

**INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE POST COLD WAR
ERA (1991-2001)**

BY

**OLADUGBA OLUWATOSIN EVELYN
ART1700875**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD
OF THE BACHELOR OF ARTS (B.A) HONOURS DEGREE IN HISTORY.**

JANUARY 2023

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was carried out by **OLADUGBA OLUWATOSIN EVELYN** and is adequate in scope, content and quality in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an award of a Bachelor of Arts (B.A) Degree in International Studies and Diplomacy.

MR DANIEL OROBATOR
PROJECT SUPERVISOR

DR FRANK IKPONMWOSA
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE

DATE

DEDICATION

To God Almighty for his loving kindness and affections towards me; giving me life, good health and strength, particularly during the process of writing this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank God Almighty for his inspiration and providence, as well as for providing me with the strength, wisdom, ability, and good health to complete this programme. The success of this project would not have been possible without him. My appreciation also goes to my supervisor, Mr. Daniel Orobator, who has being my guardian and support throughout this project work. His technical and editorial advice as well as intelligence, dynamism, and understanding nature, assisted me in conducting and presenting the research work with academic professionalism. Working and studying under his direction was a tremendous privilege and honour.

My outmost appreciation goes to all those who impacted me intellectually during my academic sojourn in the university; Prof J. I. Osagie, Prof. Ifidon, Prof. Osadolor, Odigwe A. Nwaokocha, Mr. Daniel Orobator, Dr. D.O. Iweze, Mr. Victor, Dr. Charles, Rev. Sis. J.C. Nwaka and Dr. Odion Osiki (of blessed memory).

Nobody has been more important to me in the pursuit of this project than the members of my family. I thank my father Mr Emmanuel Kole Oladugba, whose love and protection has brought me thus far and my mother Dr Mrs Evelyn Oladugba whose unending support has seen me through. I wish to thank my loving supportive siblings Oluwaseyi and Oluwaseun, my special friends Emmanuel, Ade, Joan, Jennifer, Chelsea, Joshua, Juliet, Kudi and Siama. May God bless you all for me. To those I didn't mention, I sincerely appreciate you all, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENT

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|
| Title Page | - - - - - | i |
| Certification | - - - - - | ii |
| Dedication | - - - - - | iii |
| Acknowledgements | - - - - - | iv |
| Table of Contents | - - - - - | v |

Chapter One: Background to the study

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|----|
| Introduction | - - - - - | 1 |
| Aim and Objectives | - - - - - | 8 |
| Scope of Study | - - - - - | 9 |
| Research Methodology | - - - - - | 9 |
| Literature Review | - - - - - | 9 |
| Chapterization- | - - - - - | 16 |
| Endnotes | - - - - - | 18 |

Chapter Two: Nature of peace and security in the post -cold war era

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Introduction | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21 |
| Nature and concept of peace | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21 |
| Nature of peace in the post-cold war era international system | | | | | | | | - | - | 25 |
| Nature and concept of security | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 27 |
| National security | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 28 |
| Collective security | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29 |
| Security after the cold war | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 31 |
| Endnotes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33 |

Chapter Three: international conflicts and cooperation in the post-cold war era

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Introduction | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35 |
| Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 |
| Regional conflicts | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38 |
| Endnotes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |

Chapter Four: The aftermath of the cold war on United States and Russia

| | | |
|--|-----------|----|
| Introduction | - - - - - | 53 |
| Changes in the United States | - - - - - | 54 |
| Changes in the Soviet Union during the post-cold war era | - - - - - | 58 |
| Commonwealth of independent states | - - - - - | 59 |
| Russia and the West | - - - - - | 65 |
| Endnotes | - - - - - | 69 |
| Chapter Five: Summary and Conclusion | | |
| Conclusion | - - - - - | 72 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | - - - - - | 74 |

**INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE POST COLD WAR
ERA (1991-2001)**



OLADUGBA OLUWATOSIN EVELYN

ART1700875

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
FACULTY OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN,
BENIN CITY,**

