

Conflict and Wars in International Political System: Russia and Ukraine

Samson Akpati Nzeribe

Department of International Relations, Gregory University, Uтуру.

Phone no, 234-7066025461,

email: samson.nzeribe@yahoo.com, s.nzeribe@gregoryuniversityuturu.edu.ng

Abstract: *The International Political System since the beginning of the 20th century has been bedeviled by conflicts and wars. There have been two global wars, 1st and 2nd world wars, the Vietnam war, the war in Afghanistan, the Arab- Israeli war, the cold war, desert storm, the Iraqi war, the Libyan war, the Syrian war and other numerous conflicts that space and time might not permit to dwell on here. However, in all these, the Russian-Ukraine conflict, an on-going conflict stands out in the world today. It stands out because of its genesis; the world saw it coming and pretended that it will never come to be and that the consequences could be ignored. From the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in the late 1990s, Russia that emerged in the place of the former, has never hidden it's distrust of United States of America and it's NATO allies. Russia vehemently continuously opposed NATO's expansionist incursion into Eastern Europe more especially into the former Soviet bloc but their protests were ignored by the United States of America and NATO. This paper x-rays this conflict using the secondary data and trending analysis to unravel the genesis and motives of the principal actors, NATO, Russia and Ukraine. Theories of the causes of war in the International Political System are analyzed and attempts to predict the likely scenario that will emerge at the end made. Of-course, the geopolitics of the International Political System will never be the same again. At the end recommendations are made, that if adhered to, will usher in relative peace to the international political arena.*

Keywords: cold war, conflict, hegemony, expansion, security, invasion, NATO, Russia, USA. :

INTRODUCTION

The International community heaved a sigh of relief when in the year 1989 the Soviet Union under the leadership of Mikhail Sergevich Gorbachev decided to let go of East Germany and the whole of Eastern Europe to choose their political orientation themselves.

The symbolism of this was the fall of Berlin wall. Prior to that moment since the end of the WWII in the year 1945, Berlin has been a city occupied by forces, the United States of America in the western part of the city while the Soviets took charge of the eastern axis. It so existed like that till the erection of the Berlin wall in 1961, thus it was a city divided into two, East and West Berlin. The walling of Berlin into two by the year 1961 symbolized the cold war, and pulling down that same wall in 1989 equally symbolized the end of that same cold war, Nzeribe, 2017. The then, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics decided to let go of the countries that made up 'The Warsaw Pact', a military alliance of the allies of the USSR, made up of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Romania, the opposite the 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization; . While this was going on, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) who stood to benefit from this event and scenario allegedly gave its word to the leaders of the USSR that NATO will not expand eastwards. The 'self-destruction' of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, USSR and the Warsaw Pact by the leadership of Mikhail Sergevich Gorbachev took everyone unaware, researchers, analysts, critiques and even Sovietologists. Nobody saw it coming. This event was expected to usher in an era of peace and cooperation in the international political system/arena. Nzeribe, 2017. Did that happen and for how long? To answer this question, a little trip down history lane is necessary.

After the WWII, the world found itself in a bipolar situation where United States of America (U.S.A) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R) became the two most powerful nations at opposite poles after liberating Europe and the rest of the affected world from Nazi Germany. The Soviet Union held sway in Eastern Europe while America reigned supreme in Western Europe. It was Capitalism/Market Economy versus Communism/Socialist-command Economy. This was exactly how the international political situation was in the 1980s when Mikhail Sergevich Gorbachev assumed power as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the year 1985. Uppermost in his mind was how to modernize the Soviet political and economic way of life, reduce bureaucratic bottlenecks and open up the secrecy with which the place was shrouded in. But more was his desire to reduce the international tension and mutual distrust between the east and the west (Oberdolov, 1991 in Nzeribe, 2017). To achieve these objectives, he realized that the Soviet Union was being encumbered with loads it could no longer carry. Soviet sphere of influence the world over has to go, he concluded. This article exposes the extent these Gorbachev's lofty ideas were realizable, how naïve he was in assuming that the west could be trusted in any deal of such magnitude. Either by accident or design, Gorbachev is the only President in living memory that embarked on such gigantic project without obtaining concrete promises and guarantees in form of rewards or incentives for the Soviet Union. In the study of the history of empires and nation building, no empire has ever self-destructed without extracting favorable terms and conditions from the direct beneficiaries of that singular act. But in this particular instance, an event all the scholars, observers and analysts of international affairs never saw coming and never

