped by a range of factors, including historical events, domestic politics, and economic interests. Historically, the U.S. has been involved in numerous global conflicts including both World War I and II, the cold war and the War on Terror. These events have had a significant impact on the country's foreign policy and continue to shape its approach to international relations. The main trend regarding the history of U.S. foreign policy since the American Revolution is the shift from non-interventionism before and after World War I, to its growth as a world power and global hegemon during World War II and throughout the cold war in the 20th century. (George W Bush, 2002). Promoting freedom and democracy and protecting human rights around the world are central to U.S. foreign policy. However, the guiding principles of U.S. foreign policy remain constant that is promotion of security, democracy, prosperity and development in the United States and around the world. (US department of State, 2020)

Promoting democracy in the Middle East has been cited by U.S. as a key post-Cold War foreign policy objective. As a result, the U.S. has intervened in numerous countries and conflicts, particularly since 9/11 and the subsequent declaration of the War on Terror. However, this has not been without controversy and its actions often aid imperialism rather than the country it claims its intervention is benefitting. U.S. is promoting democracy on one hand but at the same time pursuing national objectives to increase hegemony. (Ruairidh Wood, 2019) We have observed

U.S. involvement in the Middle East from the Soviet-Afghan War, through the invasion of Iraq and the Arab Spring, up to the present day, U.S. has continuously created instability in the region, in terms of both state and human security. By constructing various actors as threats to themselves, the West or the world, the U.S. has been able to justify its aggressive pursuit of foreign policy objectives in the Middle East. Utilizing the theories of realism, this research discusses how the U.S. has attempted to achieve hegemony in the region, and indeed especially in the global conflicts, before contrasting this with humanitarian efforts it has been a part of. The United States has long grappled with the dichotomy between its strategic interests in maintaining global influence and hegemony and its stated commitment to promoting democracy worldwide. This tension arises because these goals can, at times, be in conflict, leading to complex and sometimes contradictory foreign policy decisions. National security and survival are the primary national interest of each state and, in pursuit of national security states strive to increase national power.

Political realism in international relations reached its zenith in the hands of Hans J. Morgenthau in his seminal work *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948). The main signpost of political realism is the concept of interest defined in terms of power which infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible (Peu Ghosh, 24-27). The realist tradition suffered a setback due to the emergence of neo liberal thought especially by the challenge posed by pluralism. The pluralist's challenge to realism was soon met by a new brand of realists and the forerunner among them was Kenneth Waltz, who in his famous works, *Man, the State and War* (1959) and *Theory of International Politics* (1979) came up with his idea of world politics which is popularly known as neo-realism. Neo-realistic approach is a global level analysis unlike the classical realism which focused on individual interests. The end goal of the state according to neo-realists is to achieve security not power maximization like the classical realists believed. According to neo-realists, power is a means to achieve security maximization. Waltz argues that key differences between international and domestic politics lie not in the regularity of war and conflict but in the structure of international system. In the absence of higher authority in the international system there is no way to secure oneself other than self-help which will ultimately lead to security dilemma because security buildup of one would lead to insecurity of others. The resultant anarchy for the neo-realist is, therefore due to the presence of a system characterized by the absence of a higher power over the sovereign states. It is this structure of international system which decisively shapes up the behavior of the states in international relations and their struggle for power (Peu Ghosh, 28-29).

U.S. has a history of intervening in global conflicts to protect its interests, promote democracy, and maintain stability. This has included military interventions, such as in World War II, the Korean

War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, and in various other smaller conflicts. Post-9/11, U.S. foreign policy has heavily focused on counterterrorism efforts, leading to military actions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other regions. This includes targeting terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda and ISIS, and supporting global counterterrorism initiatives. (Global policy forum, 2005) Overall, U.S. foreign policy regarding global conflicts is characterized by a mix of military, diplomatic, and economic strategies aimed at protecting national interests, promoting global stability, and responding to emerging threats. U.S. foreign policy regarding global conflicts has been shaped by various historical contexts, ideological shifts, and strategic objectives. The U.S. has a history of military interventions to protect national interests, prevent the spread of ideologies opposed to its own (e.g., communism, terrorism), and maintain global stability (US department of State, 2020). It supports and leverages international institutions (e.g., UN, World Bank, IMF) to address global conflicts, promote peace, and foster international cooperation. Sometimes, USA directly intervened alone on humanitarian grounds and sometimes in alliance with NATO or with UN mandate like in Korean War. (Edieth Y Wu, 2013) Therefore, humanitarian aid and disaster relief efforts are part of U.S. policy to address the consequences of global conflicts. Out of these, two major conflicts have drawn substantial attention in recent years are the Ukraine Russia conflict and Israel - Hamas conflict.

A war between Russia and Ukraine began in February 2014 with the covert invasion of the Ukrainian autonomous republic of Crimea by disguised Russian troops. The conflict expanded in April 2014 when Russians and local proxy forces seized territory in Ukraine's Donbas region; over the next seven years, more than 14,000 people would be killed in fighting in eastern Ukraine. On February 24, 2022, Russia launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine. Although Russian forces made significant gains in the first days of combat, Ukrainian defenders rebuffed attempts to seize Kyiv and other major cities and were soon launching counterattacks at Russian positions. (Michael Ray, 2022) The invasion aimed to topple the Ukrainian government and assert control over significant parts of the country. The war has caused significant casualties, widespread destruction, and a massive humanitarian crisis, with millions of Ukrainians displaced. Despite initial rapid advances, Ukrainian resistance has been fierce, supported by Western military aid and sanctions against Russia. The conflict has since become a protracted war of attrition, with both sides locked in intense battles across various fronts. (Jeffrey Mankoff, 2022) By the end of 2024, the war continues with no clear end in sight, affecting global politics, energy supplies, and international relation.

Israel and Hamas have been at war in Gaza for over 100 days since gunmen from the Palestinian militant group ran amok in southern Israel, prompting a fierce Israeli military campaign in which

almost 24,000 Palestinians have been killed. (The Hindu, 2024). Hamas launched its deadly attack on Israel on October 7, 2023, prompting the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) to engage in aerial campaigns and ground operations within the Gaza Strip. On June 8, 2024 the IDF undertook an operation in central Gaza to rescue four hostages while Gazan authorities reported that 274 Palestinians were killed, and hundreds of others were injured. Other efforts to free the more than one hundred remaining Israeli and foreign hostages taken by Hamas on October 7 have been largely unsuccessful, and their location and health status are unknown. Almost two million Gazans—more than 85 percent of the population—have fled their homes since October 2023. Casualty estimates from the Hamas-run Gazan Health Ministry place death toll in Gaza at around 40,000, though such numbers are challenging to verify due to limited international access to the Strip. On July 13, Israel conducted a major strike on south Gaza, targeting two top Hamas commanders that killed at least seventy-one people. Meanwhile, neither Hamas nor Israel has agreed to the term laid out by U.S. President Joe Biden for a ceasefire and hostage release. The conflict has sparked increased regional tensions across the Middle East. Hezbollah fighters in Lebanon have engaged in cross-border skirmishes with the IDF, Yemen's Houthi rebels have shot missiles at Israel and commercial ships in the Red Sea and other Iran-backed groups have launched dozens of attacks on U.S. military positions in Iraq and Syria. (Centre for preventive action, 2024) A significant escalation occurred when Hamas launched a large-scale surprise attack on Israel, leading to a major military response from Israel. This escalation resulted in heavy casualties on both sides, with Gaza facing extensive destruction and a severe humanitarian crisis. The conflict remains unresolved, with occasional ceasefires but no lasting peace agreement. The situation is exacerbated by political divisions within the Palestinian territories, regional rivalries, and international interventions, making it one of the most intractable conflicts in modern history. Taking into consideration the two major conflicts of the day, the research questions are framed as follows:

1. How do U.S. overtures towards Ukraine-Russia and Israel-Hamas conflict reflect broader US policies and strategic interests?
2. What are the key challenges faced by U.S. policy makers in addressing both Ukraine-Russia and Israel-Hamas conflicts simultaneously?

