

**To what extent are Russia and the USA involved in a new cold  
war?**

**Capstone Essay**

**Submitted to the Political Science and International Affairs Program**

**College of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts**

**American University of Armenia**



**By Irina Sahakyan**

**Supervisor: Dr. Donald Fuller**

**Yerevan 2017**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	
ABBREVIATION LIST.....	
ABSTRACT.....	
INTRODUCTION.....	
METHODOLOGY& DESIGN.....	
THEORY& THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	
Literature review .....	
EVIDENCE.....	
<i>Cold War I: Cuban missile crisis, Berlin Wall crisis</i> .....	
<i>Cold War II: Ukraine crisis</i> .....	
<i>Comparison of Cold War I and new Cold War</i> .....	
DISCUSSION& ANALYSIS.....	
CONCLUSION.....	
REFERENCES.....	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am very grateful to all members of the faculty of Political Science and International Affairs for the years of study in the American University of Armenia, for providing me with the appropriate knowledge and skills to this study.

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my research supervisor, **Dr. Donald Fuller**. Without his assistance and involvement throughout the process for conducting the study, this paper would have never been accomplished. I would like to thank you very much for your support and understanding.

Most importantly, I would like to express special thanks to my family. All my family members supported me with their love and motivated me to strive towards my aims.

## ABBREVIATION LIST

<b>WMD</b>	Weapons of Mass Destruction
<b>USSR</b>	United Soviet Socialistic Republics
<b>US, USA</b>	United States of America
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>NATO</b>	The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
<b>WP</b>	Warsaw Pact
<b>WTO</b>	Warsaw Treaty Organization
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FRG</b>	Federal Republic of Germany/West Germany (German)
<b>GDR</b>	German Democratic Republic/East Germany (German)
<b>CIA</b>	Central Intelligence Agency
<b>DOD</b>	Department of Defense (U.S.)
<b>EE</b>	Eastern Europe
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<b>CSS (KGB)</b>	Committee for State Security

## **ABSTRACT**

The present paper addresses the post-Cold war era relations between US and Russia, claiming that relations 25 years after end of Cold War I become very tough. This paper questions whether there is a new cold war between US and Russia. Current geopolitical situation really question the assumption that Cold War has terminated. Maybe the old one ended, but today there is a steady emergence of another cold war.

The data is based on the case studies (triangulation) of three different issues: Cold War I and issue of Balance of power and mechanisms of deterrence during Cold War I; Berlin Wall crisis, Cuban Missile crisis and the end of Cold War I; Steady emergence of New Cold War between US and Russia.

In order to examine US and Russia's involvement in a new cold war, this capstone looks at similarities in the cold war era relations between US and USSR and the post- cold war era relations between Russia and US. During the discussion part this paper briefly examines history of the first cold war to understand what were the negative and positive sides of that period and then the paper discusses current relations between US and Russia. Discussion of the findings revealed that there is a steady emergence of new cold war between US and Russia. The paper claims that instead of keeping rival relations and escalating tensions in relations with each other, these two international actors have to cooperate, seek a balance of power and engage each othe in the global security projection process.

## INTRODUCTION

Today international relations are very chaotic and scholars underline that world became multipolar. This capstone addresses the post-Cold war era relations between US and Russia. In order to examine US and Russia's involvement in new cold war, this paper looks at similarities in the cold war era relations between US and USSR and the post- cold war era relations between Russia and US. The topic is actual as relations of two above-mentioned actors are very important in international security creation. The paper underlines that there is a lot of rivalry between Russia and US.

The main purpose of this paper is an attempt to examine history of Cold War I and then to understand, whether there is a new cold war between US and Russia; whether the two states are trying to avoid WWIII and how states can avoid further escalation of cold war and prevent direct conflict and transformation of Thucydides trap into real warfare.

The subject of the study is the evolution of US- Russia relations. The main objective of the essay is an attempt to examine history of the Cold war, seek to understand whether present the present US- Russia relations are similar to the relations between US and USSR during first Colw War.

In order to examine US and Russia's relations, and their involvement in a new cold war, this capstone essay looks at three cases connected with the topic (triangulation).

The limitation of the study is that we cannot see the final results of issues discussed in as all cases are at the ongoing stage.

## METHODOLOGY & DESIGN

**Topic:** To what extent are Russia and the USA involved in a new cold war?

**Research design:** deductive and comparative; secondary data.

**Methodology:** Qualitative

Triangulation based on descriptors from Cold War I and II.

**Triangulation** will be used for supporting or rejecting hypothesis.

Here are three triangulation cases:

Cold War I: Cuban missile crisis, Berlin Wall crisis

Cold War II and Ukraine crisis

Comparison of Cold War I and new Cold War

**Research questions:**

To What Extent are Russia and the USA Engaged in a new Cold War Triggered by Military Events in Ukraine during 2016 and 2017?

**Issues& Hypotheses:**

H<sub>1</sub>: There is partially a “new cold war” between Russia and US

H<sub>2</sub>: Both sides are lacking a balance of power but are trying to avoid World War III

H<sub>3</sub>: A Thucydides Trap exists between Russia and the USA with respect to military situation in Ukraine

## **THEORY & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Cold War was a condition, which developed after second World War. The start point was 1945- 1947 according to scholars. Cold War was kind of geopolitical tension between Eastern and Western blocks, where “the Eastern Bloc is the Soviet Union and its allies, states with communist regime; the Western Bloc is the United States, its NATO allies and other states with capitalistic values” (Britannica 2017).

Cold War was an indirect conflict, with using all tools of confrontation, except direct war. These tools were propaganda measures, espionage, arms race, nuclear atomic weapons proliferation, proxy wars, supported by the two hostile blocks; ideological, political and economic rivalry (Britannica 2017).

Examination of history of Cold War I helps to compare that historical event with current US- Russia relations in order to understand if there is an emergence of a new cold war between the two states. The issue of balance of power is examined as a best mechanism of deterrence and assumption that US and Russia today lack balance of power is tested. Crises that took place during Cold War I are discussed and tested to learn whether today similar crises as Cuban and Berlin Wall crises took place and how they can bring US and Russia to the brink of war. Aftermath current relations between US and Russia are thoroughly analyzed to see whether they are in condition of cold war and whether there is a threat of WWIII.

Given the three different issues namely: Cold War I: Balance of power and mechanisms of deterrence; Berlin wall crisis, Cuban missile crisis and the end of Cold War I; Steady emergence of New Cold War between US and Russia we can assume that the main theory of this paper is realism, realpolitik: Mearsheimer’s offensive and Waltz’s defensive realism and also Thucydides trap theory. We cannot choose between Waltz’s passive and



Mearsheimer's aggressive realism, because in discussion of cases of this paper there is balance between these two realism theories, and shifts from aggressive to passive and vice versa existed in relations between US and USSR and US and Russia.

Mearsheimer and Waltz assume that realism has limits. Mearsheimer is for direct military attacks, Waltz, notwithstanding, is for passive actions, such a means of military preparedness (Dunne et al 2014).

Thucydides trap is metaphor from history which argues that as a rising power challenges the dominance of an established power, that dominant power is likely to respond with violence (Muscato 2017); there is also another possibility: in some cases not dominant, but rising power decide to start warfare, because of ambitions of the latter and also to exercise power of the stronger side (Allison 2017).

