
Explaining Russian Resurgence: The Case Study of Georgia and Ukraine

Muhammad Imran Ashraf*

Athar Ali†

Syed Umair Jalal‡

Abstract

This thesis is an attempt to explain the Russian resurgence: The case study of Georgia and Ukraine, with the help of theoretical framework structural realism. Russia having large territory is full of natural resources, under the leadership of Putin Russia utilized its natural resources to regain its lost position and power. In this research I tried to find out the answers of the questions: Why Russia is resurging in Georgia and Ukraine? How we can explain Russia NATO relations and what will be the future course of this relationship? This study is qualitative in nature and case study design has been used. Both Primary and secondary data is being used. This study explains the probability of emergence of the new regional powers, and alliances due to Russian resurgence that counter US and NATO role in world politics up to a certain level. Russian decision to enter into the Syrian crisis and the conflict between Turkey and Russia made my hypothesis true, that Russian resurgence lead to more conflicts between Russia and NATO. Along with all diplomatic channels and cooperation between NATO and Russia has been suspended due the Russian resurgence.

- Vol. I, No. I (2018)
- Pages: 1 – 12

Key Words: Resurgence, Russia, NATO, Georgia, Ukraine

Introduction

Glancing at the history of global political affairs, one can observe a very few countries are dominant over the global outlook, and one of them is Russia. Russians are the inheritor of great power status since Tsarist Russia and Soviet Union. The past of Russia, its military might and geopolitics, keeps it in an urge for the great power status constantly. Although its collapse in 1991, the nostalgia of being an enormous power has by no means a past, the ex- leaders of the Russian military and state persist to hang around for their lost power and status. Putin in his Munich speech 2007 mourned the unipolarity of USA and that the last has exceeded its national fringes inside and out. He cautioned against US unilateralism and guaranteed that new economic centers of the world would make translate of their economic power into political power and transform the world into a multipolar framework.

The waning movement in Moscow's supremacy was proved to some level by President Putin's political and economic strives, to set Russia on reverse path of multi-polar competition. Resultantly, within a period of some years, Russia showed signs of improvement on the diplomatic, political, and economic borders. Disagreement on the wars, especially Georgia in 2008, support to Iran and Syria in international arena against Western efforts to segregate them, and making economic blocs with rising economies. In the wake of turning into the President, Putin revisited the state policy and brought about three sets of documents: the National Security Concept, the Foreign Policy Concept, and the Military Doctrine that together highlighted two critical elements of Putin's Russia. Firstly, they identified the vital areas for Russia and asserted the latter's commitment to the stability of and control over these areas.

Theoretical Framework

Theories are intermittent examples of human practices. They present to us a scholarly order. One can rapidly unravel what is going on the world affairs, with the assistance of theories that help in portraying and clarifying certain phenomena furthermore help to foresee about future too. International Relations are about war and peace and theory is an instrument to comprehend what is occurring concentrating principally on peace and war.

* Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, National Defence University (NDU) Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: imranashraf@ndu.edu.pk

† PhD Scholar, Department of International Relations, National Defence University Islamabad, Pakistan

‡ M. Phil Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

This section endeavored to investigate the suitable theoretical structure required for the study “The Russian Resurgence and its Impact on NATO post 9/11”. To establish viable framework to demonstrate Russian resurgence has been examined different theories that can better explain the resurging Russia. The aim is to explain and testify the Russian resurgence on theoretical bases that make it easier to understand the phenomena. The study analysis Russian resurgence is on the very bases of theory of structural realism, which demonstrates Georgian and Ukrainian wars on neo realist’s perspective.

Explaining Russian Resurgence: The Case of Georgia and Ukraine

Georgia

Russia has a great history that has a significant position among the great powers during World War I, World War II and Cold war era. With the collapse of Berlin wall and later on the breakdown of USSR led to an end of the cold war and seemed to linger weakly in the world political affairs and territories and now it is once again trying to control over its former territories of influence, especially Georgia and Ukraine. The strategic position of these two countries made it inevitable for Russia to have indirect control over these two states.

Russia believes its present fringes to be a shortcoming. Because of the short of accepted fringes in the northwest, any terrorizations driving from that zone are viewed as extremely grave in Moscow. Russia has dependably pushed westbound on the northern European plain, while Europe has at all times pushed eastward, with like EU and NATO development of the last mentioned. In Kremlin authorities are worried with the Afghan piece of their boundary, and there is a possible disadvantage along China’s western boundary as well. Because of its geographic area and generally poor transportation framework, Moscow faces critical significant inconveniences.