US Policies towards Ukraine-Russia Conflict

The U.S. supported Ukraine to counter Russian aggression and uphold international law and sovereignty principles till Israel-Hamas conflict begun. This support includes military aid, economic assistance, and diplomatic backing. The U.S. has imposed extensive sanctions on Russia

to deter its aggressive actions and weaken its capacity to wage war. These sanctions target key sectors of the Russian economy and influential individuals. The U.S. reaffirms its commitment to NATO, seeing the alliance as critical to European security and a deterrent against Russian expansionism. The conflict has led to increased NATO presence and cooperation in Eastern Europe. (Congressional Research Service, 2024) The U.S. provides military aid and training to Ukraine to enhance its defense capabilities and ensure it can resist Russia. Ukraine has received its first batch of long-awaited American-made F-16 fighter jets that will help the country fight back against Russia's superior air power (Greg Myre, 2024). The U.S. frames its support for Ukraine as a defense of democracy against authoritarianism. This aligns with the broader U.S. policy of promoting democratic values and human rights globally. The U.S. aims to maintain geopolitical stability by supporting allies and countering adversaries. This involves a complex balancing act of diplomacy, military aid, and economic measures to manage conflicts and prevent escalation. In the Middle East, the U.S. seeks to ensure the stability of energy supplies, given the region's significance in global oil and gas markets. In the case of Ukraine, energy security also plays a role, as Europe relies heavily on Russian gas, and the conflict has prompted efforts to diversify energy sources. The U.S. views Iran's influence in the Middle East and Russia's actions in Europe as threats to its interests and global stability. Countering these adversaries involves a combination of military presence, alliances, and economic sanctions. By actively engaging in these conflicts, the U.S. seeks to maintain its role as a global leader. This involves upholding international norms, supporting allies, and promoting a rules-based international order. Therefore, U.S. policies toward the Israel-Hamas and Ukraine-Russia conflicts reflect broader strategic interests, including maintaining regional stability, supporting allies, countering adversaries, and promoting democratic values. These policies are interwoven with efforts to uphold international norms and ensure geopolitical balance. (Foreign policy Research Institute, 2023)

The *New York Times* headline said it all: “Middle East War Adds to Surge in International Arms Sales.” The conflicts in Gaza, Ukraine, and beyond may be causing immense and unconscionable human suffering, but they are also boosting the bottom lines of the world’s arms manufacturers. American arms industry already dominates the international market in a staggering fashion, controlling 45% of all such sales globally, a gap only likely to grow more extreme in the rush to further arm allies in Europe and the Middle East in the context of the ongoing wars in those regions. (William Hartung, 2023) Military contractors have benefited from an upsurge in contracts to supply Ukraine with the artillery, tanks and drones that it has been using to defend itself. These contracts are part of an overall boom for the U.S. military-industrial complex. For 2024, Congress approved an \$858 billion military spending bill, a full \$45 billion more than even the Biden administration

requested. This represents a 4.3 percent increase in spending compared to increases closer to 1 percent between 2015 and 2021. When it comes to arms exports, the war is only accelerating recent trends by helping to boost U.S. overseas sales and reducing Russia's share of the global market. Although Ukraine has indeed increased its imports substantially, many from the United States, the major uptick in sales of U.S. arms comes from Asia—South Korea, Japan, and India—and comes in response to a perceived threat from China, not Russia. (Global Times, 2024) And where Russian exports have fallen, it has not necessarily been the United States that has jumped into the gap. In India, for instance, France has been the major beneficiary of falling Russian sales. The U.S. military-industrial complex has indeed profited from the Ukraine war. But, like with fossil fuel companies, the arms industry is not driving U.S. security policy. Providing weapons to fight an anachronistic war is more of a distraction for manufacturers, lobbyists and politicians who continue to focus on a future conflict with China. (John Feffer, 2023:11) Energy politics are of utmost concern to the Biden administration. Biden does not want to see significant increases in oil prices at home or its European partners suffer from a lack of energy. In the immediate aftermath of the war, the first challenge for the Biden administration was the surging price of gas. By the first week of March 2022, gas at the pump cost well over \$4 a gallon. This increase coincided with rising inflation (since early 2021) that threatened the administration's claims of a post-COVID economic recovery. In 2022, for instance, the United States doubled its shipments of natural gas to Europe, filling an important gap created by reductions in Russian imports. Indeed, the United States supplied fully half of Europe's natural gas needs in 2022, along with 12 percent of its oil. (John Feffer, 2023:10) Unlike the Russian or Saudi state, the U.S. state does not own the energy sector. There are, however, some indirect monetary gains through taxes—and Biden has threatened to gain even more through a windfall profits tax on oil and gas companies, which was opposed by Republicans. Washington has also acquired some additional leverage with energy poor countries. But dominant market position is a side effect of the war, not a driving force behind U.S. efforts to defend Ukraine. The runaway profits of the oil and gas sector are also something of an embarrassment for an administration that has put so much emphasis on a transition to renewable energy. The war has simultaneously given fossil fuel companies an unexpected boost and pushed countries dependent on Russian fossil fuels to accelerate their plans to shift to sustainable energy sources. This desire for the energy independence that solar and wind power provide can even be seen in China, which has been perhaps the biggest beneficiary of the war in Ukraine in terms of cheaper fuel imports. (John Feffer, 2023:9) Interestingly U.S. itself is trying to justify its support to Ukraine in terms of economic benefits. A *Wall Street Journal* report has put focus back on how U.S. economy is getting a boost from the war in Europe. Therefore, bolstering Ukraine not only serves U.S. strategic interest and moral obligations but also benefits the American economy.

(Times of India, 2024)

India has been facing criticism from policymakers in the US and West for trying to profit from the Ukraine war as it emerged as one of the key buyers of cheap Russia oil in the wake of Western sanctions. India's pragmatic strategic concern is Russia's "no-limits" ties with China. But there is very little that New Delhi can do to drive a wedge between China and Russia. China is the bigger economy that has openly provided diplomatic cover to Russia during the Ukraine war, and has helped sustain the Russian economy and its military-industrial capacities through dual-use items that can be used for both civilian and military applications such as technology, satellites, or drones. Beijing has therefore acquired considerable leverage over Moscow, something that Delhi cannot emulate. (Swasti Rao, 2024) Delhi's talk of an FTA with the EAEU and all-weather friendship with Russia should not overlook Russia's regional and global interests in having a strong strategic partnership with a territorially revisionist as well as an economically and militarily powerful China. They are united by their hostility towards America's global primacy. China's economy, nearing \$18 trillion, presents it with a better chance of becoming a global power than Russia or India, whose economies are valued at \$2.02 trillion and \$3.54 trillion respectively. India can do nothing to change Russia's lower-ranking role in the Sino-Russian ties or their aversion to America's pre-eminence. (Anita Inder Singh, 2024)