This paper argues that trap similar to the Thucydides trap ,that appeared because of Cuban missile crisis, existed now between US and Russia triggered by Ukraine crisis. Thucydides trap theory is kind of pattern, which helps to predict “when warfare is likely between two nations” (Muscato 2017). Also, except predicting possibility of warfare between states Thucydides trap theory is an attempt to find alternative solutions to crises and conflicts to prevent warfare. The paper shows that if there is balance of power and equality between sides it is less possible for sides to end up with warfare. So “the whole point of identifying a trap is to avoid it”(Muscato 2017).

### **Literature Review**

Currently, there is a large amount of scientific and journalistic literature, which touches upon the theme of cold war era relations and current US- Russia relations similarities. In this regard, we can conclude that we are facing the growing political and scientific

relevance of this topic, which was always actual. Authors as Evan Osnos, David Remnick, and Joshua Yaffa, John J. Mearsheimer, Kenneth N. Waltz, Graham T. Allison, have their input, however comparison of the two periods was not covered strongly in previous literature (Osnos et al 2017; Mearsheimer 2011; Waltz 2008; Allison 2017).

### *Cold War I*

Historians do not fully agree on the dates, but a common timeframe is the period between 1947, the year the Truman Doctrine (a U.S. foreign policy pledging to aid nations threatened by Soviet expansionism) was announced, and 1991, the year the Soviet Union collapsed (JFK 2017).

Scholars define Cold War as a geopolitical tension between the Eastern bloc and Western bloc after the second World War. According to the history the Eastern Bloc are the Soviet Union and its allies, states with communist regime; the Western Bloc are the United States, its NATO allies and other states with capitalistic values (Britannica 2017; BBC 2017; History 2017; JFK 2017). There are different opinions about the start date of the Cold War, several scholars claim that Cold War started in the period between 1947, the year of announcement of Truman doctrine (Britannica 2017; BBC 2017; History 2017), others argue that cold war started on March 5<sup>th</sup> in 1946 with the Churchill's speech on Iron Curtain in USSR (The International Churchill Society 2017; JFK 2017).

Scholars underline that the Cold War is called "cold" and not simply war because in that war there was no direct attacks from both sides, this war differs from all other types of wars. The conflict took place with the help of soft power methods, ideological confrontation, third side wars, known as proxy wars, supported by one or another side of Cold War (Britannica 2017; BBC 2017).

### *Realism theory and the Cold War*

In discussion of cases of this paper there is difference between two realism theories: offensive and defensive. Shifts from aggressive to passive and vice versa existed in relations between US and SSSR and US and Russia according to scholars (Dunne et al 2014).

International system according to Waltz consists of three main things: “organizing principle, differentiation of units and distribution of capabilities” (Waltz 2008). Structural realists among whom is Waltz emphasize that there is strong division between great powers and less strong ones. Waltz claims that international system is anarchical and sovereign states exist in system of self- help and are striving to maximize their security. Notwithstanding, Waltz is for passive actions such as means of deterrence and preparedness (Dunne et al 2014; Waltz 2008).

Mearsheimer also argues that international system is anarchical and self help system, however, he claims that states are not seeking security maximization, but instead want to increase their power in the world. He argues that behaviour of states is unpredictable. Also Mearsheimer states that “great states seek hegemonic power at the expense of other states which leads to power competition. Mearsheimer is for direct military attacks (Dunne et al 2014; Mearsheimer 2011).

### *Thucydides trap*

Another part of realpolitik theory, according to scholars among which is Graham Allison, is Thucydides trap theory. An example from history that he brought in his article was Cuba missile crisis, when missiles in Cuba were just 90 miles from Miami (Allison 2017). Here we can compare this to the situation in Ukraine and Russian actions. In this case Miami and Ukraine are considered Thucydides Trap, when neither side can tolerate

encroachment. Allison, in his study of 16 Thucydides traps emphasized that 12 out of 16 thucydides traps broke out to war, notwithstanding there were 4 exceptions. So it is hard to predict whether third world war is going to break out between Russia and US (Allsion 2017).

Thucydides was a 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE historian and he wrote during his life the most significant history of Peloponnesian War (Muscato 2017).

Sparta was dominant power in ancient Greece, Athens was the growing power. Sparta got afraid of growing influence and power of Athens and the latter was considered by Sparta as a threat to Sparta's hegemony. This fear made Sparta to attack Athens and that is the "trap". "Athens' ambition and Sparta's fear of losing power drew the two into conflict, even when no one expected it" (Muscato 2017).

According to researcher Graham Allison Thucydides trap is misjudgement of history. And Thucydides trap really brings to warfare. In 2015 scholar presented his study of 16 Thucydides trap cases identified over the last 500 years. All that cases were similar to Sparta-Athens pattern, when rising power become threat for hegemon and the latter start warfare. There also exist another type of Thucydides trap; trap appears, when growing power overexert it's growing influence and start warfare with dominant one (Muscato 2017).

## EVIDENCE

### *Cold War I: Cuban missile crisis, Berlin Wall crisis*

Cold War was a rivalry, which developed after second World War. During Cold War the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union and its allies were in kind of geopolitical tension. “The Eastern Bloc is the Soviet Union and its allies, states with communist regime; the Western Bloc is the United States, its NATO allies and other states with capitalistic values” (Britannica 2017).

Important moment was that this Cold war was an indirect conflict, there was no direct war or clash between US and USSR, however other tools were used to achieve victory: propaganda measures, also, for example, there were a lot of proxy wars, supported by the two hostile blocks; ideological, political and economic rivalry (Britannica 2017).

The term Cold War for the first time was used by English writer George Orwell in 1945. According to Orwell “cold war - a nuclear stalemate between two or three monstrous super-states, each possessed of a weapon by which millions of people can be wiped out in a few seconds” (Britannica 2017). In US, Bernard Baruch first used that term in a speech at the State House in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1947 (Britannica 2017).

Historians do not fully and exactly agree on the dates of the Cold War in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but approximately it is the period between the year of Churchill’s speech at Fulton about the “iron curtain” and USSR isolation and Truman doctrine 1947 (a U.S. policy aiming to aid nations threatened by Soviet expansionist policy) and the year the Soviet Union collapsed 1991. Notwithstanding some historians underline that Cold War started with Churchill’s famous speech in 1946 in Missouri, where he “warned that the Soviet Union had built an "Iron Curtain" to divide Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe from the West”

(Britannica 2017). Churchill hoped to join the Americans in building a postwar order that limited Soviet leader Joseph Stalin's ability to dominate European affairs (Britannica 2017).

The Soviet Union was determined to have a buffer zone between its borders and Western Europe. It set up pro-communist regimes in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Albania, and eventually in East Germany (JKF 2017).

As the Soviets tightened their grip on Eastern Europe, the United States embarked on a policy of containment to prevent the spread of Soviet and communist influence in Western European nations such as France, Italy, and Greece (JKF 2017).