JANUARY 2023

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The Cold War was a conflict after World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union 1947-1991. Fleming described the Cold War as “a war that is fought not in the battle- field but in the minds of men; one tries to control the mind of the others”. It was a psychological warfare aimed at reducing the enemy’s areas of influence and increasing the number of one’s camp followers. The superpowers never fought each other but backed opposite sides in “Hot Wars”, offered aid to influence neutral countries and completed in a dangerous nuclear arms race.¹

The conflict helped cement a world dominated by superpowers a world which might and violence or the threat of violence were the yardsticks of international relations and where beliefs tended towards absolute, only one’s own system was good. The other system was inherently evil.²

The nature of the war entails two opposite principles between the communist states and the capitalist or liberal – democratic states. The communist system on one hand entails the organization of the state and society based on the idea of Karl Max. Karl Max believed that the wealth of the country should be collectively owned and shared by everybody. The economy should be centrally planned and the interests and

wellbeing of the working class should be safeguarded by the state police. The capitalist system on the other hand, operates on the basis of private ownership of a country's wealth.³

More so, whosoever was to be blamed for the Cold War has been a bone of contention among scholars producing three different school of thought that concluded on Cold War. During the 1950s, most western historians, such as the American George Kennan blamed Stalin, arguing that his motives were sinister and that he intended to spread communism as widely as possibly through Europe and Asia, thus destroying capitals. This school of thought was known as the Orthodox view.⁵

On the other hand Soviet historians and some American historians argued that the Cold War ought not to be blamed on Stalin and the Russians. The view was that Russia had suffered enormous losses during the World War II and that Stalin motives were purely defensive and there was no real threat to the West from the USSR. Claiming that the United States should have been more understanding and should not have challenged the idea of a soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. The actions of American politicians especially Truman provoked Russian hostility unnecessarily. During the late 1960s many people in the United States became critical of American foreign policy especially United States involvement in the Vietnam War. This caused some historians to reconsider the American attitude

towards communism in general. They felt that United States governments had become obsessed with hostility towards communists States and they were ready to take a more sympathetic view of the difficulties Stalin had found himself at the end of the Second World War. This is known among historians as the revisionist view.⁶

Later a third view known as the Post-revisionist Interpretation was put forward by some American historians and this became popular in the 1980s. The post revisionist argued that both sides should take some blame for the Cold War. They believe that United States economic policies such as Marshall Aid were deliberately designed to increase United States political influence in Europe. They also believed that although Stalin had no long term plans to spread communism. He was an opportunist who would take advantage of any weaknesses in the West to expand Soviet influence. Post-Revisionists also tend to focus on domestic systems and factors when examining Cold War policies. Internal and Party Policies, domestic economic conditions, bureaucracies and security agencies were all contributors to Cold War approaches and decision-making.⁷

To an extent Post-Cold War historians, some of them with access to previously unavailable Soviet archives have returned to describe the Cold War as an ideological conflict. Some like Huntington and Fukuyama, have attempted to understand the implications for the future.⁸

In retrospect, the intensification of the conflict began when the two superpowers were involved in a struggle to establish the boundaries of the new post war order. Both parties had different opinions during the Post dam and Yalta conference especially the disagreement over polar. Some terms were not met, especially terms laid down during the Yalta conference February 1945. This indifference to the term of free election was largely played out by Soviet Union. This further led to Berlin Blockade, the Korean War. The creation of two great alliance system, the consolidation of soviet power in Eastern Europe and the consolidation of united state influence in Europe and offshore Asia.⁹

Inherently, the nature of the cold war was that both sides appeared to accept from most of the period that, ultimately, coexistence with the other political and social system was impossible and so were determined to weaken each other by any means. As a result of what was increasingly a bipolar conflict. There was an intense arms race between the USA and the USSR, and their allies, involving both conventional and nuclear weapons. As part of this Cold Conflict, both sides suppressed or sought to control their internal dissidents, the enemy within and were often prepared to ally themselves with regimes and movements that conflicted strongly with their stated political ideology and beliefs. Consequently, the Cold War was characterized with conventional and especially nuclear weapons, build up and arms race, intense propaganda, including the suppression of accurate or balanced information in both competing states, in particular, the West tried to depict the USSR

as a totalitarian equivalent of Nazi Germany, while the USSR painted capitalism as an inherently Warmongering system. There was no common ground or successful negotiation, and a deep division between the two camps across the iron curtain".¹⁰ The conflict often spilled into developing countries. Furthermore, there was the tightening of controls and repression of dissidents in both camps.

