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Russia's Plan To Get Back To The Top

The events of the 2014 have catapulted Ukraine to the forefront of the U.S. policy agenda even to this day, sparking a crisis of confidence between the United States and Russia. Russia is stridently claiming that Crimea should have a “right of return” to Russia, and the United States is citing concerns about territorial integrity and the sovereignty of state borders. Europe and the United States are almost certainly not willing to go to war over Crimea and Russia almost certainly is. Russia has invaded half of Ukraine 2014, and is looking to add it as their own, but NATO will not recognize the transaction. Right now, there is an crisis in Ukraine, which is leading to war. The epidemic that escalate if the problem is not resolved in term of peaceful matters. The city of Crimea wants to break away from Ukraine and join its motherland , which was Russia once so many years ago. This is different compared to the past, were Russia want to take the country by force. Russia now has support for most Ukrainians. This is ideal for both parties, but the Ukrainian government and the International Union, are not allowing the taking over of Ukraine. Even if they decided on vote month back, the UN have failed to recognize hostile takeover of Ukraine. UN does not want Russia to take over Ukraine. In the eyes of the global community, Ukraine is still Ukraine, and yes including Crimea. **Should the United States and the UN step in and interfere with Russia's plan, in the regard of taking over Ukraine?** The global community is outrage over the situation in Ukraine. The EU and UN have yet to respond with a hard coded response. The only response, is saying russia is wrong for taking over Ukraine. Right now as we speak, russia has military presences in the area and the Global community fails to give an response. What are Russia's motives, what are the global communities movities. To fully understand Russa main objective, you must look that the situation of Ukraine now, which is that the country is divided amongst it each other.

To understand the problem you must understand the long history between the two countries, more primary the 19 century. In the 19th century Ukraine was once under Russian control. However from the mid-19th century nationalism spread. In 1918 while Russia was engaged in civil war, Ukraine became independent. However in 1921 the Russians forced Ukraine to become part of the Soviet Union. Stalin decided that Ukraine should be apart of Russia once again. Many Ukrainians bitterly resisted the takeover. However Stalin was determined to crush the Ukrainians hope to be free by taking lives of millions of innocent people.

However Ukraine's suffering was not over. During year span 1937 to 1939 Stalin unleashed purges in which many Ukrainians were executed or sent to prison camps. Then in 1941 the Germans invaded. They murdered millions of Ukrainians. However by 1943 the Germans were losing the war and the Red Army recaptured Kiev on 6 November 1943. Afterwards Stalin took reprisals against anyone he suspected of being disloyal or of collaborating with the Germans. All the Crimean Tartars were deported. In 1986 there was a disaster at the nuclear power plant at Chernobyl. The authorities tried to cover up the disaster and it caused much resentment. In the late 1980s Ukrainians became increasingly dissatisfied with rule from Moscow and in 1989 the RUKH (Ukrainian People's Movement for Restructuring) was formed and in 1990 demonstrations were held. With the collapse of Communism and the break up of the Soviet Union in 1991 Ukraine once more became independent. But being independent, ukraine suffered high inflation and economic decline for some years. However economic growth eventually began again. The transition from dictatorship to democracy also did not go smoothly. In late 2004 Viktor Yanukovych won a presidential election. However many people believed the election was rigged and supporters of the other candidate Viktor Yushchenko held demonstrations for 10 days. Eventually a rerun was held and Yushchenko was elected. He became president early in 2005. This was called the Orange Revolution. Ukraine suffered badly in the economic downturn of 2008-2009. However that was temporary and Ukraine recovered In 2013 and 2014 a wave of demonstrations swept across Ukraine when President Yanukovych rejected an association treaty with the EU. In February 2014 the Ukrainian parliament voted to remove Yanukovych from power. After new elections Petro Poroshenko became president of Ukraine. Today the population of Ukraine is 44 million. Now that i explained the long and harsh history amongst both states, i will explain the crisis that happen in 2014 and continuing now.

Russia does indeed have a motive in the response of taking over Ukraine. UN have place sanctions a couple years back, which cripple Russia's economy. Russia thought they had a large enough economy to withstand the sanctions, but that has been proven wrong. Currently the country's economy is in a bad state, they are seeing loss left to rights. The once super giant, is just a mere country that can barely stand on its own two feet. But President Putin has a plan. They plan to start a crisis, for this instance Ukraine, and use the country as a bargaining chip. This is why Russia has forces in Ukraine. Do you think Russia really what Crimea or the whole country of Ukraine, no. Ukraine is in a bad state, and Russia can not get anything positive from obtaining Ukraine. So what will the UN response be, and what will be done in this crisis and political move that Russia has posed. Ukraine itself is even divided amongst each other. The Ukrainian people can be divided in two parts when it come down to the ethnic lines. The ethnically Ukrainian people live in the western half and the ethnically Russian people live in the eastern half. There has been violence in the country between the Ukrainians and the Russians since the fall of the Soviet Union. There have also been civil rights' violations in the nation such as the Ukrainians' alienation of the Russians. In a way, it's possible to say that Ukraine is not an independent nation. Russia has treated Ukraine like it's a puppet state since the Soviet Union's collapse.