predicted. Mikhail Gorbachev single handedly dismantled the WARSAW PACT for NATO, released and gave independence to East Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Albania most importantly the Berlin wall came down peacefully. From the then President of United States Ronald Reagan, in whose tenure the Berlin wall came down, “this was a time of relative cooperation and understanding between the Western alliance and Soviet Union.”

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Review

Conceptually, the term conflict in International Relations refers to armed conflict/ violence. For a conflict to graduate to war, it must have caused for instance a minimum of a thousand battle deaths. Levy, Jack S, 1985. Many different activities are covered by the general term ‘war’ therefore it is difficult to say how many wars are ongoing at each particular time, though one or two may be more prominent than others, a good example is the Russian/ Ukrainian conflict at the moment. Wars are diverse and arise from different situations. They play different roles in bargaining over conflicts. Scholars have been able to document different categories of war as follows.

1. Hegemonic war is one with the objective of controlling the entire world order, the rules of the international system as a whole, including the role of world hegemony. (Hegemony pp,153). This type with variations in definition and conception is also known as world war, global war, general war or systemic war. The last of this type of war was the World War II (1939-1945). Analysts are predicting the next one to come the Russian/ Ukrainian conflict.
2. Total War is warfare by one state waged to conquer and occupy another. The goal is to reach the capital city and force the surrender of the government, which can then be replaced with one of the victor’s choosing. Examples include US/ NATO vs Iraq (2003), US/ NATO vs Libya.
3. Limited War includes military actions carried out to gain some objectives short of the surrender and occupation of the enemy. A very good example is the US led war against Iraq in the year 1991 which retook the territory of Kuwait but did not go up to Baghdad to topple Saddam Hussein’s government then. A state may equally stop short and defend its gains, as Russia did in the year 2008 after expelling Georgian troops from disputed Georgian provinces. There are some other types of war like Civil war, Raids, Guerrilla and Insurgency.

Another very important aspect of the International Political System that needs to be understood by followers of events of the system is the analysis of the Theories of the Causes of War. Nearly 2,000 years ago, the Roman writer Seneca said “Of war men ask the outcome, not the cause”. This is not true of political scientists; they want to know why countries fight. Political scientists favor the search for general explanations on why wars break out. From their perspective, the World War I was caused by shifts in the balance of power among European states with the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 being a catalyst. Therefore, trying to organize the use of theories to understand why wars break out as offered by political scientists reminds us that the most important events in International Relations have multiple causes at different levels of analysis which include:

- a) *The Individual Level Theory*: On this level of analysis, theories about war center on rationality. One theory consistent with realism holds that the use of war and other violent means of leverage in international conflicts is normal and reflects rational decisions of national leaders. “wars begin with conscious and reasoned decisions based on the calculation, made by both parties, that they can achieve more by going to war than by remaining at peace. An opposite theory holds that conflicts often escalate to war because of deviations from rationality in the individual decision process of national leaders. That is to say that Joe Biden, President of the United States of America, the apex decision maker of NATO, Vladimir Putin, President of the Russian Federation and of course, President Zelensky of Ukraine should be held accountable for what is happening in Ukraine now.
- b) *The Domestic Level Theory*: This draws attention to the characteristics of states or societies that may make them more or less prone to use violence in resolving conflicts. During the Cold War, Marxists frequently said that the aggressive and greedy capitalist states were prone to use violence in international conflicts, whereas Western leaders claimed that the expansionist, ideological, and totalitarian nature of communist states made them especially prone to using violence, but truth be told, both sides have fought wars regularly.
- c) *The Interstate Level Theory*: Theories at the interstate level theory explain wars in terms of power relations amongst major actors in the international system. For example, power transition theory holds that conflicts generate large wars at times when power is relatively equally distributed and a rising power is threatening to overtake a declining hegemon in overall position. This very theory could be situated in the international political system as it is now, with China and Russia threatening to unseat the United States as the sole hegemon. At this level competing theories exist that seem incompatible. Deterrence is supposed to stop wars by building up power and threatening its use, but the theory of arms races hold that wars are caused, and not prevented by such actions.
- d) *The Global Level Theory*: At the global level of analysis, a number of theories have been proposed. Of the several variations is the idea that major warfare on the international system is cyclical, one approach links large wars with large economic waves (also called Kondratieff cycle) in the world economy of about 50 years duration.. Another approach links the largest