Russians have major aims and interests in Georgia. These interests including: the aspiration to preserve military control in the region and to increase trade and economic binds. Russians are quickly devising foreign policies and promoting Russian nationalism, which are geographically connected to Russia. Strategic importance of Georgia is one of Russia’s most significant interests in the area with the disintegration of the USSR, Russia inherent a significant military being there in Georgia. The Russian military in Georgia were there to defend the southern border of Russia particularly the three hundreds kilometers coast of Black Sea. Russia also has an instant outside geopolitical interest in the area, including an aspiration to border itself with friendly and nonviolent neighbors and avoid a security space which other international like United States or regional powers may possibly fill. Russian army stayed in the Georgia, in order to avoid a security space, to resolve real and possible conflicts, because it was excessively expensive to remove the military troops. The Russian troops acted to secure Russia’s important strategic interests. During an online interview conducted via email with American Associate Professor Dr. Kimberly Gleason said that:

“Putin wants to regain power in the region while maintaining relationships with Western Europe, especially Germany. He will not offend NATO members, and NATO members do not care about Ukraine. Ukraine proved to everyone that no one should ever give up their nukes. Unless Russia gets aggressive with Estonia, there are less possibilities of war between Russia and NATO. A world war would be infinitely more destructive today given weaponry now. Russia cannot reassert if it overextends its economy with meaningless wars in the Ukraine, and not if it doesn’t fix the corruption at the heart of its economic problems. The west was actually very optimistic about Russia, but after the transition simply led to all wealth ending up in the hands of former Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (KGB) oligarchs, we figured out there was nothing to gain from accommodating Russia.”

As Mearsheimer himself so expressively puts it, for each neck there are two hands to suffocate it. In like manner he preserves, that even naturally defensive weapon could be utilized for offense. This is what the anarchic nature of international system that led to war of Georgia in 2008. For Russian President Vladimir Putin there might have been no better moment than this to point out to the world that the Americans have hazarded away its ethical power and influence.

Over the last couple of years, America has significantly concentrated its forces in Europe and its competence to balance against Russia. NATO expanded for couple of years but on the other side in Europe, NATO’s military capability gradually goes downfall. There are two reasons for this decline, first it is evident that considerable decline in the budget of NATO, second the alliance adopted new global preferences to handle with the war against terrorism, and war in Afghanistan.

Ukraine

Ukrainian issue is a landmark after Second World War, because it's the first event after the Second World War that a part of a sovereign country is annexed by a unilateral decision. Though some of the scholars are taking this issue very light, but it is not as lighter as they are thinking to be. This is the beginning of a new era, as the great powers are trying to maintain their influence in the world politics. Things are happening very quickly, scholars from all over the world are assuming that Ukraine is the red line which is drawn by Russia and if any one violates this redline there would be war, as we have seen in Georgia and later on in Ukraine, Russia invaded both states and no one was there to stop Russia. It also indicates the anarchic nature of international system.

We need to understand the Ukrainian crisis purely on its strategic importance for Russia. It is very clear that Ukraine is the second largest country of Europe after Russia. This country is the gate way to Europe for Russia. Ukraine is like a life boat for Russia as it is the owner of gas and oil pipelines transit route to Europe from Russia. Any foreign domination in this country will directly affect the Russian economy. So, Russian concerns over the western influence are genuine, it makes very good sense to protect country's larger interest in the region. On the other hand Crimea where 60% of the total population are Russians. Crimea has a very strategic importance for Russia as it is the only access way to Black Sea and also host Russian navy. The annexation of Crimea is the biggest event of the era after the Second World War. Annexation of Crimea also indicates anarchic nature of international system, states fears from the capabilities of other states as we have examined in the case of Georgia and Ukraine.

In order to know the existing actions adjacent to Ukraine and Russia, we have to look at the causes that led to the crisis in the first place. Most significantly, we have to comprehend why President of Russia "Putin" is prepared to hazard so much to maintain his control over the Ukraine. The lifeblood of Russian economy is its energy exports. The export of gas and oil accounted more than thirty percent of Russian gross domestic products, while its energy exports provides its half of the revenues budget of Russia. So it is very clear to recognize that Russia would go through immense lengths to defend its energy sector even it has to wage a war. Ukraine has vital position strategically and geographically for transporting gas and oil of Russia to Europe. The most significant strategic oil and gas pipelines of Russia go by straight through Ukraine to the rest of Europe

The strategic location of Ukraine between the major energy producers Russia and Caspian Sea area, and consumers in the region of Eurasia, it has high significance because of its huge transit network, on the other side Ukraine has underground gas storage capacities made the state a potential important actor, in the European energy transit a place that will develop as Western European demands for Caspian and Russian gas and oil persist to raise. Russia offers 1,576km long fringes with Ukraine in the east, making Ukraine a key state especially for West and US who need to put a stop to Russia from increasing her control towards the West. If western powers make an influence in the Ukraine it becomes serious threat to Russian economy losing the control over the gas pipelines, which could be a severe setback for the economy of Russia.

Russia could not afford this strategic economical threat and did not loss its grip on Ukraine because it was the matter of survival. The theory also explains that states survival is the prime objective of great powers. John Mearsheimer characterizes survival in terms of the preservation of territorial integrity and the sovereignty of the domestic political rule of law. This means that they contemplate tactically regarding their outside circumstances and prefer the policy that looks like to take advantage of their fundamental aspire of survival and security, now and for long period of time.