In recent years, however, Ukraine has be thinking to join the European Union and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). But the county is not unified as one, so there is a split when it comes to an decision. One side want to join NATO and the other side wants to join Russia. Since Russia has enormously opposed these organizations, Russia needed to do something about this, which is their philosophy in this regard. Like in the Soviet Union, Russia used their military force to keep Ukraine in check, and to sway the decision. ﻿ The Obama administration has responded to the crisis by flexing its own rhetorical muscles, say that they will not have it with Russia. When Russian President Vladimir Putin ignored Obama’s warning that there will be costs if Russia sent troops into Crimea, Secretary of State John Kerry denounced the act of aggression, promising that Russia is going to lose and have dire consequences. Mr. Kerry goes on saying the Russian people are going to lose and suggesting asset freezes and isolation with respect to trade and investment, with this, the United States will plumper Russia economy; which already has an weaken economy to begin with.

In response, Russia claims that their armed movement into Crimea was a response to issues of Morality.[‘The movement was required “to protect deployment places of the Black Sea fleet in Ukraine. The armed men besieging are not Russian troops but self defence forces.’](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/feb/28/russia-crimea-white-house)  [Morgenthau stated that](http://www.amazon.com/Theories-International-Relations-Scott-Burchill/dp/0230219225) States are obliged to act in the best interests of national society. It will do whatever is considered necessary to pursue its goal regardless of the issue of morality. Through a structural realist perspective, we can see how Russia is only using the pursuit of moral interest as an excuse in order to pursue its own strategic interest. If Russia had taken the issue of morality seriously, they would not have moved their troops into Crimea in the first place. The approval of President Putin’s request to use force in Ukraine to protect Russian interest meant that Russia undermined Ukraine’s right to self-determination. Here, moral concepts are no longer relevant to them. Thus, we can see how, the interest of the state predominates over all other interests and values. It has been argued that structural realists overlook internal characteristic of states. The way states define sovereignty can have an impact on the way states make decisions. The West and Russia may have different definitions of sovereignty. The West may define sovereignty in association with people. Whereas, Russia may define sovereignty based on a legitimate government. This question however falls outside of structural realist scope.

Keeping in mind an global level of analysis and understanding international relations and politics, our system works multilateral rather than bilateralism. Multilateralism can be useful in explanation Ukraine conflict and the struggle between Russia and the West. Multilateralism is multiple countries working in concert on a given issue. So basically, the global community as together in the most, say Russian involvement in Ukraine poses a great threat to international security. The UN has fire back at Russia. The fragility of the latest multilateral ceasefire agreement and a potential shift in U.S. policy toward arming Ukraine show the urgent need to better understand the global causes and effects of the conflict. Ultimately, the Ukraine conflict is an inflection point of international security with an irredentist Russia acting aggressively to overhaul the Western dominated post Cold War world order. Russia understand the state of power and multiladizim that our global community operation and function. Have give that said , in June of 2014, Russian and American experts gather in Finland, Boisto, to draft a “24-Step Plan to Resolve the Ukraine Crisis.” This meeting captures the unsettle role that international relationships may play in the conflict because of our multilateral system. It demands further political relation at the global level of analysis to ascertain how Russia and the West may resolve their differences and support a “right” Ukrainian solution to the conflict. Russia understands the relations of power amongst states, and doesn't want to cause an international conflict, which can probility escalate into a war. Which can be disastrous for both parties involved. The recent ceasefire agreement on September 1 of 2015, represents a final push for peace to avoid a potential escalation of violence. This is consider the right way to go, considering over the last year, Russia has consistently escalated the crisis around the world. The annexation of Crimea and subversion of eastern Ukraine pose the most direct challenge to the western dominated post Cold War world order since the fall of the Soviet Union. President Vladimir Putin sets to negotiate an alternative, keeping in mind the interest of Russia and the the world, instead of democratic norms which are viewed as less attractive by many nations. Ultimately, Russia plans to keep forces in Ukraine until the EU fall into the demands that the country wants, which is to have the sanction uplifted so their economy can improve. Russia is playing a long game, and will hold out for a long time, if necessary. This is the tactic that they are power playing, considering that no one wants to start a war. Putin has been signaling for some time now that he sees reestablishing Russian influence over the political and economic development of neighboring countries via the establishment of a Eurasian Union as the centerpiece of his third term in office. The main focus for the country it to exit their turmoil of an weaken economy so they can once establish themselves as an supergiant in the regards of states and power, which is explained in Walt's theory of international relation and different forms of international relations theories.

