

Post-Cold War Nato - Russia Relations: A Case Study of Afghanistan And Kosovo

Major Akhtar Hussain* and Amir Ahmed Khuhro**

Abstract

NATO's interference in "Afghanistan and Kosovo" has affected relations with Russia. To attain the aim and hypothesis of the research, "critical geopolitical" approach is selected as a hypothetical outline. A schematic "critical geopolitics" conceptualization of "Gearoid O Tuathail" is exercised as the technique of study. This study pays concentration to three necessary parts of "critical geopolitics": "formal geopolitics", "practical geopolitics" and "popular geopolitics". The amalgamations of three elements permit determining the NATO's and Russian "geopolitical discourses" to crises in Afghanistan and Kosovo. As regard to substantiation of crises, NATO's and Russian "geopolitical discourses" are evaluated from very positive. It gives a chance to notice how both sides recognized these crises? How with the passage of time NATO's military interference in Afghanistan and Kosovo have prejudiced associations with Russia interest at international level? Furthermore, evocative method, discussion analysis and a proportional approach are applied to scrutinize Russian and NATO's "geopolitical discourses" towards the crises. The research of NATO's and Russian "geopolitical discourses" proved that hypothesis NATO and Russian "geopolitical discourses" towards emergency in Afghanistan and Kosovo have affected mutual relations is accurate. Crisis of Kosovo in 2008 symbolizes the ending of Russian stretch plan towards NATO and marks a fresh opening of a permanently antagonistic "geopolitical discourse" against NATO. Combined cooperation and political disputes toward Afghanistan and Kosovo emergency are slight as compare to the NATO-Russian "relations" in the European continent.

Keywords: Post Cold War, Russia, NATO, Afghanistan, Kosovo, Geopolitics

Introduction

Approximately three decades, NATO has endeavored to build a partnership with Russia by developing talks and practical partnership in the areas of common interest. First time in 1991, NATO coalition and Russia relations started with reference to the agenda of NACC "North

* Major Akhtar Hussain, PhD Scholar, Department of IR Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur Sind Pakistan. E mail: akhtar.majoka@hotmail.com

** Dr. Amir Ahmed Khuhro, Director Institute of IR Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur Sind Pakistan.

Atlantic Cooperation Council". First time Russians joined hands the peace program agenda in 1994, after joining peace programme several agreements on cooperation signed by NATO and Russia. Russia and NATO signed "Founding Act on Mutual Relations", "Cooperation and Security", "Road map for possible NATO and Russia collaboration".

In 2000, during a visit to Moscow, president of Russia Vladimir Putin wished for to be member of NATO to US President Bill Clinton, on which Clinton replied that he "didn't mind". In 2002, "Russia and NATO Council" instituted to handle security matters and combined projects/trouble areas. "Russia and NATO" developed cooperation in numerous area of mutual interest like combating against terrorism, armed forces collaboration, support in the Afghanistan "including transportation through Russia which includes non-military ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) freight NATO logistics in the Afghan War, fighting against local drug production, industrial cooperation, and weapons of non-proliferations". NATO asked Russia to assist in Afghanistan in December 2009 for granting permission to use air space for consignment, probably which were military related logistic or similar material over its country towards Afghanistan. Additional demand was to give helicopters to Afghan military. Russia did not accept these demands, while continued to let non-military supply passage through its terrain. After the end of Cold War, NATO as a military coalition power became political instrument which is being exercised for execution of west states policies globally. NATO's measures confronted Russia to re-organize her defense policy and revise her armed forces size. NATO's associations with Russia stays strained over the problem of growth, which Russia would never completely accept, however, September 11 terrorist attacks created a thaw that is sure to maintain for some time.

Poor relations were seen in 1990s between NATO and Russia, restricted by the 1999 problems in Kosovo¹. The Kosovo intervention set terrible examples. A purportedly defensive US led coalition attacked a country that had not hit any NATO member, ignored Moscow's annoyed protests, disconnected the province of sovereign county by force, placing it under international control. It was really disruptive move. Even EU states were not on board with the policy, but they were worried about its consequences. Russia strongly protested and cautioned that the West's unlawful action acknowledged a dangerous, undermine precedent. The Kosovo case came back to disturb the US again in 2014 when the Kremlin enhanced its armed forces presence on the "Crimea Peninsula".

