



## NATO'S UNNEEDED EXPANSION FOLLOWING THE COLD WAR AND ITS IMPACT ON PAKISTAN

*Dr. Samreen Aamir*  
*Assistant Professor*  
*DHA Suffa University*  
*Karachi – Pakistan*  
[samreen.bari@gmail.com](mailto:samreen.bari@gmail.com)

*Sidra Ahmed*  
*Senior lecturer*  
*DHA Suffa University*  
*Karachi – Pakistan*  
[sidrasrs@gmail.com](mailto:sidrasrs@gmail.com)

*Muhammad Mustafa Raza*  
*Senior lecturer*  
*DHA Suffa University*  
*Karachi – Pakistan*  
[mustafaraza44@gmail.com](mailto:mustafaraza44@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

*With the end of the WWII, the Western Allies and the Soviet Union's wartime coordination became dysfunctional. In 1949, the United States and its allies Canada, along with many Western European states established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to guarantee collective defense against the Soviet Union. With the fall of the Soviet Union, the world became unipolar when prior opponents were no longer remained to challenge Western supremacy. Hence, the political analysts started to believe that NATO was no longer required. But, for nearly three decades, The NATO Alliance avoided defining its long-term purpose, still welcoming for an eastward expansion. NATO has expanded five times since 1990.*

**Key Words:** NATO Alliance Expansion Ukraine Russia Peace War

### Research Questions



1. What are the reasons for NATO's existence and expansion after the Cold War and the fall of the Soviet Union
2. What are Russia's concerns regarding Ukrainian's desire to join NATO's club?
3. The direct and indirect effects of the ongoing war on Pakistan.

## **Introduction**

Russia has very long geographical boundaries it is a transcontinental state having geographical boundaries between two continents and marine boundaries with the USA as well. It is located in the Eastern part of Europe and in the North of Asia. That is why the list of its neighboring countries is so long bordering the Arctic Ocean, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, and Mongolia, Norway, Poland, and Ukraine. While Japan, Sweden, Turkey, and the United States all have marine boundaries with them with a total area of 17,098,242 sq. km. It is the world's largest country (in terms of area), covering more than 11% of the planet's surface. However, vast regions of the country were uninhabited or uninhabitable.

Russia has a long history of having a significant impact on the world's political, cultural, intellectual, and economic ramifications. Throughout history, the West has refused to recognize Russia's ideological and strategic importance. It was always portrayed as a power-hungry country with a totalitarian regime. However, it is also true that Russia, according to independent sources, lagged considerably behind the important European countries and the United States in terms of development during the early 1970s and following WWII. As per Stephen Kotkin (Stephen Kotkin is a brilliant and prolific scholar of Russian history. He is a history professor at Princeton University and a senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution.) "Russia is a remarkable civilization: in the arts, music, literature, dance, film. In every sphere, it's a profound, remarkable place—a whole civilization, more than just a country. At the same time, Russia feels that it has a "special place" in the world, a special mission. It's Eastern Orthodox, not Western. And it wants to stand out as a great power. Its problem has always been not this sense of self or identity but the fact that its capabilities have never matched its aspirations. It's always in a struggle to live up to these aspirations, but it can't, because the West has always been more powerful". However, because of its extensive geographic and natural resource availability, its significance cannot be overstated. WW2 claimed over 25-29 million deaths, with material and cultural losses that are impossible to estimate even today. (Reiman, 2016)

After WWII, the wartime coordination between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union had been completely broken down. As the world observed, US and USSR divided the world into two main blocks, i.e., the Capitalist block led by the US and the Communist block by Russia. The polarization of the world did nothing but harm each other to a certain extent.

## **Cold War – Ideological to Military Coalition**



Although both USSR and U.S. were in Allied camps during Second World War, the US was concerned not just about its physical frontiers, but also about the ideological bounds of itself and its allies. Truman Doctrine, Marshal Plan, and the establishment of NATO are proof that the US took every possible step to show that it would stand firm in the face of any Soviet military expansion, aggression, or influence in Europe. As far as Truman Doctrine is concerned, the US provided large-scale military and economic support to Greece and Turkey. The US considered these countries' security vital, since both feared Soviet aggression. During WWII, Turkey remained neutral. When the war came to an end, Soviet Russia emphasized Turkey establish joint military control of the Turkish Straits, which connected the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

Relations between the two countries soured as Turkey refused, resulting in Soviet Russia's demands for territory concessions along the Georgia–Turkey border.