US Policies towards Israel Hamas conflict

Israelis and Palestinians have clashed over claims to the Holy Land for decades, a conflict that has long been one of the world's most intractable imbroglios. Although the United States is a strong supporter of Israel, it has traditionally tried to advance a diplomatic solution that would reconcile the competing claims of the two parties. In the decades since, the Israeli-Palestinian dispute has continually flared into conflict, including multistate wars, armed uprisings, and terrorist acts. A major turning point was the 1967 Six-Day War, which culminated in Israel's occupation of East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza. The Middle East has long been of central importance to the United States as successive administrations pursued a broad set of interrelated goals including securing vital energy resources, staving off Soviet and Iranian influence, ensuring the survival and security of Israel and Arab allies, countering terrorism, promoting democracy, and reducing refugee flows. (Kali Robinson, 2023) The Trump administration opted to side with Israel on various matters, breaking with decades of U.S. policy that aimed at serving as a neutral broker in negotiations. In August 2020, the administration mediated an agreement between Israel and the United Arab Emirates, known as the Abraham Accords, in which the two countries pledged to begin normalizing ties. Under that deal, Israel also agreed to temporarily halt plans to annex about 30 percent of the West Bank. (Adam Zeidan, 2024) Bahrain, Morocco, and Sudan later announced

their own U.S.-brokered deals to normalize relations with Israel. Opponents of normalization say these moves betray the Palestinian cause, as the 2002 Arab Peace Initiative stipulates that Arab League members will establish relations with Israel only after the creation of a Palestinian state, among other conditions. The agreement shows how the Arab countries are gradually decoupling themselves from the Palestine question. Full diplomatic ties will be established between Israel, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain which will have a positive impact on the entire region. The deal buys UAE a lot of goodwill in the US, where its image has been tarnished by its involvement in the Yemen War. (*The Hindu*, 2023) Biden administration has focused on promoting equal rights for Israelis and Palestinians and encouraging more nations to seek normalization with Israel. The United States has long been Israel's ally and its leading security collaborator because the United States supports the existence of a Jewish state. The U.S. policies toward the Israel-Hamas conflict and the Ukraine-Russia conflict reflect broader U.S. strategic interests in several ways, including geopolitical stability, regional influence, defense commitments, and the promotion of democratic values. Here is a detailed explanation of how these conflicts fit into the larger framework of U.S. policies.

The U.S. has a long-standing alliance with Israel, viewing it as a key strategic partner in the Middle East. This partnership is rooted in shared democratic values, counterterrorism efforts, and mutual security interest. The U.S. provides significant military aid to Israel, ensuring it maintains a qualitative military edge over potential adversaries in the region. This support is seen as crucial for maintaining regional stability and protecting U.S. interests. The U.S. designates Hamas as a terrorist organization and supports Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas' attacks. This aligns with the broader U.S. counterterrorism strategy, which aims to combat extremist groups globally. According to court documents, Harakat al-Muqawamah al-Islamiyya, commonly known as Hamas, is a terrorist organization that was founded in 1987, and has been designated as a foreign terrorist organization (FTO) by the United States since 1997. (US department of justice, 2024) While supporting Israel, the U.S. also engages with Arab nations and promotes peace initiatives, such as the Abraham Accords, to normalize relations between Israel and several Arab states. The Abraham Accords, signed in 2021, launched a new era of cooperation and normalization not only between the Arab states and Israel but also between the U.S. and the wider region. A direct outcome of this normalization was the setting up of new initiatives, such as the I2U2, an economic and trade ecosystem between India, Israel, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), and the US, which is seen as a pilot to what this "new" Middle East (West Asia) can achieve. (Kabir Taneja, 2023) This approach seeks to enhance regional stability and counter Iranian influence.

Today, Israel remains the United States' closest strategic partner in the Middle East. Both

countries are concerned about Iran's nuclear ambitions and its support for Islamist militants, particularly Lebanon's Hezbollah and Hamas. As a result of these shared interests, the United States has pledged to help safeguard Israel's military superiority over any hostile combination of countries in the region. The United States began providing Israel with military assistance after its withdrawal from Arab territories as part of the peace process. (Amiti Sen, 2024) Washington considered it a responsibility to provide this security aid because Israel was taking risks for peace. The United States also gave large aid packages to Egypt and Jordan in exchange for their commitments to the peace process. More than half of all foreign military aid that President Biden requested for fiscal year 2022 was earmarked for Israel. Though the anti-terrorism law remains in effect, the Biden administration has resumed aid to the West Bank and Gaza, pledging to provide the Palestinians at least \$500 million by 2024, pending congressional approval. The ongoing conflict in West Asia has cast a shadow over I2U2 – a grouping of India, Israel, the US and the UAE forged to tackle global challenges such as food security, energy, water and health, and advance economic opportunities. Discussions in the group have gone dormant with no meetings taking place for almost a year because of Israel's attack on Gaza. India has adopted a 'wait and watch' approach on the matter as it does not want to disturb its balancing act in the region. UAE wanted to distance itself from Israel. It is not possible to expect the UAE to be dialoguing with Israel when it is at the center of the conflict in the Middle East and Muslim countries are being affected. It is a sensitive matter, and the UAE does not seem interested in reopening the dialogue. (Amiti Sen, 2024) The escalation in the war between Palestine-based terror group Hamas and Israel is likely to slow down projects envisaged by the I2U2. At a virtual I2U2 Summit attended by Prime Minister Narendra Modi, US President Joe Biden, Israeli Prime Minister (former) Yair Lapid and UAE President Sheikh Mohamed bin Zayed Al Nahyan, it was decided that the UAE will invest \$2 billion to develop integrated food parks across India as part of an initiative to enhance food security in West Asia and South Asia. These food parks, which would be set up in Gujarat and Maharashtra to begin with, would incorporate state-of-the-art climate-smart technologies to reduce food waste and spoilage, conserve fresh water, and employ renewable energy sources. (Amiti Sen, 2023) The UAE and Israel may want to wait for things to cool down before they talk business. The two are not in the best position for talks while such a bloody fight is on. The projects lined up under I2U2 after the leaders' summit may suffer a setback, at least till the situation normalizes. If an I2U2 meeting is held at this point, the optics would not be good. For India, it would be okay but not for Israel and the UAE. The UAE will come under scrutiny of the Arab world which may ask why it is in dialogue with Israel while there are killings going on in Palestine.

The Israel-Hamas conflict and bombardment of Gaza could “pause” progress on India-U.S. trade, and connectivity initiatives, including the India-Middle East-Europe Economic Corridor (IMEEC) and the India-Israel-UAE-U.S. (I2U2) groupings. Speaking about the India-U.S. 2+2 dialogue held on November 10, 2023 Ambassador Garcetti said that bilateral cooperation is growing in several domains. He also said that the two countries must advance their engagement on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), highlighting dangers that had been outlooked by both U.S. President Joseph Biden and Prime Minister Narendra Modi. (Suhasini Haider, 2023) Moreover, India has good relations with Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Israel and therefore it cannot take sides of any one of them. Thus, India adopted the idea of Strategic Autonomy. Despite the Russia-Ukraine war polarizing the world, India has stood out in the past period by maintaining cordial ties with both the West and Russia. While the West insisted or even indirectly pressurized India to condemn Moscow’s actions, India has stood its ground. India has followed what is termed as strategic autonomy which implies not allied or subservient to one power and to maintain ties with all the powers in protecting national interest. Apart from this specific issue of the Russia-Ukraine war, India has followed strategic autonomy on the larger geopolitical canvas as well. India’s ties with Iran are a part of the strategic autonomy that India has strived hard to maintain in its policy formulation despite relations with the United States prevailing upon India’s stand at times. Iran, for its part, with a strategic location in the Middle East as well as a route to Central Asia and Eurasia, has successfully managed to position itself as one of the important factors in India’s strategic autonomy through a combination of strategic and diplomatic overtures towards India. India-Iran relations have experienced ups and downs owing to India’s convergence of interests with the West. But still, Iran remains a strategically important country for India. While the past years have witnessed India stopping oil imports from Iran in 2019 due to the US sanctions over the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) or the Iran nuclear deal, this has not hindered the progress on the connectivity projects between India and Iran. Iran is India’s gateway to Central Asia and Eurasia and is a crucial connecting point for three projects – Chabahar Port, the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC) and the Ashgabat Agreement. (Niranjan Marjani, 2022)

