

Ukrainian Crisis In The Eastern Region And Moscow-Washington's Bid For New Allies And Political Rapprochement: A Neo-Cold War Era Or A Gradual Move To Third World War?

Sheriff Ghali Ibrahim¹, Abdullahi Nuhu Liman², Kabir Mato³

Department Of Political Science And International Relations,

University Of Abuja, Abuja-Nigeria

E-MAIL: sherfboy@yahoo.com

Abstract:

With the disintegration of the Soviet Union and subsequent reemergence of Russia in global economy as having the membership of the BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization and other relevant strategic multilateral organizations in the world, is reviving the ideological confrontation that took place between Russia and the United States immediately after the Second World War. The paper is a theoretical approach to explaining the neo-cold war era, as the conflict between the two former blocs is rejuvenating. It also analyses the American alliance with the closest Russian neighbors and the threat to that move as well as Russian odyssey to south East Asia for rebuilding old diplomatic relations. From the library and practical research conducted, findings show that, the two sides are enveloped in what can be described as neo-cold war confrontation and a political gamble that may result in to the third world war. The paper concludes that, this political tension is inevitable as Russia will never risk its national security and allow the United States coming closer to its own borders. The paper recommends a drastic balance of power between the two powers, so as to curtail the level of tension within the global polity.

Keywords: *Allies; Eastern Region; Moscow; Neo-Cold War; Rapprochement; Ukraine;*

Introduction

It is glaring that tension and dangerous confrontation has not been recorded between the two great powers (Russia and the United States)

since after the end of the Second World War, until now, when the two are busy fighting proxy wars, developing new friends and forming military alliances all over the world.

With the emergence of the Arab spring, United States of America hiding under its support for its liberal democratic values more or less supported the revolution and wind of change in the Arab states. It supported the ouster of the then Libyan head of state Muammar Gaddafi, the Tunisian revolution, the Egyptian removal of Mubarak and practically supported the removal of president Bashar Al'asad of Syria. But with the subsequent Ukrainian crisis which engulfed the state under Victor Yanukovich, there has been an escalation of tension and sanctions. One, for Moscow's annexation of Crimea, with the claim that, majority of the Crimeans are Russian speaking, while on the other, the perpetual violence in eastern Ukraine in areas like Donetsk and Luhansk. This has been seen by the West as an attempt by Russia to cause civil war in Ukraine for its own advantage.

On the other hand, Russia was optimistic, that, if Ukraine will be controlled by the west and United States, then this is a great threat to the territories of Russia; therefore, Russia had no other response and option other than to annex Crimea after the referendum as part of Ukraine.

Another major considerable factor in this conflict is that, referendum was also conducted in eastern Ukraine, for the perpetual existence of the region under Ukraine or for its total independence from Ukraine, but the result transpired that, the people favored breaking away from Ukraine. But the

situation is getting exacerbated as the new Ukrainian government has vowed to crash down pro-Russia separatists around the region. This has engendered more and more attacks everyday and the west is accusing Russia of sending its troops to fight against the Ukrainian soldiers.

It is against this backdrop that the United States is spreading its tentacles of friendship and creating more Moscow-induced diplomacy with states in Eastern Europe like Poland, Belgrade and many more to establish more US bases within the region against Russia. On the other hand, Russia is moving towards south Asia to re-establish anti-American and anti-western diplomatic movement. Russia first entered china and concealed their long time gas deal of \$400 billion Dollars.

It is also notable that, after the referendum conducted in eastern Ukraine, which favored independence from Kiev, other elections were conducted in October 2014, for presidential and parliamentary positions in the region. The region was also divided into two independent states, each with its president- Luhansk and Donetsk. This is also another driver for further escalation of tension and of war.