This intimidation campaign aimed to destabilize Turkey and drag it into the Soviet sphere of influence in the Black Sea, as well as to prevent American influence or naval presence in the region. The formation of the Truman Doctrine was sparked by the Straits Crisis, as well as the Greek Civil War. Soviet Russia had threatened Turkey not to interrupt in Mediterranean Sea. Hence to strengthen and expand and at the same time, safeguard the hard and soft boundaries of the states and tackle growing Soviet influence the Western powers felt the need to create the alliance. Therefore To provide collective defense against the Soviet Union, the United States, its allies like Canada, and many Western European states founded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949. NATO claims to be a defensive alliance whose goal is to protect its members. The official NATO position is that "the Alliance does not seek confrontation and poses no threat to Russia.", despite being founded to resist Russian expanding dominance. However, according to historical evidence, NATO was exploited by western allies and the United States to weaken the Soviet Union's position. When West Germany entered in NATO alliance in May 1955, it created a complicated situation for the Soviet Union, pushing it to build the Warsaw Pact in Central and Eastern Europe the following year. Because Germany was flooded with weaponry and ammunition, as well as trained soldiers, the West Germans gave multiple divisions and substantial air forces to the NATO alliance. USSR assumed that the Warsaw Treaty Organization could both contain West Germany and deal with NATO.

### **The Collapse of USSR and Afterwards**

The international political system took a new turn after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and the globe became unipolar. With previous foes no longer present, political analysts suggested that NATO was no longer necessary, and that future defense spending and military investment should be severely reduced. Military alliances have been formed over time to balance opposing strength, such as NATO, or the perceived threat of opposing force, as in the case of the United States. They've fallen apart when the



need for balance has faded as a result of power transitions or altering threat perceptions. It was a logical assumption for NATO after the dissolution of the USSR and the WARSAW pact.

***What are the reasons for NATO's existence and expansion after the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union?***

For nearly three decades, The Alliance has eschewed declaring its prospective mission, instead focused on immediate actions to adjust to the post-Cold War security scenario. New members of NATO have been welcomed and invited to participate in NATO's deliberations and councils. Former Warsaw Pact member countries have also benefited from its military planning, defense budgeting, and democratic control of armed forces expertise. Following Germany's unification and the establishment of the European Union, NATO's presence is now considered illogical and unnecessary. It is argued that in this interdependent and interconnected world, groupings and alliances should not be fostered or used to sow division in the cosmopolitan society. Opponents believe that the Alliance has been stagnating, desperately attempting to establish the relevance of an organization that has lost its essential purpose since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. It has only survived due to the ignorance of other institutions. In the civilized world, international relations are built without compromising each other's lines of trust. History has shown that when Germany was being unified, the United States and the Soviet Union were united and agreed that NATO would no longer be expanded, especially towards the East. In February 1990, then-US Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev come together to discuss NATO's possible development in a unified Germany. "There will be no one-inch enlargement of NATO's jurisdiction for NATO soldiers to the east." Baker presented his famous formula "not one inch eastward" and informed Gorbachev, agreeing with Gorbachev's remark that "any extension of the NATO zone is unacceptable."

To this day, ties between Moscow and Washington are plagued by this exchange and its meaning. Scholars and politicians continue to question whether the West, particularly the United States, assured the Russians that NATO would not be expanded to have included former Warsaw Pact members. Many Russian elites have resurrected the idea of such a guarantee when it is politically expedient to claim that they were betrayed in the settlement that ended the Cold War in Europe, thus justifying Russian pushback against the US-led security system, including the invasion of Ukraine. The aftershock effects of this discussion on history can be felt so far. It is confirmed or denied by various sources. Each government states its meaning in its way and explains it concerning its national interest. Scholars and officials continue to insist that the West, specifically the US, guaranteed the Russians that NATO would not expand to have included the former Warsaw Pact countries. Many Russian elites have dug up the idea of such a commitment when it is politically acceptable to imply that they were deceived in the agreement that terminated the Cold War in Europe, so validating Russian retaliation against the US-led security system, including the invasion of Ukraine.



