

**BINDURA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND GOVERNANCE
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**



POWER POLITICS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RUSSIA-UKRAINE WAR

**BY
THEMBANI MLILO**

(B213183B)

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND GOVERNANCE
IN THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS.**

SUPERVISOR : DR BBC MBANJE

3 JANUARY 2023

NAME OF STUDENT : THEMBANI MLILO

STUDENT NUMBER : W211460

RESEARCH TOPIC : POWER POLITICS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RUSSIA-UKRAINE WAR

YEAR OF COMPLETION : JANUARY 2023

Permission is hereby granted to Bindura University of Science Education to produce duplicates of this dissertation and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific purposes only. The author does not reserve other publication rights and neither the dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's consent and written permission.

SIGNED

DATE.....

CONTACT DETAILS:

CELL NUMBER : 0776454286

DECLARATION FORM

I Them bani Mlilo, hereby declare that this dissertation submitted to Bindura University of Science Education for the partial fulfillment of A Masters of Science in International Relations has never been previously submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university, that this is my own work in design and execution and that all material contained therein has been duly acknowledged.

Signed

.....

Date

.....

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my beautiful wife Josephine, lovely daughter Mellish Akatendeka Thembinkosi and great son Doyen Akudzwe Thembalami Mlilo who have stood with me and believed in my potential.

Acknowledgment

My acknowledgement goes to my project supervisor Dr Mbanje. I would like also to extend my gratitude to lecturers at the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Bindura whose input and formal talk greatly shaped the various ideas contained herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

<i>DECLARATION FORM</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>DEDICATION</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgment</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>CHAPTER ONE</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1.1 Background of the Study</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1.2 Statement of the Problem</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>1.3 Purpose of the Study</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.4 Research Objectives</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.5 Research Questions</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.6 Assumptions of the study</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.7 Significance of the Study</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.8 Limitations of the Study</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1.9 Delimitations of the study</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1.9.1 Theoretical Delimitation</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1.9.2 Population Delimitation</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1.9.3 Methodological Delimitation</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.9.4 Time Delimitation</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.10 Definition of Key Terms</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>CHAPTER TWO</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2.1. Introduction</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2.2. Theoretical Framework</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2.3 Russia-American relations vis-à-vis Ukraine</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>2.3.1 Russian influence in Ukraine</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>2.3.2 American influence in Ukraine</i>	<i>15</i>

<i>2.4 Politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the western block</i>	
19	
<i>2.5 Power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war</i>	24
<i>2.5.1 Power politics within the economic arena</i>	25
<i>2.5.2 Power politics within the military sphere</i>	27
<i>2.5.3 Power politics over United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)</i>	30
<i>2.5.4 Power politics over Media</i>	32
<i>2.6 Summary</i>	33
CHAPTER 3	35
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	35
<i>3.1 Introduction</i>	35
<i>3.2 Research Philosophy</i>	35
<i>3.3 Research Approach</i>	38
<i>3.4 Research Design</i>	38
<i>3.5 Population Sample and Sampling Techniques</i>	39
<i>3.6 Data Collection Instruments</i>	40
<i>3.6.1 Document Analysis</i>	41
<i>3.6.2 Questionnaires</i>	41
<i>3.6.3 Interviews</i>	41
<i>3.7 Presentation and Data Analysis</i>	42
<i>3.8 Validity</i>	42
<i>3.8.1 Reliability</i>	43
<i>3.9 Ethical Issues</i>	43
<i>3.10 Summary</i>	43
CHAPTER FOUR	45
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	45
<i>4.1 Introduction</i>	45
<i>4.2 Demographic information of participants</i>	45
<i>4.3 The relations between Washington and Moscow Visa// V//Vis the Ukranian war</i>	46
<i>4.4 Politics of encroachment between the Russia federation and the Western block</i>	50
<i>4.5 Power politics within the Russian Ukranian war</i>	54
<i>Discussion of Findings</i>	59

<i>4.6 Summary</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>5.0 Introduction</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>5.1 Summary of the findings</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>5.2 Conclusion</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>5.3 Recommendations</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>5.4 Areas for further research</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>5.5 Summary</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>REFERENCES</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>APPENDIX A</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>APPENDIX B</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>APPENDIX C</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>APPENDIX D</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>APPENDIX E</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>APPENDIX F</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>APPENDIX G</i>	<i>77</i>

ABSTRACT

The main focus of the study was to proffer an analysis of power politics within the Russia Ukrainian war. The study relied on qualitative research due to its ability to get people's opinions on the study at hand. The theoretical underpinnings used in the study were power theory and realism. The researcher also used Purposive sampling and snowballing. Data was collected from people who were knowledge on power politics such as journalist, Political Scientist, embassy officials from Russian Embassy, academics and security experts. The findings from the study reviewed power politics at play between the Russian federation and USA and her allies. The war in Ukrainian is not a war between Russia and Ukraine but rather it is between USA and the Russian federation. Findings exposed power politics at play within the United Nations General Assembly where the Western democracies are influencing countries to vote against Russia and those who insist to vote in favour risk losing aid and economic support. Power politics is also visible in the economy and military. The findings also held USA and its NATO allies as responsible for the war due to encroachment of the Western democracies in the previous Russia's sphere of influence. The encroachment of former Warsaw pact into the NATO allies and step made by Ukraine made Russia to defend its self against provocation by USA and its NATO allies

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The International system can be said to be anarchic since there is no world government. This leads us to the realist assumption of power politics in an anarchical system where the political player's behaviour is premised on egoism in absence of morality (*Animus dominandi*) (Mearsheimer, 2000). Scholars such as Morgenthau and Waltz are of the view that Nation states are dominated by a struggle for power. The dominance of the United States of America and its western allies in the international system is evident of the above arguments. The Western alliance is trying to dominate the world through a new World order premised on democracy, good governance, human rights, free trade, market economy and capitalist-oriented policies (Baldwin,200). Accordingly, the international system has witnessed the western block (specifically led by the USA) encroaching little by little into territories which were once Russian's spheres of influence these include countries such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and currently Ukraine (Mark,2001).

The current Russia Ukrainian war which is the major focus of this study has become a topical issue in the international system as it exposes power politics between the Kremlin and Washington. As had happened in the Yugoslav war of 1998.The Russians have perceived the Ukrainian war as a necessary evil to curb Washington and its allies influence in a country it shares a boarder with. Russia strongly believed that if Ukraine becomes an ally of Western block then it will pose an existential threat to the Russian federation (Mark, 2001)

Ukraine was part of the USSR, the superpower at the centre of the Warsaw pact an Eastern military alliance established in opposition to NATO (Western military alliance) (Heywood, 2001). Between 1989, and 1992, the Warsaw pact collapsed and the USSR disintegrated paving way for the unipolar world where the United States of America became the sole superpower (Mearsheimer, 2000). The Soviet Republics became

independent nation states that is Russia federation, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Estonia and Belarus. Russia remained a great power having inherited the bulk of Soviet military and industrial strength, particularly a potent nuclear arsenal (Baldwin,2000). Ukraine on the other hand retained several nuclear plants. This is one explanation of Ukraine's strategic importance to both Russia and the USA (Heywood,2011). Concerning Russia the nuclear plants can be used by an antagonistic Ukraine (As an Western ally) to manufacture nuclear weapons that will pose a great threat to Russia's security. As regards the USA the nuclear plants become a strategic advantage in threatening the security of Russia (Mark, 2001).

It was in 1999 that the former Warsaw Pact members Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic joined NATO, with Russia strongly opposing the move. Another NATO expansion came with accession of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. Russia a great power, felt encircled by its former NATO adversaries. Ever since the joining of some former Eastern countries into the West block Russia has felt encircled by the Western block specifically the United States of America (Mark 2001:123). This study therefore is a critical analysis of power politics at play in the Russia Ukraine War.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Initially they were agreements (founding act 1991 and Helsinki accords 1997)where United States of America and Nato agreed that they will not expand to Eastern Europe and the Russian federation also agreed that it was not going to encroach to the West. It is instructive to note that the ill-conceived expansion of NATO into areas of previous Soviet influence seems to be in violation of an understanding struck between NATO and the Russian Federation at the end of the Cold war. The agreement was that NATO would respect the independence of the former soviet states and satellite states and would not expand its military alliance into these territories. USA agreed that it will not expand to Eastern Europe. A problem arises when Nato (specifically USA and its Western allies) now encroaches in Russia's sphere of influence. In this case the problems becomes multi-faceted and the following questions might arise:

- Is the USA and its allies now undermining what they had agreed upon with Russian federation in the 1990s?
- Is this an attempt by USA to weaken Russia's influence in the Eastern region?
- Is Russia going to accept a Western controlled Ukraine?
- Is the world now witnessing the birth of a new world order characterised by multipolarity or bipolarity?.

The study therefore seeks to give a thorough interrogation of power politics between the Russian federation and the Western block (specifically the USA) in relation to Russian-Ukrainian War.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to make a critical analysis of Russia Ukraine war and power politics at play between the Russian Federation and the Western block that is the United States of America.

1.4 Research Objectives

- To examine the relations between Washington and Moscow visa/v/vis Ukraine
- To examine the politics of encroachment between the Russian federation and the Western block
- To analyse power politics within the Russia-Ukraine war

1.5 Research Questions

- What is the Russian-American relations with special focus on Ukraine?
- What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?
- How is power politics at play in the Russian Ukrainian war manifesting?

1.6 Assumptions of the study

1. Russia will never allow Ukraine to become a Western ally

2. American influence provoked Russia to intervene militarily in the former Soviet Union State

3. Both the USA and the Russian federation have vested interest in Ukraine.

4. Russia is trying by all means possible to maintain its influence in Eastern European region

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study focused on power politics at play in the Russian Ukrainian war. Principally, it is significant for students of diplomacy, foreign policy, strategic studies, public policy, public administration, sociology, development studies, psychology and international relations to broaden their understanding of power politics. The study of power is central to the broad field of international relations which includes areas such as foreign policy, diplomacy, terrorism, international law, political science, geo politics and strategic studies. A study that gives a detailed analysis on power politics that exist in the current global atmosphere is quite significant and appropriate. Similarly the study is significant in that it will broaden the understanding of fields such as conflict, military studies, defence and offensive strategies, disarmament, nuclear proliferation, energy studies, economics, political science, war studies and environmental studies. The study also has huge bearing on human security specifically on issues to do with economic, political, social, human and state security. The importance of the study also lies in proffering insightful information on military strategies to policy makers, academia, war studies analysts, journalists, political scientists, strategic analysts, security sector experts and military strategist. Likewise the study exposes the security challenges being faced by the conflicting countries with the aim of informing the above experts on how to come up with ways of addressing the barriers faced by countries at war.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The researcher anticipated challenges in obtaining data from respondents as there was unwillingness by respondents to divulge sensitive information, as they viewed the researcher with suspicion. To address the limitation, the researcher assured privacy of participants and confidentiality of their information as stipulated under BUSE research

guidelines.

Second, given the nature of the research, some respondents intentionally omitted, over exaggerated or downplayed certain issues thus accurate or relevant information was hard to come by. While this was a problem that arise with any social science research, the research also relied on information gathered from questionnaires, interviews and documentary sources.

1.9 Delimitations of the study

The study focused on power politics vis-a-vis Russian Ukrainian war.

1.9.1 Theoretical Delimitation

The study was guided by the power theory

1.9.2 Population Delimitation

The study considered 30 individuals who possessed valuable knowledge on power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war.

1.9.3 Methodological Delimitation

The study adopted a qualitative approach

1.9.4 Time Delimitation

The study largely focused on events taking place in the 21 first century

1.10 Definition of Key Terms

Hegemony: The term hegemony comes from the Greek word *hēgemonía*, which means leadership and rule. In international relations, hegemony refers to the ability of an actor with overwhelming capability to shape the international system through both coercive and non-coercive means. Usually, this actor is understood to be a single state, such as Great Britain in the 19th century or the United States in the 20th and 21st century (Nayef 2008:12). However, it could also refer to the dominance of a cohesive political community with external decision-making power, such as the European Union. Hegemony is distinct from Empire because a hegemonic power rules by influencing

other states rather than by controlling them or their territory. Unipolarity refers to the distribution of military capabilities, whereas hegemony also refers to economic, social, and cultural power. The literature on hegemony tries to explain the United States' role in the international system as a function of its privileged position within the system (Nayef, 2008:13).

Power: It can be defined as the ability to exercise one's will over others. Power affects more than personal relationships; it shapes larger dynamics like social groups, professional organizations, and government (Leo 2004:17). Foucault (1969) in Baldwin (2000) defined power as intimately linked with knowledge. Power and knowledge produce one another. He saw knowledge as means of keeping tabs on people and controlling them.

Anarchy: It can be defined as absence of any form of political authority or government in the international system. Lack of world police government that exercises coercive power over other nations states in the international arena (Waltz 2003).

War: It can be defined as a situation or a period of fighting between countries or groups of people. War generally involves the use of weapons, military organization and soldiers. War is a situation in which a nation enforces its rights by using force but not every armed conflict is war (Baldwin 2000:14)

Unipolar: Unipolar system is a condition in which one nation state in the international arena under the condition of international anarchy enjoys preponderance of power and faces no competitor (Waltz, 2003:13)

Bipolar: Bipolar system can be defined as a situation when two nation states in the international system are dominant. The period 1945 to 1991 witnessed USSR and United states of America experiencing a hegemony over other nation states in the international system (Heywood ,2011:14).

Multipolar: Kegley (1993 defined a multipolar as a system where several superpowers dominate the international system for example the period before World War 11, the World was a multipolar system with dominants of national states such as United States

of America, Britain, Germany, France and USSR were among the dominant nation states in the international system.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

To develop a theoretical insight that might enhance the understanding power politics in the Russian Ukrainian war. This chapter introduces the broader area of power politics with specific reference to Russian Ukrainian war. The theoretical framework that guided this study is based on power theory. The chapter commences by examining Russia-American relations in the 21 first century with specific focus on Ukraine. Second, the chapter goes on to examine the politics of encroachment between the Russian federation and the Western block. Third, the chapter analyses power politics at play between the Russian federation and the Western block in the Russian Ukrainian war. A detailed discussion on the power dynamics between Russia and Ukraine will be discussed in chapter 4

2.2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that guided this the study is power theory. The theory of power covers a wide range of goals and definitions which are so broad that divergent perspectives have come up on what it is or is not. Power can be defined as the ability to influence other actors by shaping how they behave, such power is characterised by indoctrination or psychological control (Cohen,2015:12). At the level of international relations power is sometimes understood as the ability or potential to get another [state] to do what it would not otherwise have done...[or]not to do what it would have done. In other words, [some states] are powerful to the extent that they affect other states [in the international system] more than they affect others. (Beetham,2019:13). Other times, power is understood as the ability to exercise one's will over others (states) (Drezner,2008), and yet in other literature power is understood as the ability to influence the behaviour of other nation states in a manner not of their choosing. This implies having 'Overwhelming influence over' other nation states. More narrowly, power may be associated with the ability to punish or reward, bringing it close to force or manipulation. (Betzold,2014:495). Simply put power can be defined as the ability of A to influence the behaviour of B to an extent that B would do something that B would not otherwise do

under normal circumstances. However, despite their differences, the above definitions of power share a common emphasis on the meaning of power as mainly referring to influence, control and authority. The definitions are relevant to this study in that they help to explain, power dynamics at play in the Russian Ukrainian war.

Regarding authority it is based on an acknowledged duty to obey rather than on any form of coercion or manipulation. In this sense, authority is power cloaked in legitimacy or rightfulness. When looking at the Russian Ukrainian war it has become a contested issue on which block that is the Russian federation or the USA and its NATO allies has authority over Ukrainian affairs (Betzold,2014). Therefore, a question is that does Moscow or Washington have any legitimacy over Kiev's national politics. Basing on the definitions of power discussed above an observation has been that power cannot exist in isolation of authority, influence and control (Heywood 2012:10).