This paper therefore, seeks to adopt a theoretical instrument to analyze the concurrent political crisis in Eastern Ukraine, as well as the tension heating the positions of the two major global powers. The paper asks whether this confrontation should be termed "neo-cold war" as there are

some certain events that look different from those of the cold war era, or should we see the events unfolding as immediate causes of the outbreak of the third world war? The findings of this research work will provide an answer to these questions.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The material used in this research work is the library material, using documented literatures and content analytical methodology applied. The methodology therefore, is the secondary method of data collection, which makes the research descriptive in nature.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Theoretical Analogy of Neo-Cold War and Third World War Description: There are two major theories which both explain the position of the United States and Russia. One explains the relevance of offensive realism as explained by Mearsheimer (2001) and the other explains the relevance of defensive realism which in contemporary global politics and in what transpires under the Ukrainian crisis can be seen as part of the position of Russia, defending itself against American and western expansionism.

The aim of Mearsheimer's theory is to explain why relations between the great powers (United States and Russia; United States and china) of the modern state system are fraught with conflict. Echoing Kenneth Waltz (1979), Mearsheimer (2002) argues that the structure of international

politics is key in understanding this state of affairs. Specifically, Mearsheimer (2002) relies on five core assumptions shared more or less by most contemporary realists, which characterize the essential traits of international politics.

These assumptions are: (1) international politics is played out in an anarchical realm, meaning that there is no 'government of governments' to enforce rules and punish perpetrators. (2) No state can ever be absolutely sure of each other's intentions nor be sure that other states will not use force against them. Furthermore, states suffer from imperfect information about each other's intentions and intentions are in constant flux, benign intentions can quickly change into malignant ones and vice versa. (3) Survival is the primary motivation of all states in the international system. Survival must have top priority since the autonomy of the state is a prerequisite for the achievement of all other ends. (4) States are rational entities in the instrumental sense of the word, that is, they think strategically about their external situation and choose the strategy that seems to maximize their basic aim of survival. (5) In the argument of Mearsheimer (1995; 2000) states always possess some military capacity enabling them to hurt and possibly to destroy each other. Marrying together these assumptions, Mearsheimer infers that the states soon realize that the most efficient way to guarantee survival in anarchy is to maximize their

relative power with the ultimate aim of becoming the strongest power, that is, a hegemon.

However, not all states can maximize their relative power simultaneously and, therefore; the state system is destined to be an arena of relentless security competition as long as it remains anarchic (Mearsheimer 2001).

Due to the anarchical nature of the global system, however, it is discerning that, United States of America had threatened Syria of Obama's red line when chemical weapons used in Syria. This caveat given was later transformed by Russia with the destruction of Syria's chemical stockpile. It is also glaring in Ukraine, when Kiev was in turmoil, America mobilized western powers against Russia, which in defensive strategy, Russia annexed Crimea.

The offensive –defensive realist analogy is changing based on condition and time between the two powers. It is clear that during the cold war, Russia pursued offensive realism, while united states defensive realism. It may also occur that, even with the case of Ukraine, Russia is still pursuing offensive realism, because of the annexation of Crimea and support for pro-Russian separatists in eastern Ukraine. Danielle (1998) argues):

The end of the Cold War has arguably been the most important change of the 20th century. The relatively peaceful and passive end of the Cold War

took the whole world by surprise -- especially those West who had been fearing World War III between the Eastern Communist bloc and the West for the past 50 years. No body had been prepared for the series of events that began in the late eighties and culminated in the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 90s. Even some of the key players at the end of the Cold War -- namely Gorbechev and Reagan -- could not have foreseen this quick end. Among the academics, there was debate over why theory hadn't predicted the end of the Cold War. I argue that two tenets of realism convincingly explain the end of the Cold War: defensive realism can be used to explain the US's behavior during the end of the Cold War, and offensive realism can be used to explain the Soviet Union's behavior at the end of the Cold War.

In the analysis of defensive realism, Danielle (1998) saw the united states under defensive realism from the prediction of the theory:

Defensive realism predicts that when leaders feel threatened and insecure, they will tend to increase their security by pursuing ambitious military and diplomatic strategies. In order to properly defend this argument, it is important to show that the United States did feel that its relative power in the international arena was declining. Indeed, the US did feel extremely insecure. Starting in 1979, America perceived a high level of external threat. The 444 day hostage crisis in Iran was particularly damaging to American morale, and the media

extensively covered the story and the implied failure of the president to resolve the crisis.