Direct hot wars between the two superpowers were avoided, but there were many international crisis during the Cold War, and several vicious hot wars involving the allies or client states of the rival superpowers in the third world.¹¹

One major characteristics of the Cold War was the logic of Deterrence. The basic concept of deterrence is that an enemy will not strike if it knows the defender can defeat the attack or can inflict unacceptable damage in retaliation. Furthermore, the war was also theorized as mutually assisted destruction which is also a principle of deterrence. The theory is based on the fact that nuclear weaponry is so devastating that no government wants to use them.

Neither side will attack the other with their nuclear weapons because both sides are guaranteed to be totally destroyed in the conflict. No one would so go to all out nuclear war because no side can win and no side can survive.¹²

Nevertheless, the Cold War was still in effect. The bipolar conflicts of the superpowers had a decisive influence on the history of the third world. The third world consisted of developing countries and saw the drastic involvement of both the

United States and the Soviet Union whom took advantage of their unstable conditions some of these third world countries includes Vietnam, Korea and Cuba Afghanistan and parts of Africa.

Without question, 1989 was a watershed in global history, in that movement our year, the Cold War that had divided the world into two opposing camps for almost half a century and defined much of the internal policies of both East and West came to a sudden, astounding halt.¹³ It continued its collapse with the demise of the Warsaw pact, the fall of the Berlin wall and the dissolution of Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. Soviet Union president Mikhail Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and internal reform perestroika brought permanent change to the political structure of the Soviet Union and eventually her fall.

Gorbachev and United States President George H. W. Bush captured the sense of hope engendered by the end of the Soviet – America antagonism, promising a “new world order”. In December, 1991, the Soviet Union officially disbanded and most of the former republics joined a commonwealth of independent states.¹⁴

This study is not to boldly examine the Cold War but to examine the aspect of peace and security after the Cold War ranging from (1991–2001) between the United States and the Soviet Union. Consequently, the end of the Cold War brought several changes alongside. The international system was transformed as the balance of power politics of the two superpowers gave way to a unipolar age of United States

dominance. Francis Fukuyama, published an article titled “The end of History” Proclaiming that the world’s age old confrontations were finally at end. The system of liberal of liberal capitalism was now universally valued and the basis for the conflict were gone.¹⁵

During the period of the Cold War, peace and security internationally was shaken. To the extent that the end of the Cold War was envisaged to introduce the normality of peace and security internationally.

Furthermore, while the changes that led to the end of the Cold War had significantly reduced the threat of East-West conflict, problems of security clearly still existed. This point was dramatized to the world by the Gulf war and other crisis, which provided a valuable attribute to the Euphoria that had been stimulated by the end of the Cold War. There are still issues of security in the post-Cold War era.¹⁶

In addition, there were other conflicts that also took place during the post-cold war era. These conflicts were the Balkan crisis and the Balkan crisis was majorly fixated on the republics of Yugoslavia which were the Bosnia crisis (1992 – 1995), Kosovo crisis (1998 – 1999) and the Croatia crisis (1992 – 1993).

So therefore, the post-cold war era demanded for security concern in most parts of the world. Lebanon was also part of the insecurity display. Security concern was also positioned on the sub-continent of Asia including Indian and Pakistan.¹⁷

The Afghanistan 9/11 and the war on terrorism was also another conflict that emerged after the cold war.

International peace and security in the post-cold war era ushered in the continuous rise of different organizations and Union that attempted to content for the possibility of international peace and security in the Post- Cold War era organizations like the United Nations, the European Community and the North Atlantic Treaty. Organizations also profess the necessity for integrated security. Although they were able to tackle the issues of insecurity and lack of peace in the international world, some of their setbacks still limited them from achieving the goals of changing the dimensions of peace and security for the better.