Western scholars have differing perspectives and are divided on what the United States promised the Soviet Union back in 1990? Some academics believe that NATO's eastward expansion in the 1990s breached what Michael Mc Gwire referred to as "top-level commitments" against NATO growth.

Mary Sarotte, writing lately, claims that "contrary to Russian accusations, [Soviet President Mikhail] Gorbachev never got the West to pledge anything that it would freeze NATO's borders." Similarly, Mark Kramer claimed that the NATO enlargement into Eastern Europe, "never came up during the negotiations." However, many are vehemently opposed to NATO's expansion. They consider it a violation of the international code of conduct as well as a breach of commitment "In 1990, we were informed quite firmly by the West that the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and German unification would not lead to NATO enlargement," Russian political analyst Sergei Karaganov stated in 1995. In October 1993, history witnessed that the then U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher visited Moscow and purposefully stated in advance of the NATO summit in January 1994 that the United States would not support or allow new members to join the alliance, but would rather develop and encourage a Partnership for Peace that would include all former Warsaw Pact states. It was a sigh of relief for Boris Yeltsin. He believed he had averted NATO expansion at a stage when he was embroiled in a political battle with hardliners at home. A year later, when he learned that expansion remained not only on the table but might be implemented, Yeltsin became enraged and openly agitated against Clinton at a summit in Budapest.

### **NATO'S expansion after the cold war**

Global politics despises uneven power as much as nature despises a vacuum. In the hands of whoever wields it, unbalanced power is a threat to others. Now, America is in a position to broaden its national interests. Another goal, (whether it was hard power or soft power) was to maximize power. The term "smart power" was coined to protect both national and corporate interests. The entire global scenario is in the favor of U.S. The long history of America explains how it has impacted and exerted control over small or third world countries, whether it's the Wilsonian concept of using power to disseminate and hegemonize ideologies or the use of armaments in various parts of the world. Indeed, an imbalanced, uncontrollable, absolute, and unaccountable great state can make weaker states feel uneasy and encourage them to reinforce their positions. In a nutshell, the United States become an "indispensable nation", with both the ability and the necessity to influence and substantially rebuild the international order in all corners of the world. Interestingly, pro-NATO academicians cosmetically crafted and showed NATO's expansion as "by invitation."

The first formal invitation, which was immensely momentous in terms of Nato's development, came with the Madrid Summit in July 1997. Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, three significant CEE countries and former Warsaw Pact members, were asked to join NATO.



## 1. Russia - 14



Map of Russia showing the 14 bordering nations.

Source: <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/countries-bordering-the-highest-number-of-other-countries.html>





Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, and Ukraine

Poland (a NATO member) is located in the geographic center of Europe and is bounded to the north by the Baltic Sea, to the northeast by Russia and Lithuania, and to the east by Belarus and Ukraine.

Poland is located in the geographic center of Europe and is bounded to the north by the Baltic Sea, to the northeast by Russia and Lithuania, and the east by Belarus and Ukraine.

Hungary a NATO member does not have a direct border with Russia, although it can be connected to Russia via Ukraine. Hungary borders Slovakia to the north, Ukraine to the northeast.

The Czech Republic (a NATO member) is a landlocked Central European country. It is bounded to the west by Germany, to the south by Austria, to the east by Slovakia, and to the north by Poland.

According to the above figure, one of the three new members has a direct border with Russia, while the other two are in the same region with a neighboring country in between.

The Alliance gained 485,000 km<sup>2</sup> of territory and over 483 million persons, giving it a new military strength to harm its former adversary. The September 11th attacks have provided the United States moral authority to impose world order around the globe, particularly in South Asia, Central Asia, and the Middle East. Military actions and the installation of puppet governments in all of these territories were clearly not in Russia's favor. Meanwhile, NATO has been inducting new partners while simultaneously marginalizing Russia and China. Now in 2004 seven countries joined NATO and enhanced its strategic importance.



Russia's advantages in the Black Sea region reversed after the second wave of extending NATO's boundaries as Bulgaria and Romania joined NATO. Ukraine borders the Black Sea to the north, Russia and Georgia to the east, Turkey to the south, and Bulgaria and Romania to the west. Russia has obvious disadvantages in the Black Sea as a result of a mix of geology and politics that restricts its access to the greater Mediterranean region.