To lose political control over the Ukraine will all together means that Russia will no longer have influence and control of all important pipelines passing through Ukraine. This would be a dual curse for Russia. By addition of new strategic stake holder Ukraine, for the Russia it would cause difficulties on deliverance of gas and oil. Russia is dependent on Ukraine for its energy exports and the pipeline located in the country gave an upper hand to Ukraine to put pressure on the Russia to get its own political and economical benefits. Meanwhile, losing be in charge of these pipelines means that Russia will have to face much and tough time to control the politics of Western Europe in the course of its energy exports. Plainly put, a politically autonomous Ukraine with its own preferences and plans is not something that Russian president Vladimir Putin is waiting for.

This is the reason Russia attacked Ukraine. Russia has major interests in the region, if the Ukraine sit in the western block than Ukraine can create issue for Russia in its mass transit route. So as the theory says, states

secure their national interest at any cost even waging a war sometimes if it necessary to do so. The anarchy in international system creates a sense of fear among the states, so it was inevitable for Russia to make necessary arrangements for their survival in this anarchic international system.

Kremlin's activities in Ukraine and its asserted part in the bringing down of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 have brought about eyewitness and approach makers on both sides of the Atlantic, including Members of Congress, to reassess the part Washington and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in keeping up European security. The security worries of NATO's Central and Eastern European part states and non NATO part states, for example, Ukraine and Moldova are of specific worry. NATO has unequivocally censured Moscow's exercises in Ukraine and has gained ground pointed both reassuring its member states and accomplices in Central and Eastern Europe and at preventing further Moscow's hostility. These incorporate determination of backing for Ukraine and its regional trustworthiness; activities to demonstrate NATO's dedication to safeguarding Central and Eastern European member states, and measures went for reproaching Russia.

Crimea has high significance for Russia because of its strategic importance and presence in the Black Sea. The city of Sevastopol is having an important port on Crimea's southern shore, home to the Russia's Black Sea navy along with its a large number of marine staff. Russia saved its half of the Soviet naval force, however was bothered in 2009, when the Western supported Ukrainian President Viktor Yuschenko told that by 2017 Russia would need to withdraw the key port. In 2010 when a pro Russian Viktor Yanukovich elected as President of Ukraine, until 2014 he approved to extend the Russian lease in replace for concessions of gas supplies from Russia. Russia doubts that new pro American government of Ukraine possibly will compel to depart it. The base of Russia in Black Sea at Sevastopol provides Kremlin entrance to the Mediterranean. Moscow is mostly paying attention in the Crimea for the presence of numerous strategic Soviet era submarine bases.

The Yanukovich's decision were reversed by the new interim government in Kiev on 27 February 2014 and decided to sign up the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement. On the other hand the situation in Crimea became worsened, due to a protest by the Russian ethnic people supported by the Russia who fueled the situation. Soon the Russian Army enters into the Ukraine and annexed the Crimea, later on arranged the referendum where majority people voted to become the part of Russia.

Russia took over of Crimea, in spite of her well built and deep rooted historical and ethnic ties to the peninsula, is a comprehensive step that characterizes the utmost revision in geopolitical landscape of Europe's since German reunification. Territorial annexation represents a major geopolitical break, one that shows that the Russia is no longer playing by recognized international set of laws. Russia now has the benefit of influence over all of the three post Soviet borderline states like Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine that desire to closer alliance with the NATO and EU. When it comes to alliance accords, Russia preserve the capability to use force on the governments of these states through, trade embargoes, through gas cut offs or the further back up of separatist movements. The Crimean takeover articulated Russia's resolution not only to restrain the NATO and EU, but also to build up its own Moscow centric assimilation plans.

On the other side, Baltic States have clearly chosen the bandwagoning tactic, sparing no effort to cast themselves as loyal friends and allies of the US. In the Baltics, the membership of NATO was apparent as a solution to their security insufficiency arising from the gigantic regional power discrepancies. Russia's post Soviet foreign policy, in compare, has been characterized by hostility to US domination and condemnation of the unipolar world order (although elements of bandwagoning are also evident. The realist and structural realist reading would reveal the Russian-Baltic relations in terms of a conventional security problem and explain the fall of Russian-Baltic relationship as a result of intensification of risk perceptions in the region, brought about by the NATO enlargement in the face of a gradually more dominant Russia. Dr. Nazir Hussain stated during an interview in connection to my research:

"NATO will not go for direct confrontation if Baltic being attacked by Russia because for Estonia they cannot put whole the Europe on the risk of war and destruction. We have to see that either Baltics has such potential to take on Russia? Will NATO or Europe commit for Baltics. Russia can do and Russia did it already many times. The Europe after 1946 is not committing, they just doing surgical operation and coming back. NATO has been punished in Afghanistan and Libya very badly. Even America is not involving itself directly even for ISIS, America is creating proxies. But Russian can commit, Putin will do two things to survive itself, he will commit his army and Europe will

destroy and economic power of Europe will collapse. If you want to destroy economy of any country engage him in a war."