As both US and USSR became nuclear powers at the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century and both have big amount of nuclear weapons there was kind of state of balance of power between them during the Cold War period. We can assume that equal military weapons help them to keep stable condition of balance of power and prevent transformation of Cold War between US and Russia to real direct conflict. The world in 1947- 1991 was bipolar and status quo of cold war was supported by the fact that if direct war started in nuclear era, where two superpowers have huge amount of nuclear weapons: losses would be catastrophic and that direct nuclear war could threaten whole world and population of the Earth. So bipolarity and equality acted as a deterrent and prevention tool during Cold War period.

The mechanisms of deterrence and prevention of direct war during Cold war are very interesting for examination, because they really worked and support of a kind of status quo during Cold War for about forty years. The most important thing was a bipolar world and equal military nuclear arsenal and potential of US and USSR. This avoided the sides from starting real warfare as both understood that if war started they would both lose too much.

Let us touch upon history of the cold war to understand how periods of crisis and peak

of conflict were alternated by periods of less tense relationships between US and USSR and how two rival blocks avoided war during first cold war period.

### *Historical events in Cold War I*

In 1948- 1953 Cold War was at its peak. US and USSR in that period were very active and relations were very tense. Several important events can be enumerated: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed by US and western allies), a unified military structure to contradict the Soviet ideology and protect Europe from communist expansion. According to 5<sup>th</sup> article of NATO's Charter "if one member- state is attacked by other state or states, remaining members of NATO should support the member- state" (History 2009; Britannica 2017). Also during this period the Soviets "exploded their first atomic warhead, and with this they put an end to the American monopoly on the atomic bomb" (National Archives and Records Administration 2017). There were several other turning points of the cold war during that period. For example, in China communists came to power, the war between North and South parts of Korea also started during this period: "the Soviet-supported communist government of North Korea invaded U.S.-supported South Korea in 1950, setting off an indecisive Korean War that lasted until 1953 with the division of Korea" (Britannica 2017).

The second period of Cold War was little bit less tense; it was the period when Joseph Stalin- tough soviet dictator died. So in the period between 1953- 1957 relations between US and USSR and in whole between Eastern and Western blocks seemed to be less tense than before.

Notwithstanding, relations between superpowers in fact remained cold and complicated. The important event of that period was the foundation of a Soviet military

organization which united the Soviet-bloc countries- the Warsaw Pact. West Germany was admitted into NATO that same year (Britannica 2017).

The period between 1958– 1962 was period of most important crises of the Cold war: Cuban missile crisis and Berlin Wall issue: during that period “the United States and the Soviet Union began developing intercontinental ballistic missiles” (National Archives and Records Administration 2017).

Period after 1962 was also rich with events. “Throughout the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union avoided direct military confrontation in Europe and engaged in actual combat operations only to keep allies from defecting to the other side” (Britannica 1998). Examples of such issues were the actions of Soviet Union in East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. USSR send troops to the above –mentioned states to preserve communist regimes. For its part, the United States “helped overthrow a left-wing government in Guatemala, supported an unsuccessful invasion of Cuba, invaded the Dominican Republic (1965) and Grenada (1983), and undertook a long and unsuccessful effort to prevent communist North Vietnam from bringing South Vietnam under its rule” (Britannica 1998). The Vietnam issue was another crisis point between US and USSR during the cold war. Such wars are known as proxy wars as they occurred on the territories of other states. Relations between US and USSR was build on balance of power and that was one of the methods of deterrence during Cold War I.

There were other mechanisms of deterrence and prevention of direct conflict during cold war: for example SALT (strategic arms limitation talks) initiative. The talks ended up with SALT I and later SALT II agreements in 1969 and 1979, in which the two superpowers set limits on their antiballistic missiles and on their strategic missiles capable of carrying



nuclear weapons. That was followed by a period of renewed Cold War tensions in the early 1980s as the two superpowers continued their massive arms buildup and competed for influence in the Third World (Britannica 1998). Then very close to Soviet Union's collapse START initiative came up: Strategic arms reduction treaty between US and USSR was signed in 1991.

As we know Cold War differs from all other kinds of war, during cold war there were no large- scale wars. Only with the help of deterrence and prevention mechanisms of Cold War period real war did not started. In this capstone essay we are going to discuss most significant crises, which threaten international peace.

#### *Berlin Wall crisis*

Berlin Crisis, which was one of the major incidents of Cold War, connected with post WW-II position of Germany and status of Berlin. Starting period of this crisis is period from 1948- 1961. At the beginning of that period Germany was divided into two parts (Britannica 2014). It was divided into the Federal Republic of Germany- West Germany and the Democratic Republic- East Germany, Germany was divided until 1990 (Harrison 2003). West Germany's blockade also was a major event during Berlin Crisis, however, Western block support West Germany in that period. It is important to mention that there was emigration from East Germany to West Germany after division (Frum 2015).

During crisis on November 10, 1958, leader of USSR Nikita Khrushchev conducted a speech in which he demanded from Western block and exactly US, Great Britain and France to take their forces out of West Berlin. Khrushchev demanded to do this during six months (Harrison 2003).

In 1950-s the Soviet Union tried to restrict emigration from the East Germany to the

West. “However, hundreds of thousands of East Germans annually emigrated to West Germany through a "loophole" in the system” (Harrison 2003). The result of emigration was a catastrophic “brain drain”. Young and educated population of East Germany left for West Germany. By 1961 20% of East Germany population emigrates to West Germany (Harrison 2003). USSR understood that decisive actions should be implemented, and after that on 13 August “East Germany erected a barbed-wire barrier that would eventually be expanded through construction into the Berlin Wall, effectively closing the loophole” (Kempe 2011). Another important event of Berlin Crisis was when Soviet and American tanks face each other at Checkpoint Charlie during Berlin Crisis (Kempe 2003). However crisis was overcame.

On November 9, 1989 East Germany’s leaders stated that their relations with West Germany changed. Berlin Wall felled and crisis came to its end. Soon the reunification of East and West Germany took place. It was exactly on October 3, 1990, almost one year after the fall of the Berlin Wall (Britannica 1998)

The Berlin wall during Cold War symbolized the lack of freedom under communism. It also symbolized the Cold War and divide between the communist Soviet bloc and the western democratic, capitalist bloc (Harrison 2003).

#### *Cuban missile crisis*

Another important crisis of cold war was the Cuban Missile Crisis, which took place during October- November 1962. It was a direct and dangerous confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War and was the moment when the two great powers came very close to direct nuclear war (Harrison 2003; Wang 2006). The history of crisis is significant. Kennedy administration had a plan name Cuba project, which aimed to

overthrow Cuba government, Castro's regime and assassinate Castro. In February 1962 Khrushchev learned about US secret plans regarding Cuba and decided to install missiles in Cuba beforehand (Britannica 1998;Wang 2006). These missiles could be launched secretly and the aim was to have possibility to launch nuclear attacks on U.S. cities if needed. However, US learned about this installement of missiles in Cuba very fast and made USSR to take the missiles out of Cuba. Khrushchev backed down from a confrontation, and the Soviet Union removed the missiles in return for an American pledge not to invade Cuba again (History 2009). It is important that after crisis the first efforts regarding nuclear arms race disarmament were implemented: "the Cold War's first arms control agreement, the Antarctic Treaty, came into force in 1961 after Cuban Missile Crisis was overcome (Britannica 1998; History 2009; Wang 2006).