Statement of the Problem

In worldwide politics after Cold War era latest geopolitics studies in the academic debates, classical or Modern "geopolitical discourse" are not comprehensive to clarify changes and conversion of the World after Cold War. At international level countries having same concepts, philosophy and their interest in development to strengthen or restore regional or global level different treaties and alliances. NATO was established in 1949, which was basically a Forces Alliance comprising West States against Russian threat. In 1990 "collapse of the Russian Union" external threat to western states was vanished. Ultimately, NATO countries had to go for new vision in the world to move forward. After 1990, NATO changed from a anti Russia military alliance to a crisis manager/ administrator. From last approximately three decade NATO has adopted vision different from its original (1949) role to deter the Russian deterrence or threat. According to NATO theory in 2010 declare to facilitate, "seeks to avert crises, management" of conflicts/ Issue in the world and to stabilize post-conflict issues, while working closely to its world partners prominently prominently US and the EU. If we have a look towards Post Cold War arena NATO's revolt was necessary and significant in so many dimensions and development of the world order, "Alliances extended and integrated new partners/ allies all over the Europe", adopted so many overseas missions to exercise its power, Improved its powers and skills a peacekeeper and reconstruction role to humanitarian base aid and fight against worldwide terrorism. Added to this in last approximately three decades NATO improved its military and modernize its effectiveness. At the time of Cold War (1949 to 1990) NATO build up huge Army and air power but in early 21st century faced by new worldwide challenges, NATO reformed its Army to small but highly expert/ skilled small Units, which are equipped and capable to be quickly employed having latest and advance technology equipment. So changes in the Global system were basic factor which boosted NATO's political agenda and Forces buildup. Now NATO is not only forces alliance but emerge as "political power / instrument" being forced to execute western states especially US ' policies related to different countries since 1990. So NATO's Forces missions interfered in "Russia's area of interest", which resulted reshaping of Russian interest related the west alliance. NATO's different steps countered by Russian for alteration its (Security) safety precaution policies and revise its Forces modernize technologies.

Russia ever growing forces power prove that Russia most likely will combat future "NATO development and willful military mission/

deployment". NATO forces involvement "Kosovo and Afghanistan have challenged Russia"² where Russia thinks that his interest and foreign affairs are being threatened and at the same time Russia felt insecure. Today's multipolar global order, the dealing "NATO and Russia" "would decide the power in European States and South Asia countries even Middle East States". The increasing disagreement of Russia with NATO giving space to new discussion keeping in view the International relation theory "The balance of power" discussion and clash are affecting the world wide political relationships, world level different social affairs and at same time world level challenge to different economies. Research will analyze that how Afghanistan and Kosovo crises came into lime light in the world and how scripted in "Kosovo and Afghanistan by NATO and Russia" both the parties used into their best interest according to the international relation different theories.

Hypothesis

NATO and Russian geopolitical discourses towards crises in Kosovo and Afghanistan have led to reciprocal accruing disagreements.

Objective of the Research

For analysis of conceptual "critical geopolitical theory" which related to "NATO and Russian positions" in this research. Furthermore, contrast dissimilarity "Russian and NATO's geopolitical" dialogue on "Kosovo and Afghanistan" crisis's spell out penalty as reciprocal relationships /partnership at Global level. At the end, to summarize all happening to draw breakdown and then ultimately conclusions of the topic.

Research Questions

Q1: What is an overview of NATO - Russia dealings post cold war and Russians view about worldwide order?

Q2: How Russians think about Afghanistan and Kosovo crises?

Q3: How "NATO and Russian geopolitical discourses" affected Afghanistan and Kosovo crises??

Q4: How NATO - Russian policies affected international relations theory?

Significance of Research

All development is born of questioning or inquiry, doubt is always better than being over confident, doubt lead to inquiry, and inquiry lead to

invention/ discovery, Hudson maxim "keeping in view this statement this research can be understood. Extensive research work and positive attitude would progress hopeful and healthy. Research work constantly inculcates systematic and investigated philosophy which give confidence to the growth of balanced behavior for opinions and association. At the same time this research is different comparatively to similar research being focused within reach of "NATO and Russian" communication and significance because relations distorted by "NATO Military intervention in Kosovo and Afghanistan". This research work reviews approximately three decade which allow the researcher a better study on martial operations. "Critical geopolitics" theories seek to discover geopolitics as educational, collective and political performance. "Critical geopolitics" also assist to evaluate not only what is "outside" although at the same time what can be "inside" the 'domestic' and 'foreign'. study of two subject countries would give opportunity to predict and draw conclusions that how "NATO and Russia" read the crises and "geopolitical discourses" while discussing all crises who led the dual incident of divergence or partnership.