Russia has major interests in the region, if Ukraine sit in the western block than Ukraine can create issues for Russia in its mass transit route. So as the theory says, states secure their national interest at any cost even waging a war sometimes if it necessary to do so. The anarchy in international system creates a sense of fear among the states, so it was inevitable for Russia to make necessary arrangements for their survival in this anarchic international system. It is evident that Russia is dependent on Ukraine of gas and oil pipelines transit route. Despite such a high level importance, why Russia waged war against Ukraine and annexed Crimea? The liberal school of thought failed to describe the situation. For structural realists trade and economic relations among the countries is low politics. States do trade and other economic activity as it is necessary to accumulate power. Here Russia felt the threat to its existence and if its former territories joined the NATO possibly Ukraine could block its transit route which could be a serious threat to the Russia's national interest.. As it's clear like crystal that states can trust on other states, under this anarchic international system Russia for the sake of its own survival and national interest attacked Ukraine and annexed Crimea. The anarchic international system compels states to wage war.

Resurging Russia and NATO

The former USSR disintegrated in 1991, and the cold war came to an end. The former superpower USSR divided into more than sixteen states. The USA and west celebrated their victory. Some of the scholars argued it was the victory of liberal democracy and an end of history. USA and the West tried to impose the western liberal thoughts on other non western countries. American and European policy makers saw Russia as strategic rival. Russia is seeking to become a global player once again. The main obstacle in her way is America. To achieve this goal Russia is trying to counter American hegemony. For this purpose Russia is containing the European institutions especially NATO on its former territories of influence.

NATO's development towards Russian fringes and the consideration in NATO of nations whose elites had verifiable buildings with respect to Russia in view of their setbacks and defeats in earlier centuries have expanded against Kremlin assessments in the alliance. NATO's expansion has turn into the primary danger to European security. To add more fuel to the division of the Old World, a choice was made to convey components of a missile defense system in Central Europe. Moscow set up wild resistance most importantly, on the grounds that it understood the essential need to stop the system of continuing encounter in Europe on new borders. On the off chance that the U.S, and Western Europe also attempt to keep enlargement of the NATO eastward, Moscow will have no alternate option except to look for sanctuary behind a wall of atomic missiles set on high cognizant and to get ready for the most exceedingly terrible, attempting to exert greatest harm on the other party.

It is an admitted fact that a country which has a glorious past and presently having a powerful military in the proximity will create sense of threat and fear to the survival all the time among its neighbors. No doubt Russian army is 2nd in the world rank. One cannot deny that an important indicator to determine power of any is its military power. Having large army as well as with most nukes Russia is a great military power in the recent era. It is one and only country challenging American hegemony around the globe. The military might is among the one of the reason that not only created sense of vulnerability among the NATO states but also led to some preemptive measures. Here I examined the things very precisely. We can divide the Russian army in the three major areas like Ground forces, Air forces, and Naval forces.

According to Wikimake BlogSpot Russian military assets:

Table 1. Russian Military Assets 2015

Military Assets, Expenditure and Budget	Numbers
Aircrafts	3,000
Tanks	15,000
Aircraft Carrier	1
Submarines	60
Nukes	8,000
Number of Military	7,66,000

Expenditure to upgrade military equipment	\$200b
Military budget	\$64,000,000,000

Source: <http://listtop10.com/list-of-top-10-strongest-armies-in-2015/>

Through all these military assets that are spreading over from Pacific to Baltic from Caspian Sea to Black Sea protecting Russian larger interests.

According to SIPRI 2015 report Russia ranks 2nd militarily in the world. Following Figure ii is elaborating the military strength of world countries.

Table 2. Military Strength Indicator

Military strength indicator								
Country	Overall ranking	Active personnel ('000)	Tanks	Aircraft	Attack helicopters	Aircraft carriers	Submarines	Final military strength score
United States	1	0.90	0.86	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.94
Russia	2	0.81	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.52	0.86	0.80
China	3	0.95	0.90	0.86	0.86	0.52	0.90	0.79
Japan	4	0.38	0.38	0.76	0.81	0.76	0.81	0.72
India	5	0.86	0.81	0.81	0.19	0.76	0.76	0.69
France	6	0.33	0.24	0.67	0.43	0.90	0.57	0.61
South Korea	7	0.76	0.57	0.71	0.71	0.05	0.67	0.52
Italy	8	0.52	0.33	0.38	0.57	0.76	0.43	0.52
UK	9	0.19	0.14	0.52	0.67	0.52	0.57	0.50
Turkey	10	0.57	0.67	0.57	0.57	0.05	0.67	0.47
Pakistan	11	0.71	0.62	0.48	0.48	0.05	0.52	0.41
Egypt	12	0.62	0.76	0.62	0.38	0.05	0.14	0.34
Taiwan	13	0.43	0.52	0.43	0.76	0.05	0.14	0.32
Israel	14	0.24	0.71	0.33	0.48	0.05	0.33	0.32
Australia	15	0.05	0.05	0.10	0.24	0.52	0.43	0.30
Thailand	16	0.48	0.43	0.24	0.14	0.52	0.05	0.28
Poland	17	0.14	0.48	0.19	0.29	0.05	0.33	0.23
Germany	18	0.29	0.19	0.29	0.33	0.05	0.14	0.19
Indonesia	19	0.67	0.29	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.10	0.12
Canada	20	0.10	0.10	0.14	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.10

Source: SIPRI, Global Firepower, Credit Suisse

Source: <http://www.businessinsider.com> (PHOTO: Business Insider).