Aim and Objectives

The aim of the study is to examine the nature of peace and security in the Post-Cold War era and how the issues of peace and security were been tackled. The objectives of this study includes;

1. To examine the nature of peace and security in the post-cold war era.
2. To examine the conflicts that posed as threats to international peace and security in the post-cold war era and attempts made to tackle such events.
3. To examine the aftermath of the cold war on United States and Russia.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study covers the period after Cold War 1991 – 2001. To ascertain how the concept of peace and security has change internationally. Also how the issue of peace and security has been overwhelming factor destabilizing the tranquil system internationally.

Research Methodology

This study will make use of the historical research method in its data collection and data analysis. This study depends on primary and secondary sources, which includes oral interview, journals, articles, publications and unpublished work. This work would also make use of the Chicago manual style of citation and referencing. Furthermore, the primary sources also includes decisions of sub regional, continental and international organizations, press releases and news clips are also employed. Secondary sources also includes scholarly books gotten from libraries most especially the University Of Benin Library. The primary sources will also include treaties and documents, thesis would also be used.

Literature Review

There is a great deal of literature on international peace and security in the Post-Cold War era as the review below shows.

Manuela Mesa Peinado in her work titled 'Culture of Peace Foundation' tries to elaborate on the nature of peace and security in her view. 'traditionally, peace has been considered as the absence of direct violence of war'. She further went ahead to portray that peace is related to human right and the human right to peace has been one of the main focus in recent years for many organizations and bodies. These organizations advocate peace being recognized as a right which denied to many societies. She also added that the classic concept of security 'national security is focused on the military differences of the state's sovereignty and territorial integrity against external aggression.¹⁸

Rafael Grasa and Oscar Matoes "Conflict, peace and security in Africa' An Assessment and new question after 50 years of African independence emphasizes that the Post-Cold War era in Africa introduced various conflicts which into international order. Their work states that the Stockholm International Peace Research institute estimates that since the end of the Cold War, a total of 14 armed conflicts can be counted in Africa, namely Algeria, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, (formerly Zaria), Republic of Congo, Eritrea-Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda. Some of these arm conflicts are still undergoing noteworthy episodes of violence. Although, the vast majority are regarded as interstate conflict type except the dispute between Eritrea and Ethiopia between 1998 and 2000. They are highly regionalized conflicts. Similarly, they are conflicts occurring in context more and more internationalized

and trans-nationalized conflicts. Similarly, they are conflicts occurring in context more and more internationalized and trans-nationalized.¹⁹

Simon Fraser, Human Security Report Project, 'The Decline in global Violence' states that the end of the Cold War not only removed a significant source of conflict from the international system. It also led to the emergence of a new global security governance starting in the early 1990s, the much criticized UN spearheaded a massive upsurge of international activism directed towards preventing wars, stopping those that could not be prevented and preventing those that had stopped reigniting its key stakeholders have been international agencies, donor governments – and those of war affected states plus huge numbers of NGOs (Non-governmental Organization).

In its current stage of development, this continually expending system of global security governance remains inchoate, disputatious, inefficient, and prone to tragic mistakes. But as previous Human Security have argued, the evidence suggests that it had also been remarkably effective in driving down the number and deadlines of armed conflicts. The aforementioned work was postulated by Steven punker in her book "Battle Angels" which was criticized for underestimating the violence of the Post-Cold War era and I solely agree with the criticisms because the Post -Cold War era ushered in more conflicts but more of regional.²⁰

Chuka Euka 'Post Cold War Conflicts'. Imperative for Armed Humanitarian Intervention' postulated that the Post-Cold War World is unarguably a world of wars and conflicts. It had been characterized by a wave of violent wars and armed conflicts that have produced unprecedented human catastrophe and suffering. Although mostly intrastate, those conflicts have spread across borders and threatened international peace and security through mass refugee flow, proliferation of light arms and the rise of local mercenary groups. However, has had far reaching negative implications on conflicts. His work emphasizes on how the cold war led to huge negative factor for instance, unprecedented human catastrophe and suffering.²¹