wars with a 100 year cycle based on the creation and decay of world orders (Hegemon, pp 57-60), These cycle theories can at best explain only general tendencies towards war in the international system over time. In as much as the ‘long cycle theory’ of George Modelski could fit very well into this work.

Theoretically, it has become more appropriate to approach this theoretical aspect of this paper through issues raised from ‘Real Politik’ because it embraces Realism as an explanatory framework because of its emphasizes on power and national interests and in this case, great power politics of the super powers. In his opinion (Waltz, 1979) believes that the International System is characterized by anarchy, i.e. the absence of a central authority to regulate it. Since states are sovereign and autonomous from each other, there is no inherent structure or authority to order relations between them. Hans Morgenthau in his famous book, ‘Politics among Nations’ put national interest first in pursuit of foreign policy of nations (Morgenthau, 2014). Here, state power constitutes the variable of interest because only through it can states defend themselves and hope to survive. Realism understands power in a number of ways such as militarily, economically, diplomatically and ultimately emphasizes the distribution of coercive material capacity as the determinant of international politics.

These attributes of power rests on about four assumptions according to (Mearsheimer, 1994). First, Realists believe that survival is the major goal of every state. Foreign invasion and occupation are the most pressing threats that any state faces. The anarchy of the international system dictates that states constantly ensure that they have sufficient power to defend themselves and advance their national interests needed for survival. Secondly Realists hold states to be rational actors. This means that given the goal of survival, they will act as best they can to maximize their likelihood of continuous existence. Thirdly, Realists assume that all states possess some military capacity, and that no state knows what its neighbor intends precisely. The world to the Realists is in order words dangerous and unpredictable. Fourthly, in this type of scenario, it is the great powers, states with the most economic clout and, especially military might, that are decisive. This is where International System is essentially a story of great power politics (Morgenthau, 1978).

According to (Mearsheimer,2001), Offensive Realists maintain that in order to ensure their survival, states will seek to maximize their power relative to others. If rival states possess enough power to threaten each other, it can never be safe. Thus, hegemony is the proper and best strategy to pursue (Keohane, 1984). Defensive Realists on the other hand believe that domination is an unwise strategy for state to pursue for survival (Waltz, 1979). They point out that seeking hegemony may bring a state into dangerous conflict with its peers. This explanation aptly describes the relation between the American led western alliance and the new Russia of today. The Defensive Realists emphasize balance of power system, where a roughly equal distribution of power among the great powers is the key to stability. Because Realists hardly pay attention to international law and international institutions, they believe the states can create them and enforce the rules they codify. However it is not those rules themselves that determine how and why a state acts in a particular way, but the underlying political, material interests and power relations. This has left no one in doubt that the Realist theory succinctly aids our understanding of the Post-Cold War relation between the West as led by the United States and Russia. Nzeribe, 2017.