The Cuban missile crisis was a confrontation that really brought the two superpowers to the brink of war before an agreement was reached to withdraw the missiles (Britannica 1998). Potential World War III seemed to be avoided. As it was mentioned Cuban missile crisis was Thucydides trap and this was a bright example that even if trap exists it is possible to avoid war (Allison 2017).

The Cuban missile crisis showed that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union were ready to use nuclear weapons for fear of the other's retaliation (and thus of mutual atomic annihilation) (Britannica 1998). The two superpowers soon signed the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty of 1963, which banned aboveground nuclear weapons testing. But the crisis also hardened the Soviets' determination never again to be humiliated by their military inferiority, and they began a buildup of both conventional and strategic forces that the United States was forced to match for the next 25 years (Britannica 1998).

### *Invasion of Czechoslovakia*

While we discuss crises of Cold War period, in addition, we should also mention an important event from Cold War such as invasion of Czechoslovakia by USSR. After creating Warsaw Pact, communist states promised to support communist regime worldwide even by such radical methods as invasion (Britannica 2017).

In 1968 Prague Spring started in Czechoslovakia, this was a period of political liberalization. In that period there was a special Action Plan which was a plan of reforms: increasing freedom of speech, freedom of press, movement, appearance of possibility of multiparty government, decreasing power of secret police and another important point which threaten communist influence was withdrawing from Warsaw Pact (Geldern et al 2008).

These reforms weaken and put under threat Communist regime and that is why on 20<sup>th</sup> august 1968 the Soviet army and members of Warsaw Pact organization invade Czechoslovakia. This invasion was hard choice and its result was huge emigration from Czechoslovakia, reaching 300.000 people. This act of USSR and Warsaw pact member states was criticized by Yugoslavia, Romania, China and even by several western communist states (Geldern et al 2008). Invasion of Czechoslovakia was one of the greatest military events of Cold War period.

### *Collapse of Soviet Union*

The cold war heated up during presidency of Ronald Reagan. Reagan believed that “the spread of communism anywhere threatened freedom everywhere”. This opinion is a reason of appearance of Reagan Doctrine (History 2009). That was a policy according to which financial and military support was provided to anticommunist governments and anticommunist insurgents worldwide. For example, this Reagan doctrine was implemented in

El Salvador and Grenada (History 2009). Regan policy weakens USSR. Another important figure in the path to the collapse of Soviet Union and end of Cold War was Mikhail Gorbachev. He took office in 1985 and start introducing two doctrines: Glasnost, which meant political openness and Perestroika, which consider economic reforms. “Soviet influence in Eastern Europe waned” (History 2009). Gorbachev’s reforms weakened Communist Party and allowed power to shift to Russia and the other constituent republics of the Soviet Union (Westad 2017).

By 1990 a lot of communist states replaced their communist governments with non-communist one. “In November of the same year, the Berlin Wall– the most visible symbol of the decades- long Cold War– was finally destroyed, just over two years after Reagan had challenged the Soviet premier in a speech at Brandenburg Gate in Berlin with the words: Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!” (History 2009)

In 1991 the Soviet Union, one of the superpowers of 20<sup>th</sup> century and one of two powerful polar of international relations had fallen apart and 15 Dearden states appeared. Russia was among them and exactly Russia was successor of USSR and inherit all nuclear potential of the latter. The Cold War was over with the victory of US (History 2009; Britannica 1998; Westad 2017).

### **Cold War II and Ukraine crisis**

The confrontation that endured about half century came to its end, however, it put a shade on Russia – US relations and after 25 years passed after the first Cold War we see similar tensed relations between US and Russia (USSR successor). Relations between two above- mentioned actors decreased to a new low point, with waves of sanctions implemented and escalations. Today relations between US and Russia are in a deep freeze. Some scholars

even argue that these conditions between two states can be called Cold War II (Dutton 2017).

Cold War II- “refers to a renewed state of political and military tension between opposing geopolitical power-blocs, with one bloc typically reported as being led by Russia and/or China, and the other led by the United States or NATO” (Tisdal 2014). “This is akin to the original Cold War” (Tisdal 2014).

The current tensed relations between US and Russia have not hot only one reason, instead there are several reasons for that situation. Not only relations are tensed because United States wanted its old adversary back, or because Russia acted aggressive in international arena, or because two states have contradictory opinions regarding important international events such as Syria, Ukraine etc. Problem is much more complicated and has its roots in history, long cold relations in past put its shadow in future. What is important today states do not try to solve problem but it seems that they try to make it deeper and deeper (Tisdal 2014).

Notwithstanding, according to Washington post relations between Russia and US worsen because of bad choices taken by President Vladimir Putin of Russia: annexation of Crimea from Ukraine; an armedinsurrection in southeastern Ukraine in 2014; the war in the Donbas region; Russia’s position against Ukraine’s decision to sign a pact with the European Union. “According to US officials Russia under Vladimir Putin is more repressive and more aggressive than the Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev was” (The Washington Post 2017).

### *Ukraine crisis*

Ukraine crisis is an actual point which makes relations between two blocks: between

Russia and US, NATO really cold, after the crisis the clash of interests between two sides showed the weakness of peace. These aggressive and bad choices are the main reason for the tension that now exists according to Washington post editorial board (The Washington Post 2017).

Allison argues that Ukraine crisis is a Thucydides trap- a situation “when one great power threatens to displace another, and result of this could be war” (Allison 2017). So ambitious Russia with its aggressive acts threatens international rules, this brought to harsh answers from West and US, such as sanctions, NATO troops in Poland, Baltic’s. If this crisis in US- Russia relations deepens result could be unpredictable. So if we consider Ukraine crisis another Thucydides trap we can really claim that cold war can flow into real war (Allison 2017). Both power blocks should think how to avoid this, as today war between great nuclear powers can threaten the peace and stability of the whole world (Allison 2017).

While discussing current international issues we have to refer to history to be able to examine issue from all angles. So let us remember how Ukraine Crisis came to international arena and when. After this we should discuss thoroughly whether Ukrainian crisis is an example of Thucydides trap and how that crisis exacerbated relations between Russia and US. Ukraine crisis, which is very tough international issue up to now, had started on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2013, when Viktor Yanukovich, who was ukrainian president at that time stopped preparations “for the implementation of an association agreement with the European Union” and this decision brought to tensed mass protest by EU proponents, these mass protests are known as “Euromaidan” (Balmforth 2013). So Ukrainian crisis broke out in November and it endures up to now. Yanukovich was blamed for supporting Russian side and don’t thinking about Ukraine. This triggered EU proponents to organize large-scale movements against the

government. Ukraine- border state of Russia, is Russia's sphere of interest and that is number one reason why Russia was against tight cooperation between Ukraine and Europe without taking into account interests of Russia.

