

# Review of: "The Russian Invasion of Ukraine in the United States National Security Strategy: A Geopolitical Approach From Neoclassical Realism"

Ihor Hurnyak<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The influence of physical geography in the 21st century does not seem to be a completely adequate approach. Some researchers believe that Putin's goal in the war with Ukraine is precisely to gain positions on the Black and Azov seas. At the same time, only a good doctor can explain the meaning of a state without modern technologies, a whole spectrum of economic sectors (most goods on the market are imports), and communities infrastructure at the level of 1960s in the acquisition of additional territories.

The successful import of technologies, more generally, knowledge, institutions, and skilled labor can hardly be overcome by new territories and access to the sea. As a result, extremely expensive Russian ships are destroyed by three or four cheap Ukrainian drones. As you can see, technology prevails. A third of the Russian fleet was destroyed by a state that has no ships at all.

"The new economy is not an appearance once an invention or an innovative "breakthrough," but rather the result of processing the current economy, in a quasi-continuity of physical and human-dominated by knowledge and globally." For example, Gâf-Deac (2017) posed a desirable trend for humanity in transitioning to a new economy **oriented on intangible assets**.

Good article to read about this:

*Gâf-Deac, I. (2017). Transition to New Intangible Resource-Based Econom. Noble International Journal of Business and Management, 1(1), 1-4. <https://napublisher.org/pdf-files/NIJBMR-454-1-4.pdf>*

*This conclusion is confirmed, for example, on the basis of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and, obviously, Norway.*

I would like to draw the author's attention to the fact that the success of the US economy in the interwar and postwar period was largely caused by the import (let me to use this not wholly adequate word) of skilled labor from Europe. In particular, what is very interesting, the famous American (!) economists Mises and Schumpeter came from Ukraine (the cities of L'viv and Chernivtsi), Tesla from Croatia, and many scientists - refugees in general from the territory of the current EU. This especially applies to the space industry. The possession OR import of knowledge and technology cannot in any case be even compared with the significantly smaller influence of geographical position. Although this approach is interesting for analysis, it seems completely outdated. Technology essentially destroyed it.

1. Accordingly, it is more appropriate to give an answer to the question: *which geographic region is more important for the interests of the United States in view of the map of innovation and educational centers, and modern scientific (not only) institutions.*
2. The modern economy once again proves that in the absence of market institutions, every economic indicator eventually loses its position. Joseph Stiglitz describes these phenomena very well on the basis of GDP per capita, mentioning first of all the role of institutions and national specific. If there is no adequate protection of property, the judicial system does not work adequately, and the banking system and stock market stay in the hands of the government, sooner or later problems will begin in such a system. This is what the Post-Washington opinion says after all. And I'm talking about China.
3. The period of stability of the Chinese system is over, and the collapse of the real estate market is only the first sign of the acceleration of this process. China cannot compete with modern America. A good demonstration of such institutional collapse is the auditing problems of Chinese companies. The essence of the problem here lies not only in the possible capital participation of the state, but above all in the inconsistency of the façade with the volume behind it. The Chinese Corporate Credit System is also something very far from the usual American or European vision of freedom. At that time, China will be able to do this with an America of *geographical isolationism*, which will distance the USA from the unimpeded exchange of technologies and institutions (first of all) with Europe.
4. It's hard to get the "cordial relations" with Russia. Let me look at this phrase as a big joke.
5. Let's look again at American interests through the lens of economics. Russian business has been squeezed out of Europe. What this means for American companies is very well demonstrated by the example of Exxon Mobil Corporation, Chevron Corporation, ... and others. Let's not forget the interests of the arms manufacturers, who have always, paradoxically, been sponsors of the Republican Party. As we can see, "sincere relations" with Russia are not in the economic interests of the United States. Maybe someone else in Europe wants to become Russia's new gas hub, but this is not about America. So far, such estimates can be made on the basis of statistics of individual companies or industries. At the same time, the general trend is already evident today based on the research of market leaders.
6. If the author makes certain evaluative judgments about the Korean conflict, then perhaps it is worth evaluating the feasibility of such a decision from the point of view of:
  - the presence of a permanent nuclear threat in the region,
  - the presence of a country in the world that has no other goods except weapons, drugs, and slaves,
  - a constant threat of invasion for a neighboring country,
  - the sources of military support for any other totalitarian regime in the world.
 The author proposes to do something similar in the territory of Ukraine. I wonder how the CEE should react to this?
1. It seems that your article should be considered as a good **scientific provocation**, for which I thank you. In this case, my rating would be 5 greens. But I don't feel in the text that you intended that.