US challenges in dealing with Ukraine-Russia Conflict

U.S. faces numerous complex challenges in dealing with the Ukraine-Russia conflict, which has escalated dramatically since Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022. The conflict is not only a military and geopolitical issue but also a test of U.S. foreign policy, international alliances, and global stability. Here are the key challenges:

1. Balancing Support for Ukraine without Direct Military Involvement – The U.S. has been

one of the largest suppliers of military aid to Ukraine, including advanced weapons systems like HIMARS, tanks, air defense systems, and drones. However, the U.S. has avoided sending ground troops or enforcing a no-fly zone to prevent direct conflict with Russian forces, which could risk escalation into a broader NATO-Russia war. There is a constant balancing act between supporting Ukraine and avoiding actions that might provoke Russia into a direct confrontation with NATO. Russian leaders, including President Putin, have hinted at the potential use of nuclear weapons if they feel existentially threatened, adding to the complexity of U.S. actions. The United States has approved sending F-16 fighter jets to Ukraine from Denmark and the Netherlands to defend against Russian invaders. Ukraine has actively sought the U.S.-made F-16 fighter jets to help it counter Russian air superiority. (Steve Holland & Idrees Ali, 2023)

2. Managing NATO and European Unity – U.S. has worked to maintain a unified NATO front, despite varying levels of support for Ukraine among member states. Some countries, especially those geographically closer to Russia (e.g., Poland and the Baltic states), have been more vocal in calling for robust military aid, while others, like Hungary, have been more cautious or sympathetic toward Russia. Many European countries, especially Germany, have been highly dependent on Russian energy, particularly natural gas. The U.S. has had to navigate these dependencies, encouraging European countries to reduce reliance on Russian energy while mitigating the economic and political fallout from rising energy prices and inflation. Beyond Ukraine, the U.S. must ensure the security of NATO members in Eastern Europe, which have expressed concerns about potential Russian aggression. This has led to the deployment of additional U.S. troops and military assets to Eastern European NATO countries, further complicating logistics and resource allocation. The only way to secure lasting peace in Ukraine is to explore Ukraine's path to a deeper relationship with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union. By taking steps to join both of these institutions over time, Ukraine will also strengthen its internal democracy. (Benjamin Jensen & Elizabeth Hoffman, 2024)
3. Managing Economic Sanctions and their Global Impact – U.S. has led international efforts to impose harsh economic sanctions on Russia, targeting its banking system, oligarchs, key industries, and access to global markets. However, these sanctions have global ripple effects, especially in the energy and food sectors, as Russia is a major exporter of oil, gas, and wheat. The sanctions on Russia, combined with the disruption of Ukrainian agriculture and exports, have contributed to inflation, food shortages, and energy price spikes globally. Developing countries, particularly in Africa and parts of Asia, have been hit hard by rising food and fuel

costs, and the U.S. faces diplomatic pressure to mitigate these impacts. There are potential limitations to sanctions targeting Russia's trade and financial relationships with the West. Despite efforts to sever these ties, Russia has shown resilience by establishing stronger connections with other nations, such as China, India, and Turkey. (Daisoon Kim, 2024)

4. Domestic Political Divisions – While there has been bipartisan support for aiding Ukraine, there are divisions within U.S. domestic politics about the scope and scale of that aid. Some lawmakers, particularly within the Republican Party, have expressed concerns over the cost of military and economic aid to Ukraine, especially given domestic issues like inflation and public spending. Over time, there is a growing concern about “war fatigue” among the U.S. public. Some Americans question the continued financial and military support for Ukraine, asking whether U.S. interests are being served. Managing this political and public sentiment, while continuing to aid Ukraine, is emerging as a significant challenge for U.S. policymakers. U.S. domestic politics is now inextricably tied to its support for Ukraine. Since February 2024, the House Republicans have blocked efforts by the Biden administration to secure aid for Ukraine and Israel. Despite an initial agreement between the Republicans and Democrats on the issue of illegal immigration through the U.S.-Mexico border, where Biden agreed to significant border control measures to break a Republican deadlock on aid for Israel and Ukraine, Republicans continue to block the latest border security bill in Congress. The Republican Party originally blocked a US\$60 billion aid package to Ukraine (Vivek Mishra, 2024)
5. Dealing with Russia's Nuclear Threats – Since Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine began in February 2022 the threat of nuclear war has loomed over the conflict. Yet with President Vladimir Putin's latest announcement that Russia would hold exercises for tactical nuclear weapons use in combat—supposedly in response to “provocative statements” from Western officials—Russia's nuclear brinksmanship has possibly reached a new phase, in which higher risks need to be met with an upgraded Western deterrence posture. (Pavel K. Baev, 2024) Russia has repeatedly made veiled threats about its potential use of nuclear weapons in the conflict, particularly if it feels its national security is existentially threatened. This has raised concerns in the U.S. about how to manage deterrence without escalating the situation to a nuclear crisis. The U.S. faces the challenge of deterring Russia from using tactical nuclear weapons while avoiding steps that might be interpreted as provocative. This delicate balance of power is critical, given that any nuclear escalation could have catastrophic consequences not just for Ukraine but for the entire world.
6. China's Ambiguous Role – China, as a close partner to Russia, has maintained a largely

neutral stance, calling for peace while avoiding direct condemnation of Moscow's actions. The U.S. must balance its competition with China while pressuring Beijing not to provide military or economic support to Russia. A stronger China-Russia alliance could have significant geopolitical implications, especially if China decides to provide Russia with more overt economic or military assistance. This would strain U.S. efforts to contain the conflict and could lead to more complex global confrontations. China's own precarious position in great power politics and its deteriorating relations with the United States, aggravated by Beijing's commitment to winning Taiwan back, make Beijing an unlikely candidate to solve tensions between Russia and the West. The crux of the problem is that Russia is China's only great power ally, and China will rely on Russia in the event of a confrontation with the United States. Unlike the United States and its allies, China does not want Russia to suffer a devastating defeat in Ukraine.(Alexander Korolev, 2023)

7. Managing Diplomatic Efforts for a Peace Settlement – While the U.S. strongly supports Ukraine, it also must be involved in any diplomatic discussions regarding potential peace negotiations. The U.S. faces the challenge of encouraging a settlement that respects Ukraine's sovereignty without being seen as dictating terms or allowing Russia to secure territorial gains through aggression. Any peace settlement will have to navigate the difficult balance between Ukraine's territorial integrity and Russia's perceived security concerns regarding NATO's proximity. The U.S. will play a key role in shaping these negotiations, but the positions of Ukraine, Russia, and European countries will complicate any resolution. The primary concern of the US is not to maintain Ukraine's territorial integrity but rather to limit Russia's strength and ability to challenge the current global order. Ukraine has proved to be an exceptional vehicle for grinding down Russian resources at a massive scale. Continuing support might not win the war, but it would likely add a few more years of Ukrainian survival. The resulting losses would degrade the capacity of the Russian leadership to continue with their ambitions. (Theodore Oltean, 2024)
8. International Law and War Crimes Accountability – By any measure, Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine is devastating. Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine has raised a host of complex issues—first and foremost for Ukrainians, and also for each and every state in relation to international law. (Olga Butkevych, Rebecca Hamilton and Gregory Shaffer, 2024) The U.S. has been vocal in accusing Russia of committing war crimes in Ukraine, particularly in regard to attacks on civilians, and the targeting of civilian infrastructure. However, holding Russia accountable through international legal mechanisms is difficult, especially given Russia's position on the U.N. Security Council and its lack of cooperation

with the International Criminal Court. The U.S. must balance its response to human rights abuses with diplomatic efforts to end the war. Pursuing accountability for war crimes while still engaging in diplomacy can be a delicate challenge, particularly when both justice and a political resolution are priorities.