After beginning of Ukraine crisis "Yanukovich had fled Kiev on February 2014" (The Amos 2014). In addition pro- European leaders took office and power and this brought to pro- Russian boycotts in Eastern Ukraine cities, among which were Kharkov, Luhansk, Odessa, Donetsk (The New York Times 2014). These movements escalate crisis and soon Russian troops entered Crimea and Sevastopol ostensibly to save and protect lives of civilians there. What happened after this exacerbate situation even more: referendum was held in Crimea and the result was Crimea's accession to Russia (Tawat et al 2015; Wang 2015). This act of annexation is condemned by international society, which blames Russia. However, majority of Russian population did not blame Russia and 85 % of Russian population who was surveyed supported Putin's decision of annexation of Crimea, blaming West in Ukrainian events (Tawat et al 2015).

Relationship between Russia and US is continuing to deteriorate. Some blame United States and NATO, others blame Putin's regime and Russia. But maybe relations never were really good and instead of asking "Has a new Cold War started?" We should ask "Did the old Cold War ever end?" (Frum 2015). Relations exactly after collapse of Soviet Union and end of Cold War relations between US and successor of USSR –Russia remain complicated and cold. After several events they became even worse and today the above mentioned relations are very similar to the old Cold War (Frum 2015; The Washington Post 2017) and even look like continuation of the latter .

So let us discuss more thoroughly if the US and Russia are really engaged in a new



Cold War? In 2017 US new President Donald Trump claimed that relations with Moscow should become better than under his predecessor, there was scandal around his personality as US officials blamed Russia in supporting Trump to become president with the help of hackers (Dutton 2017). However, Russians deny that information. Soon Trump promised that relations with Moscow can become warmer only with solving such vital problems as Ukrainian crisis. US officials argue that Russia should agree to implement Minsk agreements not partially but in whole, letting peacekeeping forces to come to Ukraine. US officials hope that this act can help Ukraine to handle long lasting crisis and become prosperous democracy. Russia on the other hand cannot imagine peacekeeping west forces right near its borders (Dutton 2017; Vershbow 2017).

Both Russia and US leaders understand the sharpness of relations. Trump said last month relations were "very dangerous low" (Dutton 2017).

So as we see cold relations between Russia and USA have a lot of reasons and without discussions and cooperation cold relation would get deeper and deeper, which is really bad choice for whole international society as it also can bring to another great direct war. Risks are too high to keep condition of kind of cold war between US and Russia. Despite the fact that kind of impasse of cold war takes place today, sides try to reject it and blame each other in current tensed relationship.

Another interesting reason for the new cold war is that in 1991, when Soviet Union collapsed George Bush promised Moscow that NATO would not expand and come closer to Russia's borders. That promise was broken some years later by the Bill Clinton. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland became members of NATO, then Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia etc. Russia was shocked with this NATO expansion, which is continuing up to now, a

lot of ex- Soviet states become part of NATO and NATO came really close to Russia's borders (Akram 2017). George Kennan stated: "I think NATO expansion is the beginning of a new cold war. The Russians will gradually react" (Akram 2017). NATO troops are located in Baltics, Poland and Russia is unhappy with this and fear further expansion of NATO.

Kennan predicted that in case of continuous NATO expansion, Russia would react. And Russia reacts and its reaction became more aggressive when Vladimir Putin with his sistema entered an office. "When the attempt was made to bring Georgia into NATO, Moscow cut off two slices from Georgia. When the pro-Russian president of Ukraine was ousted in a 'political coup', Putin took over Crimea and supported the ethnic Russian separatists in eastern Ukraine" (Akram 2017). What is significant in the new cold war is the fact that America is against two powers centers such as China and Russia which, "are likely to control the Eurasian 'heartland' and thus, if Helford Mackinder's thesis is right, also control the world" (Akram 2017).

Mikhail Gorbachev warns international society of new Cold War possibility between US and Russia. He stated that: "The language of politicians and the top-level military personnel is becoming increasingly militant" (Dearden 2017). According to Gorbachev, last leader of collapsed Soviet Union the US-Russia relations continues to worsen, and according to Mr. Gorbachev "all indicators of Cold War are there" (Dearden 2017).

Notwithstanding, Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia Rybakov claimed: "I don't think that we are in a state of a new Cold War because there are no grounds for a Cold War in the old meaning of the word, meaning a confrontation between systems and ideologies, ideological rivalry" (Isachenkov 2017).

During cold war in 20<sup>th</sup> century there were mechanisms to escape direct attacks and

direct war, for example SALT initiative etc, today situation and mechanisms change to some extent. New mechanisms of controlling of situation are sanctions. The sanctions imposed by the United States and Europe were a response to Putin's decisions connected with Ukraine and then presidential elections in US (The Washington Post 2017). Russia on the other hand answered to these with imposing sanctions on Western states.

### *Sanctions as a new tool of deterrence*

As sanctions are the most significant and new experience, which appeared in 21st century during cold war II we should discuss it examine their effectiveness under scrutiny. Sanctions as a new tool for controlling Russia's aggression, which was never used during first cold war and appeared during period of Cold War 2.

Russian actions during Ukraine crisis were condemned by international society. These actions were considered as an aggression and violation of international law and orders. The UN, EU, NATO, PACE, OSCE and the US are international actors which blamed Russia for Crimea annexation, support of separatists in Ukraine, "little green man" operation etc. As West saw that Russia continues to act aggressively without taking into account opinion of international society it decided to implement punitive measures to stop Russia's violations and aggressive behavior. These measures were three-tiered economic and political sanctions on the Russian Federation (Wang 2015; Nephew et al 2016).

As a response to the Western sanctions, Russia imposes its own sanctions on West, for example, food embargo etc. Sanctions is a new method of coercion and punishment, however, its effectiveness is questioned by scholars. In case of Russia it aggravate state's economic conditions, but it does not really make changes in political behavior of Russia, also western sanction's flaw is that they also bit western states.

The main aim of sanctions was exactly political one. US by the help of sanctions tried to weaken Russia's economy and with this make Russia to change its policy toward Ukraine, then towards Syria and the last sanctions were aimed to punish Russia for its intervention in US elections. US and European Union had previous examples when sanctions implemented by them help to change policies of states, the brightest examples are "Somalia, Haiti, Syria, North Korea and Iran". So with these experiences on mind they hope that story would be repeated with Russia, which will "give up her interests towards different international issue and change her policy" (Galbert 2015). Yes, sanctions are effective present- day measures to influence other states policy, however they cannot also be effective and with every state. In case of Russia West failed to some extent, Western states did not took into consideration Russia's specific features: strong national identity, consolidation of population over difficulties, her power , her energy resource potential and importance of its resources for some western states, and its role of big consumer in the international market (Oxenstierna et al 2015). The Prime Minister of Hungary stated very exact word connected with sanctions: "The EU is shooting itself in the foot with the sanctions imposed on Russia" (Szakacs 2014). So in whole we can assume that western sanctions up to know did not globally change Russian policy and instead weakening only Russia they are also weakening economically some western states. Russia proved that "power is not the way to change her policy"(Kyselchuk et al 2015; Emmott et al 2016).

Russia's GDP and other economic indices became lower after western sanctions implementation. However, Russia did not become significantly weak and did not end up in isolation. Instead Russia started to cooperating with Asian states more tight. And it still remains member of lots of influential political and economic international organizations: G20,

WTO and BRICS. In addition several western states are against sanctions implementations and continuation as they are dependent on Russian gas and oil. These states are Italy, Hungary, Finland, Germany (Kyselchuk et al 2015; Emmott et al 2016). Furthermore “Recent oil price increases have allowed the Russian economy to return to modest, if anemic, growth in 2017” (Ashford 2017).