In the late 1980s, all the states of Eastern Europe took advantage of the relaxation of Soviet control under Mikhail Gorbachev and began to break away from communist rule. The relationship between the U.S. and the USSR greatly improved in the final years of the USSR . On 3 December 1989, Gorbachev and the U.S. President George H. W. Bush declared the Cold War over at the Malta Summit (Graebner, Richard, Joseph, 2008). It was their second meeting following a meeting that included Ronald Reagan in New York in December 1988. This summit was declared the most important since 1945, when British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, Soviet Premier, Joseph Stalin and US President F.D. Roosevelt agreed on post war plan for Europe at Yalta (Fenby, J. 2015). On 25 December 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved and the Common Wealth of Independent States, a loose association of the former USSR’s constituent republics was formed. The USSR’s Russia Soviet Federative Socialist Republic became an independent state that inherited the USSR’s UN Security Council permanent membership and declared itself the successor state to the USSR. Relations between Russia and the U.S. remained generally warm under Russia’s President Boris Yeltsin and the U.S. Bill Clinton’s administration in the 1990s.

When in 1989 the Berlin wall came down without Moscow trying as much as raising a finger to stop it, the Eastern European countries under Moscow’s influence could not believe their luck. So one after the other they took their fate in their own hands by sacking the governments that has been in power during the Soviet dominion. The Germans quickly united their country by integrating the eastern part back into the western part and a united Germany emerged for the first time since after the WWII. Starting from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and even Yugoslavia, all renounced their previous communist ties to Moscow. In some instances these changes were violent even to the loss of lives of previous leaders loyal to Moscow but Moscow refused to intervene in all these, calling it internal affairs of the nations concerned. While all these revolutions were going on, America and the western alliance taken by surprise were clapping and urging Gorbachev on. One should have thought that after this events Moscow should have been rewarded with more trust from the western alliance. Inside the Soviet Union itself, in the early 2000, Gorbachev lost out in a power game after a failed military attempt to revert to the old ways of doing things, Boris Yeltsin, President of the Russian

Federation, himself a reformer decided with other leaders of the federating units of Ukraine, Belorussia, Azerbajhan to dissolve the Soviet Union. Russia assumed responsibility for all obligations of the former Soviet Union after the breakup. But soon after Boris Yeltsin left power and a younger and more exposed Vladimir Putin came to power in 2004 through a democratic election, the once cordial relationship started deteriorating. So, what went wrong? According to Jonathan Marcus in a paper "Russia and the West, Where did it all go wrong"? Published in CASA, quoting Paul R. Pillar. The relationship went wrong when the West did not treat Russia as a nation that had shaken off Soviet Communism," he said. "It should have been welcomed as such into a new community of nations - but instead it was regarded as the successor state of the USSR, inheriting its status as the principal focus of Western distrust (Jonathan, M. 2010). It means that despite the Soviets' openness and trust in dealing with the West, the West never trusted and accepted that Russia made sacrifices by unilaterally dismantling the WARSAW PACT and Soviet Union. It is this lack of trust that fuelled the West's ambition to expand NATO eastwards into countries like Bulgaria, Czech, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. It did not end there.

The West in its irrationality went further to attempt to admit Georgia and Ukraine into NATO. Don't forget that Georgia, Ukraine and the three Baltic states were part of the former Soviet Union and that the West gave their word to Soviet Union then that NATO will not expand eastward, not to talk of entering inside their immediate sphere of influence. In view of this, Russia feels that it has been so unfairly treated since the end of the cold war. Russia feels betrayed by the American led Western alliance. This, of course, is not the conventional view in the West, which prefers to focus on Russian "revanchism" - a stance personified by Vladimir Putin, a man who has described the collapse of the Soviet Union as "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe" of the 20th century. (13th Valdai Disc. club. 2016) They see an attempt by Putin to rebuild and reconstruct the former Soviet Union and its glory (Mearsheimer, 2016). He went ahead to say that the Russians have understood that the West does not want any foreign policy coming out of Moscow. Is it possible that America and the West want to dictate Moscow's foreign policy, how realistic are they? There is an interesting debate going on among US think- tank experts, as to which camp is right. Should one focus on the initial strategic errors of the West in dealing with the new Russia, or look at Moscow's more recent assertive behaviour in Georgia, Syria or Ukraine?. In an interview with the BBC, Sir. John Sawers, a former head of M16 said that the West has not really strived to build a lasting strategic relationship with Russia.