Looking at influence it is perceived as the ability by an actor to change the behaviour and attitude of other actors in the international system (Heywood 2012:6). This change in behaviour by other states is not done through threats, punishments, sanctions or use of force but is done through use of benefits or rewards. An example can be that in the Ukrainian war they are states within the international system which have taken the side of the USA in condemning Moscow's military intervention in Kiev mainly because these countries are benefiting from American grants and technology. In this regard the above countries are only supporting Washington because they do not want to be deprived of their benefits. This is what influence entails. Concerning control it denotes putting a limit or rule to someone's actions or behavior (Drezner,2008).When looking at the Ukrainian war it can be observed that Moscow wants to have overall control over Kiev's social, political and economic affairs. On the other hand Washington and its allies also want to have more control over Ukrainian affairs than Moscow. Below is a discussion on power as propounded by some well-known power theorist within mainstream literature.

From the foregoing the modern theorist of power theory range from Hans Morgenthau , Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Hume, Max Weber to Robert Dahl. These scholars view power as largely focusing on issues to do with authority, influence and control (Drezner, D.W. (2008). The perceptions of these leading theoreticians reflect that states in the

international system seek to exercise political power over other nation states (survival of the fittest) (Cohen, 2015:17). For the purpose of this study the discussion on power mainly focuses on the ideas of Hans Morgenthau and Thomas Hobbes the main argument is that the views of these two scholars help to bring out a clearer picture of the behaviour of the Kremlin and Washington in the Russian Ukrainian war. Regarding, Hans Morgenthau the quest for power is an inalienable part of human behaviour. In other words men want to dominate other men. Morgenthau's main argument as concerning power is premised on dominance (Morgenthau,1948) . This denotes that power is exercised when a stronger state dominates a weaker one for example the dominance that the USA enjoys over all states within the European Union.

Concerning, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) human behaviour is self -centered and individuals are always in search of power at the cost of others (Sing 2016:24). Notably Hobbe's analysis on human behaviour as regards power is also applicable among and between states in the international system(Hey,2006)). This is so because as states interact within the global arena they seem to be egocentric, self centered ,selfish and they also seek for power over others states(Hey, 2006)). An observation is that Hobbe's power focuses more on the selfish nature of states visa/a/vis their national interest and foreign policy goals (Hay 2010:14) while Morgenthau visualises his power in terms of dominance (Hay 2010:16). This makes the views of Hobbes and Morgenthau relevant to this study in that the power dynamics in the Ukraine Russian war largely focus on issues to do with power perceived as national interest and power as seen as dominance.

The theory of power cannot be divorced from politics. Accordingly within power there is politics(Heywood 2012:13). The study will therefore rely on Andrew Heywood's definitions of politics. Heywood defined politics using basically four categories that is politics as art of government, public affairs, compromise and consensus and power. First Heywood sees politics as an art of government. The argument is that politics is practised in cabinet rooms, legislative chambers, government departments and the like; and it is engaged in by a limited and specific group of people, notable politicians and civil servants. Notably in the Ukrainian war there has been specifically an involvement of

government officials. Second Heywood looks at politics as public affairs. Here Politics is concentrated in all political (the courts, police, army) and social institutions (schools, hospitals, universities, vocational colleges and transport systems) (Heywood 2012:20). In the Ukrainian war Russia is accused of targeting both political and social institutions however according to the rules of engagement its only political institutions which are supposed to be attacked. Third Heywood perceives politics as compromise and consensus. The argument is that politics is a means of resolving conflict: that is, by compromise, conciliation and negotiation, rather than through force and naked power (Heywood 2012:24). For example in the Russian Ukrainian war various avenues have been opened (Though without much success) to bring about peace in Ukraine. Lastly Heywood views politics as power. The argument is that politics involves the ability of a state to achieve a desired outcome through whatever means (Heywood 2012:28). In the Ukrainian war the Russian objective is to have Ukraine under its control and similarly the USA and its allies want Ukraine to be under their control.

Conclusively observations from the above discussion show that power politics provides a way of understanding systems of international relations: in this view, it was observed that states compete for the world's limited resources, and it is to an individual state's advantage to be manifestly able to harm others (Drezner, 2008:14). Another observation was that power politics prioritised national self-interest over the interests of other nations within the international community, and it was observed that states threaten one another with military, economic or political aggression to protect their own self-interest (Drezner, D.W. (2008). The theory is therefore relevant in that it explains, describes, explores, defines and examine power politics as seen in the Russian Ukrainian war.

2.3 Russia-American relations vis-à-vis Ukraine

Prior to 1945 the relations between the United States of America and USSR were extremely cordial (Martin,2022). From the period 1945 when the Second World War ended there was a paradigm shift in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America (Easton, 2000) The affairs between the two superpowers quickly deteriorated and were now characterised by mistrust, animosity and hostility (James,2003). The major tensions between the two superpowers emanated from the

fact that the U.S.A endorsed Capitalism whilst the U.S.S.R held in communism (Hurd,2008). Owing to the hostilities between Washington and Moscow, Europe became divided into two blocks that is one in support of the USA [Western block] and the other supporting the Russia [Eastern block] likewise Germany became divided into spheres of influence that is the Eastern block under Russia and the Western block under the USA and these divisions came to be known as 'iron curtain'. This Iron Curtain was a metaphor for the extreme political and ideological division that separated Western Europe from the Soviet Union and its satellite states in the East (Hurd, 2008)

Washington did everything to resist communist expansionism, into Western Europe and other parts of the World. This worsened the American administration's relations with the Kremlin (James, 2003). The period of the hostilities between the two superpowers that is from 1945 to 1989 came to be known as the COLD WAR period. A real war never broke out between the Soviet Union and NATO countries but proxy wars were fought in other parts of the world where Moscow would militarily support nationalist leaders and liberation movements in Latin America, Asia and Africa likewise Washington and its allies would also militarily support some leaders and militant groups to resist soviet expansionism in aforementioned continents The USA's strategy of undermining Russia's global ambitions was known as containment (Easton,2000).

Regarding strategy of containment, Washington came up with the Marshall plan where the U.S.A offered \$13 billion in aid to West European countries that were trying to reconstruct after the devastations caused by the second world war (Beetham, 2019). The American administration had seen that these Western countries were more susceptible falling into falling within communism influence as such the aid package was a deliberate strategy used by the American administration to lure Western countries into its orbit of influence thus containing Russia's geopolitical influence (Beetham,2019). Inorder to counter the USA'S strategy of containment the Russian president Joseph Stalin consequently refused Soviet countries to accept the Marshal plan as he accused the Washington of dollar imperialism. In this regard Stalin then responded with his own form of economic aid known as Comecon, The aid package was to lure Soviet satellites states within Russia's sphere of influence. (Easton, 2000:15)

Notably from 1945 up to the present the USA and its NATO allies have been trying to contain Russian influence within the Western block as well as within the Eastern block which has been [always under Moscow's influence] (Abbott and Snidal, 2022:16). As such below we now examine how America and its allies have been trying to democratize Eastern Europe specifically Ukraine and how Russia has over the years been trying to maintain its political, economic and social influence in Ukraine.

2.3.1 Russian influence in Ukraine

The end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet bloc led to the redrawing of the geostrategic map in the East, with the emergence of new independent states demanding a new ordering of the old Soviet space (Piano, 2022). Ukraine gained independence in 1991. Following its independence in 1991 Kiev adopted a foreign policy of compromise in its relations with both the Kremlin and Washington (Piano, 2022). Ukraine's considerable dependence on Russian energy and trade prevented it from associating exclusively with the West (Paper, 2017 in Hey 2006:115). The relationship between Ukraine and Russia was further consolidated by the presence of a significant Russian minority in Kiev (Hay, 2010:145).

The relations between the Kremlin and Ukraine were extremely cordial from 1991-2004 (Betzold, 2014). This was due to the fact that the Russia federation still had considerable influence in the politics of Kiev that dated back to the former soviet era (Savchenko, 200: 22). The multi vector foreign policy adopted by Ukraine prioritised the Kremlin over Washington (Brisk, 2022). Kruvchuk of the Social democratic party became the de facto and the de jure head of state following the independence of Ukraine from the Soviet Union in 1991. The first president of independent Ukraine Leonid Kruvchuk ruled from 1991-1994 and had very close ties with the Russian federation. These cordial relations were premised on trade, economics and the military. Notably, Kruvchuk and his Social democratic party relied on Moscow's natural gas and

fuel energy (Savchenko,2022:12). Ukraine's economy was intertwined with that of the Russian federation. During these year's trade flourished within various economic sectors both economies (Akingboye, 2005).

Militarily Ukraine had inherited Russian nuclear arsenals. These armaments were seen as the largest foreign stationed nuclear arsenals in the world (Fry, 2022). After the end of the Cold war in 1991 Kiev had to dismantle Moscow's nuclear arsenals Kiev was forced by the Western countries specifically the U.S.A to completely dismantle Russian nuclear arsenals on its territory. Fears were that the American administration did not want a strong Russian ally to be armed with nuclear weapons lest it would threaten its Western neighbours (Hey, 2006:17).

The leadership of Kravchuk saw cultural exchanges between Moscow and Kiev. Russian language was one of the essential languages in Ukraine this expose cultural influence that Moscow had over Kiev (Fry, 2022). Subsequently as observed above the foreign policy of Kiev was linked more to the Russian federation than USA from 1991-2004. However in as much as, Kravchuk cooperated with the West his foreign policy remained continuously biased towards Russia (Savchenko, 2022).

In 1994 Kuchma the former prime minister in Kravchuk's administration took over the presidency. He became the second president of the independent Ukraine. He had campaigned as an independent candidate. However he had a very strong allegiance towards Russia. Interestingly Kuchma was elected for two terms in office [Five years per term] that is from 1994 -1999 and from 1999 -2004 (Akingboye, 2005). Under Kuchma's leadership Ukraine continued its multi vector foreign policy. This means Russia remained at the heart of Kiev's foreign policy (Buzan, 2006). Ukraine was therefore supported in terms of trade, its economy and as well as foreign aid (Citation). Kuchma signed a "Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Partnership" with Russia. He got investment Russian companies. An observation is therefore that economically the Ukrainian economy was boosted significantly under president Kuchma's leadership (Citation). The Ukrainian president always turned to Moscow for help. He believed that by doing so this would greatly strengthen Ukraine's credibility and loyalty towards Moscow (Nayef, 2008). Incredibly between 2000 and 2004 the Russian president [Putin]

and the Ukrainian Head of State Kuchma met a record of about 40 times to discuss how their bilateral relations would unfold (Fedor, 2022).

During Kuchma's second term in office [1999-2004] Ukraine abandoned the European policy track and shifted its main foreign policy vector in the direction of Moscow (Fry, 2022). Ukraine's willingness to make concessions in order to enhance its relations with Russia increased remarkably. For example; these agreements entailed that the division of the Black Sea Fleet were generally favourable, the contents of the agreement were a clear indication of Kiev's submission to Moscow. Scholars such Betzold (2014) have observed that under Kuchma's second term in office Moscow's political and economic influence was increasing in Kiev. Similarly Polokhalo estimated that Russia stood for 80% of the foreign influence on Ukrainian domestic policies, and the West for 20% in the subsequent period. Notably Ukraine's relations had increasingly intensified with Russia.

While the relations between Kuchma and Putin had increased during his tenure in office the Ukrainian populace was not much in support of these strong relations (Akingboye, 2005). Accordingly in 2004 a pro-western opposition party in Ukraine under the leadership of Yushchenko took over power. In section 2.3.2 below Yushchenko's close allegiance with the western block will be discussed in detail.

After Yushchenko's five year term in office he was replaced by Yanukovich [of the party of regions] who was pro-Russian. The elections were judged to be free and fair by international observers (Fedor, 2022). Yanukovich's victory marked yet another shift in Ukraine's Foreign policy. According to Yanukovich the main priority of his foreign policy was to improving relations with Russia (Fox, 2022). In other words the multi vector foreign policy of Ukraine was jeopardised in the sense that the new Ukrainian president adopted a very radical pro-Russian stance. Yanukovich totally dismissed the Western relations that had previously characterised the Ukrainian foreign policy of cooperation under Yushchenko (Fedor, 2022). To show his strong loyalty towards Moscow the new president's inauguration ceremony was dominated by dignitaries from Moscow (Barnett, 2022).

Under the leadership of president Yanukovich the Russian federation had overwhelming

influence over Ukraine. Notably the Ukrainian leader rejected an EU association agreement, choosing instead to pursue a Russian loan bailout this meant having very closer ties with Moscow. On 21 April 2010, in Kharkiv, Yanukovich and Medvedev [the new Russian President] signed the Ukrainian–Russian Naval Base treaty for natural Gas. The agreement signed between the two leaders entailed that the lease on naval facilities in Crimea would be extended beyond 2017 up to 2047 (Betzold, 2014). This naval lease agreement which would serve Russia’s military interests was done in exchange for a multi-year discounted contract to provide Ukraine with Russian natural gas (Fry, 2022). In addition the treaty was approved as legal document by both the Russian and Ukrainian parliaments (Verkhovna Rada) (Betzold, 2014). An observation would be that under Yanukovich’s presidency Ukraine’s foreign policy was strongly biased towards Russia.

President Yanukovich strongly believed in the neutrality of Ukraine. This was a policy the Russian leadership had always argued [and are always arguing] that Kiev is supposed to take. The neutrality policy meant that Kiev was supposed to be part of a "collective defence system with the European Union, NATO and Russia. In this regard Ukraine was not to join neither North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nor Collective Security Treaty Organisation (CSTO) (Fedor, 2022). "Accordingly on 7 January 2010 Yanukovich had to state that Ukraine [was] ready to consider an initiative by Dmitry Medvedev on the creation of a new Europe collective security system stating " (Fox, 2022). The Ukrainian president’s argument was that the current level of Ukraine's cooperation with NATO was sufficient. The question of the country's accession to the alliance was therefore not urgent. Similarly a majority of Ukrainian citizens did not also support Kiev’s entry into NATO. Furthermore Yanukovich was totally opposed in joining the Western block. However the new Ukrainian president still believed that his relations with NATO could merely considered as partnership since Ukraine as a large country also needed to interact with other state actors in the international system (Barnett, 2022).The policy of neutrality has therefore remained a very controversial issue as some pro Western Ukrainian presidents have been seen to undermine it during their tenure in office thus creating a lot of tensions with the Russian federation. These issues will be discussed in the section below.

2.3.2 American influence in Ukraine

Basing on the arguments raised in the section above an observation was that before and after the disintegration of the soviet union, the USA was already trying to engage with Ukraine (Fox,2022). Notably in 1959 the American administration under President Eisenhower signed the captive Nations resolution policy of “rollback”. The contains of the policy were that the independence of the submerged nations was in the vital interest of the USA. Submerged /Captive nations denoted those states which were part of the Soviet Union as well as those which were following Russian communism (Hurd,2008). As such Washington called for the annual week of commemoration of captive nations in this regard Ukraine and other Russian satellite states were seen by the USA to be part of the captive nations (Roberts, 2022). This resolution exposed the USA’s interest in Eastern Europe (including Ukraine). An observation would be that attempts by Washington to have its geopolitical influence on states under Russian control started as far back as the late 1950s (Fox, 2022)

After the dissolution of Soviet Union in 1991, America and its NATO allies continued to covertly involve themselves in Ukraine’s foreign policy (Nayef, 2008). The coming in of Yushchenko as president in 2004 drastically shifted the Ukranian multi vector foreign policy. Yushchenko's administration brought Kiev closer to the Western block. An immense was created with the kremlin (Adams,2022). The new government embarked on an extensive democratisation process which was strongly pro Western. One can raise an argument that this behaviour by President Yushchenko brings out the power politics that were taking place between USA and the Russian federation at that time(Leo,2004). For example the orange revolutions that brought Yushchenko to power signaled the Western influence in Ukraine’s domestic affairs. These revolutions can be seen to have been premised on a regime change agenda carried out by the Western block. Scholars such as Hurd (2008) criticise Yushchenko’s pro-western policy as it was not calculative in nature since Kiev was still heavily depended on the Kremlin. Under the leadership of the new pro-western president the USA now overtly involved herself in the domestic affairs of Ukraine. This new shift to a radical policy marked the beginning of a Ukraine that was heavily influenced by the USA and its allies (Hey, 2006). The once

strong cordial relations between Moscow and Kiev were jeopardised by Washington's geopolitical influence. Due to America's geopolitical influence in Ukraine Yushchenko signing a cooperation accord with the European Union. Kiev welcomed the idea of NATO enlargement into Eastern Europe (Nayef, 2008). Observations from what was discussed in section 2.3.1 shows that all pro Russian Ukrainian presidents had avoided making such a decision. Looking at Yushchenko he never opposed the expansion of the Alliance or the possibility of a future Ukrainian membership to NATO. This was reflected in his quest to join NATO as he defiantly and arrogantly sought for a Nato membership plan this was seen to be in favour of a Western European security structures that is NATO and the EU national defense architect (Roberts, 2022).

