



Ukraine: 7 lessons from history that must not be forgotten

Democracy itself is under attack, and Ukraine is the front line.

Introduction

When asked, in 2015, by the Senate Armed Services Committee¹ what the greatest threat to the American and Western democratic way of life was, General Mark Milley, the then new Chief of United States Army Staff answered:

"I would put Russia right now as the number one threat ... Russia is the only country on earth that retains a nuclear capability to destroy the United States. That is an existential threat."

General Joe Dunford, the new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, expressed the same view to the same committee during his confirmation hearings. This assessment was also shared by Admiral James Stavridis, US Navy Rtd., former Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and a select group of top military leaders.

At a convention of senior political, diplomatic, and military figures in Europe, an attendee asked, with reference to Russia's military adventurism and muscle flexing in Europe, whether the present situation with Russia was more like the slide to WWI in 1914, or the failure to stand firm against Hitler that led to the next conflagration of WWII. The chilling answer was:

"No, this is Europe 2015. With nuclear weapons."

The situation has worsened.

Since 24 February 2022, Russia has further ramped up military spending and put its economy on a 'war footing'. It has also been strengthening economic and political ties with China, North Korea, and Iran, including through energy, armament, and technology-exchange agreements; and engaging in a systematic program of 'grey warfare' to undermine Western Europe politically, socially, and economically.

Meanwhile, China is becoming increasingly 'confrontational' and there is the crisis in Israel and the Middle East.

Today, with threats and stakes so high, Ukraine's importance extends far beyond country and region: **democracy itself is under attack, and Ukraine is the front line.**

History teaches many lessons. The cost of forgetting them can be great. This paper focusses on eight such lessons, underpinned by two overarching and fundamental conclusions:

- First, as in WWII, the fortunes of the countries on both sides of the Atlantic are inextricably linked: Europe's evolution is important to that of the US which, however much it might wish to, cannot insulate itself from the rest of the world.
- Second, parallels between where Ukraine stands to find itself once the war is over, and where Europe found itself after WWII, are close, after which enlightened policy, conducted in the self interest of all participating countries, worked well.

Lesson 1: Strong western economies are vital protectorates of the democratic way of life

The aftermath of war is a particularly dangerous time

At the end of WWII Europe was devastated. Years of bombing and conflict had destroyed infrastructure and killed or displaced millions of people. Demobilisation was set to release millions of soldiers into civilian life, into economies geared to the production of the materiel of war rather than the needs of peacetime.

Europe, from its Atlantic coast right across to Russia, faced two urgent and pressing needs:

- First, reconstruction and restructuring of its war-torn economies; and
- Second, putting in place policies and structures – political, military, and economic – to prevent such a conflict from happening again – something that had manifestly not been achieved after WWI.

Initially, the US sought to punish Germany by stripping it of its industrial capacity and force it into being a non-industrial economy. And it had a similar policy with respect to Japan. However, Russia became progressively more aggressive, and the US became increasingly concerned that it was seeking to dominate Europe. An East-West divide opened up. By 1946, as declared by UK Prime Minister Winston Churchill:

“An iron curtain” had “descended across the Continent”.²

By 1948 most countries in Eastern Europe, many of which had been independent, found themselves under the Soviet Union yoke or as satellite states aligned with the Soviet Union:

- The Baltic countries – Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania – part of Romania (modern day Moldova), Ukraine, Byelorussia (Belarus today), and Georgia were under Soviet rule.
- Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania became satellite states, with communist governments.
- Yugoslavia – a communist dictatorship under Marshal Tito – remained independent, notwithstanding great pressure from the Kremlin.

Meanwhile, economic adjustment in many Western countries was proving difficult and painful. Economic growth was hesitant and slow and there was significant political disillusionment. Communist parties were gaining a hold, often through democratic means. Italy in particular had a strong and influential communist party. And Germany and France too were perceived as at risk of going communist.

Relations between West and East deteriorated, marking the beginning of the Cold War between the Soviet Union and its former allies.