Muzaffer Ercan Yilmaz 'The New World Order'. An Outline for the Post-Cold War Era' Posits that the general wish of the dominant powers in the post cold ERA is to pressure the status quo from which they mostly benefit. Hence international cooperation evidently increased among major powers, as exemplified by the increased of peace operations. To be more specific, while from 1948 – 1978, only a total of 13 peace keeping forces were setup, and in the following ten year period, no new force were established, from MAY 1988 to October 1993, a further twenty forces. As a December 2008, the number of UN peace keeping cooperation's 63, 18 of which are still operating in the field involving 112, 660 military personnel and civilian police Muzaffer Ercan comments on the continuous growth of international cooperation for peace keeping but failed to mention the setbacks that

hindered the United Nations in particular from carrying out some act of peaceful cooperations.²²

Necla Tschirgi, “Security and Development Policies”. Untangling the relationship introduces that the necessity of linking security and development has become policy mantra. From the United Nations to the African Union, from the United States security strategy to Canada’s international policy statement, from academic institutions to operational NGOs, there are vigorous calls for integrating security and development perspectives and policies. On one level, this is a welcome development especially after the deliberate bifurcation of development and security policies during the cold war. On another level, the early consensus among policy makers and advocates alike about the interdependence between security and development has served to obscure the difficulties involved in aligning security and development policies. Her work tends to commend on the introduction of international cooperation’s to develop security and how they are on the increase.²³

Necla Tschirgi, “Peace Building as the Link between Security and Development” posits that the end of the cold war ushered in a new era in the international affairs and however, the anticipated peace dividend did not materialize for hundreds of millions of people around the world instead the early 1900s was a period of intense insecurity, ethnic conflicts and genocide, deadly violence with overwhelming civilian deaths and casualties, widespread suffering, and massive

refuge and population flows within and across the borders. There was a disconnect between the peace that was to arrive with the end of the cold war and the insecurity that prevailed in many countries and regions. This inevitably led to a rethinking of international priorities in the immediate post- cold war era. Including the separation between interstate conflicts and between the international and domestic sphere.

The concept of peace-building-bridging security and development at the international and domestic levels came to offer an integrated approach to understanding and dealing with the full range of issues that threatened peace and security in the cold war era, how it was on a depreciating scale and how peace building concept would be introduced to take place.²⁴

Brice D Jones and Stephen John Stedman, “Civil Wars and the post-cold war international order’ states that during the post- cold war era, the numbers and lethality of wars have decreased. The success of the post- cold war era in managing civil wars to an end and ameliorating several confrontations have been few and great-power war a distant memory. As measured by increased trade and reductions of arms expenditures as a percentage of GDP, international cooperation has been a fundamental characteristics of the international order since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, the post-cold war international order is currently under substantial pressure, and in some areas, progress has reversed. The Russian annexation of Crimea and invasion of Ukraine signals a return to militaristic approach

to its border with Eastern Europe, while China's aggressive policies in the South Chinese promise that its relations with its neighbors will be tense and dangerous. And after fifteen – years historic reduction in the number of civil wars, there has been a recent, major spike, mostly centered in the middle east. Russian intervention in Syria and Saudi Arabia intervention in Yemen, and their indiscriminate use of force run counter to the way the United Nations and its member states have managed civil wars over the past twenty years. The paralysis of the UN Security council in responding to the conflicts in Ukraine and Syria conjures up memories of cold war, when proxy competition was the predominant response to civil wars. They are emphasizing on the aspect of peace in the international order after the cold war era. They confirmed that at the inception of the Post-cold war era, there was peace but later on the failure of the international cooperation's to address the matter of peace started surfacing and these contributed more to the tensions that were rising in the post-cold war era.²⁵

The New Security Debate, “Old Answers to New Security Challenges” conferred that to pull back from the insecurities of trepid but debilitating and destabilizing conflicts, it will be necessary to reorient defense and foreign policies to address the cause more effectively. The overriding priorities of the new security debate should be dealing with the causes and the consequences of war, including international poverty and inequity, environmental degradation and climate change, over-population, resource allocation and the global challenges of famine, food

shortages and scarce resources of water and energy. These are all security threats in their own right. They also contribute to some of the most intractable political and regional conflicts. It is likely that if environmental conditions and global poverty worsen in the next two to five decades, they may precipitate acute shortage. Civil unrests and various small “regional wars”, with a risk of international escalation. The new security debate addresses the issue of security and what causes it and how it can be prevented in the post-cold war era.