In response Yunchencko's pro Western stance Moscow came up with a retaliatory stance. relations with relations democratisation wave gripped the international system. The 2004 elections propelled a pro-western party to power in Ukraine (Nayef, 2008). Scholars such as Hurd (2008) argue that the Western block was on a regime change agenda in Ukraine since its inception as an independent sovereign state in 1991. Finally the year 2004 marked a major shift in the Ukrainian multi vector foreign policy (Beetham, 2019). Kuchma was replaced by Yunchenko his former Prime minister in an election that was allegedly controversial that pitted Viktor Yanukovych (Moscow leaned) and Viktor Yunchenko (Western loyalist). Yushchenko adopted a completely pro-Western foreign policy that divorced the Kremlin totally in its relations vector (Barnett, 2022). This drastic shift in the foreign policy of Kiev brought a strain in its relations with Moscow. Accordingly, the Russian federation responded by cutting its cheap gas supplies to Kiev (Beetham, 2019). Yushchenko was poisoned and his poisoning is said to have been connected to the Kremlin specifically Putin was said to be aware of the poisoning. Yunchenko survived the poisoning and he led Ukraine as an ally of the Western block and his rule was short lived. Throughout Yushchenko tenure in office the Russia federation undermined Ukraine's foreign policy. They did this by using Yanukovych (a staunch pro-Russian who had been made Prime minister under Yunchenko's government) to block the pro-western policies of Yunchenko's government. Similarly the pro-Russian party of Yanukovych which also had a number of members of

parliament was also used by Moscow to oppose any policies that would benefit the Western block (Beetham, 2019).

After the 2014 elections in Ukraine another pro-Western leader came to power. The new European solidarity party under president Poroshenko forbade any cooperation with Russia in the military sphere. This led to Russia cutting the supply of gas to Ukraine (Getachew, 2019). To show the new president's defiance towards Russia his first visit was to the USA where he met with President Barack Obama. On 24 June 2014 during Poroshenko's attendance at the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. He stated that bilateral relations with Russia could not be normalised until Russia undid its unilateral annexation of Crimea (the issue of Russia's annexation of Crimea would be discussed extensively in section 2.4 below). His argument was that the Kremlin was suppose to return Crimea to Ukraine. Additionally in 2015 Poroshenko also met with Obama's Vice president Joe Biden in Kyiv to discuss stronger Ukrainian-American cooperation (Adams, 2022).

Poroshenko like just like his predecessor Yushchenko was calling for a stronger integration of Ukraine into the NATO alliance. He was totally opposed to Russia's geopolitical influence in the region. On 23 December 2017 in a gesture of showing solidarity with the Western block (specifically Washington) the Ukrainian parliament voted 303 to 8 in favour of Poroshenko's bill to repeal a 2010 bill (done under the presidency of Yanukovich) that had made Ukraine a non-aligned/neutral state (Roberts, 2022) . The calls by Ukraine to abandon its non-alignment or neutrality position considered by Russia to be a great threat to its security. In May 17, 2017 Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko banned 19 Russian companies, four Russian websites, the Russian radio stations, Banning of 13 journalist from Moscow and the use of Russian language in examinations in Ukraine. Notably under Poroshenko's government it can be seen that the Western block tremendously managed to manipulate the situation to their advantage (Citation).

In 2019 Zelensky (servant of the people party) took power from President Poroshenko. Zelensky just like Poroshenko and Yushchenko followed a very strong pro western

agenda he intensely ignored relations with the Russian federation as he staunchly supported the Western block (Beetham, 2019). Scholars such as Barnett, (2022) have indicated that Zelensky's foreign policy is a very and radical dangerous shift from that ever taken by any Ukrainian president. Zelensky's first official trip abroad as president was to Brussels in June 2019, where he met with European Union and NATO officials. This was more of a direct provocation towards Russia. His intention was to deliberately show Moscow that his government was serious and quiet committed in its engagements with the Western block (Avant, 2022). An observation is that Zelensky's foreign policy is characterised by a strong integration with NATO and the EU. His aim has been to end the conflict in Donbas that started in 2014 through the support of the USA and its Western allies (Abbott and Snidal, 2022).

Compared to his pro Western predecessors, Zelensky has shown a stronger determination to be a member of the European Union as well as a member of NATO. An argument can be that by being pro-Western Zelensky's joining of NATO and EU would help his government to be protected militarily from Russian aggression (Adams, 2022). Accordingly (prior to the Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022) Zelensky, had put great emphasis on strengthening the country's defence capabilities in the Black Sea Basin this was done through military exercises with troops from notably Joint military training of Ukrainian military started as far back as 2004. These then intensified when Zelensky took over as the head of state in 2019 (Barnett, 2022). Intelligence sharing and regular state visits between Ukraine and USA and her allies has characterized the new relations between Ukraine and the West in their foreign policy goals. Zelensky's foreign policy has ignored Russian relations and as he decided to look west the move in the foreign of Kiev is heavily threatening and provocative on the security of the Kremlin (Fox, 2022).

Regarding trade and commerce investors from USA began to invest in Ukraine as result of strong ties with Kiev (Fry, 2022). Owing to the strong relations between Kiev and Western democracies. Zelensky's government saw itself benefiting immensely from West European investments as well as from grants, agricultural inputs and other forms of technology. In education USA and her allies have been granting scholarships and

education materials to Ukraine (Roberts, 2022). In order to show their support for Ukraine the Western countries granted military aid to Kiev for example in 2020 Washington and its NATO allies gave Zelensky's government \$ 300 million US dollars. This was done to help Ukraine counter Russian separatist in the Donbas region from entering into Ukrainian territory (Avant, 2022:13)

The invasion of Ukraine by Russia in February 2022 was largely as a result of Zelensky's strong opposition to Russia geopolitics. Likewise the invasion might also have to do with president Zelensky's strong intentions to apply for membership in NATO and EU (Barnett, 2022). These issues will be discussed in detail in section 2.4 and 2.5.

2.4 Politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the western block

The disintegration of the USSR in 1991 led to the end of the bipolar system and the coming in of a unipolar arrangement where the USA became the sole superpower in the international system. The Unipolar system was characterised by an American economic supremacy, USA's global military preponderance, Washington's social and ideological dominance of the world (democracy and capitalism) and the American administration's global technological ascendancy (Waltz, 2003). Scholars such as Wright, Reith, Khanna and Colley (1978) are of the view that the United States of America now sees itself as the policeman of the world. Initially the post-Soviet disintegration period or the post-Soviet Union era had seen Russia trying to pursue a foreign policy more tolerant towards the USA and its NATO allies. Years later in the late 1990s, the Russian federation perception of United States and its allies changed from those of trust and cooperation to those of antagonism and suspicion (Mearsheimer, 2000). Events which followed made the Soviets to accuse the western block of trying to encroach into Russia's sphere of influence. This section seeks to question the USA and its allies' motives in trying to bring the former Soviet Union states into its ambit or sphere of influence (Mearsheimer, 2000).

Regarding encroachment, refers to a trespassing and an infringement of territories that one does not have a right to own or possess as per agreed terms (Baldwin, 2000). At the level of International relations encroachment can be understood as the gradual

advancement beyond usual limits that is it is intrusion on other nations state area of influence disturbing its rights and security (Marten, 2020). Other times encroachment suggests gradual or stealthy entrance upon another's territory or usurpation of another's rights or possessions and yet in other literature encroachment can be seen as invading a territory that is not of one's belonging using forceful means (Mark, 2001). However, despite their differences, the above definitions of encroachment share a common emphasis on issues of trespassing, infringement and invasion. In other words from the definitions above the term encroachment may also be seen as one states' ability to undermine another state's control, authority, influence and power over a specific geographic area.

Accordingly as pointed out in the statement of the problem in Chapter 1 the USA and its NATO allies have been seen to be encroaching in Eastern Europe(Which has been a geographical area where the Russian federation has had overwhelming influence) (Mearsheimer, 2000). In other words the Western block has been seen to undermine Moscow's control, authority, influence and power within Eastern Europe (Betzold, 2014). Scholars such as Getachew (2019) claim that Washington broke a promise it made in the 1990s not to enlarge NATO, toward the East. The sudden encroachment of the West into the former soviet states has been seen by scholars such Waltz (2003) as form of betrayal. An observation is therefore that the narrative of betrayal has been for decades a dominant perception in Moscow.

Basing on the above arguments it is imperative that for one to understand Russia's claims concerning the politics of Western encroachment and betrayal, it is necessary to review the reassurances that the then US secretary of state James A. Baker made to the former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev during a meeting on February 9, 1990. In a discussion concerning the status of a reunited Germany, the two men agreed that NATO would not extend past the territory of East Germany. This statement was also repeated by NATO's secretary general in a speech on May 17 that same year in Brussels (Mark, 2001). Notably both statements made by a top USA and a NATO official imply that the Western block was not to interfere or to exercise its geopolitical influence in any state that had been under Russian control during the cold war period (Mearsheimer, 2000).

Regarding more assurances made to Moscow concerning the politics of non encroachment we now look at the contents of the Helsinki accords (1975 and 1997) and the founding act (1991) clearly. Under the Helsinki accords the Kremlin and Washington agreed on the following terms:

- Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty
- Refraining from the threat or use of force
- Inviolability of frontiers
- Territorial integrity of states
- Non-intervention in internal affairs of other states [Finnemore, and Sikkink, 2007:35]

Additionally, under the founding act The Kremlin and Washington agreed on the following conditions:

- NATO not to expand in the former Soviet union's sphere of influence
- The Russian federation not to encroach into the Western sphere of influence
- Russian federation not to declare war on the former Soviet states given that the Western block would not encroach into this territory
- Former Soviet Union states not to join European Union and NATO. [Drezner, 2008]

Accordingly, Russia has consistently demanded that NATO should stop expanding towards the east. Moscow has also insisted that the USA and its NATO allies are supposed to pledge never to include Kiev in their security alliance. However a challenge has always been that the USA and its NATO allies have continuously insisted that they remain with an open-door policy towards any East European country that might be contemplating joining the Western block (Fox, 2022). In analysing the USA and its NATO allies' politics of encroachment towards the Russian federation's geopolitical sphere of influence it will be helpful to bring up the following cases, in 2008 at the Bucharest

NATO summit of heads of state held in the capital city of Romania the following terms were agreed upon:

- NATO would continue to support Ukraine and other East European countries to be democratic at all cost without backing down
- USA and her Allies' reaffirmation support Ukraine's right to choose its own path (Choosing EU and NATO membership) [Brisk, 2022]

The conclusion of the above meeting saw the NATO heads of state unanimously agreeing that Ukraine and Georgia would one day become members of NATO (Fedor, 2022). At a second Bucharest meeting of the NATO foreign ministers in November 2022 it was overwhelmingly agreed that - NATO membership was based on an open door policy and Eastern countries that were willing to join were not supposed to be intimidated by other nation states. A second agreement was based on NATO's welcome/ acceptance of Ukraine's and Georgia's Euro-Atlantic aspirations for membership. Third it was agreed that a membership action plan (MAP) was the next step for Ukraine and Georgia on their direct way to membership. The NATO foreign affairs ministers came clear that they supported these countries' applications for a membership action (MAP) (Fry, 2022).

One can argue that these are double standards as America and its allies seem not to be sincere in that on one hand they are assuring the Russian federation of non-encroachment into its sphere of influence and yet on another hand they want countries within Moscow's geopolitical sphere of influence to be part of the Western alliance. Looking at the above statements made by NATO heads of state (2008) and the NATO foreign affairs ministers (2022) there is a clear contradiction, opposition and a violation of the Helsinki accords 1975 and 1997 and the founding act (1991) as the USA and its NATO allies are now encroaching little by little into the territories that previously belonged to the Soviet Union. An observation is that the Kremlin is totally against this new form of Western encroachment into Eastern Europe (.Brisk, 2022). Scholars such as (Mearsheimer, 2000) see it as an existential threat on the national security of the Russian federation.

Owing to the above, Western rhetoric the Russian president at a meeting at a Security Conference in Munich in 2007 indicated that Western powers had violated a solemn pledge by considerably enlarging NATO. The Russian president had been worried at the pace at which the Baltic States had been allowed to join the Western alliance in 2004 and therefore his question at this conference was based on "What happened to the previous assurances the Western partners had made after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact.

Tracing NATO's politics of encroachment into Eastern Europe it can be observed that NATO'S initiative to intrude on other nation's states' geographic area of influence disturbing that state's rights and security that dates back to the Yugoslav war of 1998. It is in this context that the Yugoslav war of 1998 exposed USA and its NATO allies's quest for East European encroachment through its expansionist policies (Freedman, 2003). Notably Washington and its NATO allies militarily intervened in Yugoslavia in order to put an end to what they termed ethnic cleansing (genocide). However United Nations did not approve of this intervention. The Yugoslav war made Russia to strongly realise that the USA and its NATO allies had strong interest in undermining Moscow's spheres of influence.

Notably in 2004 an observation is that the USA and its NATO allies formalised the process of joining the organization with "Membership Action Plans. This open door policy led to the accession of seven Central and Eastern Europe countries. The former Eastern countries which were originally under the Russian federation sphere of influence and were now under the Western orbit of influence were namely Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Slovakia, and Slovenia these were known as the Baltic states and a strong anchor of Russian geopolitics and a once strong anchor of Russian geopolitical influence. In 2008 the state of Georgia also announced its intentions to be a member of the Western alliance incensed by this move President Medvedev of Russia sent in Russian troops to contain the situation this saw Russia declaring independence of two pro-Russian provinces in Georgia namely Abkhazia and South Ossetia (Fry, 2022) .Currently Georgia has remained committed to EU and NATO membership. Though it remains questionable whether this bid will be successful

owing to Russia's aggressive behaviour towards this East European state (Barnett, 2022).

The Crimean crisis of 2014 was mainly triggered by the USA and its NATO's politics of encroachment towards Ukraine. The American administration now had immense influence on Ukraine through its overwhelming sponsorship of the government Viktor Yushchenko (Fox, 2022). Accordingly Owing an overpowering American influence in Kiev in March 2014, Russia invaded Ukraine and took over Crimea, a republic situated on the Black Sea that [is] was of huge strategic importance to Russia" (Avant, 2022). Notably scholars such as Freedman (2022: 23) are of the view that "the Russian move to annex Crimea in 2014 was in part motivated by its desire to avoid any challenge to its naval base at Sevastopol' 'in this war Moscow "confiscated 75 percent of the Ukrainian fleet "and this then enabled Russia to have full control over Crimea and also specifically the city Sevastopol where the Russian naval base is located (Friedman 2003: 24). Russian forces seized council of ministers, Crimea was dissolved and a new pro-Russian Prime minister was installed. The pro Russian supreme council declared the republic of Crimea an independent, self-governing entity. It then held a referendum on the status of Crimea which resulted in a majority vote to join the Russian federation (Fox, 2022:12). Scholars such Abbott and Snidal (2022) Highlight that 'during the 1990s, the dispute over control of the Black Sea Fleet and Crimean naval facilities were source of tensions between Russia and Ukraine'. Notably it was observed in subsection 2.3.1 above that under the presidency of pro Russian Ukrainian leaders (Kruvchuk 1991-1994, Kuchma 1994-2004 and Yanukovich 2010) they were always assurances through some concrete agreements that Russia would remain with vast control of the naval base in Crimea . However when the pro Western Ukrainian leaders (Yushchenko, Poroshenko) came into power they was a strong shift in policy as they were more interested in trying to bring Crimea under the Western sphere of influence (Roberts, 2022). An observation can be that Moscow's military intervention in Crimea was also highly motivated by events that had taken place in previous years specifically in 2009. This is highlighted in the paragraph below.