But what should be pointed out here is that, this time around, Russia is at both offensive and defensive. Offensive by not compromising Crimea and eastern Ukraine and also thinking it has the military capability to resist any military challenge which might emanate from the west. It is also defensive, as it is under western pressure and a series of sanctions; this has made Russia, knowing about its weaknesses since after the disintegration of the soviet union, to be careful and pursue diplomatic ties, which is currently going on between china and other states in south east Asia, such as china and North Korea.

Another event in global politics which reflects Russia's offensive realism was its invasion of Afghanistan which was "the most blatant threat since the Cuban missile crisis" Danielle (1998). These two world events according to Danielle (1989):

Led to a widespread perception of American weakness, which ultimately proved to be detrimental to Carter in the 1980 campaign. As defensive realism would predict, the presidential administrations, beginning in 1979, took steps to increase the US's security by pursuing an ambitious foreign policy. Even under Carter, beginning in fiscal year 1980, the military budget started to increase. The budget was increased even more

notoriously under the Reagan administration. Reagan pursued an increase of \$1.7 trillion for the period 1982-1987, which amounted to a real annual increase of 7 percent a year. This was part of a long-term plan to spend the Soviets out of power. Also, this increase in expenditures led to an increase in military preparedness.

Defensive realism also predicts that in the face of an external threat, the government will be able to mobilize economic, military and human resources. Finally, defensive realism predicts that when state leaders perceive a relative advantage, they will pursue more co-operative security policies (Danielle, 1989). These predictions of defensive realism on the united states of America during the cold war era has now changed to be part of Russia's defensive realism, which predicts the mobilization of economic, military and human resources whenever there is external threat.

NATO-AMERICAN MILITARY EXPANSIONISM IN EASTERN EUROPE

With the outbreak of political tension in Ukraine and the subsequent annexation of Crimea by Russia, the united states and NATO are consolidating their efforts towards military presence around and across Russian borders. This signifies that, when Russia defied the western and American sanctions, the west is taking another alternative of expanding military presence.

The US sanctions according to Marcus (2014), targeted seven Russian influential citizens and 17 companies which Washington claimed are linked to President Vladimir Putin's "inner circle". The European Union's list includes Gen Valery Gerasimov, chief of the Russian General Staff, and Lt Gen Igor Sergun, identified as the head of the Russian military intelligence agency, the GRU. It also includes Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Kozak and pro-Russian separatist leaders in Crimea and in the eastern Ukrainian cities of Luhansk and Donetsk. This list does not appear to follow the US line in targeting President Putin's associates, but rather those involved in events on the ground in Ukraine.

With the persistent nature of Moscow on Ukraine, and the glaring failure of sanctions on Russia, NATO and the United States have resorted in deploying more troops in and around Russian neighbors. Marcus (2014) wrote that:

Nato insists that its deployments are simply to reassure its worried members. Company-size groups of around 150 US paratroops are being sent for exercises in Poland and the three Baltic republics. So that's about 600 men. Around a dozen additional fast jets have been deployed to Poland and to reinforce air patrols in the Baltic states' airspace. Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania - all Nato members - have no jet fighters of their own. And to cap Nato's "build-up", a small flotilla of mine hunters - almost as small a vessel as you can

get in naval terms - has been sent to the Baltic Sea. The US has reinforced its naval presence in the Black Sea, but again this is a question of showing presence. By contrast Russia has some 40,000 armoured and mechanised troops on Ukraine's border, which Nato says are ready to advance at short notice.

This is really an era of a neo-cold war defined by the events shaping history in the making. The United States has also named its recent operation in Eastern Europe "Saber Strike", involving around 4,700 soldiers from 10 countries, which is now under way in the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Another large NATO-led exercise was held in Estonia in May, 2014 (Soldakin and croft, 2014). Drills also began last month in Poland, Slovakia and the three Baltic states involving several hundred U.S. Special Forces personnel.