But the US had a forward-looking vision for a strong and united Europe

Amid increasing fears of a growing Soviet bloc and another war, the US changed policy tack, not least to safeguard its own interests. The US:

1. Spearheaded a containment policy to prevent the ideological and geographical spread of communism; and
2. Sought to rebuild Europe – including importantly Germany – so as to form a strong economic and democratic bulwark to face the power from the East.

“The main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies.”

(George F. Kennan, US diplomat, 1947)³

In turn, Western policymakers saw not just greater co-operation, but increased integration between Western nations, as the primary way to re-establish economic growth and prosperity, and thereby reduce the future likelihood of such conflicts.

The recovery and reconstruction of Western Europe was facilitated in large part by the Marshall Plan (officially the European Recovery Plan). Between 1948 and 1952, the US provided substantial material aid – over 5%-odd of US GDP.⁴ Much of this found its way back to US companies, because only the US had an intact economy that could supply much of what was being demanded.

Probably more important for the long run however, the US also provided the transfer of knowledge concerning the institutions and policies necessary to construct and operate a large modern economy. (For more see, Box: *European unity and prosperity – the foundations of sustained peace.*)

To this end, in 1948, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation⁵ (OEEC) was established, to: design the initial economic structures and policies; distribute the US aid to its then seventeen members; and to dispense governance and other technological know-how as they took their first steps towards creating a progressively more open and unified European economy.

Policy was successful, creating a strong Europe

The four years of the Marshall Plan itself saw the fastest period of growth in European history. The poverty and starvation of the immediate post-war years progressively disappeared; and the threat of communism sweeping Continental Europe receded.

Thereafter, Western Europe experienced an unprecedented two decades of sustained increases in living standards and social conditions, together with the sought-for political stability.

“...there developed in the reconstruction period an institutionalized pattern of economic interdependence in Western Europe which was a better basis for Western Europe’s economic and political existence than the comprehensive regulation by treaty of major political issues which was attempted after 1918 and which failed.”

(Alan Milward, historian, 1984)

Establishing the European Commission provided further impetus in a number of directions. The most important, in the minds of many, has been its active, determined, and basically successful policy of creating the single European market.

Today the European Union (EU) is the US’s biggest export market, accounting for just under 20% of US exports; and the EU is the origin of nearly 20% of US imports, approximately equal to China.⁶

Importantly, and largely unexpectedly, one of the greatest successes of the EU has been to be a powerful magnet for the smaller countries of the former Soviet Union, enabling them to become democratic, materially richer, and socially more stable than would have happened had there not been a modern and prosperous Europe to which to adhere.

In parallel with these developments on the economic policy front, the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) was signed. The treaty, or more specifically defence pact, was and continues to be today more than just a military alliance, and also promotes integration between national militaries, including through standardising materiel. It was formed by member parties determined:

“... to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of the peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.”

With a stated goal:

“ to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down.”

(Lord Ismay, first NATO Secretary General, 1949)

Box: European unity and prosperity – the foundations of sustained peace

European, unity and prosperity were seen as the essential foundations for sustained peace. French civil servant Jean Monnet in 1943:

“There will be no peace in Europe, if the states are reconstituted on the basis of national sovereignty ... The countries of Europe are too small to guarantee their peoples the necessary prosperity and social development. The European states must constitute themselves into a federation...”⁷

Not all Americans found the argument convincing, however. George Ball, an American diplomat at the time, questioned Monnet’s attitude to, and hopes for, a united Europe, asking:

“Was Monnet really right in believing that a change in institutions would cause men and women to conform their thoughts and actions to a new set of principles? Could allegiance to a united Europe someday play the same activating role that national sovereignty had played in the past?”⁸

The United Kingdom, although playing little direct part in the founding of the new united Europe, considered it important that unity in Europe be achieved. Its prime minister, Winston Churchill, was early in calling, in 1946, for ‘a kind of United States of Europe’, saying that:

“If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, to the prosperity and the glory ... its ... people would enjoy.”⁹

Robert Schuman, Prime Minister of France in 1948, initiator of many of Europe’s key institutions, the Schuman Declaration, and one of the founding fathers of the European Union, declared:¹⁰

“Our century that has witnessed the catastrophes resulting in the unending clash of nationalities and nationalisms, must attempt and succeed in reconciling nations in a supranational association.”¹¹

Lesson 2: Not doing ‘enough’ now will cost more later

Russia is again in expansionary mode

Russia’s military spending is today estimated to be around 16% of total government expenditure and 6% of its GDP, and the economy is on a ‘war footing’.¹² It is selling more oil and gas to China and India; obtaining war material from China, North Korea, and Iran; and entering into armaments and technology-exchange agreements with China¹³ and North Korea.¹⁴

Russia is also engaging in a systematic program of grey warfare to undermine Western Europe politically, socially, and economically.