Over the years some former Soviet Union satellite states have succeeded in falling

under the USA and its NATO allies' orbit of influence. For example in 2009 Albania and Croatia joined the NATO alliance. Recently the USA and its NATO allies's politics of encroachment have bore more fruits as evidenced in the membership to NATO of Montenegro (2017), North Macedonia (2020) and Finland and Sweden 2022 whose ratification process is in progress. Similarly on September 2022, Ukraine applied for NATO membership. As of October 2022, two additional states have formally informed NATO of their membership aspirations that is Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia (Mearsheimer, 2000). In addition Kosovo also aspires to join NATO (Mearsheimer, 2000). An observation from the above willingness of Eastern countries to join the Western block shows that the Russian federation is losing out its geopolitical influence in the region thus in a way minimizing its geopolitical power. The encroachment of the Western block in the former Soviet states has been perceived by the Kremlin as an existential threat on the Russian security.

2.5 Power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war

As noted in the theoretical framework. Power is at the center of politics in the international system. Scholars such as Hans Morgenthau, Niccolo Machiavelli and other emphasise that power is an inherent part of the international system (Waltz, 2003). Power cannot be separated from control. Authority and influence. Similarly power, control and authority are a major characteristic of politics (Heywood, 2012). Loosely defined politics is the continuous struggle for power (Morgenthau 1948). In this regard power which has been attributed to actor A making actor B do what B would not do under normal circumstances and politics being the struggle for power clearly explains what characterises the Russia- Ukrainian war (Heywood, 2011). Accordingly power politics or the struggles for power can be evidenced between socialist Russia and the capitalist West, specifically the USA and its NATO allies (Nayef, 2008). Notably on one hand Moscow is trying to assert its influence in the former Soviet Republics and similarly on the other hand the USA and its NATO allies are little by little encroaching into Moscow's geopolitical sphere of influence. (Brown, 2009).

Specifically the major actors in the Russian Ukrainian war are Moscow and Washington. An observation can be that the Russian Ukrainian war is heavily immersed in power

politics. The American administration has seen to it that the conflict in Eastern Europe becomes its proxy war to test the military might of Russia as well as to undermine Moscow's geopolitical influence in the region. (Grigas, 2016). Below are four sub sections which characterise the power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war.

2.5.1 Power politics within the economic arena

Observation from mainstream literature indicate that there is a lot of power politics in the Russian Ukrainian war as largely concerning economic issues. The USA and its NATO allies imposed various levels of sanctions on the Russian federation for invading Ukraine in February 2022. The sanctions are meant to cripple the Russian economy (Kott and Droux, 2022). NATO and its allies imposed a 9 level package of economic sanctions on Moscow. The sanctions which have been intended to completely paralyse, destroy and suffocate Russia's economy have been targeted at important sectors which include finance, trade, energy, transport, technology and defence. Western democracies have always had a strong advantage as regarding the above sectors in that they have always wielded more power, control, authority and influence than any other state in terms of issues to do with economics (finance, trade, technology, energy and transport) in the international system (Kahler, 2022). Given their economic power and global influence the USA and its NATO allies have always used the option of sanctions in order to cripple the economies of states which go against what the term international norms examples of states that have been heavily sanctioned by the Western democracies include Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea and Zimbabwe. Similar power politics over economic issues have also been done to the Russian federation (Adams, 2022).

As highlighted above the Russian federation has been slapped with nine levels of sanctions by the Western democracies owing to its invasion of Ukraine. Accordingly the levels of sanctions are as follows;

- Removal of Major Russian banks from Swift
- Prohibition on imports from Russia of coal, gold and oil.
- Sanctioning of 1,000 Russian individuals and businesses including so-called

oligarchs.

- Banning of dual-use goods - items with both a civilian and military purpose, such as vehicle parts - by the UK, EU and US
- Banning of all Russian flights from US, UK, EU and Canadian airspace
- Suspension of many international companies from trading with Russia, or withdrawn altogether.
- Prohibition on imports from Russia of iron, steel, wood, cement, plastics, seafood, spirits, cigarettes, jewellery and cosmetics
- Freezing of Assets belonging to President Putin and Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov in the US, EU, UK and Canada.
- Prohibition on Russian and Belarusian road transport operators from entering the EU
- Banning of Russian-controlled companies based in illegally annexed Crimea or Sevastopol from trading with the West (Kahler, 2022)

In the international system sanctions are mainly used by powerful states in order to make the sanctioned state comply to the demands of the powerful state (Kahler, 2022). In most cases the sanctioned country is usually perceived to be weaker than the sanctioning state. In this regard the sanctioning state is seen to wield more control, authority and influence over the sanctioned state (Krasner, 2022). As such sanctions can be seen as a state's exercise of its power on another state (Adams, 2022). Looking at the above Western sanctions on Russia it means that they want to use their power (the ability to make B do what he would not do under normal circumstances) to make Russia immediately withdraw from Ukraine. The Sanctions are an indication that the Western democracies have immense control of the levers of international economics that is finance, trade, energy and technology (Kahler, 2022). Third the sanctions denote that Washington and its allies wield a lot of authority in terms of international economics. Lastly the sanctions mean that the American administration and its Western allies have the ability to influence other state actors within the international system to limit their economic interactions with the Russian federation (Adams, 2022).

In as much as the USA and its NATO allies had imposed their sanctions on a perceived

weaker Russia. Observations are that Moscow had shown that it was as equally powerful as the Western alliance. In this case the Russian federation had also shown that in a similar way could retaliate to Western sanctions by also imposing its own sanctions on the USA and its Western allies. The perception of Western democracies had been that their sanctions would heavily cripple Russia's economy as evidence on the ground showed that Moscow's sanctions had also had very negative impacts on the economies of the Western democracies. Accordingly to counter the sanctions of Western democracies the Russian federation banned exports of more than 200 goods, including telecoms, medical, vehicle, and agricultural, electrical equipment and timber products. Moscow also blocked interest payments to foreign holders of government bonds, and banned Russian firms from paying overseas shareholders (Hurd, 2022). Foreign investors who hold billions of dollars were stopped from selling Russian investments (Krasner, 2022).

President Putin in his response to Western imposed sanctions also sold Russian gas to China, Saudi Arabia, India and others at a cheaper price. The strategy of selling gas to China, India and Iran helped to boost Moscow's economy (Zürn,2022). The solidarity shown by the above countries in buying Russian gas is an indication of the power politics at play in the anarchical international system. Despite the Western sanctions Moscow also proved that it has immense power, control, authority and influence as far as the international economy is concerned. (Kahler,2022)

2.5.2 Power politics within the military sphere

Never in the Russian Ukrainian war had power politics been displayed as was seen in the military assistance both Moscow and Kiev received from varied sources. The Western block in particular gave overwhelming military assistance to President Zelensky's government as way of greatly subduing and minimizing Russia's geopolitical influence within Ukraine (Abbott and Snidal, 2022). In this case international politics as visualized by Hans Morgenthau (1948) became a continuous struggle for who had more power, control, authority and influence over Kiev. The Western democracies projected, displayed and exercised their military power on Russia's equally preponderant military power in the Ukrainian war. Power which is understood as " the ability to exercise one's

will over others” (Kegley, 1993) was exercised in the form of excessive military force in order to subdue either Moscow or Kiev to the will of either the Russian federation or the USA and its allies. Ukraine had been turned into a proxy war between a militarily preponderant Moscow and NATO (Mearsheimer, 2000).

Concerning the Western military, since the beginning of Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine the western block has been supplying military aid to Ukraine. The military aid is largely comprised of military equipment and money to finance the war (Hurd, 2022). In terms of military hardware Ukraine received some of the following equipment from western democracies are as follows that Canada (Four M777 howitzers,grenades,M72 rocket launchers, 100 older generation Carl Gustaf M2 recoilless rifles and anti-tank rounds), United kingdom (84,000 helmets, Starstreak missiles,80 NLAW, Javelin anti-tank missiles and precision loitering munitions),Poland (300 armoured fighting vehicles,230 tankers,110 pieces of self propelled guns and multiple rocket launchers),France (multiple launch rocket systems, two batteries of crotale air defence systems),Sweden (anti-tank missiles,anti tank weapons, mine clearance machines guns,Robot 17 portable short range anti ship missile systems,bullet proof vests and field range),Czech Republic (T-72B main battle tanks,short barreled and long barreled weapons as ammunition) and Estonia (Drones,personal protective equipment and winter uniforms) (Adams,2022)

Regarding financing the war militarily (military aid)Ukraine got the following amounts from a few selected Western countries that is from 24 January to 3 December 22 in particular Germany (\$ 2.34bn),United kingdom (\$1,9bn),Poland (\$1,82bn),Canada (0,99 bn),France (0,47 bn),Czech Republic, Sweden (\$ 0,39bn),Estonia (\$0,33bn) and Italy (\$ 0.32bn) and Netherlands ((500million) and USA gave (\$50bn) including humanitarian, financial and other security assistance (Fox,2022:3). Scholars such as Simes are of the view that NATO soldiers were sent in the guise as private military companies. The above military assistance and financial aid given to Ukraine by the USA and its NATO allies is an indication that the Western democracies want Moscow to be embarrassingly defeated in the war by a weaker Ukraine (Leftwich, 2004). Another indication might be that the American administration and its Western allies were seeking to achieve their

politics of encroachment in Ukraine thus completely undermining President Putin's control, authority and influence over the former Russian cold war satellite state. Commenting on the tensions of the USA and its allies' involvement in the Ukrainian war the Russian foreign affairs minister Sergei Lavrov pointed out that:

Getting back to the legal aspect, the United States, NATO, and the EU say that they are not parties to the conflict, which brings us to a certain convention. There are the 1907 Hague Conventions – Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land and Convention Relating to the Legal Status of Enemy Merchant Ships at the Outbreak of Hostilities. They have not been terminated and are still effective. They have to do with neutral powers' obligations during wars on sea and land. These conventions read that the term "neutral states" applies not only to the states that have declared their neutrality for all times, like Switzerland, but any states that are not party to an armed conflict. I would like to remind everyone that the United States and Europe have not declared themselves parties to the developments in Ukraine. In this case, they should act in accordance with Article 6 of the sea convention, which says that the supply by a neutral power to a belligerent power of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden. In other words, the United States, the EU, and NATO, which are sending weapons to Kiev, cannot be regarded as neutral powers that are not involved in the conflict (Barnett, 2022:1)

The reason for the Western democracies involvement in the Ukrainian war is quite obvious. They seek for Kiev's victory in the war. The heads of state of the USA, NATO AND EU as well as their foreign affairs ministers had on several occasions pointed out that Ukraine was supposed to be a member of Nato and the EU. The Western democracies are therefore determined to make Ukraine a part of the Western block (Piano, 2022:122). Peace negotiations would also be an advantage to the USA and its allies since the Zelensky government which is pro-western would remain in power thus in way achieving their major goal of fully encroaching in Ukraine. The power politics in the and after the war would give the Western democracies overriding power, control, authority and influence over Ukrainian affairs (Heywood,2012).

The Russian federation had its own preponderant military hardware which was used in the war against Ukraine this included advanced fighter jets, helicopters, unmanned drones , sophisticated military tanks , vehicles, long range missiles, hypersonic missiles,

submarines and navy ships among many others (Fry,2022). On the ground it had an estimated military force of 200000 men and women. Moscow also got military support from by North Korea, Syria, Iran and Belarus. In terms of military hardware Russia received the following from its allies that is Iran - sophisticated drones , North Korea - infantry rockets and sophisticated missiles and Belarus -MP 5A3 sophisticated missile ,MP5SD3) (Barnett, 2022).The Ukrainian war therefore became a new battle ground for power politics where those who supported Russia wanted to help Moscow to maintain its previous control, authority and influence over Ukraine. Similarly Russia was trying to prove to the Western democracies that their power politics of encroachment would neither be successful nor tolerated in Ukraine as it would by all means possible frustrate such US, EU and Nato intentions to indirectly colonise / or Westernise Kiev (Fox, 2022:35).

2.5.3 Power politics over United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)

The United Nations general assembly (UNGA) has not been spared from the power politics taking place in the Russian Ukrainian war. The question has been that who between the Russian federation and the Western block should have power, control, authority and influence in decisions made by states in the UNGA. Countries or states have been seen to be willing and unwilling to take sides in supporting either Russia or Ukraine in the war. The voting pattern in the United Nations general assembly has shown how the international system is heavily divided over the Russian Ukrainian war (Abbott and Snidal,2022:30) .The United Nations general assembly has been made to vote over issues to do with naming of the aggressor in the war, Russian expulsion in the human rights Council and the decision on Russia's annexation of Ukrainian territories (Abbott and Snidal,2022:34).

Concerning, the United Nations general assembly (UNGA) Resolution on naming the aggressor in the Russian Ukrainian war. 141 states voted to condemning Russia's invasion of Ukraine and called for the withdrawal of the Russian federation in Kiev. 35 states abstained, while four voted in favour of Russia. The states which openly supported the Russian federation were Belarus, North Korea, Eritrea and Syria. Notably longstanding allies Cuba and Nicaragua joined China in abstaining. The contains of the

above resolution demanded that “the Russian Federation immediately cease its use of force against Ukraine” and “immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw all of its military forces” (Adams, 2022:3).

Regarding the United Nations general assembly resolution on Russian expulsion in the human rights Council. 93 states voted in favour of the resolution. While fifty eight abstained from the process while 24 voted against the resolution. China, Cuba, North Korea, Iran, Syria, Vietnam, were among those who voted against the resolution. Those abstaining, included India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, among others. The resolution was not legally binding, but was an expression of the views of the UN membership, aimed at increasing pressure on Moscow (Adams, 2022:3).

Accordingly the United Nations general assembly met to vote against Russia's expulsion in the human rights Council. The UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on calling for Russia to be suspended from the Human Rights Council. The resolution received a two-thirds majority of those voting, minus abstentions, in the 193-member Assembly, with 93 nations voting in favour and 24 against. Fifty-eight abstained from the process. The meeting marked the resumption of a special emergency session on the war in Ukraine and followed reports of violations committed by Russian forces (Hurd, 2022:13).

Looking at United Nations General Assembly resolution on the decision of Russia's annexation of Ukrainian territories. 143 states voted in favour of the resolution, 35 abstained while five voting in support of Russia. The states which openly voted in support of Russia were Belarus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nicaragua, Russia and Syria. A majority of those states abstaining were African countries, alongside China and India. The contents of the resolution were that the regions of Donetsk, Kherson, Luhansk and Zaporizhzhia were seen to be temporarily occupied by Russia as a result of Moscow's aggression thus violating Ukraine's territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence (Roberts, 2022:12).

Basing on the above outcomes of the three resolutions concerning the Russian Ukrainian war. The Russian Foreign affair minister Sergey Lavrov sums up the results of

the above resolutions by claiming that:

The west has used 'methods of diplomatic terror' at UN against Moscow. The USA and its NATO allies have used methods of diplomatic terror to make countries vote in favour of an anti-Russian resolution at the UN General Assembly. The statements of the Americans that they do not persuade anyone, everyone votes themselves' is a lie. Initially Russia had suggested holding a secret vote so that the countries have no fear of "getting punished" for what they voted, but the Western countries rejected the proposal (Piano, 2022).

The above statement strongly suggest that power politics is a central feature in the decision being made at the UN General Assembly visa//a//vis the Russian Ukranian war. In this regard Western democracies have seen to it that their narrative of the Russian Ukranian war dominates that of the Russian federation (Hurd, 2022:9). From the Russian foreign ministers claims it shows that the USA and its allies are using a carrot and stick approach whereby those who vote in favour of the Western position as concerning Ukraine are rewarded and those who decide to go against the Western democracies position are punished or deprived of rewards (Hurd, 2022:10). Accordingly the fear of being deprived of resources has made the weaker states comply with Washington's position over Ukraine. This shows a display, projection and exercise of power. The politics (power struggles) are in favour of the USA and its allies as observed in the voting patterns. As such politics has always been an exchange of power, control, authority and influence (Roberts, 2022:15).