THE RUSSIA'S RESPONSE

With the continuation of the crisis in eastern Ukraine and the determination of western powers to control Ukraine, Moscow had no other option other than to look for more allies and political rapprochement. Russia cemented its gas deal with china, a deal of about 40 billion dollars; it went to north Korea to revive a good diplomatic ties, Iran is ready to fight for Russia whenever it so demands, Syria did not fall because of Russia's support to Assad; albeit, Syria is suffering from a

long term civil war, but if there is room for help, Syria may offer its land and territory, for Russia and Iran to deal with western strongest ally in the middle east (Israel).

From the inception of Russia's response, soldakin and croft (2014) have described the nature of Moscow's preparation and readiness to respond to any western threat in the region, when they wrote:

Russia has begun military exercises in its Baltic enclave of Kaliningrad in what the Defence Ministry said was a response to drills by NATO allies in parts of eastern Europe, which were launched after Moscow's intervention in Ukraine. The equipment and number of troops involved "corresponds" to the size of the NATO maneuvers. "The training of the army's group in the Kaliningrad operational (theater) is being held simultaneously with the international (NATO) exercises of Saber Strike-2014 and Baltops-2014 launched in Europe. 24 ships from Moscow's Baltic Sea Fleet were patrolling Russian territorial waters there while its regional air force had been beefed up with extra Su-27 fighter jets.

With the increasing tension in Ukraine, Russia is also surveying some American coastal areas and American territories in the Asia Pacific. This includes, Guam, South Korea and Japan. Russia is assessing the American military strength in these areas for preparation on how to deal with them in case of any outbreak of war. The head of American military operation in the Pacific has also acknowledged that that "Russia's intervention in Ukraine had been accompanied by a significant increase in Russian air activity in the Asia-Pacific region in a show of strength and to gather intelligence" (Herbert, 2014).

It was since 2013, that Putin ended Russia- NATO missile pact and later showed to the west that he will "retaliate in force" against what he calls US President Obama's "insane" plan for global tyranny that is even now threatening to destroy America and the European Union. Putin's ordering the strategic forces to carry out a large-scale surprise military drill was accompanied by launching four nuclear missiles that were closely monitored by US intelligence agencies that included the test launch of two land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and two submarine-launched ballistic missiles (EU times: June, 2014).

ORIGIN OF THE PRACTICAL WAR BETWEEN KIEV AND PRO-RUSSIAN ACTIVISTS IN THE EAST

The crisis started when the Ukrainian government of Yanukovich took a different move towards Ukrainian-international economic relations, by shifting in favor of Moscow at the expense of the west. This triggered protest which resulted in the deposition of Yanukovich and the subsequent invasion of Crimea, which later escalated to the crisis in the eastern part of Ukraine, between the newly elected government of Ukraine and the pro-Russian separatists in the east. Below, is a timeline showing the genesis of the crisis and where the conflict is heading to:

NOVEMBER, 2013
* Nov 21: Kiev suddenly announces suspension

of trade and association talks with the EU and opts to revive economic ties with Moscow, triggering months of mass rallies in Kiev.
* Nov 30: Riot police try to break up the Kiev demonstration by force. Protest turns against Yanukovich and his government.
DECEMBER
Protests continue with crowds of up to 800,000. Some clashes with police. Opposition forms bloc called Maidan.
Yanukovich and Putin meet, Putin agrees to buy \$15 billion of Ukrainian debt and to slash by a third the price of Russian gas supplies to Ukraine.
JANUARY, 2014
* Jan 22: Three people die in protests in Kiev. EU threatens action over crisis. Talks between opposition, Yanukovich fail.
* Jan 23: Washington threatens sanctions over violence.
* Jan 26: Unrest spreads to pro-Yanukovich East.
FEBRUARY
Anti-government protests turn increasingly violent. At least 77 people killed in clashes between demonstrators and police.
* Feb 21: Opposition leaders sign EU-mediated peace pact with Yanukovich.
* Feb 22: Ukraine's parliament votes to remove Yanukovich, who flees. Arch-rival Yulia Tymoshenko released from jail.
* Feb 26: Ukraine appoints new government. Angry Russia puts 150,000 troops on high alert.
* Feb 27-28: Armed men seize Crimea parliament, raise Russian flag. Militia take control of two airports in Crimea.
MARCH
* March 1: Putin wins parliamentary approval to invade Ukraine, angering the White House. Russian forces fan out in Crimea.
* March 6: Crimea's leadership votes to join Russia. U.S. President Barack Obama orders sanctions on those responsible for Moscow's actions in Ukraine.
EU leaders hold emergency summit to find ways to pressure Russia to back down and