China is in confrontation mode

Meanwhile China, while not necessarily so expansion-oriented, is certainly in confrontational mode:¹⁵ Not least, it has strengthened its ties with Russia, sending them semiconductors, unarmed drones, explosives, and other products.¹⁶ China also is buying substantial amounts of Russian oil.

“The warmth of Putin’s reception when he visited Beijing last week is testament to the enduring solidity of the China-Russia relationship.”

“The Xi-Putin bond remains strong because it is based on a common world view. Both are autocratic nationalists who see the US as the main threat.”

(Gideon Rachman, Financial Times, 20 May 2024)¹⁷

Meanwhile China’s intimidation and confrontation towards Taiwan and other nations continue, alongside troubles in the Middle East, both of which show no signs of resolution, and are at risk of severe escalation.

“Even as President Putin’s war continues, we will remain focused on the most serious long-term challenge to the international order — and that’s posed by the People’s Republic of China.”

(Anthony Blinken, US Secretary of State, May 2022)

An emboldened Russia brings more danger

Were Russia allowed to succeed in Ukraine it would likely, at a minimum:

1. Be emboldened, and thereby more dangerous.
2. Nibble, or more, at other neighbouring European states – potentially the Baltics, Poland, and Moldova. In May this year, the Kremlin released a draft decree that proposed revising its borders in the Baltic Sea around Russian islands in the Gulf of Finland and around the exclave of Kaliningrad. This draft decree was deleted just one day later, following Lithuania’s warnings that the Kremlin was aiming to intimidate its neighbours with a *“deliberate, targeted escalatory provocation”*.¹⁸
3. Be in a strengthened position vis-à-vis its *“Axis of Adversaries”* alliance with China, North Korea, and Iran.

The West is responding to the growing pressures

The growing pressures, including from the Middle East, are eliciting response from the West to confront such developments – lest the post-WWI mistakes be repeated. These include:

- In Europe, a fundamental reorientation of foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia – both in Germany, and in France, with President Macron going so far as to not rule out the use of European troops in Ukraine.
- Recognition of the need to continue providing aid, and to strengthen NATO – not least by European countries progressively raising the proportion of their countries' GDP spent on defence towards 2%.
- The US strengthening its defence cooperation ties with Japan, Australia, and its European allies, including through AUKUS, in order to help contain China.

Lesson 3: Ukraine has the potential to be a substantial bulwark against a resurgent Russia

Ukraine is resource rich ...

Just as the large, resource rich, countries of Western Europe became a powerful bulwark against Russian expansionism after WWII, so today Ukraine offers similar potential.

It has a well-educated, skilled labour force, and a strong industrial tradition.

It also has some of the most fertile soil in the whole of Europe, accounting (pre-war) for significant proportions of global supply, including *inter alia*:

- Barley 7%, buckwheat 6%, chicory roots 20%, gooseberries 10%, maize 3%, dry peas 5%, potatoes 6%, pumpkins 6%, rapeseed 4%, raspberries 4%, rye 5%, sour cherries 13%, sunflower seed 28%, sunflower seed oil 27%, wheat 4%.¹⁹

... mineral and energy rich

Ukraine also has important mineral reserves, including the largest assessed reserves of uranium in Europe; the second largest reserves of iron ore, titanium, and manganese; and it is a major source of fossil fuels, with the third largest reserves of shale gas.²⁰

It has 117 of 120 of the most widely-used minerals and metals, accounting for significant proportions of the world's production, including:

- Rutile 14.4%, titanium sponge 4.0%, bromine 1.0%, ilmenite 6.4%, magnesium 0.7%, graphite 1.8%, iron ore 2.6%, kaolin 4.2%, manganese ore 2.6%, pig iron 1.6%, peat 2.1%, bentonite 1.1%, silicon 0.7%, raw steel 1.1%, lime 0.5%, nitrogen 1.1%.²¹