As we see Russian economy is very strong and big to be impacted toughly by the Western punitive sanctions. Russia in the period of sanctions started to search alternative ways to regulate and stabilize economy and overcame economic crisis to some extent.

According to scholars failure of the West was that they did not have clear and specific goal connected with Russian external policy, while implementing sanctions (Veebel et al 2016).

NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg says that NATO and US do not want a new cold war emergence. Instead, Stoltenberg claimed that the aim of the alliance is using deterrence. The employment of 4,000 extra troops in Eastern Europe had an aim to prevent conflict or aggression from Russia, but not to provoke conflict. Multi-national NATO battalions made up of 1,000 troops each deployed to Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (BBC 2016). But rather than seeking to confront Russia, NATO continues "to strive for a more co-operative and constructive relationship", According to Mr. Stoltenberg NATO is trying not to confront Russia but to build constructive relationship on the bases of cooperation (BBC 2016). However, it is hard to agree with above mentioned statements. Russia’s aggressive actions in Ukraine and Syria gave NATO a ground to freeze NATO- Russia relations, so is there any cooperation in reality? The answer is no.

“Despite fears that President Donald Trump might throw Ukraine under the bus for the sake of a reset with Moscow, the administration has taken a clear position that better relations

with Russia are impossible without a resolution of the Ukraine crisis” (Vershbow 2017).

Refusing to recognize annexation of Crimea by Russia and underlining that such acts of aggression are unforgivable in present-day international society is strong policy of Western states. Russia should understand that her ambitions and aggression should make her end up in kind of isolation, and Russian Federation should realize that it's better to stop that aggressive policy and put an emphasis of external policy at cooperation and negotiation and other soft tools (Vershbow 2017).

Today Putin knows that sanctions implemented by West are not going to be lifted very easily. Strategy of US and West is to push until Russia's policy towards several important questions should change. Up to now sanctions weaken Russia only economically, however, presently Putin's "September peacekeeping proposal regarding Ukraine question indicate that he is considering ways to cut his losses (Vershbow 2017). According to western powers Ukraine crisis can be solved only by implementing Full Minsk plan, which includes peacekeeping forces entrance to Eastern Ukraine and restoration of the latter's sovereignty. This version against Russia's interests as Russia do not want to have peacekeepers right near its borders. However, this Full Minsk is the only right way to regulate and put an end to Ukraine crisis and turn it to prosperous democratic state (Vershbow 2017). Full Minsk can become reality only "if west pressure Putin to negotiate seriously" (Vershbow 2017). For example, because of unprofitable economic sanctions Russian oligarchs, who are base of Putin's system and power, can pressure Vladimir Vladimirovich to negotiate with the US and Europe and to regulate crisis as soon as possible and as a result make Europe and US to lift the sanctions. Notwithstanding, scholars and experts underline that today problem of sanctions is beneficial for Putin. Attention of Russian society is on sanctions and Ukraine and

new cold relations of Russia and US, instead realizing internal problems. So Putin would not make any decisions and negotiate seriously about full Minsk till 2018 presidential election (Vershbow 2017; The Washington Post 2017).

Another point which worsen US -Russia relations and deepen the coldness of that relations was Russia's attempt to interfere in the U.S. election. "That new sanctions, according to US officials, were a logical response to Putin's attempt to meddle in American democracy" (The Washington Post 2017). However, this information was denied by official Russia. This event is another step to cold war II between US and Russia.

On October 31, 25 days after the deadline set by Congress, the administration of U.S. President Donald Trump finally released guidance about the implementation of new sanctions on Russia (Ashford 2017). As academic research has long shown, sanctions are often ineffective, particularly those focused on national security issues. The new sanctions are also no more likely to produce policy change than their predecessors.

The sanctions are also emblematic of a larger problem in U.S.-Russian relations. Everyone acknowledges that the relationship is at its worst point since the Cold War, but few have any idea of how to improve it. With the world's largest arsenal of nuclear weapons, Russia remains the only country capable of utterly destroying the United States, but is a vital interlocutor on issues such as nonproliferation and the global arms trade. Sanctions poison U.S.-Russian relations long after the Cold War ended, this sanctions bill reduces future flexibility in negotiations with Russia and inhibits the ability to cooperate in key areas, whether on arms control or conflicts in Syria, Ukraine, and elsewhere.

Sanctions locks U.S.-Russian relations into a path of confrontation and offers no off-ramp from rising tensions. As a result, things may get worse before they get better

To conclude discussions about sanctions let us mention that the EU and the US sanctions did not make Russia change her policy in Ukraine and, according to scholars, new waves of sanctions are not going to change it. Instead of changing policy, Russia impose sanctions on Western states. This actions make rivalry between Russia and Western states even worse.

Each side pursue their own selfish interests and it seems that sides do not seek compromises and solutions. Clash of interests of such great states as Russia and US also bring to catastrophis, crises, indirect local wars. The result of above mentioned is that because of clash of interests of powerful actors less powerful states suffer and find onselves in crises and wars. This relations are in fact very similar to cold war and that is why expersts call present- day US-Russia relations -cold war emergence.

### **Comparison of Cold War I and new Cold War**

US and Russia in current international environment are engaged in kind of Cold War- new Cold War. Some scholars claim that the term cold war is "unsuited to the present conflict, but the situation is arguably more dangerous than during the original Cold War" (Howard 2012; Tisdal 2014). Other researchers call new Cold War "Colder War".

Notwithstanding, we can assume that Cold War exists between US and Russia because comparing current relations between states we can find many similarities with US-USSR relations in period of Cold War: by triangulation of cases in Cold War with cases in Cold War II we see a familiar pattern shaped a Thucydides trap. Also similar cold relations, different opinions regarding important international situations, crises exist in both Cold Wars.

Periods of Berlin Wall Crisis and Cuban Missile Crisis brought two states really close to 3rd World War during Cold War I. Today scholars are claiming that world again see



impasse of cold war between US and Russia, and similar crises situations appear between two states. Yes, there is no direct and open confrontation between Russia and US, but Ukrainian crisis, Syrian War and other important international events showed that relations between two great players are unfriendly. This is similar to the cold war time and again world can appear in a situation when Third World War would start being reality. To avoid war sides should seek balance of power and normalization of relations (Mearsheimer 2011; Waltz 2008).

Cold War I had clear timeframe and several events such as Truman Doctrine Churchill's Fulton speech were the start point of it, Cold War II, also have clear timeframe and according to some scholars, began with the Ukraine crisis (Legvold 2015). Also scholars argue that this new Cold War is similar to the first one as it is also, as the first Cold War, experienced with the help of media, information infrastructure, propaganda methods, soft power tools.

Also another similarity is that during both Cold Wars states seek balance of power and try to avoid war and trap by deterrence tools. However tools of deterrence of Cold War I differ from tools of Cold War II.

There are a lot of similarities between Cold war I and II, but there are also differences. So let us discuss what are the differences between Cold War I and Cold War II.