accept mediation.
* March 15: Two killed in clashes between pro-Russian demonstrators and Ukrainian nationalists.
* March 16: Referendum held in Crimea, shows overwhelming support for joining the Russian Federation.
* March 21: Putin signs laws completing annexation of Crimea. The U.S. imposes sanctions on Putin's close allies, EU follows with similar measures.
* March 23: NATO says Russia has amassed a large force at Ukraine's border.
* March 24: Ukraine pulls troops from Crimea.
APRIL
* April 2: NATO suspends cooperation with Russia.
* April 7: Pro-Russia activists in eastern Ukraine proclaim the creation of the "Donetsk People's Republic".
* April 12: Separatists take control of city of Sloviansk in eastern Ukraine. Kiev prepares troops.
* April 13: One Ukrainian state security officer killed and five wounded in operation against separatists.
* April 14: Obama warns Putin in phone call that Moscow would face further costs for its actions in Ukraine.
* April 17: Pro-Russian separatists seize armored vehicles of Ukraine forces trying to recapture rebel-controlled town.
* April 18: The United States, Russia, Ukraine and the EU reach deal for illegal armed groups to disarm and end occupations of public buildings and spaces.
* April 19: Separatists say they will not sign deal until the Kiev government steps down.
* April 24: Ukraine sends in troops again to try to expel the separatists in Sloviansk, kill five rebels.
* April 25: Ukrainian forces mount full blockade of Sloviansk. Separatists detain group of international observers, say a Kiev "spy" among them.
* April 26: G7 leaders agree to impose extra sanctions on Russia over Ukraine.

Source: Gabriela, B, Pavel, P. And Raissa, K. (2014): Timeline: Ukraine Crisis And Russia's Stand-Off With The West. Reuters, Sun. April, 27.

After the previous confrontation in the past months as indicated in the table above, in May, 2014, a battle between pro-Russia separatists and government forces at Donetsk airport in eastern Ukraine has claimed 40 lives, in what can be described as the deadliest outbreak of violence yet in the flashpoint city (nick and spark, (2014). An additional 31 people have been injured, including four civilians, out of which two were civilians. The conflict at Donetsk International Airport broke out only hours after newly elected Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko gave a sign that he would potentially like to negotiate a way out of the crisis (Nick and Spark, 2014).

In the month of June, 2014, the Ukrainian interior minister claimed that three tanks crossed into Ukraine along with other armored vehicles from Russia and were attacked by military forces fighting pro-Moscow separatists. Russia on the other hand denied sending troops or weapons to Ukraine, describing Russian citizens who have joined the armed separatists as volunteers. There was no independent confirmation that the tanks had come from Russia. In Washington, U.S. State Department is of the view that if the military incursion was confirmed, it would be a "serious

and disturbing escalation of the crisis in eastern Ukraine" (David, 2014).

The Presidential Elections and Waning of American Foreign Policy's Global Influence

With the elections conducted in eastern Ukrainian region on the second day of November 2014, Kiev did not recognize the election and its holistic process. NATO and the European Union have condemned the elections, describing the process as illegitimate. This was also noted when Mogherini (2014) condemned the elections with the voice of the European Union:

I consider today's 'presidential and parliamentary elections' in Donetsk and Luhansk 'People's Republics' a new obstacle on the path towards peace in Ukraine. The vote is illegal and illegitimate, and the European Union will not recognize it.