... and was an important energy exporter to Europe

Also, until the war and the destruction of so much of its energy generation capability, Ukraine was an important energy exporter to Europe, and able to help particularly importantly at times of peak demand. But much of this capability is now under Russian control – already before the end of 2022 Russia had seized over 40 coal fields, nearly 30 natural gas sites, 14 propane sites, and 9 oil fields.²²

*“... denying Ukraine its own [natural resources] has strategically undermined the country's economy, forcing Kyiv to import coal to keep the lights on in cities and towns. Should the Kremlin succeed in annexing the Ukrainian territory it has seized ... Kyiv would permanently lose access to almost two-thirds of its deposits.”*²³

(Anthony Faiola and Dalton Bennett, The Washington Post, 2022)

“Russian occupation of Ukrainian territory has direct implications for Western energy security,”

(Robert Muggah, SecDev co-founder, 2022)²⁴

This potential could be reinstated quite quickly, however. It is striking, in retrospect, how much more quickly post-WWII development proceeded in, for example, Germany, France, and Italy than it did in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia – even though each of these latter three countries was well endowed with physical and human capital.

And most importantly perhaps, Ukraine wishes to be part of Europe.

Allied to the West these huge resources will be a substantial bulwark against a resurgent Russia and the axis of adversaries. Under the control of Russia, it would be a quite different story.

Lesson 4: Aiding Ukraine benefits donor economies

Aid provision has been huge ...

Without in any sense decrying the generosity of the US financial contribution to the Marshall Plan, much of the Marshall Plan money went back to the US – essentially because its economy was the only one capable of producing many of the products that were being demanded. Similarly today, and for the same reason, much of the military and financial aid to Ukraine finds its way back to donor economies.

Ukraine is currently the largest recipient of aid from the US, and indeed a larger recipient than any European country since the Marshall Plan.²⁵

To date, US Congress has approved \$175bn of aid to Ukraine through five bills, the largest of which was \$61.3bn in April 2023.^{26,27}

Europe and the EU, as of the end of February, had allocated 90bn euros in aid for military, humanitarian, and financial support.²⁸

... benefitting Ukraine and donor economies

Of the US's \$175bn, \$107bn directly supports the Ukraine government. Most of the remainder funds US activities associated with the war, while a small portion supports countries near Ukraine.²⁹ Estimates suggest that of the funding supplied by the US to the end of March this year, over 60% of it has "*stayed within US companies*".³⁰

As European countries ramp up their military production capacity and military aid to Ukraine, they will have a similar experience. Moreover, in contrast to the immediate post-WWII period, Europe has the capacity and ability to provide a full range of 'civilian' materiel, and technical assistance of all forms through the EU.

"... there is no silver bullet."

(National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan, April 2024.)³¹

Lesson 5: It is imperative to 'keep the lights on'

Were the electricity system to fail, consequences would be catastrophic

Important though a continued stream of war material and related help is, it is equally important to maintain the electricity supply and 'keep the lights on': national infrastructure, public services, and industry need to continue to function.

Were the supply of electricity to fail, water supply, sewerage, heating, telecoms, banking, transport, refrigeration, and more – would come to a standstill; Ukraine's public and private sector providers would no longer be able to operate, its industry would no longer be able to provide materiel for the war; and the armed forces, which depend on electricity in the field, would be weakened to the point of not being able to function: the war could be lost.

Most fundamentally, the human cost would be immense: everyday life would become intolerable and unsustainable, public unity would likely collapse, and determination to continue to stand up to the invader would disintegrate.

Ukraine's energy system is severely damaged and being continually targeted

Since October last year, Russia has launched thousands of missiles and drones with the aim of destroying Ukraine's energy sector – not only its electricity generators, but also the grid and the supply chain for electrical equipment.

Heavy bombardment has massively reduced Ukraine's electricity generation capacity, forcing the introduction of rolling energy system blackouts.