If there was a clear understanding between Washington and Moscow about the rules of the road - that we are not trying to bring down each other's systems - then solving regional problems like Syria or Ukraine or North Korea - which is coming rapidly down the path towards us - would be easier. (John, S. BBC, 2016)

In that same interview, Sir John went ahead to say that the West should not look for a rosier or frostier relationship with Russia, he opines.

What we are looking for is a strategic understanding with Moscow about how we provide for global stability, for stability across Europe between Russia and the US, so that the fundamental stability of the world is put on a firmer basis than it has been. (John, S. BBC, 2016)

So where did it all go wrong? Why were Russia and the West unable to forge a different type of relationship? Who is to blame? Was it US over-reach and insensitivity, or Russia's nostalgia for Soviet greatness? Why have things now got so bad and is it correct to describe the present state of affairs as a "new Cold War"? In short, Russia tends to believe that it has been treated unfairly since the end of the cold war. This, of course, is not the conventional view in the West as pointed out earlier. Some of the visible sore points in the relationship between the Western alliance and Russia includes but not limited to the following.

The New War in Ukraine

It is not the intention of this paper to lump together the first Ukrainian war of 2014 with the present on-going war of 2022. The war in Ukraine is the most dangerous international conflict since the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. Understanding its root causes is essential if we are to prevent it from getting worse and, instead, to find a way to bring it to an end, (John Mearsheimer "On why the West is responsible for the Ukrainian Crisis"). Though genesis and causes are same but eight good years has passed since then. After the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the breakout of hostilities in Eastern Ukraine, wisdom and rational thinking, attributes really lacking in NATO and America's dictionary as far as Russia and Ukraine are concerned, should have seen a soft pedaling or even a turn-about approach in their dealing with Moscow. But because America and NATO (the globalists) have concluded that Ukraine will serve as the spring board for the start of the WORLD WAR III, they continued in their provocation of Russia as if nothing happened. In 2014, Jacques Attali, the mastermind behind the Great Reset, predicted on French television that World War III will start with Ukraine. That same year former French President Nicolas Sarkozy who Attali helped mold, warned,

"We would proceed together toward a new world order, and nobody, and I do mean nobody, will be able to oppose it"(retr, http://opr.news/50285c4220317en_ng?link=1&client=news)

In the year 1997, Joe Biden, President of the United States of America, then Vice President to President Barrack Obama had this to say, *“the only thing that could provoke a vigorous and hostile Russian response would be if NATO expanded as far as the Baltic states”* (C-SPAN).

This paper will further buttress the point that what is ongoing in Ukraine right now has been, planned, orchestrated and being implemented. Predicted by international relations experts, public opinion molders, American experts and strategists. America and NATO were adequately advised and warned not to venture into Ukraine unless they risk provoking Russia beyond their imagination. In line with the above assertion, Rnaud (2022) compiled the following opinions of experts buttressing the need not to expand NATO East-Ward:

- George Kennan, was America's foreign policy strategist, the architect of U.S. cold war strategy. As early as 1998, he warned that NATO expansion was a *“tragic mistake”* that ought to provoke a *“bad reaction from Russia”*.
- Henry Kissinger, in 2014, warned that *“to Russia, Ukraine will not just be as foreign country”* and therefore the West needs a policy that is aimed at reconciliation, he was also adamant that Ukraine should not join NATO.
- John Mearsheimer, Arguably the leading geopolitical scholar in the U.S. today, In 2015, he said, *“The West is leading Ukraine down the primrose path and the end result is that Ukraine is going to get wrecked”*. What is going on right now is encouraging that outcome.
- Jack F. Matlock Jr., US Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1987-1991, warning in 1987 that NATO expansion was the most profound strategic blunder, encouraging a chain of events that could produce the most serious security threat since the collapse of the Soviet Union.
- William Perry, Clinton's defense secretary explained in his memoir that to him NATO enlargement is the cause of the rupture in relations with Russia and that in 1996 he was so opposed to it that in the strength of my conviction, I considered resigning.
- Stephen Cohen, a famed scholar of Russian studies, *“warned in 2014 that if we move NATO forces toward Russia borders, it's obviously gonna militarize the situation and Russia will not back off, it is existential”*.
- Bill Burns, CIA director in 2008: *“Ukrainian entry into NATO is the brightest of all redlines for Russia”* and *“I have yet to find anyone who views Ukraine in NATO as anything other than a direct challenge to Russian interests”*. He is now director of the CIA. *“08 memo ‘nyet means nyet: Russia's NATO Enlargement Redlines.*
- Russian-American journalist Vladimir Pozner, in 2008 stated that *“NATO expansion in Ukraine is unacceptable to the Russian, that there has to be a compromise where Ukraine guaranteed will not become a member of NATO”*.
- Malcom Fraser, 22 Prime Minister of Australia, warned in 2014, *“that the move east by NATO is provocative, unwise and a very clear signal to Russia. He adds that this leads to a difficult and extraordinarily dangerous problem”*.
- Paul Keating, former Australian PM, in 1997: *“expanding NATO is an error which may rank in the end with the strategic miscalculations which prevented Germany from taking its full place in the international system in the early 20th century”*.
- Bob Gates, former US defence secretary, In his 2015 memoir opined *“Moving so quickly to expand NATO was a mistake. Trying to bring Georgia and Ukraine into NATO was truly overreaching and an especially monumental provocation”*
- Pat Buchanan, in his 1999 book *‘A Republic, Not an Empire’* by moving NATO onto Russia's front porch, we have scheduled a twenty-first century confrontation”.
- Robert McNamara, Bill Bradley, Gary Hart and others in 1997 wrote a letter to Bill Clinton warning the *“US led effort to expand NATO is a policy error of historic proportions and would foster instability in Europe. Today it's fringe, traitorous position”*.
- Sir Roderic Lyne, former British ambassador to Russia *“warned that pushing Ukraine into NATO is stupid on every level. He adds if you want to start a war with Russia, that's the best way of doing it”*.
- Jeffrey Sachs writing in a column in the Financial Times (FT) *“warned that NATO enlargement is utterly misguided and risky. True friends of Ukraine and global peace should be calling for a US and NATO compromise with Russia”*. (all as compiled@RnaudBertrand)
- Fiona Hill, *“we warned George Bush that “Mr. Putin would view steps to bring Ukraine and Georgia closer to NATO as a provocative move that would likely provoke preemptive Russian military action. But ultimately, our warnings weren't heeded”*.

CONCLUSION

In concluding this paper, it is useful to remember that on the June 21st, 2017, the Associated Press quoting Sergei Shoigu, Russia's defense minister, *“said that the security situation near Russia's borders has worsened because of NATO's activities”*. He was speaking during a visit to Kaliningrad which is Russia's westernmost region. He pointed at the alliance's military exercise in the Baltics as an example of NATO's growing presence in the area. He added that the large scale drills reflect NATO's *“anti- Russian”* course. Mr. Shoigu went on to announce that Russia will form twenty new units along its western frontiers by the year's end, and

that Russia and Belarus will hold a war game code named ‘west 2017’ as an answer to NATO’s drills in a neighboring country, affirming the point that Russia merely reacts to the Western alliance’s actions and antics (Russia Direct, 2017). All what is happening in Ukraine right now is an expected reaction of Russian Federation to a very well planned provocation by the United States of America, (U.S.A) and its NATO allies. For Russia, it is existential for it, to react. It is the opinion of this paper that wars have been fought before and will be fought over and over again, what is worrisome is the direct involvement of two super-powers who during the cold war used détente and deterrence to keep peace in the world though often under tension. Therefore this paper has made some useful recommendations towards the search for peace and diplomatic ending to the bloodshed.