The European Union, NATO and other parties that condemned the elections in the eastern region of Ukraine, claimed that the elections contradicted the Minsk cease fire agreement. Under the cease fire agreement, some twelve fundamental points (OSCE, 2014) were raised and accepted which are:

1. Ensure an immediate bilateral ceasefire.
2. Ensure the monitoring and verification by the OSCE of the ceasefire.
3. A decentralisation of power, including through the adoption of the law of Ukraine

"about local government provisional arrangements in some areas of Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts" (law on the special status).

4. Ensure the permanent monitoring of the Ukrainian-Russian border and verification by the OSCE with the creation of security zones in the border regions of Ukraine and the Russian Federation.
5. To immediately release all hostages and illegally detained persons.
6. A law on preventing the prosecution and punishment of persons in connection with the events that have taken place in some areas of Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts.
7. Continue the inclusive national dialogue.
8. To take measures to improve the humanitarian situation in Donbass.
9. Ensure early local elections in accordance with the law of Ukraine "about local government provisional arrangements in some areas of Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts" (law on the special status).
10. Withdraw the illegal armed groups, military equipment, as well as fighters and mercenaries from Ukraine.
11. To adopt the program of economic recovery and reconstruction of Donbass region.
12. To provide personal security for the participants in the consultations.

The crisis in Ukraine is one that affects the American foreign policy and domestic factors greatly among other factors such as the war on ISILS, Iranian nuclear crisis and Israeli position to the United States. Domestically speaking, the Obama foreign policy has been underrated in the united states due to the nature he handles some key foreign issues. Albeit the Americans partly supported military action on Syria, but Obama reverted his red line ultimatum; the way and manner the United States is taking it likely with president Putin of Russia, the way he has been so flexible to Iran and shifting the friendly American policy on Israel to a frustrating one. Israel continues to construct settlements in the west bank and Obama wants it stopped. The results of the above trend, therefore, lead to Democrats loss in the recently concluded parliamentary elections in the United States in favor of the republicans.

Contrary to what the Americans see as Obama's handling of the American foreign policy, is what obtained in hitherto American foreign policy which built the empire of liberty (Jerald, 2008). Liberty in the states and everywhere in the world has been cherished and fought for. For what Samuel (1934) describe as foreign policy of democratic promotion has also been pursuit by the united states throughout its bid to democratize or Americanize the world. The philosophy of liberal internationalism and contesting war and cold war by the United States has been a great theme in the American foreign policy (Norman, 1961) and

fighting global terrorism which the current administration of Obama is finding it difficult to against ISIL and withdrawal of American troops from Iraq and Afghanistan (Lynn, 1970; Kinley, 1972).

From the above overview, the democrats lost the parliamentary elections in favor of republicans for their weak performance in both domestic and foreign policies, especially, the Ukrainian crisis.

CONCLUSION

The spread of capitalism and American liberal democratic values has been justified with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and manifest itself in the economies of Russia itself and china, having some elements of market economy. Albeit the Chinese have created a new name for their own system, and called it “communism with Chinese characteristics”, but it suffices researchers to comprehend the nature of global economy dominated by capitalist orientation.

But this apart, the overriding dominance of global capitalist system and subsequent leaning of members of the defunct soviet union to western economic and military orientations such as being members of the European union and NATO, this has recently exacerbated the political and military rivalry and confrontation between the united states and Russia. This time, it is unlike the former confrontation because the former, involved the whole of the Soviet Union and the United States, while now (the neo-cold war era) members of the

former Soviet Union have allied with the United States against Russia.

The implication is that, Russia will at the same time continue to be offensive and defensive in order to maintain its own economic, political, military and territorial integrity. The neo-cold war era shapes global politics under US-NATO alliance with states of Eastern Europe in dominating china, while on the other hand, Russia refuses such intimidation and offensively or defensively invaded Crimea, and indirectly continue to support the rebellion in eastern Ukraine.

The inevitability of the confrontation between west and Russia lies around the fact that the west under NATO and supervision by the United States are spreading their tentacles, which led to the horizon (Russian borders). Russia must fight on its own for its national and security interest. The west making friendship with Ukraine will serve as the greatest threat to Russian security. Consequently, Russia is furiously fighting back such threat against the west and United States of America.