9. **Rebuilding Ukraine and Long-term Commitments** – Once the conflict ends, Ukraine will require massive international assistance to rebuild its economy, infrastructure, and military. The U.S. will likely play a key role in this, but the scale of the financial commitment and international coordination required presents a long-term challenge. Even if the conflict ends, ensuring Ukraine's security and preventing future aggression from Russia will remain a U.S. and NATO priority. This may involve discussions about Ukraine's potential membership in NATO or other security guarantees, which could further complicate relations with Russia. To date, the United States has allocated \$175 billion dollars towards civil and military aid to Ukraine. Over two and a half years of fighting, this comes out to just under \$60 billion annually. (Theodore Oltean, 2024)

Therefore, U.S. faces a complex array of challenges in managing the Ukraine-Russia conflict, from military support and economic sanctions to diplomatic efforts and managing global repercussions. The stakes involve not only Ukraine's sovereignty and security but also broader international norms, alliances, and the global economic order.

US challenges in dealing with Israel-Hamas conflict

Apart from this, U.S. also faces several key challenges in dealing with the Hamas-Israel conflict, driven by a combination of strategic, political, and humanitarian considerations. These challenges include:

1. **Balancing Support for Israel with Regional Stability** – U.S. has a long-standing alliance with Israel, providing military aid and diplomatic backing. This relationship, especially in times of conflict with Hamas, leads the U.S. to support Israel's right to defend itself. While supporting Israel, U.S. must ensure it doesn't destabilize relationships with Arab nations or provoke broader conflict. Many of these nations, like Egypt and Jordan, have peace treaties with Israel and are key U.S. allies. U.S. must also consider Iran's influence in the region, as it supports Hamas and other anti-Israel groups. There is a risk of escalation and therefore U.S. must tread carefully to prevent a wider regional war, especially with the involvement of Hezbollah (in Lebanon) or Iran. Iran's financial and military support for Hamas adds another layer of complexity to the U.S. response. Iran's influence in the region is a major concern for the U.S., as it seeks to limit Tehran's power and ensure that it does not escalate

the conflict further by supporting other militias like Hezbollah. U.S.'s tensions with Iran over nuclear development and regional influence add an additional challenge. Iran's backing of Hamas and other anti-Israel groups makes any U.S. action in the region more complicated. The Biden Administration has provided political and material support for Israeli efforts to end Hamas rule in Gaza and secure the return of hostages. In Israel, debate is ongoing about whether and how these objectives can be achieved separately or together, if at all. In April 2024, Congress appropriated the President's requested supplemental funding for Israel (\$8.7 billion in Foreign Military Financing and missile defense) and global humanitarian assistance (over \$9 billion) in P.L. 118-50. The legislation also includes provisions aimed at preventing the \$1 billion of humanitarian aid intended for Gaza from diversion, misuse, or destruction. The Administration increased criticism of Israel during the first half of 2024, in apparent connection with Israel's prosecution of the war, questions regarding the achievability of the Israeli government's stated objectives, and the conflict's impact on Palestinian civilians. The Administration has pushed for a multi-phase cease-fire and hostage-prisoner exchange (working with Qatari and Egyptian mediators) and increases in humanitarian aid and civilian protection. It is unclear whether regional tensions connected to various July 2024 strikes and attacks, including the reported killings of top Hamas leaders Ismail Haniyeh in Iran and Muhammad Deif in Gaza, might affect the prospects for a cease-fire deal. A February presidential memorandum (an executive document, not standing law) set forth oversight mechanisms for Israel's compliance with international law as a U.S. arms recipient, and the Administration provided an initial report on Israeli compliance to Congress in May. Also in May, the Administration paused some weapons shipments to Israel, triggering debate in Congress. (Congressional Research Service, 2024)

2. Managing Relations with Arab and Muslim Nations – U.S.'s close ties to Israel can lead to strained relations with many Arab and Muslim-majority countries. A perception of pro-Israel bias risks alienating these nations, complicating diplomatic efforts. Beyond the Middle East, global Muslim populations are sensitive to the U.S.'s stance on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The humanitarian crisis in Gaza and the loss of Palestinian civilian lives often lead to widespread protests and anti-American sentiment in these communities. Most U.S. Jews (89%) see Israel's reasons for going to war against Hamas as valid. Only 18% of U.S. Muslims see Israel's reasons as valid. (Laura Silver, Becka A Alper, 2024)
3. Humanitarian Concerns in Gaza – U.S. support for Israeli military operations is often met with concern over the humanitarian impact on Palestinians. In particular, airstrikes on Gaza, where Hamas operates, often result in significant civilian casualties and destruction of

infrastructure. Balancing the need to provide humanitarian aid to Palestinian civilians in Gaza without benefiting Hamas, a U.S.-designated terrorist organization, is a constant challenge. U.S. has to ensure that aid reaches civilians and not the group controlling the area. In this conflict till date, more than 39,000 Palestinians in Gaza have been killed, according to the Hamas-controlled health ministry there. Additionally, about 1.9 million of Gaza's some 2.1 million residents have been displaced, with most facing unsanitary, overcrowded conditions alongside acute shortages of food, water, medical care, and other essential supplies and services. Obstacles to transporting aid through crossings and Israeli checkpoints and then safely delivering it have contributed to high levels of food insecurity. The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification assessed in June 2024 that increases in assistance since March helped temporarily avoid famine in Gaza, but warned that 96% of Gazans would likely experience crisis or worse levels of acute food insecurity through September, and that any significant change in humanitarian access could lead to famine. (Congressional Research Service 2024)

4. Addressing Domestic Political Pressures – U.S. domestic politics play a significant role in shaping its policy on the conflict. The issue is highly polarized, with Republicans generally favoring more robust support for Israel, while Democrats often push for more balanced approaches that consider Palestinian rights. Managing this divide, while maintaining a consistent foreign policy, can be politically challenging. Public sentiment in U.S. is divided, with some groups advocating for Israel's security, while others call for Palestinian rights and an end to Israeli occupation. The U.S. government must navigate these competing pressures, especially during periods of intense violence. Overall, Americans' support for a two-state solution has increased modestly since 2022 from 35% to 40%. Much of the shift has come among Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents. Today, 48% of Democrats favor a two-state solution, up from 36% in 2022. Indeed, this shift has opened up a partisan gap in views of the two-state solution that was not present in 2022. (Laura Silver, Becka A Alper, 2024) U.S. designates Hamas as a terrorist group, which complicates any direct diplomatic engagement with the group. This limits the U.S.'s options in terms of negotiation or conflict de-escalation. However, Hamas remains a key player in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and ignoring its role makes achieving a lasting peace more difficult. The broader Israeli-Palestinian peace process has been largely stalled for years, with the U.S. struggling to find a path forward. The two-state solution, historically backed by the U.S., faces significant challenges, including Israeli settlement expansion in the West Bank and internal Palestinian divisions between Hamas and Fatah.