First, difference that we would like to mention is that first Cold War was bilateral, and the second is trilateral power struggle. Crisis management and conflict management became more complex and hard. International relations are under realism paradigm and states lack balance of power which was the most important method of deterrence at the first cold war period. States and non-state actors are able to disrupt international stability and peace, there are a lot of crises and local wars in different places worldwide (Akram 2017).

Second point is that today Russia, even as a successor of USSR, have not got same power, however, have same ambitions. Also US is no longer absolute global hegemon as it was at the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century, notwithstanding it continues to behave as hegemon. Both Russia and US should realize that coercion and force as method of regulation of IR is not best choice. These ambitions of two great players hinder them from profitable cooperation with each other. If states continue acting aggressive and too ambitious fear of World War 3 would become reality: South China Sea issue; US and North Korea issue; Iran's question; Syria; Ukraine Crisis; terrorism and Pakistan intervention; escalation of cold relations between US and Russia (Akram 2017).

The third difference is also connected with balance of power term. In 20<sup>th</sup> century, during cold war only USSR and US possess nuclear weapons, and this help them to stay in condition of balance of power and also that fact deter states from starting direct war. In 21<sup>st</sup> century there are nine nuclear states. Lack of balance of power can bring to escalations and irrational actions in international arena which can bring to third world war with nuclear weapons usage. Conflicts in South Asia or with North Korea can escalate to nuclear level (Akram 2017).

Another difference of cold war II period from cold war I period is that today wars and conflicts are no more conventional, they are "Hybrid", which is a special kind of warfare with using unconventional war methods, sabotage, propaganda, cyber and informational methods: "Afghanistan, Iraq, Ukraine, Syria, Libya and Yemen have illustrated, it is easy to start such 'complex' wars but extremely difficult to prevent their escalation and expansion and to stop them" (Akram 2017; Britannica 2017).

Another difference is appearance of new tool of deterrence, which was not

experienced during Cold War I (Legvold 2015; Howard 2012; Tisdal 2014). These new tool is three tired sanctions on Russia, and Russia's sanctions on West.

“The most tragic consequence of the new cold war will be the erosion of the collective efforts required to address the emerging existential and global threats: poverty and hunger, climate change, nuclear war, mass migration, communicable diseases. Nor will it be possible to collectively exploit the vast opportunities for human progress and wellbeing that technology and innovation now promise” (Akram 2017).

This new cold war differs from cold war I also because of scale of the latter. Cold War I was an ideological confrontation of capitalism and socialism. Ideological confrontation of two superpowers US, which represents capitalistic world and USSR, which represents socialism. Today “neither China nor Russia is willing or able to mount a global ideological challenge backed by military power. Rivalries may lead to conflicts, or even local wars, but not of the systemic Cold War kind” (Doyle 2017; Akram 2017).

## **DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS**

The Cold War I was very dangerous period, when states were very close to direct war. Current generations should realize faults of past and do not let history to be repeated. Today world sees a steady emergence of New Cold War between Russia and US, and threat of real war in international arena, where every day new conflicts and crises emerge. However, it is not late to sit down and negotiate and to keep promise of United Nations organization to the world: “keep future generations from the scourge of war” (History 2009).

During Cold War I for about 40 years US and USSR try their best to contradict each other by soft power means and by all other means except direct attacks, as both realize that costs of direct attacks would be too high. After Korean War, Berlin and Cuban crises and after

Czechoslovakia invasion relations became catastrophic, however there were attempts to improve them. The end of Cold War was one of the most important events of 20<sup>th</sup> century.

US entered 21<sup>st</sup> century with status of standalone superpower. The main right aim of US should be consolidation of all nations and bringing them to the rule of law, “especially as its own power diminishes” (Doyle 2017). Instead of that United States did lots of mistakes: “engage in futile, needless wars far from its borders, in which short-term security is mistaken for long-term strategic goals” (Doyle 2017). US lost possibilities to start tight cooperation with Russia and link the latter with western structures such as NATO and European Union. Unites States flaw to build healthy and friendly relations with emerging power –Russia which is successor of USSR. Security cooperation with Russia should be really important for international peace and stability projection worldwide. “As a result of this flawed approach, America and Russia are less prepared to deal with the big challenges such as the rise of China, systemic challenges like climate change and disease epidemics, terrorism, cyber attacks etc” (Doyle 2017) This flawed approach also worsen US Russia relations to the extent that it can be called Cold War II.

The world’s destiny cannot be left to be determined by militarists, political leader’s selfish interests. ‘Westphalian’ consensus should be achieved, a 2<sup>nd</sup> cold war can be avoided with the help of international cooperation, addressing of common challenges (Akram 2017).

Today instead continuing sanctions implementation Europe and US should lift the sanctions and change strategy towards Russia and find more effective methods and tools for calming Russia’s aggression down or put even harder sanctions on Russia and make Russia find itself in isolation (Veebel et al 2016). However, the last point would also make Western states suffer from losing such a consumer and supplier as Russia. Furthermore, this isolation

would have even more frightening consequences: If Russia end up in isolation US, Europe and Asia should face global problems such as climate change, terrorism etc without Russian Federation's help which would be catastrophic. Cooperation is much better choice than power and force, however behavior of states still prove that realism's paradigm is actual and that trap, which appeared because of Ukraine events could broke out into real war.

## CONCLUSION

After discussing all the three distinct cases namely: Cold War I: Cuban missile crisis, Berlin Wall crisis; Cold War II: Ukraine crisis; Comparison of Cold War I and Cold War II; it becomes apparent that the US and Russia relations became very cold and unpredictable. Similarities in the cold war era relations between US and USSR and the post- cold war era relations between Russia and US prove that US and Russia currently are involved in new cold war.

The discussion of the three separate cases reveals that the first hypothesis is partially accepted , as there is partially a “new cold war” between Russia and US.

Its apparent that both sides are lacking balance of power and both feel threat of WWIII and try to avoid it by using mechanisms of deterrence such as sanctions for example, international agreements regarding crises. Hence, second hypothesis is accepted.

Third Hypothesis regarding thucydides trap ia accepted, too. Thucydides trap exists between Russia and US due to Ukraine situation. Relations between states were deteriorated and came to lowest point triggered by military situation in Ukraine and there is threst that Ukriane crisis can bring sides to large- scale warfare, so both should strive to avoid “trap” (Allison 2017).

Relations of two above mentioned actors are very important as they both have big military potential and influence in the world. Paper underlines that there are a lot of contrariety between Russia and US, however, these two international actors have to cooperate, seek balance of power and reckon each other in global security projection process to create save and peaceful international environment (The Washington Post, 2017).