Literature Review

Theoretical portion, basic thoughts of important Geopolitics comprehended and analyzed. Mainly books are consulted at the same time as key factor for this research work and study of "critical geopolitics". Specially books of "Gearoid O Tuathail, Simon Dalby", "Introduction to Rethinking Geopolitic³ Routledge, G. O. Tuathail, S. Dalby and P. Routledge,"⁴ "Routledge, John Agnew Geopolitics⁵: Revisioning World Politics, Routledge, Klaus Dodds, MerjeKuus⁶, Joanne Sharp Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics". The famous writer and expert of Geopolitics "Simon Dalby and especially Gearoid O Tuathail are the main theorists of critical geopolitics"⁷ are read and martial is also included in this research work these writers have sound knowledge on the topic. Interpretations by different think tank is also considered for good and practical conclusion and related thoughts concerning "Gearoid O Tuathail's perception about critical geopolitics" evaluated with other research material, other authors are also read like "Erin H. Fouberg, Alexander B. Murphy, H. J. de Blij, John Agnew and Klaus Dodds"⁸ which not only learn "critical geopolitics" but wrote for the conceptualization, and given their assessment and specifically the basic concept about "critical geopolitics written by Gearoid O Tuathail and Simon Dalby" both writers were very comprehensive in their writings.

While dealing with Afghanistan crises research would concentrate on the writing of "M. J. Williams (The Good War) NATO and the liberal conscience in Afghanistan, Oksana Antonenko"⁹ book "The Central Asian states and Russia". The next writing of "Dodge and Nicholas Redman, Routledge, and StenRynning" well-known book "NATO in Afghanistan"¹⁰ so many other periodical article defiantly would have their consideration and included in this research for better understanding and for wide-ranging. Analyses, assessment and the reviews by different scholars would have its own importance for these writings who would make it promises for improved understanding "formal geopolitics" of "NATO and Russia". by all research technique, data, particulars in order to compare or contrast to each other so that for better understanding and recognizing Russian-NATO's "practical geopolitics." interest. Of course the opinions of law experts, spokes person interviews by officials, Important papers, important "strategies and speeches" of state representatives are all so evaluated and matched for the comprehension and understanding mutual interest and their own state objectives keeping in view the International relation theories.

Different official papers or statements like NATO's tactically concepts, "Russian foreign" office "military strategies", "UN Security Council resolutions and principal, the Prague Summit declaration of NATO" in 2002 are part of research work. In the literature "official speeches/ statements of Russian and NATO states their state leaders ,websites of Russian Ministry of the Foreign Affairs and NATO official"¹¹ are also included to achieve good results and understanding. The "popular geopolitics" of "NATO and Russia" their interest would be contrasted for the dialogue "Western states and Russian media social media" will also be included for appraisal and analysis to draw comparison study about the Russia and NATO."NATO-Russian formal geopolitics", "practical geopolitics" and "popular geopolitics" would also be compared which be pinched to each other. Available collected concerning information would be short listed and scrutinized and comparison with other's school of thought and opinions, educational dialogues, different important "books and journals" to make this research more comprehensive and fruit full out come. "Martin A. Smith' s book NATO-Russia relations will the future be like the past?"¹², "NATO search of a vision, Gulner Aybet and Rebecca R Moore"¹³, The writer "Georgetow's book named Representing the West" and available important books and articles internet based material consulted which will help for "discussion NATO-Russian relations after the Cold War".

Research Methodology

This research would be definitely different from other similar research work owing its thorough research approach leading to NATO-Russia interaction which overstated at the time NATO interfered in Kosovo and Afghanistan. This research basically evaluating the era since post cold war, which will provide the basis and give better assessment for NATO forces operations. In the mean time "Critical geopolitics theories" try to investigate and look for investigating Geopolitics while studying the civilization societal standards of the under study states towards political application. Study of "Critical geopolitics" also draw and review the situation "not only what is outside of actor or state, but also inside including domestic and the foreign affairs".

Data Collection

Primary Data

Primary source information is not available due to limitations of researcher to visit or approach to official data, documents or physical visit of the area of the states. However direct dialogue/ discussions with the learned Scholars are helpful in the research.