P. Terrence Hopmann, “Building Security in Post-Cold War Eurasia in Peace’ Works” states that in the period since the end of the war, the security landscape in Eurasia has changed dramatically conflict has frequently resulted from the breakup of states along ethnic lines, with elements such as regional, linguistic, or religious affiliation serving as the principal markers of identity. One of the main reasons for the outbreak of the conflicts in areas such as the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is that ethnicity is linked to territory and claims for self-determination, producing secessionist and irredentist wars. This form of ethno-national conflicts has retarded the process of state building, prevented the growth of democratic institution, given outside parties the ability to intervene and manipulate the outcome and created massive refugee flows. This work commends on the causes of conflicts by highlighting the effects on the conflict of specific region.²⁷

Chapter Outline

This study would be divided into chapters, for better understanding.

Chapter One

Background to study

This is the framework of the entire study. It contains introduction, aim and objectives, scope of study, methodology and literature review.

Chapter Two

Nature of peace and security in the post-cold war era. This chapter would emphasize on the concept of peace and security, historical analysis of peace and security and nature of peace and security in the post- cold war era from 1991 – 2001.

Chapter Three

International Conflicts and Co-operation during the Post-Cold War Era. The chapter entails the conflict that erupted during the post -cold war era and the attempts that were made to tackle such conflicts most especially by the United States and Russia.

Chapter Four

The Aftermath of the Cold War on the Superpowers. The chapter entails the aftermath of the Cold War on the United States and Russia whom were the Cold War adversaries.

Endnotes

1. US History available on <http://www.C.F.usu.org,2014constitutionalrightsfoundation> Accessed December 15, 2021.
2. Odd A. Westad, *The Cold War*, (New York: NY10104, 2017), p. 6.
3. Norman Lowe, *Modern World History*, 3rd Edition (United kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan 1997), p.122
4. Allan Todd, *The Cold War: Superpower Tensions and Rivalries*, 2nd Edition , (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 14.
5. Lowe, *Modern World History*, p.123
6. Ibid., p.123
7. Ibid., p.123
8. Cold War Historiography Alpha History Com <https://alphahistory.com/coldwar/cold-war-historiography/> accessed on December 15 2021.
9. Charles W. Maynes, William G. Hyland, *The Nature of the Post- Cold War World*,(English: BiblioGov 2012), p. 8.
10. Todd, *The Cold War*, p. 14.
11. Ibid., p. 16.
12. What is Mutually Destruction? <https://www.thoughtco.com>. Accessed on Saturday January 8.

13. Irwin Unger, *The United States: The Questions of our Past*, 6th Edition. (USA: Prentice Hall, 1978), p 924.
14. Boorstin Kelley, *A History of the United States*, (USA: Prentice Hall, 1999), p. 930.
15. Unger, *The United States*, p. 928.
16. Michael D. Wriligator “Global Security After the Cold War” *Journal of Conflict Management and Peace Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1994, p. 102
17. Ibid., p. 102.
18. Manuela M. Peinado, *Culture of Peace Foundation*,
19. Rafeal Grasa, Oscar Mateos “*Conflict Peace and Security in Africa*”, (Barcelona: Institute Catal a International Per la pau, 2010), p. 10.
20. Simon Fraser, *Human Security Report*, Canada: Simon Fraser University, 2013, p. 3,4.
21. Chuka Euka, “Post-Cold War Conflicts” *Global Journal of Human Social Science Interdisciplinary*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 2012.
22. Muzaffer E. Yilmaz, “The New World Order”, *Alternatives Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7, No. 4, Winter, 2008.
23. Necla Tschirgi, *Security and Development Policies*, Bonn, September 2005, p. 3.
24. Necla Tschirgi, *Peace Building as the Link between Security and Development*, New York, 2003, p. 1.

25. Bruce D. Jones, Stephen J. Stedman, Civil Wars and Post-Cold War International Order, Available at <http://amacad.org>. accessed on August 3, 2021.
26. Kerstin Hoffman , “Old Answers to New Security Challenges” Journal of New Security Debate, No. 1, 1999, p. 10.
27. P. Terrence Hopmann, *Building Security in the Post -Cold War: Eurasia in Peace Works*. (Washington: United States Institute of Peace,1999), p. 5.