It is rather, an era of neo-cold war; Obama is not really willing to carry-out any move towards third world war.

RECOMMENDATION

For the global polity to be sanitized and free from all tension and confrontation, the following

recommendations are applicable in international relations and politics:

There should be perpetual balance power within the global system. By having balance of power, members of the global system would be very conscious of the “ mutually destructive capability “ of one another-thus war would be avoided, but cooperation would be maintained.

The opposite of balance of power is also applicable, but which will almost be impossible. But when it is considered, it will be useful to the survival of humanity at large. This is the freeing states from possessing weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated weapons. When this is done, nation-states will live peacefully without the great tension enveloping major powers in global politics today.

Russia must continue to pursue its own national interest as western alliance with Ukraine may lead to the establishment of US military base near Russian borders. If this continues, Russia should maintain a permanent military bases in Cuba, Brazils and Venezuela, which will also serve as a threat to American national security. If this is obtainable, each will be aware of collateral damage-hence tension will ease between the two powers.

There is also the need for the advancement of shanghai cooperation organization (SCO) which will serve as a replica of WARSAW to

counterbalance the activities of NATO in alliance with Moscow.

Russia must adopt a new policy towards its own neighbors: Policy of rapprochement, good neighborliness, economic assistance and political alliance, which it has continued to pursue with Kazakhstan and other states in central Asia.

Finally, Russia must also continue coupling policy with china. They should have a defense pact and uplift the two strongest organizations of which both Russia and china are members. These organizations are: the shanghai cooperation organization and Eurasian organization.

REFERENCES

Danielle, C. (1998): The End Of The Cold War: Defensive or Offensive Realism? Tufts, Tufts University Press.

David, M. (2014): Ukraine says three (3) tanks cross from Russia. AP. News, 13, June.

Herbert, C. (2014): Russian war plane Buzz California Coast, Gathering Intel. Reuters May 06.

Jerald A. Combs (2008). The History of American Foreign Policy: To 1920. M.E. Sharpe. pp. 21–25.

Kinley J. Brauer, "British Mediation and the American Civil War: A Reconsideration," Journal of Southern History, (1972) 38#1 pp. 49–64 in JSTOR

Lynn M. Case, and Warren E. Spencer, the United States and France: Civil War Diplomacy (1970)

Marcus, J. (2012): Ukraine Crisis: Russia Alarmed Over UA-NATO Military Moves. BBC News Europe, 29, April.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1995): 'The False Promise of Institutional Institutions', in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds, *The Perils of Anarchy*, 332-376, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mearsheimer, John J. (2001): *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: Norton.

Mearsheimer, John J. (2002): 'Hearts and Minds', *The National Interest* 69(Fall): 13-16.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen Walt (2003) 'An Unnecessary War', *Foreign Policy* 134(January-February): 51-59.

Mogherini, F. (2014): The European Union Reiterated Its Objection to the Separatist Elections Held In Eastern Ukraine. UPI News, November 03.

Nick, P.W. and spark, L.S. (2014): Ukraine: Fierce Fighting Closes Donetsk Airport, Claims Dozens of Lives. Reuters, 27, May.

Norman K. Risjord, "1812: Conservatives, War Hawks, and the Nation's Honor," *William and Mary Quarterly*, (1961) 18#2 pp 196-210. in JSTOR

OSCE (2014): "Chief Monitor in Ukraine urges all sides to allow monitors to carry out duties safely" (Press release). Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. 15 September 2014. Retrieved 15 September 2014.

Samuel Flagg Bemis, "Washington's Farewell Address: A Foreign Policy of Independence", *American Historical Review*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Jan., 1934), pp. 250-268 in JSTOR

Soldakin, V. and croft, A (2014): Russia Holds Military Exercises In Baltic, In Response To NATO. Reuters News Agency, 12th June.

The EU Times (2014): Putin Ends NATO Missile Pact, Warns Military To Prepare For War. June 12.