Power needs to be treated as ammunition

The problem has become so serious that maintenance of the power system warrants being put on a 'war footing' – treating 'power as ammunition'. This could well be a role for NATO, or the delivery and coordinating organisation European Network of Transmission Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E).

"The destruction since March is worse than anything we've seen since the full-scale invasion ... russia has wiped out 90% of the company's thermal power generation capacity."

"I'm confident we can overcome these attacks. We have a clear plan and our teams on the ground are working around the clock ...

... now we need our friends and allies to step up with equipment and funding to do this before winter, along with the air defences to stop this happening all over again."

(Maxim Timchenko CEO of DTEK, which supplies 20% of Ukraine's electricity, May 2024)

Lesson 6: An effective grey warfare strategy is essential

“That limbo land between peace and war.”³²

(Ben Wallace, British Defence Secretary, 2023)

The means to enact grey zone warfare have proliferated

The concept of state-directed adversarial activities being conducted in times of ostensible peace is not new. For centuries, nations have sought to achieve advantage at the expense of other nations, and to counter threats posed to their own interests. That includes being prepared, as a last resort, to wage war.

But the globalisation of trade and capital markets, technology, and the proliferation of the internet and social media are multiplying opportunities to operate in such adversarial fashions.

China has an unofficial manual for waging non-military ‘war’

Unrestricted Warfare – China’s Master Plan to Destroy America,³³ published in 1998, is effectively a manual for waging a form of war, in peacetime, that avoids direct conflict but makes extensive use of non-military means. As the preface to the US version of the book states:

“When people begin to lean forward and rejoice in the reduced use of military forces to resolve conflicts, war will be reborn in another form and in another arena, becoming an instrument of enormous power in the hands of all those who harbour intentions of controlling other countries or regions ...

In this sense, there is reason for us to maintain that the financial attack by George Soros on East Asia ... and the havoc wreaked by the likes of Morris Jr on the Internet ... represent semi-warfare, quasi-warfare and sub-warfare, that is the embryonic form of another kind of warfare.”³⁴

Twenty-five years after the book’s publication the ‘embryonic form of another kind of warfare’ referred to has taken shape. The slow but inexorable assault on Western values, societies, economies, and institutions by competitor nations who are using many of the techniques of what the authors call ‘beyond limits’ or ‘unrestricted’ warfare³⁵ in the so-called grey zone is well underway.³⁶

No realms – political, economic, or social – are immune from being targeted

Hitherto, thinking about warfare and national security has been largely the preserve of the military, intelligence, and security community. However, that is no longer the case. Threats are temporal and often indirect, more ‘creeping crisis’ than immediate shock, with no realms – political, economic, or social – immune from being targeted.

“Social spaces, a particular vulnerability for nations where freedom of the individual and transparency are seen as the ‘backbone’ of democracy, have become battlegrounds.”

(Lt General (Rtd) Sir Andrew Graham CB CBE, 2024)

As a more multi-polar world continues to gather pace, autocracy and nationalism are resurging, and the post-WWII order is being challenged. Security thinking and action has become everyone’s business: corporates and society, along with government, have a part to play today in countering such activity.

Poly-dimensional resilience will be essential

Competing effectively in the grey zone, whether to attack or to defend requires that states engender and deploy multiple state and non-state entities in a resolute, coordinated, risk

based, and synchronised manner. The strategic need becomes to build the organisational, technical, economic, security, and societal resilience to deter and defend against a barrage of attacks – and then to recover quickly.

The ability of a state or organisation to sift from a plethora of seemingly innocuous and unconnected activities in one or all of the (political, social, economic, security, information, or infrastructure) pillars of society – those that veer into the grey zone – where the motive is not cooperation but gaining of strategic advantage, and to deal effectively with the threat, depends on:

1. **Resolute leadership.** The resolve of leaders, governments, and society to act firmly and decisively, and potentially politically unpalatably, not only in the immediate crisis but over the long term.
2. **Acuity of vision,** to scan widely and identify direct and indirect connections and risks, vulnerabilities, and indicators.
3. **Risk identification,** assessment, management, and mitigation systems that are independent, honest, and comprehensive.
4. **Determined resistance,** both to pre-empt, deter, and prevent risk crystallising; and to mitigate the impact of an event or crisis should initial resistance fail.
5. **Effectiveness of its immediate and cumulative response** and reaction, once engaged.