5. Navigating International Diplomatic Dynamics – U.S. faces pressure from European and other global allies to push for restraint on Israel's part and to actively work toward a peaceful resolution. The international community often calls for a ceasefire and condemns the humanitarian toll, which may conflict with U.S. strategic interests. U.S. must balance support for Israel's right to self-defense with international concerns about potential violations of international law, including civilian casualties, the use of force, and the blockade of Gaza. Things are difficult for the US because, after being such vocal supporters of Israel from the beginning of the war, it is hard to suggest that an end to the war is now the priority and that the focus should be on what post-war Gaza will look like. (Al Jazeera, 2024)

Therefore, the U.S. faces a complex web of challenges in addressing the Hamas-Israel conflict, balancing its strong support for Israel with humanitarian, regional, and domestic considerations. The situation is made more difficult by geopolitical dynamics involving Iran, Arab nations, and international expectations for the U.S. to play a role in finding a path to peace.

The United States attaches great importance to the success of Ukraine's transition to a modern democratic state with a flourishing market economy. U.S. policy is centered on realizing and strengthening a democratic, prosperous, and secure Ukraine more closely integrated into Europe and Euro-Atlantic structures. The U.S.-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership highlights the importance of the bilateral relationship and outlines enhanced cooperation in the areas of defense, security, economics and trade, energy security, democracy, and cultural exchanges. It also emphasizes the continued commitment of the United States to support enhanced engagement between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Ukraine. To fulfill one of the key tenets of the charter, the two countries have established the Strategic Partnership Commission. Thus, U.S. Government assistance to Ukraine aims to support the development of a democratic, prosperous, and secure Ukraine, fully integrated into the Euro-Atlantic community. (US Embassy in Ukraine).

The risks of conflict between two nuclear-armed powers are so great that virtually any rational leader should, in theory, seek to avoid one. This is especially true of the United States and Russia, who together control an estimated 90 percent of the world's nuclear warheads. The issue is not merely the size of their arsenals but also their structure — both countries have robust “second strike” capabilities, meaning each can sustain a devastating nuclear first strike from the other side and still retaliate. The U.S. and Russia maintain second strike capabilities through the so-called “nuclear triad”: bombers armed with nuclear bombs, submarines equipped with nuclear missiles, and land-based missile launchers. The result is

that neither the U.S. nor Russia can hope to “win” a nuclear war. The only way to win is not to play. This appears to be the reason the Biden administration has been so adamant on avoiding any kind of involvement in Ukraine; the risks of any direct intervention are far too high. (Zack Beauchamp, 2022) Sanctions against Russia and aid to Ukraine have come from many directions. But putting troops on the ground in Ukraine, which is not a member of NATO, is a line that the U.S. and other Western allies have not been willing to cross. In other words, the U.S.’ entry into the conflict has the potential to touch off a global war. If NATO or the U.S. sent troops into Ukraine to help them fight the Russians, the dynamic would shift to a multinational conflict with potential global implications due to the nuclear power status of both U.S. and Russia. Because of that, the U.S. and NATO — and other nations around the world — are attempting to influence the success of Ukraine and the defeat of Russia by providing other types of support. Moreover, the United States will not put U.S. pilots in the air to create a no-fly zone in Ukraine. While some Ukrainian officials have called on NATO countries to “close the sky” over Ukraine, establishing a no-fly zone would put the U.S. in direct engagement with the Russian military which the White House has made clear it is not interested in doing. (Farrah Tomazin, 2022) The U.S. and Western countries have imposed several rounds of sanctions on Russia, targeting its banking, aerospace and technology sectors (Paul LeBlanc, CNN, 2022). Much of the current U.S. strategy comes down to the fact that sending troops into Ukraine is simply not in America’s national interest. Ukraine is not a major trading partner and there’s little strategic benefit for the U.S., which does not even have an army base there.

On the other hand, Biden administration faces pressure from progressive Democrats, Arab officials and even some U.S. diplomats to help end the Israel-Hamas war. But the White House does not necessarily want to stop the fight because the U.S. agrees with Israel’s goal of destroying Hamas, a Palestinian network designated by Washington as a terrorist organization. Destroying — or at least degrading Hamas — is in the U.S. interest on multiple levels. Hamas is a proxy of Iran, a major U.S. adversary, so dismantling it undercuts Tehran. Hamas is a destabilizing force in a region that remains critical to U.S. economic and security interests. The militant group also does not recognize Israel’s right to exist, making it a major barrier to a two-state solution. Plus, publicly breaking with Israelis could damage U.S. ties with a partner who is critical on fronts including intelligence sharing. The U.S. has significant tools it could use to pressure Israel beyond the mere words. It could threaten to cut military aid to the country, stop defending it at the United Nations, or abandon long-term efforts to help Israel normalize diplomatic relations with Arab countries. Some congressional Democrats are even considering legislation to curtail intelligence sharing with Israel. But the Biden administration has steadfastly rejected such moves. (Nahal

Toosi, Alexander Ward and Lara Seligman, 2023). U.S. leaders are mounting an urgent effort to prevent Israel's war against Hamas and a resulting civilian catastrophe in Gaza from turning into a widening regional conflict that could snowball into an even greater geopolitical crisis after the horrific attacks. For the United States, there is the risk that a wider conflict could lead to reprisals by terror groups of Iran-backed militias against its remaining troops in Iraq and Syria, where they are engaged in missions to counter ISIS. (Stephen Collinson, CNN, 2023).

Worldwide, oil is very important but people are searching for alternatives like electric cars bio fuels etc. Therefore, Middle East countries especially Saudi Arabia are thinking and realizing that after few decades, oil would not be an essential resource due to availability of other alternatives with the technological advancements. Since the need of oil will be reduced with time so they want to diversify their economy. Apart from oil business they want to enter into other business-like production manufacturing and so they are looking for partners and therefore connecting with India, China, USA, etc. Life is a balance between holding on and letting go. The basic objectives of Gulf Co-operation Council are to effect co-ordination, integration, and interconnection among member states in all fields in order to achieve unity among them. Their idea is that if peace prevails then only it is possible to run the business smoothly. Therefore Abraham Accords, I2U2 etc. were signed. However, recently, Iran launched almost 200 ballistic missiles towards Israel. The missile barrage was retaliation for what it called the "violation of Iran's sovereignty and the martyrdom" of Hamas political leader Ismail Haniyeh, who was killed by an explosion in Tehran in July 2024 that Iranian officials blamed on Israel. (David Gritten, Matt Murphy and Patrick Jackson, BBC news, 2024). Strategically, Israel is so important for U.S. that recently it was observed that United States sent troops to Israel along with an advanced U.S. anti-missile system, in a highly unusual deployment which was meant to bolster the country's air defenses following missile attacks by Iran. U.S. President Joe Biden stated that the move was meant "to defend Israel," which is weighing an expected retaliation against Iran after Tehran fired more than 180 missiles at Israel on October 1, 2024. (Phil Stewart and Jasper Ward, 2024). The U.S. House of Representatives with broad bipartisan support passed a \$95 billion legislative package providing security assistance to Ukraine, Israel and Taiwan, over bitter objections from Republican hardliners. (Richard Cowan, Moira Warburton and Patricia Zengerle, 2024)

This study set out to explore how U.S policies towards Ukraine Russia and Israel Hamas conflict reflect broader US policies and strategic interests as well as the key challenges faced by U.S policy makers in addressing both Ukraine-Russia and Israel-Hamas conflict simultaneously. The findings indicate that, US wealth is at risk due to these conflicts. In 2023, U.S. approved F16 fighter jet to Ukraine after pressure from NATO. U.S. attention got diverted due to Israel-