CHAPTER TWO

NATURE OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN POST COLD WAR ERA

Introduction

The purpose for this chapter is to provide an account which will be useful as part of the background to the understanding of international peace and security in the post- cold war era which evolved from the late twentieth century to early twenty first century (1991 – 2001). Before proceeding to examine international peace and security in the post-cold war era. The nature of peace and security in the Post-Cold War internationally must be put into consideration. It can be ascertain that peace and security of life and property are the primary conditions for progress and development of any society. The ques for peace and security has dominated international thought since the earliest times of the history of international politics.

Nature and Concept of Peace

The term “Peace” is prone to multiple explanations and interpretations. Its meanings are different in accordance with the context of usage. The word “peace” is derived from the original Latin word ‘Pax’ which means a pact, a control or an agreement to end war on any dispute and conflict between two people, two nations or two antagonist groups of people.¹

Although some scholars defined peace as the absence of war, however, even common sense would suggest that peace does exist independent. Thus there can be peace even when there is war, as in situations when there are peaceful interactions between countries that are engaged in active war. For instance, the Palestinians and Israeli's have been able to establish peaceful use of water resources even as the water between them raged.²

John Galtung posits that the definition of peace as the absence of war is inapplicable in situations of structural violence. According to him, war is only one form of violence, which is physical open and direct. But there is another form violence that is not immediately perceived as such. This had to do with social conditions such as poverty, exclusion, intimidation, oppression, want, fear and many types of psychological pressure. It would be wrong to classify a country experiencing pervasive structural violence as peaceful.³

That is to say, although war may not be going on in a country where there is pervasive poverty, oppression of the poor by the rich, police brutality, intimidation of ordinary people by those in power, oppression of women and monopolization of resources and power by some sections of the society. It would be wrong to say that there is peace in such a country. Consequently, it is quite possible not to have peace even when there is no war.⁴

However, many interpretations has been given on the definition of peace for example, John Jacques Rousseau on his part conceptualizes a peaceful original state of existence of a man in which there are no desires. Men were born free and had few desires. However, this tranquil state subsequently became corrupted by human desire and greed thus undermining the peaceful, pristine 'state of nature'.⁵

Also, Thomas Hobbes, argues that the state of nature is rampant with conflict and violence life was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. In order to escape this nasty life, men resolved to create a social contract in which each gave up his/her right to a powerful force above all and to which all were subject, thus creating a more peaceful and orderly life. Consequently, he prefers peace to war and violence. For Plato, Justice is the basis of peaceful social existence. He defines justice as giving to each his/her due.⁶

Dialectical materialism is a tradition of social analysis associated with the German philosopher Karl Max. this theory emphasizes on how human societies produces and distributes their work and rewards. In societies divided into classes, there is an exploitative relation which give rise to class struggle which entails violence. Marx perspective assumes that peace is not feasible in so far as society is divided into antagonistic classes and there is a persistence violence. Peace is only feasible in societies in which classes are non-existent because society produces enough to give to each according to his/her needs.

In reality, however, such a society remains an aspiration in modern times and we have to go back many centuries to find very simple societies that came close to this aspiration.⁷

The above definitions of peace are not totally wrong but one problem many of them share for instance, is that there is no recorded human society corresponding to such a stylized state of tranquil existence. Even the earliest humans had to confront nature in its raw and brutal form, including dangers posed by wild animals. Some has come to see peace as an absolute, once and for all condition. Although many have come to see conflict as inherent in society, meaning that conflict is always present in different gradations, they fail to also see that peace exists in all societies in different gradations.