Aleksandr Dugin in 1997 in his book “Foundation of Geopolitics” had predicted all that is happening now in Ukraine. In December 2021, satellite images of massive Russian military deployment along their borders with Ukraine were shown to the world by the Americans. This led to the conclusion by western military experts that Russia was about to invade its neighbor Ukraine. The military deployment kept on increasing by the day until it reached an estimated 100,000 personnel with tanks and heavy duty trucks. In all these Russia kept denying that no invasion of Ukraine was in the books, on the other hand America kept shouting that an invasion was imminent. While anxiety was in the air as to what exactly was the intention of Russia, NATO led by America embarked on both military and naval exercises probably as a deterrence to Russia around Russian territorial and international maritime waters. In the process both Russia and British warships nearly collided and shots were fired. Ukrainian military were part of this NATO and American exercises. This without doubt infuriated Russia the more. On the 24th of February 2022, the Russian President, Vladimir Putin announced a military operation in Eastern Ukraine comprising the Donbas region and Lugarsk who are already at war with Ukraine since 2014, (Russian National Television). These parts of Ukraine are mainly Russian speaking ethnic minorities in Ukraine who by no mistake of their own found themselves in Ukraine, and since 2014 have been visited with ethnic cleansing and genocide by the Ukrainian authorities with the European Union and the Western collaborators looking the other way. The Russian President saw it as a moral responsibility of ‘Mother Russia’ to protect these Russians under threat of extermination by America and Ukraine. A major objective of the military operation according to President Putin in his address to the Russian National Legislative Assembly is to root out and destroy neonazists that have made Ukraine their base, from where they plot evil against Russia. (Russian Television). This military operation is still on-going, about the 60 plus days already with no end in sight. As if this was what United States and its western allies were waiting for, a signal to embark on an economic destruction of Russia and its people, barrage of unilateral sanctions never before seen in history were unleashed on Russia. Amongst them is the removing of Russia from international payment system known as ‘SWIFT’, banning of international flights to and from Russia. The most ridiculous is the persecution of wealthy Russians living, doing business and employers of labor in their respective America and European abodes. Russians are suddenly not wanted anywhere in the world.

Russian literature and culture that has enriched the world for centuries are equally targeted and boycotted by the western world and their posturing globalists want to be leaders. Weapons of all sorts are being sent into Ukraine by the Western alliance in-order to prolong the war and the suffering of Ukrainian civilians instead of engaging in diplomatic efforts to bring the conflict to an end. American leaders starting from the President Joe Biden seem to take pleasure and turns in dehumanizing the Russian President Vladimir Putin. He has been called a killer by Joe Biden, who equally undiplomatically called for a regime change in Russia while on a visit to Poland. It is no secret that NATO has soldiers on the ground in Ukraine under the guise of volunteers. The alarming scenario now is that instead of trying a diplomatic approach, America and NATO seem to have made up their mind on destroying Ukraine by sending deadly offensive weapons to Kiev, knowing that this will only escalate the situation resulting in more civilian casualty. Russia on the other hand will not bow out quietly; there is a possibility of it resorting to nuclear weapons, in which case humanity will be the ultimate loser.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Cessations of fighting/hostilities from all sides and the resumption of diplomacy by the United Nations and its conflict resolution agencies.
2. United States of America and NATO should stop sending deadly/offensive weapons to Ukraine because that only escalates the fighting and more casualties are recorded.
3. Withdrawal of all foreign mercenaries from the theatre of war.
4. The Western countries should stop encouraging Ukraine’s NATO membership.
5. The West to accept that Russia has the right to its national interests just as each of them.
6. The U.S.A and NATO should understand that Russia has national interests to protect and pursue just like they do. Russia will never shy away from protecting its national borders and integrity.
7. The West must understand that politics aside Russia and Ukraine are one and the same people.