### **RUSSIA'S NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES**

Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, and Ukraine

Estonia (a NATO member) is located in northeastern Europe and stretched into the Baltic Sea, which encompasses it to the north and west. To the east, Estonia is bordered by Russia, mostly by the Narva River and the lakes Peipus (Peipsi; Russian: Chudskoye Ozero), Tyoploye, and Pskov, and to the south by Latvia.

Latvia (a NATO member) is bordered by Estonia to the north, Russia to the east, Belarus to the southeast, and Lithuania to the south along the Baltic Sea and the Gulf of Riga.

Lithuania is flanked to the north by Latvia, to the east and south by Belarus, to the southwest by Poland and the isolated Russian oblast of Kaliningrad, and to the west by the Baltic Sea.

### **RUSSIA'S NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES**

Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, and Ukraine

Slovakia (a NATO member) is bordered by Poland to the north, Ukraine to the east, Hungary to the south, and Austria to the southwest. Its former federal partner, the Czech Republic, lies to the west.





Bulgaria and Romania emerged as potential platforms for armed power projection. Their assets were deployed in several routine military maneuvers as part of the task force known as the Black Sea Rotational Force. One significant difference: the line of tension has shifted nearly 1,000 kilometers eastward. As a result, Russia lost its strong position in the North (in the Baltic region) as well as in the South and the Black Sea area. Whatever the reasons, whatever the background, whatever is presented. However, history demonstrates that Russia was pushing back on all sides. Now, all scholarly and strategic groups in Russia are speaking out against the disruption of the power balance, and the deception, greedy and dishonest behavior of the West and the United States. It was not a conventional circumstance. It was a matter of national integrity and survival for the Soviet Union. As a result of the election of Russia's President, Vladimir Putin, a new phase of Russian antagonism against NATO enlargement began. He halted the collapse of Russian military funding and inspired new doctrinal thinking, which was defined in the Governmental Rearmament Programs, which were primarily focused on the development of new generations of tanks, armored vehicles, artillery systems, and missiles. As a result, NATO member countries saw the Russian reactions as hysteria, aggressive modernization, and pointless saber-rattling aimed at deterring future NATO member states.





The lava erupted in August 2008, when two ex-USSR countries were offered membership in NATO, and those two states were none other than Russia's neighbors, Ukraine and Georgia.

This could not possibly be acceptable to Russia. Now, the tension in the region has increased, causing havoc all around the world. Faced with this issue, Russia's president explicitly stated that Russia viewed this offer as a direct security threat. On August 8, 2008, the Russian army launched attacks on Georgia, ushering in Europe's first twenty-first-century war. Russia's military intervention in Georgia elicited a surprisingly mild international response, with Moscow incurring few negative consequences. On the contrary, EU leaders led demands for a ceasefire that looked to suit Russian interests, while the US under the Obama administration quickly called for a reset in relations with Moscow.

The recent conflict between Russia and Ukraine has attracted worldwide attention. This war started in 2022 but its roots go back to 2014. Ukraine, which is located next to Russia, was previously part of the USSR. Apparently, relations between Ukraine and NATO began in 1992. In simple words this was the beginning, but Ukraine applied for NATO membership in 2008. But then the country's foreign, internal and political situation was preferred to remain non-aligned. But then the political and internal situation of the country changed drastically and the elected government of the country expressed its intention to join NATO in 2014. It has been working tirelessly since 2014 to become a member of NATO and a permanent member of the European Union. Its chances of becoming a member were bleak from the start because Russia has long opposed Ukraine joining the treaty and warned of reprisal if the country was permitted to join. The people of Ukraine are also willing to join NATO and the European Union. According to the Ukrainian Rating Sociological Group, a growing consensus on the question in late 2021 and early 2022 is a testament to the increased threat Ukrainians were feeling in the weeks and months leading up to the Russian invasion. As of Feb 16-17, 62 percent in the country supported membership, up from just 51 percent one year earlier. This was a geographical and defensive alarm for Russia. It was running out of balance of power. So Russia enforced war on Ukraine on its own.

### **NATO's Eastward Growth: goals and ambitions**

Economic stability is the most important strength and power that states require to acquire and achieve in this global world. Through historical events, it is important to determine that the underlying principle behind the objective of NATO member enlargement has always been to limit Russia's economic and defensive strength. This time, the conflict is affecting its agricultural export.