Effective, systematic, and integrated resistance, response, and reaction both lay the foundation for, and reduce the burden of, recovery.

The ability to recover from a setback or crisis is itself the essence of resilience.

Lesson 7: A comprehensive long-term plan is a near-term imperative

Being ready for when the war ends needs to start now ...

The willingness of Western countries to continue to deliver financial assistance will be influenced at least in part by their being confident that, once the war ends, Ukraine will have in place, and will implement, a credible plan for its future.

It may seem early to be thinking in such terms. But it is noteworthy that more than a year in advance of WWII ending, the US and its allies met at the Bretton Woods conference in July 1944, to agree on a post-war institutional structure that would be capable of ensuring the rebuilding of war-shattered countries and ensuring their return to economic prosperity.

When the Ukraine war ends, the requisite capital, both public and private, will doubtless be made conditional throughout on Ukraine's government pursuing sound policies and, where necessary, reform. It is noteworthy that Marshall Plan disbursements were conditional on European recipient countries making progress in a range of areas, including dismantling trade barriers between them.

Thus, Ukraine needs a long-term plan.

... with its elements comprehensive, long-term, and joined-up ...

The plan needs to be comprehensive. It must include not only keeping the aid going, the electricity supply running, the private and public sectors enabled, and effective grey-zone action: in addition, it needs also to satisfy a range of criteria, underpinned by strong institutions, in respect of:

- Democracy, with free and fair elections and the upholding and promotion of a democratic culture and accountability to the public.
- Human rights, with a commitment to protect and promote civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights.
- Rule of law, including an independent, impartial, honest, and competent judiciary to protect both individual and property rights.
- Good governance, ensuring transparency and the rooting out of corruption.
- A stable monetary and financial system, with a freely convertible currency, capable of providing low inflation while supporting economic growth. This will have to include dismantling, progressively, the present system of currency controls, which are an imperative in times of war. But the longer such controls are in place, the more complications mount.³⁷
- An open trading system, providing engagement with world markets.

... that is worthy enough to protect the increasingly fragile democratic way of life

Authors

Preston Llewellyn and Dr John Llewellyn

With substantial contribution from Michael Roberts

Endnotes

¹ At his confirmation hearing, in 2015, following Russia's annexation of Crimea in February 2014.

² 'Sinews of Peace' speech, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, 1946.

³ From 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct' (1947), George F. Kennan, US diplomat.

⁴ This was in addition to the aid the US gave to Europe from the end of the war to the beginning of the Plan.

⁵ Now the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

⁶ In 2022, 17% of US exports were to the EU,⁶ and in 2021, 17% of US imports came from the EU.

<https://ustr.gov/countries-regions/europe-middle-east/europe/european-union> and
<https://www.bis.doc.gov/index.php/documents/technology-evaluation/ote-data-portal/3015-2021-statistical-analysis-of-u-s-trade-with-european-union-countries/file>

⁷ In a meeting of the 'Victory Programme' in Washington D.C., 1943.

⁸ Marjolin, R. (1989).

⁹ Winston Churchill, during his speech to the Academic Youth, University of Zurich, 1946.

¹⁰ He received the title 'Father of Europe' from the European Parliament, of which he was also president 1958 to 1960.

¹¹ (Robert Schuman, Strasbourg, 1949.)

¹² <https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2024/global-military-spending-surges-amid-war-rising-tensions-and-insecurity>

¹³ <https://foreignpolicy.com/2024/04/30/russia-china-partnership-trade-relations/>

¹⁴ <https://www.iiss.org/publications/strategic-comments/2023/the-surge-of-activity-in-relations-between-north-korea-and-russia/>

¹⁵ <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/05/26/blinken-biden-china-policy-speech-00035385>

¹⁶ For more, see [No Substitute for Victory: America's Competition With China Must Be Won, Not Managed \(foreignaffairs.com\)](https://www.foreignaffairs.com)

¹⁷ *The relationship between Xi and Putin is built to last*, Gideon Rachman, Financial Times, 20 May 2024.
<https://on.ft.com/3UQnfOj>