Hamas War. Moreover, U.S. faces several challenges which include balancing support for Ukraine without direct military involvement, dealing with Russia's nuclear threat etc. The primary concern of U.S. is not to maintain Ukraine's territorial integrity but rather to limit Russia's strength and ability to challenge the current global order. Basically, the risk of conflict between two nuclear armed powers such as Russia and USA, are so great that virtually any rational leader would seek to avoid it. However, the U.S. military industrial complex has indeed profited from the Ukraine war. On the other hand, U.S. is facing some challenges due to humanitarian concerns in Gaza, addressing domestic political pressures etc. As mentioned above, strategically, Israel is very important for U.S. but ultimately U.S. strategy is to prevent conflict and promote stability which is necessary to carry out business smoothly. Therefore, after Donald Trump became the President-elect, Israeli-Palestinian conflict came to an official end by forming a two-state solution for the Jewish and Palestinian people, promoting the idea of everlasting peace and putting an official halt to any further land claims. Thus, USA is promoting democracy but at the same time we can observe a hegemonic behavior of USA in order to fulfill their interests. Therefore, we can come to the conclusion that the U.S. adopted a neo-realistic approach towards international relations in their quest for power and hegemony. Neo-realists do not overlook the prospects of cooperation among the states but the point of contention is that states like U.S. while cooperating with others to uphold certain common values, in effect, try to maximize their relative power and preserve their hegemony.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al Jazeera Staff. 2024. June 17, "US says Hamas is to blame for ceasefire delay – but is it Hamas or Israel?" ,<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/6/17/us-says-hamas-is-to-blame-for-ceasefire-delay-but-is-it-hamas-or-israel> ,accessed on 15/09/2024
- Baev,Pavel K, 2024. May 14, "Nuclear brinkmanship in Putin's war: Upping the ante", <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/nuclear-brinkmanship-in-putins-war-upping-the-ante/> ,accessed on 22/09/2024
- Beauchamp, Zack, 2022. February 25. "Why the US won't send troops to Ukraine", <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2022/2/25/22949351/ukraine-russia-us-troops-no-fly-zone-nuclear-weapons>, accessed on 28/09/2024.
- Bertrand, Natasha, 2024. October 13. "US to deploy about 100 troops to operate advanced anti-missile system in Israel amid heightened tensions", <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/10/13/>

politics/israel-iran-antimissile-system-us-troops/index.html, accessed on 16/10/2024.

- Bush, George W. 2002. September 17, “The national security strategy of the United States of America”, <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nssall.html>, accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Butkevych, Olga, 2024. February 22. “International law in the face of Russia’s aggression in Ukraine -the view from Lviv”,<https://www.justsecurity.org/92554/international-law-in-the-face-of-russias-aggression-in-ukraine-the-view-from-lviv/> , accessed on 24/09/2024.
- Centre for Preventive Action, 2024 (October 6),”Israeli-Palestinian Conflict”, <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>, accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Chaulia, Sreeram, 2024 May 29. “Chabahar is a metaphor for strategic Abrahamautonomy”, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/opinion/chabahar-is-a-metaphor-for-strategic-autonomy-101716989825501.html>, accessed on 10/09/2024.
- Choi, Seung - Whan, 2014. Journal of conflicts resolution 2016, “Why Does the United States Intervene Abroad? Democracy, Human Rights Violations, and Terrorism”, Volume 60(5), sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav DOI:10.1177/0022002714560350 jcr.sagepub.com, accessed on 16/10/2024.
- Congress, Section 504(a) of the Global Fragility Act of 2019, “United States Strategy to Prevent Conflict and Promote Stability”, 2020.
- Congressional Research Service. 2024 June 10. “Russia’s War on Ukraine: U.S. Policy and the Role of Congress”<https://crsreports.congress.gov> accessed on 12/09/2024.
- Congressional Research Service. 2024 August 1. “Israel and Hamas Conflict In Brief: Overview, U.S. Policy, and Options for Congress”, <https://crsreports.congress.gov> ,accessed on 15/09/2024.
- Collinson, Stephen. 2023, October 17. “The US is mounting a frantic effort to head off a wider Middle East war”, <https://www.cnn.com/2023/10/16/politics/us-prevent-wider-middle-east-war/index.html> , accessed on 27/09/2024.
- Cowan, Richard, 2024, April 21. “US House passes \$95 billion Ukraine, Israel aid package, sends to Senate”, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-house-vote-long-awaited-95-billion-ukraine-israel-aid-package-2024-04-20/> , accessed on 13/10/2024.

- Daily updates. 2023, September 22. “Three years of the Abraham Accords”, <https://www.drishtias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-editorials/three-years-of-the-abraham-accords>, accessed on 10/09/2024
- Feffer, John, 2023, April. “Sending Arms or Twisting Arms: The U.S. Role in the Ukraine War”.
- Ghosh, Peu. 2014. International Relations, Third edition, February, pp 24-29.
- Global policy forum, December 2005, “U.S. interventions”, <https://archive.globalpolicy.org/us-westward-expansion/26024-us-interventions.html>, accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Global Times, 2024 (January 30), “As biggest broker for US arms industry, Washington greatly profits from Russia-Ukraine conflict”, <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202401/1306369.shtml>, accessed on 24/ 08/2024.
- Gritten, David. 2024, October 3. “What we know about Iran's missile attack on Israel”, <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c70w1j0l488o>, accessed on 03/10/2024.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas k. 2023 (February 16), “The confrontation with Russia and US grand strategy”, <https://www.fpri.org/article/2023/02/the-confrontation-with-russia-and-us-grand-strategy/> , accessed on 15/09/2024.
- Haidar, Suhasini. 2023, November 20. “IMEEC, I2U2 progress could be paused due to Israel-Hamas conflict: U.S. envoy”, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/imeec-i2u2-progress-could-be-paused-due-to-israel-hamas-conflict-us-envoy/article67555319.ece>, accessed on 10/09/2024.
- Hartung, William. 2023, November 18. “Good Times for the Military-Industrial Complex”, <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/military-industrial-complex-ukraine-israel/>, accessed on 25/08/2024.
- Holland, Steve. 2023, August 18. “US approves sending F-16s to Ukraine from Denmark and Netherlands”, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us-approves-sending-f-16s-ukraine-denmark-netherlands-2023-08-17/> accessed on 20/09/2024.
- Jahshan, Khalil E. 2023, October 17. “The War on Gaza: Deterrence or Inching toward Direct US Involvement?”. <https://arabcenterdc.org/resource/the-war-on-gaza-deterrence-or-inching-toward-direct-us-involvement/>, accessed on 28/09/2024.