It is worth noting that America is more than just an economic and military power. It also has a highly distinct geographical location. The size of the United States' farmable land is the most essential feature. Russia and China may have equal land areas, but the large territory of their soil is not suitable for cultivation, habitation, or development. The United States boasts the world's greatest continuous amount of fertile land due to the Mid-West. The United States is attempting to assert its supremacy over



agricultural products as well. Due to the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, the wheat exports will reduce from both countries by 12%, according to an initial assessment of the war's consequences. Countries stretching from Europe to Asia and Africa would import perhaps less wheat in the following months as a result of increased costs and fewer shipments from the Black Sea region. Russia and Ukraine are two of the world's major wheat exporters. USDA researchers predicted that exports from the two countries would total 52 million tons this marketing year, a 7 million-tons decrease from their forecast before the invasion. President Joe Biden described measures on Wednesday to assist U.S. farmers in increasing crop production to offset reduced global food exports caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Now is the best time for the USA to take the advantage of this situation.

"America is fighting on two fronts right now," Biden remarked. "At home, we're dealing with inflation and rising prices. It is assisting Ukrainians in defending their democracy and feeding those who are starving."

As the Black Sea is important to Russia's geopolitical and economic interests, since it is surrounded by six states. Russia dominates its northeast shores: Ukraine to the north, Georgia to the east, Turkey to the south, and Bulgaria and Romania to the west. Important to note that three of those countries, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Romania, are NATO members, which is a source of friction for the Kremlin. It has been strategically and economically important to Russia for decades. Russia also relies on the Crimean ports of Sevastopol and Novorossiysk - huge, warm-water seaports with significant cargo trans-loading capabilities for marine trade to the rest of the world as well as naval might - to keep control of the sea in the south for security reasons. The Black Sea is crucial to Russia because it provides access to the Sea of Marmara, the Mediterranean, and the Atlantic Ocean.

Whether Russian concerns are justified or not but the latest incident that happened in the Black sea proved that now the Russian territory, Russian trade, and Russian ideology are the target behind NATO's expansion. On April 14, the Russian Black Sea Fleet flagship Moskva was sunk, becoming the largest naval ship sunk in combat since World War II. The report that two of Ukraine's Neptune missiles sank the ship was viewed as particularly shocking, prompting a reevaluation of the country's coastal defense capabilities, particularly its capacity to safeguard its southwestern coasts. The fact that the historic sinking occurred on the Black Sea's waves, on the other hand, has received less attention.

### **Ongoing Conflict and its impact on Pakistan**

Pakistan is the country that is directly or indirectly feeling and bearing the brunt of the Russian-Ukraine conflict in both political and economic terms. Commodity prices are rising on a daily basis, not only as a result of the ongoing conflict, but also as a result of a massive and devastating flood. Ex-Prime Minister Imran Khan has also linked the political and economic crisis, as well as political mismanagement and chaos, to his visit to Russia during the height of the conflict. Soon after the disintegration of the USSR,



Pakistan maintained good relations with both countries. We have also maintained a trustworthy economic relationship over the years. When the Pakistani political regime failed to manage the wheat crop yield in 2020, and average Pakistanis were facing acute wheat shortages, the government allowed private companies to import wheat to stabilise the market and keep prices under control. Between July and November 2020, Ukraine was the main supplier of wheat to Pakistan, exporting 1.2 megatonnes (Economics, 2022) (MT). Russia supplied 0.92 MT to Pakistan during the same time period (Economics, 2022). Wheat imports from both countries exceeded 2.1 MT between 2020 and 2021.

As previously discussed, Russia and Ukraine are both chief suppliers of agrarian products, but they are off the market due to the conflict and ongoing war between the two countries. Russia's blockade of Ukrainian ports, as well as European and US sanctions against Russia, have made it even more difficult for Ukrainian and Russian wheat and other essential exports to reach a large portion of the world. As a result, many countries have already reported food shortages, and Pakistan has been forced to find a new wheat supplier. The government may be forced to cover any shortages with costly wheat imports. Saeed Ahmad Nawaz, Managing Director of Pakistan Agricultural Storage and Services Corporation (PASSCO), briefed the committee on the loss and damage to stocked wheat in Sindh and Balochistan, estimating the loss at Rs4 billion. He stated that severe flooding damaged 26,956 metric tonnes of wheat in Khairpur and 564 metric tonnes of wheat in Hyderabad. PASSCO has lost 52,670 metric tonnes of wheat in Sindh out of a stock of 22 lakh and 66,000 metric tonnes (Abbas, 2022).