## REFERENCES

- Amos, H. Ukraine crisis fuels secession calls in pro-Russian south. *The Guardian*. (23 February 2014) <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/feb/23/ukraine-crisis-secession-russian-crimea>
- Mearsheimer, J. "The Case for a Ukrainian Nuclear Deterrent," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3. (Summer 1993). pp. 50-66.
- Kennedy announces blockade of Cuba during the Missile Crisis. *History*. (2009) <http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/kennedy-announces-blockade-of-cuba-during-the-missile-crisis>
- Pape, R. "Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work." *International Security* 22 (2). 1997. pp. 90–136.
- Isachenkov, V. Russian Official Says U.S. and Russia Aren't in New Cold War. *Bloomberg Politics*. (August 23, 2017) <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-08-23/russian-official-says-us-and-russia-aren-t-in-new-cold-war>
- Akram, M. The new cold war. *Dawn*. (August 06, 2017) <https://www.dawn.com/news/1349838>
- Howard, P. "Social media and the new Cold War". *Reuters*. *Reuters Commentary Wire*. (1 August 2012).
- Ashford, E. Why New Russia Sanctions Won't Change Moscow's Behavior. *Washington's Approach Lacks Clear Goals*. (November 22, 2017) <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2017-11-22/why-new-russia-sanctions-wont-change-moscows-behavior>
- Kenneth, R. "Putin Admits Sanctions Sapping Russia." *Forbes*. (2016). <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2016/10/21/putin-admits-sanctions-sapping-russia/>
- The Cold War. John F. Kennedy (JFK) Presidential Library and Museum (2017) <https://www.jfklibrary.org/JFK/JFK-in-History/The-Cold-War.aspx>
- Legvold, R. On the New Cold War, Interview with Columbia University Professor and Leading Russia Scholar 10 November 2015.
- Osno, E., Remnick, D., Yaffa, J. Trump, Putin and The New Cold War. *The New Yorker*. (March 6, 2017) <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/03/06/trump-putin-and-the-new-cold-war>

Dan, R., Trayner, I. "US and EU Impose Sanctions and Warn Russia to Relent in Ukraine Standoff." *The Guardian*, March 1, 2014, World sec. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/06/us-eu-sanctions-obama-russia-ukraine-crimea>.

Westad, A. *The Cold War and America's Delusion of Victory*. The New York Times (August 28, 2017)

Hardin, R., Mearsheimer, J., Goodin, R., Dworkin, G. *Nuclear Deterrence: Ethics and Strategy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (1985).

Doyle, K. *Cold War Legacy: Why Russia, China and America Are Where They Are Today*. Russia Matters. (September 25, 2017) <https://www.russiamatters.org/blog/cold-war-legacy-why-russia-china-and-america-are-where-they-are-today>

Szakacs, S. "Europe 'shot itself in foot' with Russia sanctions: Hungary PM." Reuters, August 2015. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3233641/Hungary-braces-massive-surge-30-000-migrants-just-one-day-Serbia-attempts-huge-push-neighbour-introduces-tough-new-laws-jailing-illegal-immigrants.html>

Frum, D. *The Cold War Never Really Ended*. The Atlantic. (August 2015) <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/07/cold-war-never-ended/395243/>

Tawat, M., Zdanovich, Y. "Economic Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: A Comparative Analysis of Their Effects on the Russian and Iranian Oil and Gas Industries." 2015 <http://www.icpublicpolicy.org/conference/file/reponse/1433960996.pdf>.

Veebel, V., Markus, R. "At the Dawn of a New Era of Sanctions: Russian-Ukrainian Crisis and Sanctions." *Orbis* 60 (1). 2016.pp 128–139.

Allison, G. *Destined for war: can America and China escape Thucydides's trap?* Brunswick, Victoria Scribe Publications (2017). 364 p.

John J. Mearsheimer, *Why Leaders Lie: The Truth about Lying in International Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press. (2011).

We're on the road to a new Cold War. *The Washington Post* (July 31, 2017) [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/were-on-the-road-to-a-new-cold-war/2017/07/31/213af6be-7617-11e7-8839-ec48ec4cae25\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.ba84c3c766cc](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/were-on-the-road-to-a-new-cold-war/2017/07/31/213af6be-7617-11e7-8839-ec48ec4cae25_story.html?utm_term=.ba84c3c766cc)

Geldern, J., Siegelbaum, L. "The Soviet-led Intervention in Czechoslovakia". (March 2008)



Soviethistory.org

The Sinews of Peace "Iron Curtain Speech". The International Churchill Society.  
<https://www.winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace>

Waltz, K. *Realism and international politics* (1st ed). New York. Routledge (2008).

Mearsheimer, J. "Structural Realism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 3rd Edition Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2013). pp. 77-93.

Waltz, Kenneth N. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics". *International Security* 18 (2). The MIT Press. (1993). 44–79.

Wang, J. A Cold War Story. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 34(3/4). (2006). pp. 204-218.  
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40003541>

Wang, W. "Impact of Western Sanctions on Russia in the Ukraine Crisis." *Journal of Politics and Law*. Politics sec.( March 26, 2015)  
<http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/jpl/article/viewFile/45567/25287>.

Encyclopedia Britannica. Berlin Crisis of 1991. 2014

Encyclopedia Britannica. Cold War. 2017 <https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War>

Encyclopedia Britannica. Cuban Missile Crisis. 1998  
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Cuban-missile-crisis>

Balmforth, R. Kiev protesters gather, EU dangles aid promise. Reuters. (12 December 2013)  
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine/kiev-protesters-gather-eu-dangles-aid-promise-idUSBRE9BA04420131212>

Kempe, Frederick (2011), *Berlin 1961*, Penguin Group (USA)

Dunne, T, Schmidt, B. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations: Realism*. OUP Oxford (2014). 635 p.

Kyselchuk, E, Marioni.M.. "Examining the Policy of Sanctions." In *The Sanctions on Russia*, 2015. 7–32

<https://www.bowgroup.org/sites/bowgroup.uat.pleasetest.co.uk/files/Bow%20Group%20-%20Sanctions%20on%20Russia%20-%20Adriel%20Kasonta.pdf>.

Harrison, H. *Driving the Soviets Up the Wall: Soviet-East German Relations, 1953–1961*. Princeton University Press, (2003). 368 p.

Laidi, Z. Rethinking Post-Cold War. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 29(32), (1994). pp. 2067-2069.

Vershbow, A. How to End the War in Eastern Ukraine. Atlantic Council (October 30, 2017) <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/ukrainealert/how-to-end-the-war-in-eastern-ukraine>

McWhinney, E. "Coexistence", the Cuba Crisis, and Cold War International Law. *International Journal*, 18(1). (1962). pp.67-74.

Dutton, J. Are the US and Russia engaged in a new Cold War? Al Jazeera. (September 3, 2017) <http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/insidestory/2017/09/russia-engaged-cold-war-170903190745839.html>

Muscato, C. Thucydides Trap: Definition, Theory & Historical Examples. 2017

Dearden, L. Mikhail Gorbachev warns of new Cold War with US-Russia arms race 'in full swing'. *Independent*. (18 April 2017)

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/mikhail-gorbachev-new-cold-war-us-russia-arms-race-full-swing-soviet-premier-putin-trump-north-korea-a7688321.html>

Nephew, Andrew S. Weiss, Richard, and Andrew S. Weiss Nephew Richard. 2016. "The Role of Sanctions in U.S.-Russian Relations." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/07/11/role-of-sanctions-in-u.s.-russian-relations-pub-64056>.

<https://www.britannica.com/event/Berlin-crisis-of-1961>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/28/opinion/cold-war-american-soviet-victory.html>

Tisdall, S. "The new cold war: are we going back to the bad old days?". ? The Guardian. Guardian News and Media Limited. (19 November 2014).