NATO's INSINCERITY ABOUT EXPANSION EASTWARDS



Formatted: Font: (Default)

+Headings CS, 12 pt

REFERENCES

- Ambrosio, Thomas, and Geoffrey V. (2013). "Mapping the Geopolitics of the Russian Federation: The Federal Assembly Addresses of Putin and Medvedev." *Geopolitics*. 18, 2 pp 435–466.
- Asmus, R. (2008). "A little War that shook the world", (*Russian Direct* 8, August).
- English, R. D. (2000). *Russia and the Idea of the West: Gorbachev, Intellectuals, and the End of the Cold War*. Columbia, Columbia

University Press.

- Emmanuel Macron. Reproduced from public account Guo Rong (ID:xuu5336).
- Fenby, J. (2015), *Alliance: the inside story of how Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill won one war and began another* (2015).
- Globalists Enraged: Putin Disrupts Their Plans For a 'New World Order' (Video), retrieved from: http://opr.news/50285c4220317en_ng?link=1&client=news, 2022.
- Graebner, N. A., Richard, D.B, and Joseph M. S, (2008). *Reagan, Bush, Gorbachev: Revisiting the end of the cold war*. Greenwood.
- *International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Reading.
- Jonathan, M. (2010) Russia and the West, where did it go wrong?
- Joshua S.Goldstein and Jon C. Pevenhouse, 2013-2014 Update, *International Relations*, sixth ed. Library of Congress,pp 57-60, 153
- Keohane, R.O. (1984), *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton –University Press. Princeton.
- Levy, Jack S,1985, in Joshua S.Goldstein and Jon C. Pevenhouse, 2013-2014 Update, *International Relations*, sixth ed. Library of Congress.
- Matlock Jr, Jack F. (2005). *Reagan and Gorbachev: How the cold war ended*. Analysis by the American ambassador to Moscow
- Maxim, S. *Arms Control In Russia-West Relations: Learning from the Experience of the 1st Cold War*. *Peace and Security Journal*. IMEMO-Russia
- Mearsheimer J.J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Norton, New York
- Mearsheimer J.J. (2016). *13th Valdai Discussion Club*, Sochi, Russia
- Mearsheimer J.J. (1999). *The False Promise of International Institutions*, Vol. 19 No3. *International Security* 5-49
- Mearsheimer J.J. on why the West is principally responsible for the Ukrainian Crisis, by Invitation. *The Economist*, March, 19th, 2022, edition.
- Morgenthau, H. (1978). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th edition revised, New York; Alfred. A. Knopf,pp 4-15
- Nzeribe, 2017, Western Response To A New Russia. (**Baze African Journal of Management and Social Sciences,(BAJMASS. Vol 1, No.1. 2018, Page 133-154)**)
- Oberdorfer, Don. (1991). *The Turn: From the Cold War to a New Era: the United States and the Soviet Union, 1983-1990*, in Nzeribe 2017.
- Service, Robert. (2015). *The End of the Cold War: 1985-1991*, excerpt, a standard scholarly history.
- Stent, Angela E. (2014). *The Limits of Partnership: U.S. Russian Relations in the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton UP, 355 pages.
- The Kremlin, Moscow. February 21, 2022, 23.35, address by President Putin to Russian Citizens.
- Tsygankov, Andrei P. (2013). "*The Russia-NATO mistrust: Ethnophobia and the double expansion to contain "the Russian Bear".*" *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*.
- Ukrainian Crises Timeline of major events: Ukraine.csis.org/
- Vinod, A, Kristi, Govella. (2011) eds. *Responding to Resurgent Russia: Russian Policy and Responses from the European Union and the U.S*. New York-Springer,
- Waltz, K.N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Reading.
- WESTERN STRATEGIC THINKERS WHO WARNED OF UKRAINIAN CONFLICT, as compiled by @RnaudBertrand, <https://twitter.com/RnaudBertrand/status/14984911902062592s>
- <http://www.theguardian.com>world>Ukraine>
- <http://www.ibtimes.com/Ukraine>

http://opr.news/58e491aa220529en_ng?link=1&client=news