To further explain the topic you must have to understand the theory of Waltz's Man, the State, and War. The topic on hand is much more complicated than it seems and Walt's theory helps explain why and what in the situation using his famously known for his three levels of analysis known as images. First let me explain the situation using Waltz’s three images of international relations. Well the first image is Individuals, so who are the Individuals in the situation? On one side is Vladimir Putin and the other side is the everyone else, and not Ukraine's president, Petro Poroshenko. If we had to put a face on the opposition, Obama would be the other individual. Obama and Putin are the two individuals in the matter. The second image with is states, it would have to be Russia and United Nations and more specifically the United States due to the balance of power. It doesn't look like it but the United States is the main superpower and Russia is in competition in the struggle of power. Once Russia was an superpower it self, but has lost power, in which i believe it is due to economical problems the country has be facing over the years. Power is what Russia are trying to get back. The UN has place sanctions on Russia which is hurting Russia’s economy. The taking over of Ukraine is an outlash of the situation. Russia want theses sanction upheld, in order for their economy to gain economic strength. [Sanctions imposed by United State and the European Union over the Crimea referendum](http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/news/international/us-eu-impose-sanctions-against-russia-over-crimea-vote/article5797022.ece) is best explained by theory of balance of power. The referendum is seen as a serious threat in international realm. [‘The power of state is always a threat when there is no government to turn to for protection.’](http://www.amazon.com/Theories-International-Relations-Scott-Burchill/dp/0230219225) The result of the referendum of Crimea leaving Ukraine to join Russia confirms Russia’s increasing power. [In International relations, a rising power is seen as a crucial threat.](http://www.amazon.com/Theories-International-Relations-Scott-Burchill/dp/0230219225) Just like the cooperation of American- Soviet Union during the rise of Hitler’s Germany, United States and the EU are cooperating in an attempt to reduce a common risk by opposing the rising power of Russia. This scenario is common in a multipolar world. States experience the imbalance of power and lack of trust. This gives them reason to gang up and attack others to maintain their survival and strengthen their position. It is arguable that the case scenario may not apply since EU is not a state. However, the creation of international institution is a result of the power of states to use such institutions to achieve their goals. This can be seen as an ordinary result of ordinary efforts by great power to maintain their position in the international order. This is how today's global community functions due to the support of mutiladderlism. But in the back, if you had an problem or conflict, the two or more countries would duke it out in a war, but not in current times. Things are fought politically, which is due to the fear of global destruction.

Continuing, we must look at the two sub divisions in neorealism, defensive and offensive. Neorealism is the new theory to understand international relations and marks a significant departure from classical realism. Both theories work under the assumptions, defensive and offensive, that international system is anarchic and that the states are unitary actors that according to their placement in the system, and not by reference to their internal qualities. Both neorealist theories would categorize the international crisis in Ukraine as a losing game, whereas Waltz states, “The uneasy state of affairs is exacerbated by the familiar” and “security dilemma”. Where in measures that enhance one state's security typically diminish that of others.

Continuing, Russia claims that they were countering a security threat from the global community, by creating closer ties with Ukraine and the European Union was taking away some of Russia's security for its own gain. Taking Ukraine was a matter of security, regarding it nation. Leading actions for the country Russia were justified, were backed up on the ideal of neorealism and realism, which lead them to the decision to the taking and harboring Ukraine. Belief in the idealistic post-Cold War world order underlies the Western narrative on the Ukraine conflict. Russia is not the soviet union any more. The Soviet Union is a thing in the past, democracy won the decades long ideological battle. The West seeks to promote freedom and prosperity around the world with each country able to dictate its own political path. But for some countries and especially the middle east, do not want the “west” to interfere in nation matters, and Russia is one of these countries. A large majority of Ukrainians chose to reject the west and disregard the former Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych for his snub to Europe, and take the side of President Putin. Their revolution embodied a central feature of the democratic process. The West desires three main elements of the Kantian nature for Ukraine, democratic institution building, fair governance, and European integration. The new Ukrainian government, consisting of pragmatic reformers not minority-oppressing right-wing radicals whose parties won only 2% support in parliamentary elections, are entrusted with these tasks. The West blames Russia for undermining Ukraine’s pursuit of a more efficient and transparent system through European integration as well as challenging the post-Cold War world order. However Kenneth Waltz would argue that states are primarily seeking to maintain the existing balance of power and the counterargument would argue that states are always trying to gain more power. Defensive neorealism would argue that the international conflict in Ukraine was caused by Russia trying to maintain its current placement in the international system. The European Union’s economic advancement towards Ukraine was a threat to Russia’s security and Russia had to intervene to survive. Russia is a battle over the global community sanctions and not for Ukraine. The conflict is like an mini Cold War. The competing narratives of the conflict parties analytic and realism approach to conclude an analyses of the Ukraine conflict.