- Jensen, Benjamin. 2024, May 15. “Victory in Ukraine Starts with Addressing Five Strategic Problems”, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/victory-ukraine-starts-addressing-five-strategic-problems> accessed on 19/09/2024.
- Kim, Daisoon. 2024, February 26. “Economic Sanctions: Lessons from the Russia-Ukraine Conflict”, <https://poole.ncsu.edu/thought-leadership/article/economic-sanctions-lessons-from-the-russia-ukraine-conflict/>, accessed on 22/09/2024.
- Korolev, Alexander. 2023. May 27. “China’s ambiguous mediation role in Ukraine”, <https://eastasiaforum.org/2023/05/27/chinas-ambiguous-mediation-role-in-ukraine/> accessed on 22/09/2024.
- LeBlanc, Paul. 2022, February 28. “Why the US isn’t sending troops into Ukraine”, <https://www.cnn.com/2022/02/27/politics/us-troops-ukraine-russia-what-matters/index.html>, accessed on 29/09/2024.
- Mankoff, Jeffrey. 2022, April 22. “Russia’s War in Ukraine: Identity, History, and Conflict” <https://www.csis.org/analysis/russias-war-ukraine-identity-history-and-conflict>, accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Marjani, Niranjana. 2022, October 28. “How Iran positions itself in India’s pursuit of strategic autonomy?”, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/nolimits/how-iran-positions-itself-in-indias-pursuit-of-strategic-autonomy/>, accessed on 10/10/2024.
- Mastriana, Sante. 2023, November 29. “U.S. Foreign Policy Decisions in the Israel-Hamas Conflict: Part 2”, <https://www.closeup.org/u-s-foreign-policy-decisions-in-the-israel-hamas-conflict-part-2/>, accessed on 7/09/2024.
- Mishra, Asit Ranjan. 2024, January 2. “Israel-Hamas war may impact future I2U2 project collaboration efforts” https://www.business-standard.com/india-news/israel-hamas-war-may-impact-future-i2u2-project-collaboration-efforts-124010100839_1.html ,accessed on 10/09/2024.
- Mishra, Vivek. 2024, April 24. “Mapping the Arc of US Support to Ukraine: Economic, Political, and Strategic Imperatives”, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/mapping-the-arc-of-us-support-to-ukraine-economic-political-and-strategic-imperatives>, accessed on 18/09/2024.

- Myre, Greg. 2024, August 1. "Report: Ukraine receives first batch of U.S.-made F-16 fighter jets", <https://www.npr.org/2024/08/01/g-s1-14698/ukraine-receives-u-s-f-16-fighter-jets#:~:text=Ukraine%20has%20received%20its%20first,power%2C%20according%20to%20news%20reports> ,accessed on 12/09/2024.
- Office of public affair, us department of justice. 2024, September 3. "Justice Department Announces Terrorism Charges Against Senior Leaders of Hamas", <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-terrorism-charges-against-senior-leaders-hamas#:~:text=According%20to%20court%20documents%2C%20Harakat,the%20United%20States%20since%201997>accessed on 24/09/2024.
- Rao, Swasti. 2024, May 24. "India can't ignore Russia-China bonhomie. Pursue CNP with a grand strategy", <https://theprint.in/opinion/india-cant-ignore-russia-china-bonhomie-pursue-cnp-with-a-grand-strategy/2099675/> , accessed on 25/08/2024.
- Real conflicts. 2024, July 5. "The United States Should Continue Supporting Ukraine".
- https://www.realconflicts.com/post/merican-interests-in-ukrainewhy-aid-should-continue?gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjw9Km3BhDjARIsAGUb4nxk4KrCyB6pqKlu0BMgQnNrQFswgDWu6CsN0dHaLLcAluiELRiEzQwaAoZZEALw_wcB, accessed on 19/09/2024.
- Ray, Michael. 2022, "Russia Ukraine War" <https://www.britannica.com/event/2022-Russian-invasion-of-Ukraine> ,accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Robinson, Kali. 2023, July 12. "What Is U.S. Policy on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict?", <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-us-policy-israeli-palestinian-conflict> , accessed on 7/09/2024.
- Sen, Amiti. 2023, October 25. "Israel-Hamas war could slow down I2U2 projects in India" <https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/economy/israel-hamas-war-could-slow-down-i2u2-projects-in-india/article67458507.ece> ,accessed on 10/09/2024.
- Sen, Amiti, 2024(August 30), " Israel-Hamas conflict casts shadow on future of I2U2 group", <https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/news/world/israel-hamas-conflict-casts-shadow-on-future-of-i2u2-group/article68586280.ece> , accessed on 24/09/2024.
- Singh, Anita Inder, 2024 (July 12), "To Russia with love: India's new attempts to cultivate Russia won't contain China, could spoil ties with the US", <https://www.>

financialexpress.com/opinion/to-russia-with-love-indias-new-attempts-to-cultivate-russia-wont-contain-china-could-spoil-ties-with-the-us/3551059/lite/#amp_tf=From%20%251%24s&aoh=17245297712175&referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com, accessed on 25/08/2024.

- Silver, Laura, 2024(March 21), “Majority in U.S. Say Israel Has Valid Reasons for Fighting; Fewer Say the Same About Hamas”, <https://www.pewresearch.org/2024/03/21/majority-in-u-s-say-israel-has-valid-reasons-for-fighting-fewer-say-the-same-about-hamas/>, accessed on 15/09/2024.
- Stewart, Phil, 2024 (October 15), “US to send anti-missile system and troops to Israel, Pentagon says”, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us-send-anti-missile-system-israel-says-pentagon-2024-10-13/>, accessed on 13/10/2024.
- Taneja, Kabir, 2023 (November 23), “The Gaza crisis and challenge to future-proof I2U2”, <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/the-gaza-crisis-and-challenge-to-future-proof-i2u2>, accessed on 24/09/2024.
- The Hindu, 2024(January 14),”Israel-Hamas war | Timeline of major events from the first 100 days”, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/international/israel-hamas-war-timeline-of-major-events-from-the-first-100-days/article67740155.ece> accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Times of India, 2024 (February 19), “How Russia-Ukraine war is boosting US economy, defense industry”, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/how-russia-ukraine-war-is-boosting-us-economy-defense-industry/articleshow/107816099.cms>, accessed on 25/08/2024.
- Tomazin, Farrah, 2022 (March 2), “Why the US won’t fight in Ukraine”, <https://www.smh.com.au/world/north-america/a-direct-us-intervention-in-ukraine-is-still-off-the-cards-20220301-p5a0qd.html> , accessed on 30/10/2024.
- Toosi,Nahal, 2023 (July 11), “Why the U.S. isn’t stopping this war, and other Middle East realities”, <https://www.politico.com/news/2023/11/07/why-the-u-s-doesnt-want-to-stop-this-war-and-other-middle-east-realities-00125860>, accessed on 25/09/2024.
- Usher, Barbara Plett, 2023 (October 10), “President Joe Biden's foreign policy upended by Hamas attack”, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-67061453>, accessed on 30/09/2024.

- US embassy in Ukraine, 2022 “Policy and History”, <https://ua.usembassy.gov/our-relationship/policy-history/#:~:text=U.S.%2DUkraine%20Relations,with%20a%20flourishing%20market%20economy> ,accessed on 25/09/2024.
- Wood, Ruairidh, Journal of Global Faultline’s, Vol. 6, No. 2, Security Challenges of the 21st Century: New Challenges and Perspectives (December 2019-February 2020), pp. 166-185 Published by Pluto Journals, “Promoting democracy or pursuing hegemony? An analysis of U.S. involvement in the Middle East”, accessed on 28/08/2024.
- Wu, Edieth Y., 2013, “SHOULD THE UNITED STATES INTERVENE IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS: WHY, WHEN, AND HOW?”, Volume 23, accessed on 18/08/2024.
- Zeidan,Adam, 2024 (September 30), “Abraham Accords”, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Abraham-Accords> ,accessed on 10/09/2024.

Bio Profile of the Author:

PGT Political Science Educator (class XI & XII) & Social Science (classes VII-X)

ISC Affiliated reputed English Medium School 05/2022 - Present,

Visiting Examiner for ISC Examination (Class XII) for political science Engaging in external invigilation, participation in cultural programs in school

Assistant Examiner for Centralized evaluation of Political Science answer scripts for ISC Examination

Email ID: shreyaghosh1700@gmail.com