These statistics are quite alarming for the neighboring states especially for NATO states. They have strong reservations over the Russian resurgence that started to influence its former territories. The Baltic state's security according to the NATO slogan is now quite challenging for NATO. After the successful war of Georgia and Ukraine it is possible that the next could be Baltic States the member of European security treaty NATO. Scholars arguing that whether NATO defend Baltic States or sort out its diplomatic solution if it taken place. If we assume NATO comes forward to defend the Baltic States, what will be the next? Every European country is on the target Russian Nuclear arsenals. It can lead to a third world war. The whole world particularly the European region is on the risk.

John Mearsheimer (2001) took the opposing perspective; he kept up that it makes well strategic sense for states to accomplish however much power as could reasonably be expected and, if the conditions are right, to seek after influence. The contention is not that success or mastery is great in itself, however rather than having incomprehensible power is the most ideal approach to ensure one's own particular survival. For traditional realists, power is an end in itself; for neo-realists, power is an objective and the inevitable end is survival. According to the study above, Moscow owns significant military resources. The enlarged level and capacity of armed forces military exercises in the past few years, has enhanced the capacity of the divisions.

Putin gathered the countries which were against American hegemony. The Russian support to Iran and Syria is a good example. Accusations of a chemical weapons assault took out by the Assad's government has sharpened anxiety worldwide. There be hard converse from Western leaders and an outbreak of action by the America, all of which appear to propose that armed action alongside the government of Assad might be in the instant future. However, Syria appears to maintain the support of some outstanding allies. Moscow is one of Syrian major weaponry dealer more than \$4 billion. In the SPRI projected he noted the worth of Moscow's weapons deals to Damascus at \$162m every year in both 2009 and 2010. Kremlin furthermore \$550m agreement with Damascus for fighting exercise jet aircraft. Moscow also rent a marine capability at Tartus to Damascus, providing the Moscow's fleet its only straight entrance to the Mediterranean.

Kremlin has the ability to veto UNSC resolutions against the Assad administration and has prepared as such over and over in the course of recent years. Thus, if the Washington and its partners are depending on a UN order to show the green light for a military strike, they may be holding up quite a while. On the Syrian Crisis Putin not only favored the Assad regime but also threatened the UN will be no more if Syria is being attacked by NATO forces. By adopting such an aggressive policy Putin not only protect its alliance from the western advancement in Syria but also challenged the US hegemony. He took a clear stance on the American hegemonic nature decisions, and makes it realize to the America that Russia will not allow the American hegemonic natured decisions on the world issues.

The recent development in Syrian Crisis changed the whole scenario. Russia sent its jets to Syria and targeting terrorists. These situations create sense of policy failure among the western countries. It is reported in different news channels and newspapers that Russia is attacking the western trained rebels. By putting its foothold in Syria Russia not only is saving their friend Assad but also making sure its presence in the Middle East. It is considering as strategic success of Russia that holds its foot in the region of Middle East.

"Americans were very reluctant to get involved militarily in Syria because it's a slippery slopes to a war, in large, America has possession on Syria but doesn't have strategy to end the war. Russia is taking a much more active role, and has been able to step into vacuum left by USA, and more importantly Russia has reset the chessboard in the Syria. Russia made it difficult to US to carry through its air strikes against ISIS, now it's clear that everybody in Syria is confronting Russia and it is now very different calculations front before. The things have changed Russia has changed the dynamic, for Turkey and Saudi Arabia, because they are no anymore confronting Iran they are now confronting Russia and both countries are not in a position of confrontation with Russia."

Russia President reacted strongly over the Jet downed by Turkey and stated that Turkey is collaborator of terrorists and intimidated serious consequences. It is first occasion that Kremlin and NATO have exchanged straight fire over the Syrian crisis. He further stated that our military is a historical heroic role against terrorists in Syria and Iraq, but the jet downed by Turkey is a stab in back. Tehran is a long-established alliance and a decent adjacent state of Moscow. We are resolved to additional reinforcing the cordial relations with Iran. We regard the privilege of Iran to tranquil utilization of nuclear vitality and participate with the Iranians in adding to their atomic energy segment. In the meantime, Moscow is steadfastly against any possibility of an armed measurement of Tehran's atomic project. Kremlin accepts that anxieties of the worldwide group with respect to a few parts of the project must be truly tended to. That is the reason Moscow has bolstered UN Security Council declarations on Tehran. Moscow is certain that at hand is no distinct option for an arranged conciliatory arrangement of the Iran-related issues. We bolster the endeavors of the Agency in clearing up the inquiries concerning the improvement of the Iranian atomic project; further so as the need of endeavors had affirmed by declarations of the UN Security Council and IAEA Governing Council. Kremlin emphasizes the significance of continuing the discussions between permanent members of UNSC plus Germany and Iran.

Moscow's foreign policy post collapse of USSR has been aggravated by a constant wish to re-establish its great power status, and to be acknowledged as a key center of power by leading international players. When Kremlin faced with the expansion of potentially anti-Russian organizations, Russia became busy in immediate and viable multilateralism, as seen in its promotion of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) and Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). The CIS was permitted to remain a feeble forum, outlined just for examinations of squeezing issues among heads of state. Of the Eurasian joining configurations of the 1990s, just the CSTO stayed related toward the start of the 21st Century. Eurasian incorporation has along these lines turned into a key target in the new 2013 Foreign Policy Concept of the Moscow which unequivocally vows 'to back the Eurasian economic combination process towards foundation of the Eurasian Economic Union and the change of the Eurasian Economic Community.