2.5.4 Power politics over Media

The conflict between Russia and Ukraine again exposed the propaganda wars which had once characterised the ideological differences between Washington and Moscow during the cold war period (Avant, 2022:15). Notably the cold war period was characterised by media misinformation, disinformation and propaganda between Moscow and Washington. (Avant, 2022). Each superpower had tried to win the support of the international system by portraying itself in good light while vilifying the other. In the Russian Ukranian war they was continuity of distrust and open animosity portrayed in the media narratives of the Russian federation and the Western democracies

(Barnett,2022:23). Both sides pushed forth propaganda and favourable media coverage so as to always show their side in positive light. Looking at the Western media it portrayed Ukraine in a very positive way. Western media showed the exact opposite when reporting about Moscow's involvement in the war. Scholars such as Fedor (2022:122) indicated that the Western media quickly picks up Ukrainian propaganda pieces and repeats them for their audiences at home, who then take to social media to gloat over Russian losses and embarrassments. This was a deliberate strategy to influence the war in favour of Kiev to an gullible Western audience (Fedor 2022:122).

Basing on the above arguments, it can be seen that both the Eastern and the Western media are heavily politically divided when reporting about the situation in Ukraine. Two main narratives came out regarding the Russia Ukrainian war. The first narrative portrayed Ukraine as the victim of Russian aggression while the second narrative saw Russia as being justified for its military intervention in Ukraine. For example under the first narrative most Western media outlets came up with some of the following headlines in relation to the Russian Ukrainian war Russia stealing Ukrainian grain to fund destruction of Ukraine (The trumpet 03/02/2022:23), Brutal Russian strikes (BBC,11/10/2022),Russia lashes out against Ukraine but it's in the death throes of war (BBC11/10/22),War crimes have been committed by Russia in Ukraine (BBC 07/07/2022),Dire and deteriorating pattern of rights abuse continues in Ukraine(UN News 27/08/2022) and At least 437 children have been killed since February. Russia Suspends Ukraine deal over ship attack claim (Guardian Moscow 07/10/22), Putin says the west aiming to tear Russia apart (Pravda 11/09/22), Group of Ukrainian soldiers killed in Bryansk oblast (Moscow times 09/09/22)

Basing on the above narratives it can be noted that both the Western media and the Russian federation's news outlets were either trying to support or defend a specific position regarding the Russian Ukrainian war. Concerning the first narrative an observation was that the Western media was first, trying to make its audience sympathise with Ukrainians as victims of Moscow's unprovoked military aggression. (Brisk, 2022).Second, it was trying to raise issues of human rights abuses of Ukrainian citizens by the Russian military. Third, the Ukrainian military was seen to be bravely and

defiantly defending Ukraine against a militarily preponderant Moscow. Fourth the Russian military was seen to be indiscriminately killing civilians including children in the war. The above narratives showed strong elements of power politics as the Western media's intention was to undermine Russia's global image and influence in the international system (Savchenko,2022).Regarding the second narrative it can be observed that the Russian federation through its media outlets wanted to first portray its war as being justified against Ukraine. Second the Russian military was to be seen as only targeting Ukraine's military infrastructure and not that of civilians. Third, Moscow wanted its global audience to understand that Western democracies wanted a regime change in Russia. Fourth the Kremlin wanted to be seen as not sabotaging Kiev's grain rather it was Ukraine which was attacking Russian ships leading the Russian navy to block the grain deliveries. The above narratives also displayed elements of power politics in that Moscow's intention was to expose the 'hypocrisy' of western democracies as well as to seek global support for its military intervention in Ukraine (Fry,2022)

2.6 Summary

The chapter focused on the existing literature concerning power politics in the Russia-Ukraine war. Various subheadings on issues related to the subject under study were put. Through theoretical framework, the researcher was able to articulate the objectives of the study. The chapter overall covered introduction of the topic, theoretical framework and literature review pertinent to power politics in the Russian Ukrainian war. The next chapter, chapter 3 gives a detailed analysis of the research methodology in data gathering.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a discussion of how the information, later to be analysed in Chapter 4, was collected from different sources. It gives an outline of the research philosophy, approach and design, population sample and sampling techniques, data collection methods, presentation and analysis, validity and reliability issues as well as ethical issues considered throughout the research. Overall, this serves to justify the method by the researcher to reach the stated research objectives in Chapter One. Selection of one particular method over others was considered with the view of ensuring reliability, validity and effectiveness of the research findings in addressing the research questions on power politics in the Russian Ukrainian war of 2022.

3.2 Research Philosophy

The research philosophy used by the researcher was interpretivism. The researcher chose this philosophy because it is qualitative in nature. It involves people's attitudes, opinions and beliefs. Interpretivism best suit the type of research that is qualitative. In order to make sense of the world, society, and human behavior (the social world) there are different approaches used by social researchers to perceive and interpret social reality. This concerns ontological and epistemological principles regarding social inquiry (Barron, 2006). Ontology is viewed to be 'about the theory of social entities and is concerned with what there exists to be investigated' (Walliman, 2006:15). In other words, it focuses on 'the way the social world is seen to be and what can be assumed about the nature and reality of the social phenomena that make up the social world' (Matthews and Ross, 2010:142).

The ontological debate centers on two contrasting perspectives namely positivism and interpretivism (Matthews and Ross, 2010; Walliman, 2006; Barron, 2006). From a positivist point of view it is the environment which shapes who we are not human beings shaping the environment. For the positivist, the world is very real and is knowable as it truly is (Patton, 2015). This implies that 'the social phenomena that make

up our social world have an existence of their own, apart from and independent of the social actors (humans) who are involved' (Matthews and Ross, 2010:25-26). In other words, 'social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is not dependent on social actors' (Walliman, 2006:15). Thus, social phenomena have a reality of their own which is not determined or created by social actors.

Creswell, (2014) further stress that objectivists/ realists consider reality to be of an objective nature and that it is out there in the universe we live in. As such, the objectivist/ realist perceives the social world as having an existence which is equally as hard and concrete as the natural world. This implies that the researcher's relationship to the social world as well as the social phenomenon being studied is supposed to be based on objective observations which can be scientifically measured or statistically analyzed (Matthews and Ross, 2010). In paragraphs below, the objectivist/ realist approach to ontology is supported by a positivist epistemology.

For those social researchers who subscribe to the interpretivism /nominalist (subjective) ontology, they believe that the social world or social phenomenon can best be understood through meanings ascribed to them by individuals (Matthews and Ross, 2010). This implies that the reality to be investigated is created through individual awareness which is subjective and this makes social phenomenon a creation of an individual's cognizance (Kvale, 2014). In other words, social phenomena making up the social world are perceived quite differently by individual actors (Creswell, 2014). In this regard, though the world is very real 'we can only experience it personally through our perceptions which are influenced by our preconceptions and beliefs; we are not neutral, disembodied observers' (Walliman, 2006:37). As such, the interpretivism/ nominalist researcher is 'guided by the desire to investigate the differing ways in which social actors are constantly interpreting the social world from their own particular perspective' (Barron, 2006:200). This implies that social reality can mainly be perceived in a more personal and subjective way. In paragraphs below, the constructivist/nominalist (subjective) approach to ontology is supported by an interpretivist/anti-positivist epistemology.

Closely linked to ontological issues are also epistemological concerns. Epistemology

refers to 'the theory of knowledge and how we know things (Matthews and Ross, 2010:18). It focuses on how one can have knowledge of truth or reality (Barron, 2006). The main argument is on whether knowledge can be acquired (objective school) or whether it can be personally experienced (subjective school) (Kvale, 2014). As such, the epistemological debate is based on two opposing views namely positivism and anti-positivism/interpretivism (Matthews and Ross, 2010; Walliman, 2006).

Positivism is premised on the idea 'that 'knowledge of a social phenomenon is based on what can be observed and recorded rather than subjective understandings' (Matthews and Ross, 2010: 27). This implies that a positivist researcher believes that the social world and social phenomenon can be objectively and scientifically measured in much the same way as the subject matter of the natural sciences. The researcher has to understand the social world and social phenomenon from the outside. Such a position resembles natural science where the behaviour of animals, plants and chemical components are studied in their natural setting/form.

In this regard, Matthews and Ross, (2010) summarize the positivist approach as follows: the collection of quantitative data; measurements of some parts of the social world or social phenomenon; a need to find out the underlying relationships between some aspects of the social world; and the widespread use of large data arrangements and statistical analysis. In other words, positivists rely on quantitative techniques of 'collecting data that is numerically based and amenable to such analytical methods as statistical correlations, often in relation to hypothesis testing' (Walliman, 2006:37). The positivists' views concerning knowledge can also be perceived as follows: Knowledge of social phenomenon focuses on what can be observed and recorded systematically (Leeds and Ormrod 2018). The researcher relied on the use of quantitative techniques for the analysis of data (Berg, 2010). Data was collected to test a hypothesis emanating from existing theory (Matthews and Ross, 2010). The researcher is expected to be objective and to have no influence or control on the data (Leedy and Ormrod, 2018:13).

Concerning interpretivism/anti-positivism, it is based on the idea that 'prioritizes people's subjective interpretations and understandings of social phenomena and their

own actions' (Berg, 2010:28). This implies that for one to have a deeper understanding of the social world one has to obtain first-hand information directly from the individual(s) being investigated. Thus, Matthews and Ross (2010:28) characterize the interpretivist/anti-positivist approach as follows: It encompasses the collection of qualitative data which is 'rich in detail and description'. It comprises the interpretation of subjective meanings within a given context. Lastly, it makes the researcher stand in another's shoes. In other words, interpretivism/anti-positivism mainly relies on qualitative techniques which focus 'more on language and the interpretation of its meaning, so data collection methods tend to involve close human involvement and a creative process of theory development rather than testing' (Walliman, 2006:37).

The interpretivists/anti-positivists' perceptions of knowledge can be seen as follows: Data collected by the researcher focus on individuals' own knowledge, interpretations and understandings of the social world (Berg, 2010). Individuals are considered to be very conscious of what goes on around them and they are quite capable of making their own choices (Leedy and Ormrod, 2018). The researcher can have deeper knowledge of social phenomena by occupying the frame of reference of the individuals in action (Barron, 2006:32). Thus, data is mainly collected in order to come up with a theory (Walliman, 2006:37).

3.3 Research Approach

There are basically three major types of research approaches namely qualitative, quantitative and mixed approach method. The study used a qualitative research approach to describe, explain and evaluate the phenomenon under study. Qualitative research involves collecting and analyzing non-numerical data (e.g., text, video, or audio) to understand concepts, opinions, or experiences of people in a social setting (Creswell, 2014:121). It can be used to gather in-depth insights into a problem or generate new ideas for research (Barron, 2006). The researcher used qualitative research since he wanted to get in depth information on power politics within the Russia-Ukraine war (Chikomo 2017:115). The use of qualitative research approach gave the researcher a chance to carry out the study in several stages rather than through once off data collection approach. Use of qualitative approach can allow the participants to expose

their feelings and freedom of participation in research can be triggered (Leedy and Ormrod, 2018:115). The use of qualitative research approach is healthy since it can guarantee a level of freedom to those participating in the research (Leedy and Ormrod, 2018:117). The study aimed at getting data without creating rigidity hence qualitative approach was the most suitable as it ensured full participation of respondents by allowing them to freely air their views on power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war. The three major actors in the Russia Ukraine war were USA, Russia and Ukraine.

3.4 Research Design

A research design can be defined as a plan, structure and a strategy that guides an investigation so as to ensure search questions and control variance (Creswell, 2014:12). Similarly a research design can also be defined as a blue print that guides how a research study is conducted(Berg,2010:125). There are many types of research designs and these include Case study design, Causal design, Cohort design, Cross-sectional design, Experimental design and Descriptive research design (Chikomo 2016:13).In this research, the study used a case study as a research design. A case study is a research approach that is used to generate an in-depth, multi-established faceted understanding of a complex issue in its real-life context (Chikomo, 2017:16). It is a research design that is used extensively in a wide variety of disciplines, particularly in the social sciences (Patton, 2015) . This design was selected because it appropriately addressed the study problem as well as the study objectives

3.5 Population Sample and Sampling Techniques

Regarding the sampling of participants for the study, the researcher used purposive sampling. A sample is part of a population. It is usually selected to be representative of that population: those included in the sample are chosen as a cross-section of the larger population (Walliman, 2006). With purposive sampling, there is a desire for in-depth understanding of a case and this leads to the selection of individuals who can provide rich information about 'issues of central importance to the purpose of the research' (Patton, 2015: 46) or 'individuals who will best help [the researcher] understand the research problem and the research questions' (Creswell, 2014:294).

The use of samples saves the researcher time and money, since it reduces the number of individuals being studied. If the sample is chosen carefully, it is possible to generalise from it: that is, to make statements about the whole relevant population on the basis of the sample (McBurney, 2006). Sampling is important because it enables the researcher to see all the characteristics of, the whole population therefore sampling is useful towards this research (Kvale, 2014:13). Purposive sampling is a method in which the investigator depends on his/ her own judgment when selecting elements of the population to partake in a research (McBurney, 2006:161). Scholars such as Graziano and Raulin (2020:120) indicated that purposive sampling also known as judgmental or expert sampling is a form of non-probability method of sampling. People who are knowledgeable about the power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war and were chosen to be part of the sample and these include academics, journalist, political and strategic analysts, ambassadors or consulates, security and defence experts. The population of 30 respondents was targeted from interviews and questionnaires but it should be noted that only 18 respondents became part of the study. The key goal of a purposive sampling method is to yield a sample that can be reasonably presumed to be demonstrative of the population under the study (MacNealy,2017:18). Purposive sampling can be advantageous when a researcher is dealing with a narrow number of participants that can aid as primary sources of data. The method is also time and cost effective (Creswell 2014:19).

The numbers of those interviewed were as follows: two journalists, two academics; 1 ambassador (consulates), one political and strategic analysts and two security and defence experts. The researcher targeted 25 interviewees by only 8 responded. Regarding questionnaires, were distributed and 13 were returned. The overall number of participants for the whole study including questionnaires and interviews adds up to 18 respondents.

This study also made use of extensive snowball sampling where the researcher after identifying some respondents was also assisted by these respondents to get 'in touch with, others who qualify for inclusion and these, in turn, identify yet others' (McBurney, 2006). This type of sampling technique became a possibility after the researcher was referred to other respondents.

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

There are various research instruments that can be used to collect data when one is doing research. The data collection instruments that are effective translate to effective research. The types of data collection instruments are as follows questionnaire, interviews, surveys, participant observation and experiments. Data collection tools such as open ended questionnaires, document reviews, and unstructured interviews were used by the researcher to collect data for the research. The combination of these methods was done to reduce the effect of the weaknesses of each method selected. For instance the questionnaire and documents reviews revealed the trends, while interviews explained the trends and gave in-depth data. By implementing different methods of data collection the researcher intended to increase the authenticity of facts gathered, since the different methods complemented each other. The researcher also noted that any findings or conclusions are likely to be much more convincing and accurate if they are based on several sources of information. The study used unstructured interviews with academics, journalist, political and strategic analysts, ambassadors or consulates, security and defence experts. The study relied on unstructured interviews as they allowed the researcher to gather qualitative data that provided an in-depth explanation of diverse opinions and philosophies that support the research. The research also administered open ended questionnaires. These open ended questionnaires gave the respondents room to express themselves freely concerning power politics in the Russian Ukrainian war.

3.6.1 Document Analysis

The use of documentary evidence is important as it helps the researcher to add on to information collected from other methods as well as to help check on the reliability of information obtained from interviews and questionnaires (MacNealy, 2017). In this case the study, used documentary evidence to get insights on the area under study. Documents from textbooks, WhatsApp, Twitter and other valuable documents were used.

3.6.2 Questionnaires

The researcher used the open ended questionnaires to collect primary data from the respondents. The questionnaires were open ended and contained questions that allowed the respondent to give his or her opinions. Berg (2010) notes that one of the advantages of using the open ended questionnaires is that the results or responses are easy to interpret and analyze. Open ended questionnaire takes less time to complete unlike the face to face interview, which needs more time to arrange, and a suitable place to conduct it. The researcher observed that the open ended questionnaire also allowed for the use of a wide sample and so standard instructions were given to all the respondents. The researcher's own biases were minimized. The researcher's personal appearance, mood or conduct did not influence the findings of the study. In addition, the identity of the respondents in the questionnaires remained anonymous which encouraged most respondents to answer the given questions freely and honestly.