Secondary Data

Qualitative approach linked to the community constructivist model emphasizes on construction of communally natural history and realism. It is to proof ,study and at same point challenge to representation the thorough sense and implication of the being presentation and experiments, covers disagreement in viewpoint, behavioral feeling and opinions. learned persons are involved to increase a prosperous, multifarious thoughtful of different experiences and not interested in order which can be universal to bigger groups or bodies. This research included with reference to "formal geopolitics, " Books, editorials and printed and internet based journal discussed for establishing exact outcome of "NATO and Russia formal geopolitics".

Data Analysis

Analysis of two separate countries would provide us chance to look at that how NATO policy makers or "Russia have scripted these crises and how their different geopolitical discourses" have led to reciprocated happening of disagreement or trust.

1) By using the combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods process probed how global humanity think or look at the attacks on "Afghanistan and Kosovo". This research work also includes "formal geopolitics," specially books written by different writers, researched articles or magazines in order to study all pertinent facial look for "NATO and Russia formal geopolitics".

2) All collected information to complete this research is from an indirect source which includes different internet base web site data, books written on relevant data, think tank observation and analysis different writings observe from specific perspective to attain or represent beneficial analysis and subsequently conclusion.

3) Analysis of geopolitical discussion could give an prospect to forecast the future method of worldwide political affairs.

4) Analysis based on comprehensive research work and material would craft promising understanding and comprehension and better technique to comprehend the "formal geopolitics" of "NATO and Russia".

Conclusion

The critical geopolitics now a day's turns out significantly since analysis of contemporary geopolitics. Critical geopolitics includes the relationships between countries at the same time formation for concentration at the same time approval and execution of particular policies, decision or orders by the states. "Gearóid Ó Tuathail's and Simon Dalby's conceptualization of the critical geopolitics" being old in this examine methodology. All country or societies consist of character, historical prospective, geographical boundaries and state apparatus, which decide "geopolitical traditions". Russian's geopolitical customs can survive "Russia with in Europe' Eurasian theory and 'Russia is a bridge between East and West' and NATO's geopolitical traditions as Euro Atlantic" combined defense or disaster management.' All geopolitical customs comprises so many geopolitical discourses who can be alienated as "formal geopolitics" "practical geopolitics" and "popular geopolitics". These three geopolitical discourses are interlinked with each other and having interaction and influential to each other so few matters between them could be blur. This is more prominent for the Russian, due to specific case of Russian's geopolitical culture, mostly prohibited and dominated through "practical geopolitics". For , NATO's coalition "formal and practical geopolitics" frequently collaborate to be added, at the same time "popular geopolitics" frequently criticize/condemns all

together. While grouping three "critical geopolitics elements" will allow to establish/ decide that "NATO's and Russian's geopolitical "discourses towards "Kosovo and Afghanistan" crises.

In case of Kosovo crisis in 1999 NATO's geopolitical discourse was very positive practical and formal geopolitics which be powerfully supported so were less partial according to "popular geopolitics" but at same time Russia took these crisis pessimistic. Vigorous role of NATO "formal and practical geopolitics" which caused aggression for Russia assessment and policy makers which negatively affected the Russian stance. "NATO's geopolitical discourse towards Afghanistan " may be clarified optimistic. So With the support of "popular geopolitics", NATO's plan by policy makers attained short-term achievement in Kabul capital of Afghanistan and its vicinity area. "Geopolitical discourse could be observe from the Russian' s side". So increase in combat around Kabul at same time threat by violence pushed mutual collaboration with NATO. "Geopolitical discourse united both sides and increased joint partnership and mutual trust". The alliance lacks agreements and mutual coordination in 2008 when "NATO's geopolitical discourse towards the independence of Kosovo looked like impartial". Russian "geopolitical discourse" Apparently were also not positive . NATO's "formal and practical geopolitics" Russia was not included in the decision making and was not given priority towards geopolitical discourse in the European dealing. So Russian geopolitical discourse turned further aggressive and opinion of distrust towards NATO enhanced. NATO's denial to the Russian geopolitical discourse was not appreciated at same time towards Kosovo crisis which were aggravated as counter reaction from Moscow.