The Shanghai Five groups formed in 1996, and was succeeded by the SCO in June 2001 is a significant development in present day global politics. Its member states are china, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Its observers incorporate India, Pakistan, Iran and Mongolia. SCO covers one of the biggest land zones of any regional association, and its members and observers by and large posses 17.5% of the world's demonstrated oil reserves, 47-50% of known normal gas reserves and 45% of global population. Its unique goal is to counter the danger of terrorism, separatism and radicalism yet after some times, its goals have been expanded to incorporate collaboration in energy sector, infrastructure, base and economic affairs. The theory also suggests that states go to make for alliance for their own security, here, we examined some of the cases that Russia is doing the same to make international alliances, for example BRICS, SCO, EURASIA. This is the bandwagoning strategy used by the Russia to counter the western institutions.

Some of the western analysts considered SCO as the "NATO of the East" in the central Asia to counter the presence of West. On the other hand, some analysts regarded it as Chinese and Russian struggle to preserve the status quo in the central Asia. Russian regime is not comfortable with the multilateral organizations because these multilateral organizations challenging the sovereignty of the state, and also influence in the decision making process away from advantaged organizations such as UN Security Council and G8 countries. For this reason, Kremlin desires multipolarity, where its authority is improved relatively than its concern in unmanageable bodies where its power is reduced by the presence of numerous less important states. Moscow is encouraging regional organizations rather than global organizations, where Kremlin could play a decisive role within these regional Organizations. In precise, Russia seeks equal position and treatment in regional and international level with EU, NATO and USA.

The western scholars believe that Moscow is attending on its larger national interests. Some of the western scholars are looking these entire events as to contain NATO's enlargement as it is perceived threat to territorial integrity and the security of the Russia is simply denial to accept the sovereignty of its neighboring states. Moscow is looking for modifying the current European security system by diminishing the US role in NATO and European security. In all these areas, Moscow's national interests basically deviate from those of the America or, more accurately, the Kremlin does not share the interest of west or threat perceptions.

Moscow is a resurgent great power in the light of Medvedev foreign policy concept The Kremlin follows the five important principles according to the Foreign and Security Policy Principles:

Table 4. Five Key Foreign Policy Concepts

S. No	Russian Foreign Policy Concepts
i	The primacy of international law
ii	Multipolarity to replace U.S. dominated unipolarity
iii	The avoidance of Russian isolationism
iv	The protection of Russians wherever they reside
v	Russia's privileged interests in regions adjacent to Russia

Source: <http://www.moscowtimes.ru/opinion/article/381661/>

Russian National Security Strategy portrays the expansion of NATO and its extended worldwide role as a foremost threat to Moscow's national interests and to international security. Much concentration was also devoted to the possible hazard of future energy wars over regions such as the Arctic, where Kremlin would

apparently preserve its access to hydrocarbon resources. Some of the analysts arguing that there will be a tough competition over the energy resources that can lead to an armed conflict near the Russian borders. Moscow is determined to reestablish its lost position in the world to attain this goal Russia is busy in a wide ranging historical revisionist promotion in which it looks for to portray Russia's Soviet and Tsarist empires. Understandings of the past are vital for legacy of the present government, which is dedicated to representing Russia's assumed prominence and reestablishing its privileged interests over former territories of influence.

As the theory of structural realism also covers the relative capabilities which lead to an unending struggle among the countries, and we can examine the struggle between west and Russia for the regional hegemony and relative capabilities. Relative capabilities also lead to uncertainty and fear resultantly states seek more capabilities in militarily Russia is striving to secure its borders from the NATO's enlargement which is in the larger interest of the Russia, because as theory says that states feel threat from their opponents' capabilities as NATO encircling the Russia, the fear of survival and security among the Russians are also increasing and concerns to secure their borders and trying to keep the NATO out of there farmer territories of influence. So, Russia is enhancing its military expenditures due to the threat of survival and security, and according to the theory the primary goal of the states is its survival. So Russia is striving to keep its position in the world politics.

Conclusion

No one imagined that a country just collapsed a decade ago, will be able to reemerge as a regional power once again. It was not less than a surprise for the world. Russia has a great history for being a great power and this history was nostalgia for the rulers of Russia. The circumstances were worst that ever have faced by the people of Russia from 1989 up to 2000. When an ex-army personal came into power things are started to change. It is Putin's efforts that once again he made his nation stand on its own feet. The man in crisis has the ability to find out opportunities even in the worst conditions. Russia today is wealthier and economically stronger than ever. Russia has a vast territory that makes its significant position regionally as well as globally.