¹⁸ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c6ppl5v1lwzo>

¹⁹ <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#country/230>

²⁰ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/08/10/ukraine-russia-energy-mineral-wealth/>

²¹ <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ukraines-mineral-wealth-global-markets-the-secdev-group/>

²² <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/08/10/ukraine-russia-energy-mineral-wealth/>

²³ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/08/10/ukraine-russia-energy-mineral-wealth/>

²⁴ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/08/10/ukraine-russia-energy-mineral-wealth/>

²⁵ <https://www.cfr.org/article/how-much-us-aid-going-ukraine>

²⁶ <https://www.cfr.org/article/how-much-us-aid-going-ukraine>

²⁷ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-68848277>

²⁸ <https://www.ifw-kiel.de/topics/war-against-ukraine/ukraine-support-tracker/>

²⁹ <https://www.cfr.org/article/how-much-us-aid-going-ukraine>

³⁰ <https://www.cnbc.com/video/2024/04/10/ukraine-funding-battle-kicks-off.html>

³¹ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-68893196>

From BBC article Ukraine war: Kyiv uses longer-range US missiles for first time. Accessed 26 April 2024

Briefing reporters on Wednesday, the state department spokesman confirmed that the provision of the longer-range ATACMS had been "at the president's direct direction".

The US "did not announce this at the onset in order to maintain operational security for Ukraine at their request", Vedant Patel explained.

It is not clear how many of the weapons have already been sent, but US National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan said Washington planned to send more. "They will make a difference. But as I've said before at this podium... there is no silver bullet," he said.

³² What British Defence Secretary Ben Wallace has called "that limbo land between peace and war". His resignation letter of 31 August 2023 adds: "I genuinely believe that over the next decade the world will get more insecure and more unstable".

³³ Unrestricted Warfare - *China's Master Plan to Destroy America*. Qiao Lang and Wang Xiangsui. Shadow Lawn Press. 2017. First published in China by the PLA in 1998. The book is not a work of contemporary fiction or conjecture. It was written by two senior colonels from the younger generation of Chinese military officers and arguably sets the scene for the second and third decades of the 21st Century when President Xi is consolidating his power.

³⁴ The Morris worm of 2 November 1988 was the first computer worm to gain mainstream media attention. It resulted in the first felony conviction under the 1986 Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (US).

³⁵ "In terms of beyond-limits warfare there is no longer any distinction between what is or not a battlefield. Spaces in nature including the ground, the seas, the air, and outer space are battlefields, but social spaces such as the military, politics, economics, culture, and the psyche are also battlefields.... And the technological space linking these two great spaces is even more so the battlefield over which antagonists spare no effort in contending. Warfare can be military, or it can be quasi-military, or it can be non-military. It can use violence, or it can be non-violent." Unrestricted Warfare *China's Master Plan to Destroy America*. Qiao Lang and Wang Xiangsui. Shadow Lawn Press. 2017.

³⁶ [Clementine G. Starling](#) is the deputy director of the Forward Defense practice and a resident fellow in the Transatlantic Security Initiative. "The grey zone describes a set of activities that occur between peace (or cooperation) and war (or armed conflict). A multitude of activities fall into this murky in-between—from nefarious economic activities, influence operations, and cyberattacks to mercenary operations, assassinations, and disinformation campaigns. Generally, grey-zone activities are considered gradualist campaigns by state and non-state actors that combine non-military and quasi-military tools and fall below the threshold of armed conflict. They aim to thwart, destabilize, weaken, or attack an adversary, and they are often tailored toward the vulnerabilities of the target state. While grey-zone activities are nothing new, the onset of new technologies has provided states with more tools to operate and avoid clear categorization, attribution, and detection—all of which complicates the (United States' and its allies') ability to respond".

³⁷ Exchange control is sometimes used as an active instrument of public policy. For example, after the Great Depression of the 1930s a number of countries – Australia, New Zealand, and Brazil were three – took the political decision to industrialise their economies. Imports of products that could potentially be produced domestically were disallowed, and this was enforced through a mixture of currency controls and import controls. In the case of these three economies, as well as many others, these actions materially shaped their economic structure, in some cases for many decades.