At the same time Russia was also not included in decision making in the International arena. Now a days in current Afghanistan situation , due to separation inside NATO countries and disapproval on the media by scholars, completely "NATO's geopolitical discourse could be defined as negative". But at the same time Russia's is having deeply concern about NATO issues and future of Taliban, but at the same time, due to current disputes in Europe Russian are not cooperating with NATO like a decade back. As per geopolitical discourse efficiency of NATO has been declining day by day and prospect of NATO forces as a 'crisis manager' is dubious in any part of the world. Certainly "NATO geopolitical discourses" are having unfair relation with the Russians. The Hypothesis for research "Dissimilar NATO and Russian geopolitical discourse towards crisis in Kosovo and Afghanistan have led to reciprocal accruing disagreements" partially correct. Russians did not contain critical benefit at all in the world and as whole also fragile headed for against NATO's

actions all over world. Therefore Moscow focuses its thoughts and reactions to the basic geopolitical custom in the area of Europe.

Notes and References

- ¹Tsygankov, Andrei P., *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*, (3rd Edition), (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010).
- ² Albrecht Schnabel and Ramesh Thakur, *Kosovo and the challenge of humanitarian intervention: selective indignation, collective action, and international citizenship*, United Nations, (University Press, 2000).
- ³ Gearóid Ó Tuathail and Simon Dalby, *Introduction: Rethinking Geopolitics*, (Routledge; second edition, 2002).
- ⁴ Andreas Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse after the Cold War: Representing the West*, Routledge; 1st edition, 2012.
- ⁵ John Norris, *Collision course: NATO, Russia, and Kosovo*, Praeger Press, 2005.
- ⁶ Klaus Dodds, Merje Kuus and Joanne Sharp, *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics*, (Ashgate, 2013).
- ⁷ Gearóid Ó Tuathail, Simon Dalby and P. Routledge, *The Geopolitics Reader*, (Routledge, second edition, 2006).
- ⁸ Dodds Klaus, *Global Geopolitics: A Critical Introduction*, (Routledge, 2004).
- ⁹ M. J. Williams, *The Good War: NATO and the liberal conscience in Afghanistan*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- ¹⁰ Oksana Antonenko, "The Central Asian states and Russia", in *Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond*, ed. Toby Dodge and Nicholas, (Redman, Routledge, 2011).
- ¹¹ Sten Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, Stanford Security Studies (2012).
- ¹² Martin A. Smith, "NATO-Russia relations: will the future resemble the past?", in *NATO in search of a vision*, ed. Gulner Aybet and Rebecca R Moore, (Georgetown University Press, 2010).
- ¹³ Jamie Shea, "NATO at sixty – and beyond", in *NATO in search of a vision*, ed. Gulner Aybet and Rebecca R Moore, (Georgetown University Press, 2010).

After the Cold War, the alliance dramatically redefined itself. In the 1990s, it fostered stability across Europe by beginning its process of enlargement to the formerly communist east and by intervening to stop genocide in the Balkans. In the 2000s, it broadened its scope through the mission in Afghanistan as well as a counterterrorist operation in the Mediterranean and counterpiracy efforts in the Gulf of Aden and off the Horn of Africa (in addition to continuing the enlargement process).¹¹ The core problem in NATO-Russia relations can be summed up quite simply: NATO will not allow Russia to have a veto over alliance decisions, while Russia believes it is a great power deserving a full voice in European security affairs. When historians examine the first few decades of the so-called post-Cold War era, they are likely to marvel at the clumsy and provocative policies that the United States and its NATO allies pursued toward Russia.¹² U.S. leaders managed to get relations with Russia wrong just a few years after the dissolution of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991.¹³ Citing NATO's military interventions in Bosnia and Kosovo during Bill Clinton's administration, Gates noted that "the Russians had long historical ties with Serbia, which we largely ignored." And in an implicit rebuke to his current boss, Gates asserted that "trying to bring Georgia and Ukraine into NATO was truly overreaching." That move was a case of "recklessly ignoring what the Russians considered their own vital national interests." The North Atlantic Treaty was largely dormant until the Korean War initiated the establishment of NATO to implement it, by means of an integrated military structure: This included the formation of Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) in 1951, which adopted the Western Union's military structures and plans.¹⁴ In 1952 the post of Secretary General of NATO was established as the.¹⁵ No military operations were conducted by NATO during the Cold War. Following the end of the Cold War, the first operations, Anchor Guard in 1990 and Ace Guard in 1991, were prompted by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.¹⁶ KFOR-MSU Carabinieri Patrols in front of the Ibar Bridge in Mitrovica, Kosovo, 2019.