Flooding has destroyed vast areas of agricultural land in the Pakistani provinces of Balochistan, Sindh, and Punjab. It is critical to restore and provide emergency assistance to flood victims as soon as possible, as well as to restore thousands of acres of cropland, or else Pakistanis will face even more severe food shortages than they are experiencing now. Sindh province is responsible for 42% of total rice production. According to a study on yield losses in Sindh prepared by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, a Nepal-based research organization, flooding was especially severe in rice-growing areas. This has led to an estimated loss of 1.9 million tonnes (1.7 million tonnes) of rice, or 80% of the province's projected rice production. According to the report, the total economic impact in Sindh alone is \$1.3 billion due to an 88% loss of sugarcane and a 61% loss of cotton. Three key vegetable crops in Sindh – tomatoes, onions, and chili – face losses of \$374 million, according to the report. (Rahn, 2022) This is the depressing reality for ordinary Pakistanis. The high rate of inflation may worsen if expensive vegetable items are imported from various parts of the world. Because of the ongoing war, it is difficult to overcome food scarcity at a low cost.

### **Opportunities for Peace not for War**

There is still certain immediate steps the international community should take to adapt to the post-Cold War security situation. It is obvious from historical facts that the alliance system was to blame for the two world wars. The primary cause was the leaders' ignorance and irresponsible behavior. Egoistic



tendencies frequently aggravate rather than settle conflicts. Making strategic partnerships for security purposes will impair the world's peace and stability.

No state can thrive in isolation in today's global and interdependent world. The confrontation usually has an immediate or indirect impact on its own people, economy, and defense. The world now can be termed a “global village” as it is more interconnected, more interdependent, and more homogenized now. Fast, speedy, and affordable communication and transportation, economic dependency around the globe, technological advancement, and transference of ideas, knowledge, and services without any restrictions are creating a borderless world. Hence it is necessary to resolve the strategic, political, geographic, and economic issues without polluting the global peace. The current Strategic Concept (2022) reinforces NATO's primary goal of ensuring its member nations' mutual security through a 360-degree approach, and it explains three essential component tasks: deterrence and defense, crisis prevention and management, and cooperative security. At this point, it is difficult for states in conflict with NATO countries to maintain peace and stability in such a strong alliance system. As a result, it is critical for NATO to initiate dialogue and foster harmony in order to achieve a peaceful world. If the alliance system has to be sustained then, its framework and objectives must be loud and clear and must not be hostile to any nation or state. Security and ideologies should not be intertwined, as any state's ideological heritage should not be used to undermine the other state's defense mechanism. Hegemony should also be considered when ideas are imposed.

The United Nations is a venue for efficiently resolving all types of disputes. When it comes to superpowers, it seemed that their effectiveness is lessened and limited. Before placing a prohibition on weaker nations and governments, the superpowers must freeze and surrender their nuclear capabilities and cease work on developing weapons of mass devastation.

It is critical to boost competitor countries' commerce and dependency in order to reduce the cost of war and future wars. Because trade between Russia and European countries is huge, European countries can play a considerable role in this regard.

- In 2021, Russia was the EU's fifth largest trade partner, representing 5.8% of the EU's total trade in goods with the world.
- In 2020, the EU was Russia's first trade partner, accounting for 37.3% of the country's total trade in goods with the world. 36.5% of Russia's imports came from the EU and 37.9% of its exports went to the EU.
- In 2021, the total trade in goods between the EU and Russia amounted to €257.5 billion. The EU's imports were worth €158.5 billion and were dominated by fuel and mining products – especially mineral fuels (€98.9 billion, 62%), wood (€3.16 billion, 2.0%), iron and steel (€7.4 billion, 4.7%), fertilizers (1.78 bn, 1.1%). The EU's exports in 2021 totaled €99.0 billion. They were led by machinery and equipment (€19.5 billion, 19.7%), motor vehicles (€8.95 billion, 9%), pharmaceuticals



(€8.1 billion, 8.1%), electrical equipment and machinery (€7.57 billion, 7.6%), as well as plastics (€4.38 billion, 4.3%). (Commission, 2022)

In an interview with the Italian press shortly before the twelfth Russian European Union summit in early November 2003, Russian President Vladimir Putin stated, "For Us Europe is a major trade and economic partner and our natural most important partner, including in the political sphere Russia is not located on the American continent, after all, but in Europe. Russia is interested in developing relations with our partners in the United States and the American continent as a whole and in Asia but of course above all with Europe." (Lynch, 2004)

States' sovereignty should be respected in accordance with the Treaty of Westphalia, and states should not intervene in the foreign and domestic affairs of other countries.