The motives behind state policy actions is a tall order amid the widespread information war. But scholars and people involved must comprehend these competing narratives in order to stretch beyond incomplete conflict assessments only considering rational geopolitical calculations. Identity markers including culture, history, nationality, ethnicity, and language also prove to be extremely relevant. With this in mind, the following section aims to provide a concise, comprehensive analysis of the primary and secondary drivers of the Ukraine conflict from the global perspective. Realists may believe that the ongoing Russo Ukrainian war is a matter between two states, but Ukraine experts, in both Ukraine and the West, know that the war is no less the result of important domestic developments within Ukraine and Russia. Ukraine has been in turmoil since at least 2004, when the Orange Revolution reversed Viktor Yanukovych’s first attempt to seize power illegally. The Revolution in Dignity that followed in 2013-14 entailed the “people power” of millions of Ukrainians who, in late February, succeeded in effecting Yanukovych’s flight from Ukraine. As Ukraine experts know, both pro-democracy uprisings were the products of domestic factors and had absolutely nothing to do with Western agendas. Just as Ukraine underwent these signal changes, so too did Russia, but in an opposite direction.

Almost immediately after coming to power in 1999, Vladimir Putin began dismantling democratic institutions and civil liberties, seizing control of the media and economy, amassing enormous power (including wealth) in his own hands. Reviving a neo-imperial rhetoric and agenda, and instituting a cult of personality centered on his machismo image. But Russia does and clam to be about diplomacy, but this is only on paper, but regardless of what one calls the resultant regime, it marked a radical rejection of the inchoate democratic ethos that characterized Russia under President Boris Yeltsin. Which is a bold leap toward authoritarianism, empire building, and possibly even fascism. As Ukraine was rejecting the authoritarianism of Presidents Leonid Kuchma and Viktor Yanukovych, Russia was embracing it under Putin. Realists are entitled to believe these disparate trends are irrelevant to understanding the ongoing war, but Ukraine experts suggest that downplaying or ignoring these developments is foolhardy. But Neorealism helps explains that Russia is trying to uphold its image of power in order to prove to the European Union and NATO that it is capable and willing to go to war against them. The credibility of such a threat is questionable, knowing that it would be irrational for Russia to actually go to war when nuclear weapons are involved and against such a huge and powerful alliance as NATO. Because the threat is not as threatening as Russia would want it to be, the European Union is not agreeing to Russia’s demands. As both sides want to increase security and power, diplomatic talks will take a very long time to achieve. Both Russia and the European Union are reluctant to find a compromise because, as neorealism argues, both sides care about who gains more, not if both sides gain.

Second, focusing as they do on “interests,” realists also prefer not to take ideology, culture, and norms into account, while Ukraine experts do not see how ignoring these matters can possibly enhance understanding of the conflict. Putin’s neo-imperial ideology, his stated determination to make Russia great again, his conviction that all Russian speakers are Russians deserving of the Russian state’s protection, and his belief that Ukraine is an artificial state with no right to exist appear to be part and parcel of his pursuit of authoritarianism and empire and his adoption of a hegemonic policy toward Russia’s “near abroad.” The realist case for ignoring ideology would be stronger if Putin’s ideological message were not so openly rooted in Russia’s cultural heritage. As his high popularity ratings suggest, Putin’s ideology resonates with, and may even be a product of, Russian political culture. Once again, in ignoring ideology, culture, and norms, realism appears to be ignoring the two most important developments within Russia and Ukraine. The former abandoned democratic norms at precisely the time that the latter embraced them. Can these parallel and intersecting movements be considered as irrelevant to the war? Ukraine experts are not so sure about the bedrock assumption of the realists that states or, more precisely, their elites always act rationally. Yanukovych seemed determined to undermine his own power and did little to promote Ukraine’s state interests. Putin appears obsessed, sometimes bizarrely so, with Russian state interests, but it’s not at all clear just how annexing Crimea made Russia stronger. Nor is it clear how destroying one-third of the Donbas in eastern Ukraine benefited Russia or Putin. Nor, finally, is it clear just how Russia’s interests have been enhanced by the imposition of Western sanctions. Let me explain the motive of Russia on what they want and what they don't want, truey and coherently. Russia does not want to win the war and take control of crimea, they could care less, meaning they, i mean Putin. Scholars and international realist understand that Russia does not want to win this war theoretically. The want to fight back at the “unfair” treatment that the EU and UN have place on the already weakened country's economy. Russian involvement in the Ukrainian crisis is just a small battle to let the global community, more primarily the United States, what their intention are in the regard . Which is, again, to uplift these sanctions that was place so many years ago. Russia does not want to “win” the war, they have a different agenda, and frankly Ukraine is not one of them. Their only regard in political, which is to better their economy, and not adding Crimea