However, although open ended questionnaires have got a number of advantages, there are some disadvantages which are associated with the open ended questionnaire. The researcher noted that for the respondent to be able to complete a questionnaire, he or she needed to be literate. The other handicap of open ended questionnaires that was observed by the researcher is that, there was no chance to probe the respondents if they gave either an inadequate or interesting answer, or to provide explanations to the respondents of questions which they did not understand.

3.6.3 Interviews

An interview can be defined as a planned and guided conversation (Chikomo, 2017). In this regard, the researcher drew out questions that solicited for appropriate responses on perceptions towards power politics over Media, military, United Nations General assembly and economic arena. Patton (2015) notes that interviews offer both the interviewer and interviewee the chance to clarify their questions and answers. The researcher observed that the interview method was a flexible technique since he was

able to expose some underlying facts, perceptions and opinions of the respondents.

The limitation of interviews is that the presence of a researcher might make the interviewees feel reluctant to deal with matters of ethical controversy as well as those of a delicate nature. The researcher observed that some local respondents were rather a bit reluctant to answer questions which sensitive especially officials from the Russian embassy. The researcher also found out that the processing of the data from the interviews was quite taxing and time consuming. Leedy and Ormrod (2018) point out that an interview requires a great deal of paying attention to ethical considerations.

3.7 Presentation and Data Analysis

The research is qualitative in nature. Qualitative data gathering and data analysis methods were used. Research findings were presented using qualitative thematic approach. Therefore Barron (2006) regards thematic analysis as an approach utilized to present data in a qualitative research. The researcher used a table to show demographic information of participants. Data sourced from various sources was presented, analyzed and discussed.

3.8 Validity

In general qualitative research is criticized for lack of objectivity given the latitude the researcher has in interpreting the data (McBurney, 2006:132). Accordingly, the question to be asked is, is one measuring what one thinks is trying to measure or “the extent to which our observations indeed reflect the phenomena or variables that are of interest to us” (Kvale, 2014:265). The idea of validity is centered on methodological reflexivity primarily because, “every aspect of research is both empirical and theoretical” (Patton, 2015: 245). Validity also entails ensuring quality control throughout the knowledge production process as opposed to emphasizing the inspection of the end product (Kvale, 2014: 236). The important aim of checking validity of research is to have ‘defensible knowledge claims’ that stand competition from other claims. Following this brief discussion on validity, the importance of having this study subjected to validity test becomes self-evident.

3.8.1 Reliability

Leedy and Ormrod (2018) notes that, reliability is the extent to which a specified procedure such as a measure yields consistent observation of the same facts from one time to another. The researcher formulated interview questions that covered the content of each objective.

3.9 Ethical Issues

Ethics are schemes of moral tenets that are concerned with the degree to which enquiry techniques abide by professional, legal and social obligations (Berg, 2010). The ethical principle of informed consent was employed whereby the participants were permitted to decide to participate or not to participate in the research upon receiving all pertinent information about the risk of harm that might arise if they participate in the study (Creswell, 2014). Debriefing or disclosure ethic was applied subsequent to data gathering. The respondents' voluntary liberty to contribute or pull out from the exercise was explained. All study respondents were treated with respect, fairness and dignity. The study of research ethics is called axiology (MacNealy, 2017). Research ethics are applied principles in the research field to uphold the rights of research stakeholders. Ethical standards required that participants are protected from potentially harmful situation, physical or psychological and these ethical standards are as follows confidentiality, informed consent, avoiding harm to participants among others. The researcher obtained a letter from the Bindura University of science education and ethics committee to commence the study so as to fulfill the ethical considerations.

3.10 Summary

This chapter has concentrated on the research design, data collection methods, sampling techniques and data analysis. The chapter dealt with data collection tools

highlighting their strengths and limitations as well as the designing of these tools. The employment of these tools in collecting the data was meant to produce quality valid and reliable results. The chapter also considered some ethical considerations that were observed during data collection. The next chapter, Chapter 4 gives a detailed analysis of the research findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at the findings of the research. The outcome from interviews, questionnaires, and secondary documents will be analysed following the research objectives and research questions. Secondary sources are compared with the research conclusions from interviews and questionnaires. A discussion that seeks to harmonize the findings and the literature review will also be carried out. The discussion will further attempt to fill the knowledge gap identified in relation to power politics in the Russia Ukrainian war. What is the Russian-American relations with special focus on Ukraine? What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block? How is power politics at play in the Russian Ukrainian war manifesting?

4.2 Demographic information of participants

Before discussing and analysing the research findings it is helpful to provide a brief description of the individuals interviewed for the findings discussed in this chapter. Information for my fieldwork was collected through interviews with academics, journalist, political and strategic analyst, ambassadors or consulates, security and defense experts. Interview guides were also administered to different participants from those who were interviewed and these also comprised of journalists, politicians, ambassadors and ordinary citizens.

The table below are an illustration of participants interviewed and also those who filled in the questionnaires. For the in-depth interviews, the questions were diverse, with some questions being asked more frequently than others depending on their level of significance to the major goal of this research. These questions are included in the Appendix section. Regarding the interview guide, the participants gave their opinions to the questions given. An example of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix section

In depth interview Responses

<i>Target group</i>	<i>Target respondents</i>	<i>Actual respondents</i>	
Journalist	5	2	
Academics	5	2	
Ambassadors	5	1	
Political and strategic analyst	5	1	
Security and defence experts	5	2	

Figure 1 Demography information of Participants

4.3 The relations between Washington and Moscow Visa// V//Vis the Ukranian war
 Responding to question regarding the previous relations between Russia and America
 visa via the Ukranian war. The respondents came up with divergent viewpoints.
 Concerning the previous relations between Moscow and Kiev responses from both the
 interviews and questionnaires indicated the following:

The response from the academic highlighted that:

Ukraine was part of the Soviet Union. After the collapse of the Soviet Union she became independent. There was an agreement in the 90s that NATO should not continue expanding into former Soviet states. The US was determined to defy that arrangement by including more Soviet states into Nato in the 90s. The crisis we have today can be traced back to November 2013 when the then Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovych rejected a deal for greater economic integration of Ukraine into the EU. There was a violent crackdown on nationwide protesters by Fascists in Ukraine. These forced Yanukovych, a pro Russian president to flee

Ukraine for Russia in Feb 2014. In March 2014, Russian troops took control of the Crimea region before formally annexing it in a referendum. Russian annexation was based on the need to protect Russian citizens and Russian speakers in the Crimea and South Eastern Ukraine. Two months after the annexation of the Crimea, pro-Russian separatist regions of Donetsk and Luhansk in Eastern Ukraine also held their referendum and declared themselves independent from Ukraine. Ukraine and NATO have been building up forces and in 2014 the US and EU became more involved when a Malaysian airlines flight was shot down over Ukrainian airspace. 298 on board were killed. Investigations showed that a Russian built surface to air missile was used to shoot down the plane. Russia was also accused of providing the missile system. In April 2016 NATO announced that it would deploy four battalions to Eastern Europe and these troops are rotated through the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and also Poland. NATO said the goal is to deter future Russian aggression especially in the Baltics. NATO forces have been joined by the US two tank battalions in Poland since September 2017 (I also hope that those who said Russia was the one preparing for this war will have new insights). In October 2018 Ukraine joined the US and 7 other NATO countries in a series of war games simulating attack on the Russian Federation. Most of these exercises are air exercises in Western Ukraine. Now against this background if you were Vladimir Putin should you just watch hence his decision to attack Ukraine was a pre-emptive strike that was largely defensive

Another respondent a Journalist pointed out that:

Ukraine had a foreign policy that was closely intertwined with that of the Russian federation as such Moscow had some form of overriding power over Kiev's political and economic affairs. Mind you the relations were this strong we cannot ignore that Ukraine was once a satellite state of the Soviet Empire

The participant from the embassy shared almost a similar response with that of the Journalist regarding the relations between the Russian federation and Ukraine:

If all things were fair and equal Ukraine was always supposed to have a very strong links and ties with Putin's Russia. I say this because these two countries always shared a very strong bond which cannot be wished away by anyone. Notably in the previous years I mean the 1990s the relations were very harmonious.

From the above responses it can be observed that all the three responses from the questionnaires and interviews are agreed that in previous years the relations between

the Kremlin and Kiev were very cordial.

Concerning the previous relations between Washington and Kiev responses from both interviews and questionnaires highlighted the following:

A certain political analyst explained that:

From 2000 onwards I think thus when the relations between Moscow and Kiev started to take a nosedive. Remember it was around 2000 when the USA and its allies' democratic wave began to grip most countries in the international system that is the very time when the relations between Washington and Kiev begun to blossom especially when looking at the way the Americans where funding civil society groups and political parties in Ukraine.

An embassy official from the Russian embassy had this to say:

USA and Kiev had compromised relations this was due to that after the fall of the Soviet Union. States that used to be part of a big Soviet empire still had nostalgia elements so was Ukraine and other former Soviet states after gaining their independence. USA in its foreign policy related on a smaller scale with Ukraine as compared to the Russian federation. Washington's relations with Ukraine before the year 2004 was characterised by a diplomatic strategy to lure and establish stronger relations that surpassed those of the Russian federation.

Similarly response was made by, another participant, a journalist who had this to say:

The relations between Kiev and Washington were lukewarm before the 2004. The two nation states were co-operating not on a greater scale than what Kiev did with to Russia. Washington was trying to incorporate Kiev under the Western block. This can be seen through its open economic and political interference and support to Kiev after the year 2004 when a pro Western Yushchenko became the president of Ukraine.

An observation from the above responses clearly shows that in previous years 1990s to 2000 the relations between Ukraine and the American administration were not yet as established as they are today. Basing on the views of the second and third respondents it can be seen that diplomatically Washington was using all means possible in order to

lure Ukraine within its geopolitical orbit. This was being done through various strategies which as highlighted by some of the respondents included foreign aid. Signing bilateral treaties and the invitation of Kiev to security meetings held by the Western block. This echoes the views of scholars such as Fox (2022:23) who points out that though the Ukrainian presidents such as Kravchuk, Kuchma and Yanukovich were very loyal to the Russian federation they also did not have any option but make some compromise with Washington and its allies.

Looking at the current relations between Russia and America via Ukraine the responses from interviews pointed out the following:

They relations are like oil and water. The USA is on the extreme of supporting Ukraine and Russia wants to crush it (political analyst). The relations between Moscow and Washington are far from being cordial if not handled carefully can lead to a Third world war as emphasised by the Serbian president (Academic A). The war in Ukraine can be equated to the historical Spanish Civil war it's a dress rehearsal for a major showdown between Russia and NATO (security and defense expert). The relations between USA and Russia are far from being cordial as they show ideological conflict between capitalism and Socialism (Journalist) and the issue of tilting balance of power has been clearly articulated (Academic B)

The above responses characterise the current animosity now inherent in the relations between Moscow and Washington. Basing on the above responses they are strong indications that the Russian Ukrainian war has created tension, hostility and animosity between Washington and Moscow. The response from the academic on the issue of tilting balance of power shows that Washington is gaining ground in the previous Soviet states. An observation is that all five responses from the respondents expose that the relations between the superpower and the great power were now characterised by issues concerning power, control, authority and influence. The relations are highly motivated by politics of indifference.

The response from the political analyst above brings out the political struggles between Moscow and Washington which have been heavily strained by highlighting the extent to which the Russian federation can go in blocking the USA from having political control

over Kiev. Accordingly the responses from the Academic A showed that the strained relations between the Kremlin and the American administration might trigger a third world war. Similarly the responses from the embassy official indicated that the antagonism between Moscow and Washington (due to the proxy war in Ukraine) is largely as a result of ideological differences which had previously separated USA and Russia during the cold war period.

In the response given by the Journalist there is an indication that relations are competitive in that the USA wants to maintain its unipolar position in the international system while on the other hand the Russian federation is trying to bring in a new international order which is multipolar in character. Likewise the response from security and defense expert shows that the relations between Russia and USA are characterised by a struggle for power. In this regard the USA is fighting to tilt Russian federation's geopolitical influence in Eastern Europe.

Basing on the above, the relations between Washington and Moscow can be therefore be defined through the equation of power. Notably in chapter two power was defined as the ability to influence to an extent that one is in a position to affect the other. In this case one can observe that both Washington and Moscow are competing to undermine the geo political influence of the other through their proxy war in Ukraine. This means that either American administration or the Russian federation is trying to have a strong influence over Ukrainian affairs.

The responses raised above are similar to the arguments brought forward by some scholars in chapter 2 for example Hurd (2008) was of the view that the relations between Moscow and Washington were characterised by mistrust and hostility. Similarly James (2003) was also of the view that the relations between Moscow and Washington had hit a low as these relations were by animosity and tensions.

Findings from this study indicated that Washington and Moscow's relations have hit a low in the 21st century as a result of the superpower (USA) and the great power (Russia). The relations between the Kremlin and Washington are now strained as largely caused by Washington's encroachment in the former Russia's sphere of influence.

Russia have seen its geopolitical influence being threatened by USA and its allies. The relations of the Russian federation and USA have been strained by the Russia Ukrainian war.

4.4 Politics of encroachment between the Russia federation and the Western block
Looking at the politics of encroachment between the Russian federation and the Western block the responses from interviews highlighted the following:

The response from the academic A argued that:

The war in Ukraine was caused by USA's interference into Eastern Europe this becomes contrary to what a lot of people claim that it is Russia that provoked the war.

A certain political analyst asserted that:

USA's politics of intrusion provoked the Russian federation to act in an aggressive way. The strategy of interference in the affairs of former Soviet states especially in Ukraine is possessing an existential threat on the security of Moscow

An embassy official from the Russian embassy cemented the response from the political analyst and had this to say:

If Ukraine is making decisions to join NATO and its joining is possessing a security threat in the existence of NATO as a state then Kiev is supposed to be blocked from joining it

A response from the journalist pointed out that:

The annexation of Crimea by the Russian in 2014 violating the so called international law as put by Western democracies was not Russia's primary goal. The invasion of Crimea was a deliberate diplomatic strategy by the Kremlin to block the intrusion of NATO into Ukraine and other former soviet satellite states

A reply from the academic B argued that:

To think the NATO issue caused the Russia-Ukraine war shows your lack of knowledge of analysis of events in the international system. It's not a matter of joining NATO you are misled. The Russian president Putin is very ambitious like

Alexander the Great, with such role models he has ambition to expand Russian territories .it is naive to think the NATO issue led to war in 2014, Russia invaded and subsequently annexed the Crimean Peninsula from Ukraine the invasion was not caused by the NATO issue but Putin's territorial ambitions. In March 2014 he fulfilled his goal. His goal was to annex Crimea, annexation of territories is a long process, he wanted to continue with the process in the Russia-Ukraine war but it became a terrible miscalculation on Putin as he has met resistance from Ukrainians in the battlefield. He never thought Ukraine was going to get support from NATO countries. He thought he was going to repeat the exploits of the Crimean annexation

The response from the security and defence expert pointed out that:

Ukraine as a sovereign state do not have a need to include itself into Western block politics as this can cause serious tensions and hostilities between Russia and USA. Ukraine is supposed to use all her energy on maintaining a compromising foreign policy that makes it neutral as it needs both Russia and USA in its foreign policy matrix

The responses from both the academic A and political analyst brings out the idea of the politics of encroachment between the Russian federation and the Western block. Accordingly it is the USA and its NATO allies that have encroached in the former Soviet States. The strong interference of Western democracies in Eastern Europe where Russian was seen to be having an overwhelming geopolitical influence can be regarded as intrusion, meddling and trespass by a superpower (USA) to the great power (the Russian federation). The power struggles that are currently taking place between Washington and Moscow over the Russian Ukranian war have been brewed by years of the USA's little by little encroachment into a region where Russia had previously had strong authority, control and influence. What these two respondents are saying echoes the views of scholars such as Getachew (2019) when they point out that Washington broke a promise it made in the 1990s not to enlarge NATO, toward the East. The sudden encroachment of the West into the former soviet states can be seen as betrayal of Moscow by Washington.