## References

- Carter, A. (2017). A Strong and Balanced Approach to Russia. *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 58(December 2016–January 2017), 55–56.
- Daalder, I. H. (1999). *NATO in the 21st century: what purpose, what missions*. Brookings Institution, April.
- De Luca, Anthony R. (Autumn 1977), "Soviet-American Politics and the Turkish Straits". *The Academy of Political Science*. 92 (3): 503–524
- Eichler, J. (2021). From Hamburg and Munich to Tallinn and Burgas. In *NATO's Expansion After the Cold War* (pp. 33-64). Springer, Cham.
- Eichler, J. (2021). *NATO's Expansion After the Cold War*. Springer International Publishing.
- Goldgeier, J. (2016). Promises made, promises broken? What Yeltsin was told about NATO in 1993 and why it matters? *War on the Rocks*, 12.
- <https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/9577/black-sea-becomes-turquoise>
- [https://en.as.com/en/2022/02/25/latest\\_news/1645814627\\_130506.html](https://en.as.com/en/2022/02/25/latest_news/1645814627_130506.html)
- <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/warsaw-treaty>
- [https://ratinggroup.ua/files/ratinggroup/reg\\_files/rg\\_international\\_moods\\_022022\\_press.pdf?\\_x\\_tr\\_sl=auto&\\_x\\_tr\\_tl=en&\\_x\\_tr\\_hl=en](https://ratinggroup.ua/files/ratinggroup/reg_files/rg_international_moods_022022_press.pdf?_x_tr_sl=auto&_x_tr_tl=en&_x_tr_hl=en)
- <https://www.agriculture.com/news/business/war-to-cut-ukraine-and-russia-wheat-exports-by-12-percent>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Czech-Republic/Land>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Estonia>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Latvia>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Lithuania>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Poland>
- <https://www.britannica.com/place/Slovakia>
- <https://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/russia.htm>
- <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/115204.htm>
- [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_56626.htm#:~:text=The%202022%20Strategic%20Concept&text=It%20reaffirms%20that%20NATO's%20key,and%20management%3B%20and%20cooperative%20security.](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_56626.htm#:~:text=The%202022%20Strategic%20Concept&text=It%20reaffirms%20that%20NATO's%20key,and%20management%3B%20and%20cooperative%20security.)
- <https://www.voanews.com/a/biden-pledges-help-to-us-farmers-offset-ukraine-crop-crisis/6568042.html>
- Ibid
- Ibid 6
- Klein, M. (2016). Russia's Military: On the Rise? *Transatlantic Academy Paper Series*, No. 2, pp. 11–12
- Knight, Jonathan (Autumn 1975), "American Statecraft and the 1946 Black Sea Straits Controversy". *Political Science Quarterly*. *The Academy of Political Science*. 90 (3): 451–475



- Mankoff, J. (2009). *Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mark Kramer, "The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (April 2009), p. 41; and Mark Kramer and Mary Elise Sarotte, "Letters to the Editor: No Such Promise," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 6 (December 2014), p. 208.
- Mary Elise Sarotte, "A Broken Promise? What the West Really Told Moscow about NATO Expansion," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 5 (September/October 2014), p. 96.
- Quoted in Anatol Lieven, "Russian Opposition to NATO Expansion," *World Today*, Vol. 51, No. 10 (October 1995), p. 198
- Ro'i Yaacov (1974), *From Encroachment to Involvement: A Documentary Study of Soviet Policy in the Middle East, 1945–1973*.
- Zenko, M. (2014). *The Myth of the Indispensable Nation*. *Foreign Policy*. Available at <https://foreignpolicy.com/2014/11/06/the-myth-of-the-indispensable-nation/>.