Well taking in the consideration and swaying of political tactics, what will be beneficial for Russia if they do indeed obtain Ukraine. First, will strengthen Putin's public support in Russia. Putting forces in Ukraine has strengthened Putin support in both county, which is good considering the lack of positive opinion in the country over the years. Adding an new land will put him in public opinion as an hero and a saver. Another positive gain on the crisis is an increase of power for Russia, due to their withstanding and resistance of western pressure. With the harboring of the country, Russia has shown that they can still fight back when it comes to western pressures. But do this, they show that they still have power and declare that they are still a nation with a lot of resources and man powers to be a force to recon. An state with power, really doesn't have a say in global affairs, but Russia is try to flex their arms to show to the world that they are still here. Global Affair are hand by an multilateral. Russia reputation as an state, is prepared to withstand western and european pressures to pursue a policy of their own will. Russia wants a say in the arguing that surround the politics of global affairs. Don't look at the capturing of Ukraine as a cry for more land, look at as a strategic move to fight back against the European Nations. Putin is look out for Russia and what is good for the country, which to establish dominance that they once had some many year ago. But besides power, respect and identity, Russia really does gain anything beside these three aspects.

Most cons to the arguing ment are mostly non political but more humanity. For example, Ukrainian armed forces and interior troop are more likely to offer armed resistance to an attack by Russian troops in Eastern Ukraine. Russia has to be careful, although and voting was cast in the country, which the decision was to let the half to join Russia. But this is not ideal, and does not satisfy the global community (UN). The UN responded with the threat of placing heavier sanctions. But Russia is more likely, not going to stop until the sanctions are uplifted. If the issue does not resolve in the coming months, it is most likely that the country (which is Ukraine) will end up in a civil war. The other half will resist. Which would be bad for Russia and the West (more primarily the United States). Escalation even might evaluate to an Global War, and Russia understand this, and trust both parties involved don't want that to happen; Understanding will end up in a annihilation due nuclear arms. Another con would be that Russia already had a lot of land, why need more? The country economy is struggle as it is now. And adding more land with more people will surly won't help the situation. It would make matter even worse. Even know the country is send resources and money over to establish presence in the county which is costly.

Weighing the pro's and cons of the matter and understand the true motives of the country, should the UN interfere with Russia plan to “take over” Ukraine? Well taking an unbiased and appropriate decision, i would have to say no, in the matter of starting another conflict. Russia has made in intention, that they want sanction remove. Russia will continue with the harboring of the country until something about these sanctions. If Russia wants the sanction uplifted, they must continue the hold of Ukraine, until the global community fall to thier demands. This is also good for the UN and the rest of the world. Russia is a tough country in perspective, so hearing the country say sorry won't happen. President Putin wants sanctions lifted, so he did it the tough love way.. They want to show the world that they can play nice with other countries, by cooperating with the UN. For example, they lended and assisted missile bombing of ISIS last year.

Let's face it, the world doesn't work in an liberal way, realism is how the world works. Russia is not just going to say, let us play again. They gonna show in a complex way that their intention are to work with world again. Their taking of the county is so what justified, because the argument was put up to an votes, which favor for the country to join its motherland Russia. So the taking is not inhumane or an violation of human rights, key here sorta. The UN has struction and guidelines for an country to join another country. But Russia violating the “UN's” rules, which making the joining unofficial. Europe has a long history of the battle over power, which leads to competition and conflict at most times. In the east, borders have been weak and unstable for centuries. Especially in the first half of the twentieth century, Central and Eastern European countries were pushed around and their populations abused by great powers with unprecedented brutality. But there is still hope that relations with Russia can be restored and both parties can reach a mutual decision on the crisis in Ukraine.
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