The responses from both the embassy official and the journalist shows that the Russian federation detest the idea of Ukraine joining NATO as this would pose an existential

threat on the national security of the Kremlin. The annexation of Crimea in this case can be seen as a secondary goal. The primary goal was to block the encroachment of USA and its NATO allies into Ukraine and in Eastern Europe. What these two respondents are saying echoes the views raised by scholars such as (Mearsheimer, 2000) in chapter 2 when they point out that the encroachment of the Western block in the former Soviet states has been perceived by the Kremlin as an existential threat on the Russian security.

A reply from the academic B brought out an interesting contrasting response that is absent from the mainstream literature in chapter 2. The respondent argued that it is not a matter of Ukraine joining NATO that has caused Russian president Putin to invade Ukraine. In the view of the respondent Putin is seeking to revive the glories of the Soviet Union. It is Putin's ambition that has made him to declare war on Ukraine. This is captured in some of his speech when he was quoted saying:

In addition to, in contrast scholars such as Waltz (2003) argue that it is not the ambitious character of the Russian president Putin that contributed to the Crimean crisis in 2014 and the current Russia-Ukraine war of February 2022. The above rhetoric echoed by the respondent seem to have failed to read along the lines that it was part of Western propaganda to paint the Russian president Putin as an irrational aggressor. An observation can be that USA blocked Russia when it embarked on a mission to open a military base in Cuba in 1970. The American administration resisted the Russian federation's strategy of opening a military base as it feared that the base was proximately close to its borders and this was to pose national security threat on it. Cuba was a sovereign state with its right to make its own choice of who to relate and allow to open bases with in its state. Accordingly if USA did not allow Russia to establish a military base in Cuba fearing for its security then Moscow is justified not to permit USA to join Ukraine into NATO alliance as this can pose a security threat on the security of the Russian federation.

The response from the security and defence expert explained that the Russian federation did not have a need to include itself into the politics of the Western block.

Ukraine was to be a neutral state that was neither aligned to the West or East. This response raised by the respondent is similar to the arguments raised by some scholars in Chapter 2 for example (Barnett, 2022) was of the view that Ukraine was to be a neutral state similarly Mearsheimer (2000) was also of the view that a neutral Ukraine just like Switzerland can ensure a peaceful international system.

Findings from the above analysis of respondents indicate that the Western block encroached in Eastern Europe. The extension of NATO to incorporate former Soviet satellite states has created a conducive ground for power politics between the great power and superpower in the international system. The encroachment of USA into Eastern geopolitical influence has created a divided international system between Moscow and Washington. NATO has enlarged to include former Soviet states such as Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Slovakia and Slovenia(Baltic states) joined in 2004, followed by Albania and Croatia in 2009,in 2017 Montenegro, in 2020 Macedonia and and Sweden have joined only awaiting the ractification of Turkey. The USA and its NATO allies are now making steps to include Georgia and eventually Ukraine. The Russian federation on the other hand is fighting to resist the inclusion of Cremea,Georgia and Ukraine as the politics of encrotchment pose a security threat on Russia as a great power.

4.5 Power politics within the Russian Ukranian war

Regarding the power politics over economic issues within the Russia Ukrainian war responses from interviews highlighted the following:

The response from the academic pointed out that:

Despite the Pentagon budget being a trillion dollars war is war it affects the American economy. Deep inside the minds and hearts of US allies they feel the colossal effects of the pangs of the war on their economies. They feel being used by America who has much to gain in Ukraine than them that is fact

A response from the Journalist asserted that:

Cracks are emerging in the NATO alliance. Numerous Western corporate media

outlets have published reports showing growing political divisions between the United States and European Union. EU leaders are angry that the US is making lots of money from the proxy war in Ukraine, both by selling vast quantities of weapons and by making Europe reliant on its expensive liquefied natural gas (LNG), instead of Russia's significantly cheaper pipeline gas. EU leaders are furious that the US is profiting from the proxy war in Ukraine by selling weapons and expensive natural gas. Meanwhile European industries are being destroyed by high energy prices.

An embassy official had this to say:

The imposition of sanctions by the Western democracies is a deliberate strategy by USA and its allies to try and cripple the Russian economy

Basing from the above, the responses from both the academic and journalist brings out that the Russian Ukrainian war has affected the economies of USA's allies as they are in need of the Russian gas. Due to the economic strain of USA's allies such as France, Netherlands, Hungary and many others. They are reports of growing divisions between USA and the European Union and in France for example opposition parties and French citizens are threatening to pull out of European Union. The Russia Ukrainian war has exposed USA to its allies that it is greedy and it wants to fulfil its national interest while sacrificing that of its allies in the region. The American administration is taking advantage of its allies that are no longer trading with Russia due to economic sanctions that have been imposed on Moscow. Washington is now hiking prices of natural gas to its own allies. This interesting view is absent from the mainstream literature in chapter 2. An observation is that the Russian Ukrainian war can cause antagonism between the Western democracies themselves.

The response from the embassy official shows that USA and its NATO allies are using sanctions as a deliberate strategy to weaken Russia federation economically. What the embassy official is saying echoes the views of scholars such as (Kahler, 2022) in chapter two from the literature review when they point out that USA is resorting to economic war in order to fighting Russia in Ukraine . Sanctions are a weapon to strike the great power (Russia) to force her to surrender the war. The American administration is waging an economic war to assert its control, power and influence in the former

Soviet space violating the agreements such as the founding act signed in 1991 and Helsinki accord signed in 1997.

Findings from the above analysis of respondents exposed that the Russian Ukrainian war has created tensions among USA and its allies as other states in the European Union are realising that they are being taken advantage by USA and are threatening to boycott the EU as USA is economically benefiting from the war by selling weapons to Ukraine and natural gas at high price to its allies. The sanctions imposed on her for invading Ukraine are meant to cripple the economy of Moscow.

Looking at power politics within the military sphere in the Russia-Ukraine war responses from both interviews and questionnaires highlighted the following:

Evidence from the Russia embassy official pointed out that:

Peace in Ukraine depends on the United States, Ukrainians will be able to fight only as long as the Americans provide them with military and financial support, weapons. If the Americans want peace [in Ukraine], then there will be peace

The response from the political analyst A argued that:

Were it not the intervention of the US and its NATO allies supplying weapons to Ukraine. Ukraine would have been history by now

A certain journalist responded by pointing out that:

It looks like this war won't end easily. The support of the USA, Europe and the West continues. Accordingly, [the Ukrainian military] is being trained, [the plans remain in force] and [the money allocated in [their] budgets is being allocated. On the other hand, there are also statements by Russia. If we combine all this, it would not be a mistake to say that this war is likely to continue in 2023, despite all our good intentions and wishes for the establishment of a ceasefire and peace.

The reaction from the security and defence expert was that:

Zelensky the current Ukrainian president is on CIA payroll. No leader would sacrifice national interests like that. Indeed no sensible leader in his /her right senses will ever let go national interests like that. In fact what Zelensky is doing

is a good sign of a puppet leader

The reply from the political analyst B argued that:

I think underestimate the broader picture here. Some of Russian objectives have already been met for example destroying the US biological weapons labs in Ukraine that were based at the Azovstal Steel plant. Russia has also managed to strain the economies of West by increasing the cost of war. Just look at their war budget daily.

A certain academic had this say concerning the power politics within the military sphere:

This war has shown the military might of Russia. Ukraine has been getting support from all over but they are still largely receiving end. Those who were saying strength of Russia military might has been overrated were wrong. Russia at the moment is at war with NATO indirectly but she still stand tall

Basing on the responses from the embassy official, political analyst and journalist above, Ukrainian's survival is determined by USA and its NATO allies as there are supporting Ukraine militarily by supplying weapons to Kiev so that it can defend itself against the Kremlin. If these Western democracies continue to supplying weapons to the Ukrainian government then the war will be prolonged. Kiev's military is receiving military trainings from NATO before joining the alliance. An observation is that the Ukrainian president Zelensky is a puppet as it is believed that he is on a payroll of the CIA. His adamant ignorance of the Ukrainian national interest might to some extent expose his strong reliance with Washington and its allies.

The response from academic is of the view that Ukraine continues to experience difficulties despite being aided militarily by the USA and its NATO allies. The military might of Russia is evident in the Russia Ukrainian war since Russia is now fighting 30 NATO powers in Ukraine but it is still standing this shows that the Russian federation is a force to reckon in the international system.

Concerning power politics over United nations General Assembly (UNGA) and responses from interviews pointed out the following:

An embassy official from the Russian embassy had this to say:

Nation states in the United Nations General Assembly that voted against Russia an aggressor did so in fear to be bullied and harassed by USA and its allies. It is said that those nation states that decided to vote in favour of Russia in the United Nations General Assembly resolutions risked to lose economic support and aid from Western democracies that is USA and its allies.

A response from a political analyst emphasised that:

The United Nations is a captured institution as it favours Western democracies at the expense of other nation states. The institution is used to whip and push the agenda of nation states in the global North for example the voting procedures for countries to vote against the Russian federation as an aggressor in the Russian Ukrainian war. If the Western democracies are the ones that have declared war like what they did in Iraq, Libya, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan among others. The USA and its allies are always by passing the legal binding procedures of the United Nations Security Council and those of United Nations General Assembly but the invasion of Ukraine was quick to be labelled by Western democracies as the worst violation of human dignity and international law since the end of World War 11

One of the Journalist's response he explained that:

Countries that are members of the United Nations General Assembly are being bullied to vote in favour of supporting Ukraine against Russia in the resolutions of who is the aggressor in the war. The voting in the United Nations General Assembly should allow countries to vote in secrecy this will make the voting procedure to be objective

The respondents above exposed power struggles between the Russian federation and the USA and its allies in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). The American administration have been using the UNGA to influence countries to vote against the Kremlin in almost all three resolutions namely (naming the aggressor in the Russia-Ukraine war, expulsion of Moscow in the human rights council and voting to block Russia from annexing Ukrainian states) that saw all members of the UNGA voting in favour of Western democracies. An observation is that USA and its allies have been using threats to nation states in the global south of denying aid and support of any kind to states that decide to vote in favour of Russia. As pointed out by one of the respondent above that United Nations organisations is no longer serving the interest of

nation states rather it is now a captured institution that is saving the national interest of Western democracies.

Regarding power politics over media in the Russia-Ukraine war responses from both interviews and questionnaires pointed out the following:

The reply from the journalist indicated that:

We have also long pointed out here that most news outlets support and feeds the EU twisted, engineered, cooked, manufactured and hegemonic narratives which is aimed at blinding people from its evil deeds done serreptuously.

Evidence reported by the journalist B pointed out that:

The media is always biased and favouring Ukraine in the at one the Russian Soldeirs were said to be sharing the same weapons as group

The response from the academic highlighted that:

Are you aware of the Russia running out of weapons headline that has been reported almost more than 20 times on the Western media as of 26 November 2022 and I strongly believe that they will continue to report about Russian stock pile depleting to wrongly portray the Russian federation as a failure in its special military operation in Ukraine.

A certain political analyst pointed out that:

The Western media is spreading propaganda as it is favouring Ukraine in all its facets. The Russian federation's withdrawal from Kherson was reported by the Western media as a defeat of the Russian military by the Ukrainian army but if truth be told USA and its allies are using propaganda. Strategies in the war involve withdrawal and attacking

The responses from the four respondents exposed that the Western media is being used by USA and its NATO allies to spread propaganda on the Russian federation in the Russia Ukraine war but instead favouring Ukraine. The reply from the Journalist shows that the media is twisted and cooked to portray Ukraine on a good note. The western media is always portraying the Russian federation as losing the war. The response from the academic exposed the Western media propaganda as proven by Russia running out

of weapons headline that Russia's stock pile is depleting. An observation is that western media always twist issues to do with who is winning the war, Russia's stock pile is said to be depleting

Findings from the four responses above showed that the Western media narratives portray the Russian federation as an aggressor, dictator that deny to consider that Ukraine is a sovereign state.

Discussion of Findings

The information obtained from the responses that were given by respondents were more valuable as they gave insight on power politics within the Russian Ukrainian war. The findings obtained from the study were also similar to some of the information in the literature review in chapter two. Some of the information obtained was absent from the literature for example the fact that members of the EU are complaining that USA is benefiting from selling weapons to Ukraine and also by selling natural gas to its allies on a high price. Regarding findings from 4.3 above, the study showed that the previous relations between Kiev and Moscow were cordiale but went on to expose that the relations were jeopardised by Washington's meddling in the politics of Eastern Europe. While the relations of Washington and Kiev were lukewarm before the year 2000 as Kiev related more with Russia, Over years beginning with the year 2000 the relations of USA and Ukraine became more cordiale while those of Ukraine and Russia became strained. The findings also exposed that the relations between Washington and Moscow have soured in the 21 first century the strain have been caused by USA's encroachment in the former Russia's sphere of influence.

Concerning findings from 4.4 on issues to do with power politics of encroachment the respondents wide opened that NATO's extension into Eastern Europe is a main factor that has triggered the Russian aggression. This is contrary to a popular assumption that Moscow is an aggressor. The USA and its NATO allies are the one that caused Russia to declare war on Ukraine. The two agreements that is the founding act (1991) and Helsinki accords (1975 and 1997) signed by USA and its NATO allies guaranteeing the Russia federation of politics of non-interference in Eastern Europe has been violated as

seen by USA and its NATO allies little by little from the 1990's incorporating former soviet Union states into the western block alliance. The strategy have been met by extreme aggression by Moscow as it invaded Crimea and eventually Ukraine in 2022. These invasions are a defence strategy from the Kremlin to try and block the encroachment of USA and its NATO allies into the former Russian sphere of control, authority and influence.

Looking at findings from 4.5.1 to 4.5.4 the respondents brought varied viewpoints. Findings from 4.5.1 disclosed that economically the Western democracies wants to cripple the economy of the Russia federation so that they establish their control, authority and influence in Eastern Europe once they succeed to paralyse Moscow through economic sanctions for invading Ukraine. The nine level package of economic sanctions imposed are a form of economic war in the power struggles between USA and its NATO allies and the Russian federation. The respondents also brought an interesting analysis that was not considered in the mainstream literature in chapter 2. Power politics is also now at play within the western democracies themselves since the Russian invasion of Ukraine begun. France, Neatherlands, Hungary among others are cranky about USA's behaviour of selling natatural gas at a high price taking advantage of its other allies in the international system. Findings from 4.5.2 on power politics over the military sphere the respondents revealed that USA and its NATO allies scheme of supplying weapons to Ukraine to as they fight Moscow is supposed to be responsible for prolonging and creating instability in the Eastern region. The approach is also making Western democracies to be in the conflict one way or the other.

Accordingly adding to the above, the findings from 4.5.3 on power politics over the UNGA the respondents exhibited the power struggles between Moscow and Washington. The UNGA was portrayed by respondents as an instrument in the hands of Western democracies to cripple the Russian federation's dignity among nation states in the international system. The NATO allies are said to have threatened UNGA members not to vote in favour of Russia federation as illustrated in 4.5.3 above. Similarly, findings from 4.5.4 exposed that Western democracies are using propaganda when broading casting the events in the Russia-Ukraine war. Ukraine is always portrayed as blameless

and victims but Russia is portrayed as losing at times cruel and intruders

4.6 Summary

The main task of this chapter was to present the results of the research which in short are the perspectives and views of the respondents. This research study was presented and analysed qualitatively which involved the laying out of opinions of respondents in words. However two tables were employed to present some of the data to make it to be soundly and clear. The data presented in this chapter from all respondents revealed power politics at play within the Russia- Ukraine war. From the findings, it was noted that the American administration and its allies are fighting Russia in Ukraine. The findings discussed power dynamics pertaining to the relations of the actors, issues of encroachment of Western democracies in the former soviet geopolitical space, power politics that has to do with media, military, economy and United Nations general assembly. The next chapter, chapter 5 provided the summary, recommendations, and the conclusion of the study.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter gave the major findings linked to the objectives and questions that were suggested by respondents on power politics at play within the Russian-Ukrainian war. It draws attention from the analysis and interpretation of data that was presented in various chapters. It comprised a summary of the whole chapter and presented a brief summary of findings. It went on to give a conclusion as well as suggested recommendations on the peaceful strategies of ending the Russia-Ukraine war in a ground that is full of power struggles between the USA and its NATO allies and the Russian federation in Ukraine. The recommendations on ways to handle the relations between USA and its NATO allies and the Russian federation were also proffered.