A country having such vast territory is feeling insecure due to the anarchic nature of international system. This was the anarchic international system that led to war of Georgia 2008 and Ukraine 2014. Geostrategic importance of Georgia and Ukraine is attracting both NATO and Russia. Russia is trying to secure its national interest as theory says states secure their interests at any cost, and even some time wages wars to secure their national interest. In Georgia and Ukraine Russia did so, because that interest was like life boat and Russia has to secure it at any cost. This is all happening because of the anarchic nature of the international system that Russia is looking to enhance its resources that is essential for its security and in larger national interest. the offensive Realism states that Great powers are rational actors, which imply that they are mindful of their outside environment and contemplate strategically how to survive in it. The first event took place after the collapse of Russia was Georgian war, which was the first unilateral action against any state after the Second World War. Georgia has very significant geostrategic position and Russia has its interest in Georgia to control over the Black Sea. This was the anarchic nature in the intentional system that led to war of Georgia. Russia established its position in the affairs of regional countries by controlling their foreign policy.

We can see the economic activity despite disagreements. But Kenneth Waltz argues that economic activity is the low politics, whereas states interests and survival in the anarchic nature are high politics. Russia has successfully maintained itself as regional power, and trying to assert itself as global power. Russia check matted USA in Syria, Ukraine, and Georgia as well as in Nuclear Deal with Iran. Russia has potential to become a global power but still lacks behind in economic front, if they improved their declining economy than soon they will easily counter US hegemony with multi polarity.

We need to understand the Ukrainian crisis purely on the bases of its strategic importance for Russia and NATO. It is very clear that Ukraine is the second largest country of Europe after Russia. This country is the gate way to Europe for Russia. Ukraine is like a life boat for Russia as it is the owner of gas and oil pipelines transit route to Europe from Russia. Any foreign domination in this country would directly affect Russian economy. So, Russian concerns over the western influence are genuine, it makes very good sense to protect country's larger interest in the region. On the other hand Crimea where 60%of the total population are Russians. Crimea has a very strategic importance for Russia as it is the only passage way to Black Sea and also host Russian navy. Here again argument is the anarchic nature of international system that makes states to feel insecure from other

state's intentions that led to annexation of Crimea. The second argument is national interest as Crimea is life boat for the economic activity of Russia and Russia secured it interest even waged war.

Advancement and enlargement of NATO towards Russia is also purely on the basis of national interest. If we examine the Russian dilemma, it is encircled by the NATO forces. They gradually, are entering in the former territories of Russia. That is considered by Russia a threat to its security. A large army presence in the Eastern Europe especially, in areas which have geostrategic importance for Russia is not less than a threat for its survival. So Russia went for war in 2008 in Georgia and Ukraine in 2014, but this time NATO and American miscalculation led to the annexation of Crimea.

The relative capabilities which lead to an unending struggle among the countries, and we can examine the struggle between the west and Russia for the regional hegemony and relative capabilities. Relative capabilities also lead to uncertainty and fear resultantly states seek more capabilities in militarily Russia is striving to secure its borders from the NATO's enlargement which is in the larger interest of the Russia, because as theory says that states feel threat from their opponents capabilities as NATO encircling the Russia, the fear of survival and security among the Russians are also increasing and concerns to secure their borders and trying to keep the NATO out of there farmer territories of influence. So, Russia is enhancing its military expenditures due to the threat of survival and security, and according to the theory the primary goal of the states is its survival.

In the international arena support to Iran and Syria especially recent development in Syrian Crisis changed the whole scenario. Russia sent its jets to Syria and targeting terrorists. These situations create sense of policy failure among the western countries. It is reported in different news channels and newspapers that Russia is attacking the western trained rebels. By putting its foothold in Syria, Russia is not only saving his friend and ally Assad but also making sure its presence in the Middle East. It is considering as strategic success of Russia that hold its foot in the region of Middle East. Deployment of ICBMS in Poland by US and in response Russian installation of ICBMS further led to icy relations. The conflict between Turkey and Russia, as well as Russian decision to enter into the Syrian crisis supported my hypothesis, that Russian resurgence lead to more conflicts between Russia and NATO.

Though Russia is less powerful than America in term of economy and military, but despite all this, we cannot ignore Moscow's nuclear power having more than 8000 nuclear arsenals and inter-continental Ballistic Missiles. The European Union and other international bodies should think over the issue very seriously and find out some diplomatic solution to the issue. If sovereignty of Russia threatened and the red lines were underestimated, there could be a nuclear catastrophe once again, and the first and foremost victim of war surely will be Europe, and this will be most disastrous than Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Any triggering event can modify the map of the Europe.

Changes in the leadership in the world, Trump, Boris Johnson, Modi, Muhammad bin Salman and Imran Khan led to a new situation in the world affairs. Many of the international agreements including JCPOA have been revoked or reconsidered their previous decisions by Trump administration, which led to uncertainty. Most of the leaders mentioned above are vocal and outspoken. This new leadership will lead to new military and economic blocs. Russia will avail this opportunity and get closer to the former US alliances e.g. Pakistan and Afghanistan. Post withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan, Russian role in the region will increase further as we have witnessed in Syrian case. Russia will get access to warm waters sooner or later Russia will get engage more in Central Asia and South Asia particularly with Pakistan and Afghanistan. By sitting in Middle East , Central Asia and South Asia, Russia will occupy an important place in the world affairs.