5.1 Summary of the findings

Basically, the study aimed at critically analyzing power dynamics in the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The research established that relations between Kiev and Moscow were cordial at first before the year 2004. The relations were endangered by Washington's interference in the politics of Eastern Europe. While the relations of Washington and Kiev were tepid before the year 2000. The year 2000 onwards marked a paradigm shift in the relations of USA and Ukraine as they became cordial while those of Ukraine and Russia became nervy. The outcomes also disclosed that the relations between Washington and Moscow have fermented in the 21st century the tension have been caused by USA's intrusion in the former Russia's sphere of influence.

Regarding the second objective, the enquiry found out that NATO's enlargement into Eastern Europe was central reason that has prompted the Russian aggression. Based on this view the USA and its NATO allies are seen as the ones that provoked Moscow to declare war on Ukraine. The two agreements that is the founding act (1991) and Helsinki accords (1975 and 1997) signed by USA and its NATO allies ensuring the politics of non-interference in Eastern Europe has been violated as seen by USA and its NATO. Findings divulged that economically the USA and its NATO allies want to paralyse the economy of the Russian federation.

On the third objective, the study found out that, power politics is at play in the UNGA as it is exposed by power struggles between the Russian federation and USA. The NATO allies are said to have threatened UNGA members not to vote in favour of Russia federation. Similarly, findings exposed that Western democracies are using propaganda when reporting about the events in the Russia-Ukraine war. Ukraine is always represented on the Western media as victims of Russian aggression but Russia is depicted as harsh and trespassers in a sovereign state of Ukraine

5.2 Conclusion

Basing on the data and information presented and the main findings, it can be noted that power politics is at show in the Russia Ukraine war. Observations from the study were that Russia- Ukraine war has created tensions between the Russian federation and the USA and its NATO allies over issues of influence, control and authority in Ukraine. The Russia-Ukraine conflict was seen to have been triggered by the USA and its NATO allies' interference into former Soviet States. The encroachment of the USA in the former Warsaw pact members have strained relations between Moscow and Washington. Previously in the presidency Yanukovych Ukraine was to be a neutral state that followed the foreign policy of compromise but it should be noted that when President Poroshenko took over the presidency he reversed the neutrality status of Kiev in bid to join NATO. The current Ukrainian president Zelensky made tangible steps to join Nato this provoked Russia to declare war on Ukraine as a defence strategy since the joining of NATO pose an existential threat on the security of the Russian federation. The Kremlin will never allow Ukraine to join NATO just like what USA did in the Cuban missile crisis when it blocked Russia not create a military base in Cuba as this strategy was a threat on Washington's security. Power struggles were also evident in the voting procedures in the UNGA where countries were forced by Western democracies to vote against Russia. The United nations have failed to uphold international law due to the fact that it is no longer objective as it is favoring western democracies.

5.3 Recommendations

Having conducted the research and noted the areas that need to be attended to, to bring peace in between Russia and Ukraine as well external nations states involved. The researcher's observation proposed the following recommendations. The recommendations include the perspectives from respondents as well.

- Negotiations between Ukraine and Russia in order to end the war peacefully
- Ukraine to be a neutral state this will create a sense of national security to Russia
- USA and its NATO allies is supposed to circumvent the politics of encroachment that has created Russia's aggressive behaviour on Kiev
- The USA and its NATO allies to avoid inclusion of Ukraine into NATO this will make the relations between Moscow and Washington to improve
- The USA and its NATO members to genuinely demand peace in the Russia-Ukraine conflict than dividing the international system through its double standards of supplying weapons in Ukraine at the same time calling for peace.
- Strengthen institutions to be effective in solving conflicts without favour of any states unlike United Nations that has become a captured institution by Western democracies.
- All nation states in the international arena should adhere to international law and respect the United Nations Charter

5.4 Areas for further research

- The impact of Russia Ukrainian war in the economies of Sub Saharan Africa
- Role of NATO in the Russia-Ukraine war
- The impact of Russia-Ukraine war on Children
- The NATO expansion as a cause of Russia-Ukraine war
- The Ukraine Crisis: A story of misperceptions

5.5 Summary

This chapter highlighted various conclusions that were arrived at in the study. It also put

forward recommendations on ways to try and end the Russia –Ukraine war. Recommendations for further study were also highlighted. The major findings of the study were that USA and its NATO allies have encroached in the former soviet states. This encroachment have made them to violate the promises that they penned in the 1990s where it ensured the Russian federation that it was not going to move an inch in the former soviet Union states a pledge that USA and its NATO allies have gravely dishonored as they have enlarged into Moscow’s previous areas of influence. The study also exposed power politics at play within the Russia-Ukraine war. Power politics on issues to do with media, military, UNGA and economy were disclosed by respondents.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, K. and Snidal, D. (2022) 'Why states act through formal international organizations', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1): 3–32.
- Adams, J. (2022) 'Global International Relations (IR) and regional worlds: a new agenda for International Studies', New York: Routledge.
- Adams, T. (2006) 'The IMF: back to basics', *i for the 21st Century*, Washington, DC: Peterson Institute for International Economies
- Akingboye, S. (2005). *A Systematic Approach to international Relations*. Lagos. Nigeria: Concept Publication Limited. Columbia University Press.
- Avant, D.D. (2022) *Who Governs the Globe?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Baldwin, D. (2000). *Power and International Relations*. New York
- Barnett, M. (2022) *Rules for the World*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Beetham, D. (2019) *The Legitimation of Power*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Betzold, C. (2014) *“Borrowing” power to influence international negotiations:* , London: Routledge.
- Brisk, W.J. (2022). *The Dilemma of the media and international relations in the modern Era*: Anguilla, Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Buzan, B. (2006). *From International system to International Society to International: Structural Realism and Regime Theory*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Drezner, D.W. (2008) *All Politics is Global: Explaining International Regulatory Regimes*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Easton, D. (2000) *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, New York: John Wiley.
- Fedor, A. (2022). *Western media propaganda in the 21st century*, Boston : MIT Press.
- Finnemore, M. and Sikkink, K. (2007) 'International power dynamics and political change', Cambridge: Intersentia.
- Fox, A.B. (2022) *The Power of big States: Diplomacy in World War II*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freedman, M. (2003)., *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*A brief (as promised) but authoritative guide to the nature of ideology and its place in the modern world. Hey,

J.A.K. (2006) *Great States in World Politics: Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior*, Boulder: Lynne Reimer.

Getachew, A. (2019) *Worldmaking After Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hay, C., (2013), *New Directions in Political Science: Responding to the Challenge of an Independent World*. A series of astute reflections on the nature, extent and implication of global interdependence for politics and a variety of political issues., London: Routledge

Heywood A. (2011). *Global Politics* Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York

Heywood, A., *Political Ideologies: An Introduction (5th edn)* (2012). An accessible, up-to-date and comprehensive guide to the major ideological traditions

Hurd, I. (2008) *After Anarchy: Legitimacy and Power in the United Nations Security Council*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hurd, I. (2022) *After Anarchy: Legitimacy and Power in the United Nations General Assembly*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

James, H. (2003) *Russo America relations in the past and today*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kahler, M. (2022) 'Aid and state building', workshop on economic aid policy and state building, CUNY, Graduate Centre.

Kegley C. Jr (1993). *World Politics, Trend and Transformation*, (4th Ed.). New York: St. Martins Press.

Kott, S. and Droux J. (2022) *Rise and fall of World global economies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krasner, S.D. (ed) (2022). *Competing World economies in the 21 first century*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Leftwich, A. (ed.), *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study* (2004). A very useful collection of essays examining different discipline.

Fry, G. (2022) *Power and Diplomacy in international affairs*, Acton, ACT: ANU Press. concepts of politics as well as contrasting views of the

Leo, S. (2004). *Machiavelli's Intention: The Prince, The American Political Science*

Review,

Mark E. (2001). *Explaining the Post-Cold War Order: An International Society Approach*, London: Routledge Kegan Paul Ltd.

Mearsheimer, J. (2000). *Structural Realism, International Relations Theories*, New York: Oxford University Press

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics among Nations the Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf

Nayef, A. (2008). *The future of International Relations: Symbiotic Realism*. New York: Macaleb.

Piano J. (2022) 'Why do states change positions in the United Nations General Assembly?', Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press.

Roberts M. (2022) *Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism in Political Science*, London: Macmillan

Savchenko, J. H. (2022) 'The quest for legitimacy in world politics: international institutions' legitimation strategies', : Oxford University Press.

Waltz, K. (2003). *Theory of International Politics*, Addison: Wesley Publishers

Wright, M. (1978) *Power Politics*. New York: University of Chicago Press.

Zürn, M. (2022) *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*, Oxford:

APPENDIX A: KEY INFORMAT PARTICIPATION SHEET

Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukraine war

Good Day

My name is Thembanani Mlilo and I am a Masters student registered for a Masters in International Relations at Bindura University of Science Education. I am doing a research aimed at making a critical analysis of power politics in the Russia Ukrainian war

It is hoped that the findings of this study will be influential to policy formulation. I am kindly extending my invitation to you to participate in this study. Participation is however voluntary and should you have any reservations to participate, you will not be disadvantaged in any way. If you agree to participate, there will not be any compensation.

A semi structured interview guide will guide the interview. The interview will be set at a place and time that is convenient for you lasting not more than an hour. You have the right to refuse to answer questions that are discomforting to you. At any point, you may also withdraw from the study without any consequences. With your permission, the research interview will be audio recorded. Access to the tap recording will be restricted to my supervisor. Your name and personal details will be kept confidential.

Should you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me on +263 776454286, 07777771156 or my supervisor Dr Mbanje on Should you wish to receive the research outcomes, a summary of the research findings will be made available to you on request. Your consideration to participate in this study is appreciated.

Yours Sincerely

Thembanani Mlilo

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

I,.....hereby consent to participate in this research study. The purpose of this investigation has been highlighted to me. I do understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I have the right to withdraw from the study at any point or refuse to answer questions without any consequences. I understand that confidentiality will be maintained and my identity will remain anonymous when the findings are presented. I also consent to tape recording of the research interview and that the recordings will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed within two years after the production of any publication arising from the study or six years after completion of the study if there are no available publications.

Name of Participant: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name of Researcher: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR JOURNALIST AS KEY INFORMANT

My name is Them bani Mlilo I am a student at Bindura University of Science. I am studying a Masters in international Relations. I am conducting academic research for academic purposes on the topic Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukrainine war

Please feel free to participate in the study by giving honest answers, as the study is meant to show the power struggles involved in the Russia-Ukrainine war. If you free you are unable to continue please stop.

1. How is power politics of the Western allies affecting the Western economies?
2. Is the strategy of weakening Russia using Sanctions by Western allies working?
3. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?
4. How is power politics over the military manifesting in the Russia Ukrainian war?
5. What is power politics over the media like in the Russia Ukrainian war?
6. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?
7. Do you think Western Allies will be successful to weaken Russia's military prowess by using United Nations General Assembly to lure support?
8. How did Washington use its regime change agenda to influence Ukrainian politics and how did it lead to the Russia-Ukrainine War
9. What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?
10. Do you think the Russia Ukrainian war will expose Americans quest for World dominance and lead to shift of World order?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ACADEMICS AS KEY INFORMANTS

My name is Them bani Mlilo I am a student at Bindura University of Science. I am studying a Masters in international Relations. I am conducting academic research for academic purposes on the topic Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukrainine war

Please feel free to participate in the study by giving honest answers, as the study is meant to show the power struggles involved in the Russia-Ukrainine war. If you free you are unable to continue please stop.

*Dr/Professor/:*_____ *Thank you for accepting my invitation to participate in this interview.*

<i>Age of the Academic Expert</i>	
<i>Sex</i>	
<i>Date of Interview</i>	

- 1. How is power politics of the Western allies affecting the Western economies?*
- 2. Is the strategy of weakening Russia using Sanctions by Western allies working?*
- 3. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 4. How is power politics over the military manifesting in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 5. What is power politics over the media like in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 6. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*

7. Do you think Western Allies will be successful to weaken Russia's military prowess by using United Nations General Assembly to lure support?

8. How did Washington use its regime change agenda to influence Ukrainian politics and how did it lead to the Russia-Ukraine War

9. What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?

10. Do you think the Russia Ukrainian war will expose Americans quest for World dominance and lead to shift of World order?

Thank you for participating in the study

APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR POLITICAL AND STRATEGIC ANALYST AS KEY INFORMANTS

My name is Thembanani Mlilo I am a student at Bindura University of Science. I am studying a Masters in international Relations. I am conducting academic research for academic purposes on the topic Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukrainian war

Please feel free to participate in the study by giving honest answers, as the study is meant to show the power struggles involved in the Russia-Ukrainian war. If you are unable to continue please stop.

- 1. How is power politics of the Western allies affecting the Western economies?*
- 2. Is the strategy of weakening Russia using Sanctions by Western allies working?*
- 3. How is Russia-Ukrainian war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 4. How is power politics over the military manifesting in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 5. What is power politics over the media like in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 6. How is Russia-Ukrainian war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 7. Do you think Western Allies will be successful to weaken Russia's military prowess by using United Nations General Assembly to lure support?*
- 8. How did Washington use its regime change agenda to influence Ukrainian politics and how did it lead to the Russia-Ukrainian War*
- 9. What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?*
- 10. Do you think the Russia Ukrainian war will expose Americans quest for World dominance and lead to shift of World order?*

APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR AMBASSADORS AS KEY INFORMANTS

My name is Them bani Mlilo I am a student at Bindura University of Science. I am studying a Masters in international Relations. I am conducting academic research for academic purposes on the topic Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukrainine war

Please feel free to participate in the study by giving honest answers, as the study is meant to show the power struggles involved in the Russia-Ukrainine war. If you free you are unable to continue please stop.

Mr/Mrs/Ms:_____Thank you for accepting my invitation to participate in this interview.

<i>Occupation</i>	
<i>Agency of Employment</i>	
<i>Date of Interview</i>	

- 1. How is power politics of the Western allies affecting the Western economies?*
- 2. Is the strategy of weakening Russia using Sanctions by Western allies working?*
- 3. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 4. How is power politics over the military manifesting in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 5. What is power politics over the media like in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 6. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 7. Do you think Western Allies will be successful to weaken Russia's military prowess by using United Nations General Assembly to lure support?*
- 8. How did Washington use its regime change agenda to influence Ukrainian politics*

and how did it lead to the Russia-Ukraine War

9. What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?

10. Do you think the Russia Ukrainian war will expose Americans quest for World dominance and lead to shift of World order?

APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SECURITY AND DEFENCE EXPERTS AS KEY INFORMANTS

My name is Them bani Mlilo I am a student at Bindura University of Science. I am studying a Masters in international Relations. I am conducting academic research for academic purposes on the topic Power politics: A critical analysis of Russia-Ukrainine war

Please feel free to participate in the study by giving honest answers, as the study is meant to show the power struggles involved in the Russia-Ukrainine war. If you free you are unable to continue please stop.

- 1. How is power politics of the Western allies affecting the Western economies?*
- 2. Is the strategy of weakening Russia using Sanctions by Western allies working?*
- 3. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 4. How is power politics over the military manifesting in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 5. What is power politics over the media like in the Russia Ukrainian war?*
- 6. How is Russia-Ukrainine war causing tensions between America and her allies?*
- 7. Do you think Western Allies will be successful to weaken Russia's military prowess by using United Nations General Assembly to lure support?*
- 8. How did Washington use its regime change agenda to influence Ukranian politics and how did it lead to the Russia-Ukrainine War*
- 9. What is the politics of encroachment between the Russian Federation and the Western block?*
- 10. Do you think the Russia Ukrainian war will expose Americans quest for World dominance and lead to shift of World order?*