References

- Rama Sampath Kumar, From Kosovo to Georgia: The US, NATO and Russia, *"Economic and Political Weekly"*, Vol. 43, No. 36 (Sep. 6 - 12, 2008), pp. 24-27, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40277922> Accessed: 02-03-2015 12:42
- James Goldgeiger, 2014, "Stop Blaming NATO for Russia's Provocations," *The New Republic*, April 17, 2014, accessed 11-05-2015, retrieved from, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/>
- The Strategic importance of Ukraine and why both Russia and U.S. are interested" Accessed 03-05- 2015, retrieved from, http://www.liveleak.com/view?i=ac4_1431202960&utm_source=dvr.it&utm
- John J. Mearsheimer, 1994, "The False Promise of International Institutions" *International Security*, Vol. 19. No 3. Winter
- Leon Aron, 2013, The Political Economy of Russian Oil and Gas, *"American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research"*, pp, 4-7.
- Paul Belkin et al, 2014, "NATO: Response to the Crisis in Ukraine and Security Concerns in Central and Eastern Europe" *Congressional Research Service*
- Ibid
- Hall Gardner, 2014 NATO, the EU, Ukraine, Russia and Crimea: The "Reset" that was Never "Reset" *"NATO Watch"* Briefing Paper No.49 , 3 April 2014, retrieved from, www.natowatch.org Accessed date 04-05-2015
- Ibid.
- Ambrosio, T . (2005), *"Challenging America's Global Preeminence: Russia's Quest for Multipolarity"*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Dr. Nazir Hussain, 2015, interviewer Athar Ali, *"Interview"* Associate Professor Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 21 September 2015.
- Janusz Bujajski, 2010, Russia's Pragmatic Reimperialization, *Caucasian "Review of international Affairs"*, Vol. 4 (1) Winter 2010
- Sergei Karaganov, 2009, The Magic Numbers of 2009: How to Finish 20th-Century History, "Russia in Global Affairs" Vol. 7 • No. 2 • April--June, 2009
- List of top Ten Strongest Armies in 2015, Accessed 11-06-2015, from, <http://liststoptens.com/list-of-top-10-strongest-armies-in-2015/>
- Ibid
- Photo, Business insider 2015, accessed, 06 -10-2015, retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/>
- Ibid
- John J.Mearsheimer. (2001), *"The Tragedy of Great Power Politics"* (New York: Norton). The most Comprehensive Statement of Offensive Realism.
- Jakob Hedenskog & Carolina Vendil Pallin, 2013, *"Russian Military Capability in a Ten-Year Perspective 2013"* FOI Publishers.
- Holly Yan, 2013, "Syria allies: Why Russia, Iran and China are standing by the regime" Accessed 20-06-2015, retrieved from ,<http://edition.cnn.com/2013/08/29/world/meast/syria-iran-china-russia-supporters/>
- Ibid
- "Associated Press"* 17-06- 2010, retrieved <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/world/main6592403.shtml>
- Vali Nasr, 2015, *"Russian action reset chessboard in Syria"* Dean John Hops kin University USA, An interview with euronewstv, retrieved <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RpCARquYjaU>
- David Smith, 2015, "Putin condemns Turkey after Russian warplane downed near Syria border" *the guardian*, 24 November 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/24/turkey-shoots-down-jet-near-border-with-syria>
- Ibid
- Larson, Deborah and Alexei Shevchenko. 2010. Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy. *International Security* 34 (4): 63–95.
- Ibid
- Vladimir Putin, 2013, "Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation", *the ministry of foreign* Putin's Prepared Remarks at 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy," *Washington Post*, February 12, 2007

- * James T. Quinnivan and Olga Olikier, "Nuclear Deterrence in Europe: Russian Approaches to a New Environment and Implications for the United States" RAND Corporation, 2011
- "The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation," 2000 FAS Federation of American Scientists, www.fas.org.
- "Russia's Military Doctrine," Arms Control Association, May 2000.
- Russia Geography, retrieved from, URL:<http://www.mapsofworld.com/russia/geography/>, day of accessed 23-04-2015,
- Vinod K. Aggarwal, Kristi Govella, "Responding to a resurgent Russia", Russian policy and responses from European Union and the United States, Springer New York, 2012 p;31-32
- Nicole J Jackson, 2003 "Russian Foreign Policy and the CIS" Rutledge, Landon and New York Kimberly Gleason, 27 September, 2015, "online interview via email", Associate Professor Finance *affairs of the Russian Federation*, accessed 21-06-215
- http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/76389FEC168189ED44257B2E0039B16D
- Steven Pifer, "Reversing the Decline: An Agenda for U.S.-Russian Relations in 2009," *Policy Paper*, No.10, January 2009, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- David J. Kramer, "The Russia Challenge: Prospects for U.S.-Russian Relations," *Policy Brief*, June 9,2009, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, Washington D.C., 2.
- "The Moscow Times", September 1, 2009, <http://www.moscowtimes.ru/opinion/article/381661/JanuszBujajski>, 2010, Russia's Pragmatic Reimperialization, Caucasian *"Review of international Affairs"*, Vol 4 (1) Winter 2010