Peace is a process involving activities that are directly or indirectly linked to increasing development and reducing conflict both within specific societies and in wider international community.⁸

There is an expression known as ‘Culture of Peace’ which presumes that peace is a way of being, doing and living in society that can be taught, developed, and best of all, improved upon. Although the expression “culture of peace” took shape in 1989, such a word already existed before the word was created. UNESCO’s creation is a testimonial to the existence of such a cultures. Early as 1945. Even though UNESCO has several mandates, it has but one mission, namely that of

constructing peace. The purpose of the organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, the rule of law for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the people of the world.⁹

Culture of peace implies that peace means more than the absence of war. Peace is considered as a set of values, attitudes and modes of behavior promoting the peaceful settlement of conflict and the quest for mutual understanding. In fact, peace is one way to live to settle. The elaboration and establishment of a culture of peace require the whole hearted participation of everyone. Countries must cooperate, international organizations must coordinate their different actions and populations must fully participate to the full in the development of their societies.¹⁰

Nature of Peace in the Post -Cold War Era International System

In the Post-Cold War era, the international system is relatively peaceful with no major wars between competing world powers. There has also been a shift in the trends in the armed conflicts. Overall, the number of armed conflicts occurrences in the post-cold war era has decreased. According to a report compiled by PRIO in 2016, there is also a downwards trend for interstate conflicts while the trend for intrastate conflict is generally rising. Therefore, there has been a shift towards a

symmetrical armed conflicts. Such as between states and insurgence groups. In contrast to the typical symmetrical conflicts trend in the past.¹¹

Moreover, these conflicts generally only involve states which are not a major or even an emerging power. The frequency of a great power war ‘has completely diminished in the post-cold war priod.¹²

The fall of communism left only liberalism standing as the main ideology held by a major power which was the United States.

The democratization process played an important role in promoting and maintaining peace. Vision of the world peace have been put on the foundation of the collective peace between democracies.

There are no more major power wars with devastating effect. Incidentally, this era also sees the emergence of liberal democratic states. In his essay of perpetual peace, Kant stated that to attain peace, states must be democratic. This is because the values embedded in liberal democratic framework actively support the promotion of peace.¹³

Various attributes and practices of democratic states also factor in the process of maintaining peace. Hence in an era where democracy is the dominant system in the world, the frequency of major power war has diminished.¹⁴

Nevertheless, as earlier spoken, peace does not necessarily mean the absence of war because there are cases, where there is no war but lack of peace prevails.

The aforementioned paragraphs cordially emphasizes on the nature of peace in an explanatory term and also nature of peace in the international post-cold war era. Therefore, it can be ascertain that peace as a term is opened to several meanings and definitions and one of the explanations that can be stated is that peace is a process involving activities that are directly or indirectly linked to increasing development and reducing conflict both within specific societies and in wider international community. Haven discussed the nature of peace, the nature of security in the post-cold war international system and term would be discussed in the subsequent paragraphs.

Nature and Concept of Security

Security encompasses the whole domain of human life. The term society is prone to multiple interpretations. The definition depends on the objectives one wants to attain. Yibaikwal appears to have corroborated this position when he asserts that security can only be defined with reference to specific cases. Some see security as the ultimate end of their struggles. Richard Cooker, a classical security theorist, suggests that security is the capability of a nation or society to enjoy and cultivate its cultural values.¹⁵ Hanrender and Buel, in their own opinion suggest that we can lucidly conceive security as protection of a nation from all types of external

aggression, espionage, hostile reconnaissance, sabotage, subversions, annoyance and other inimical influence.¹⁶

Security is generally accepted as a ‘contested concept’, but is generally about the condition or feeling safe from harm or danger, the defense, protection and preservation of core values and the absence of threats to acquire values.¹⁷ Security is about the survival and the conditions of human existence.

The traditional conception of security has largely focused on the threat and the use of force. This largely military conception of security has focused on the state as the primary referent object of security. The traditional military conception of security which focused on war has been criticized by various scholars because it does not account for or explain the emerging non-military sources of threat to security at the individual societal, state, regional and global levels. This debate has led to the redefinition of security and the broadening of the conception of security to embrace non-military dimensions such as environment, migration, ethno-religious and nationalist identities, poverty and human insecurity and disease.¹⁸

Traditionally, security was the security of the state, it was threatened by the military power of other states and defined by the military power of the state itself. Security covers a whole lot of areas whereby it can be segmented into various forms which includes national security, collective security, concert security, common security, comprehensive security, cooperative security and a whole lot of other forms

which may include human security, energy security, maritime security, cyber security, environmental security and many others.

Although, the project focuses on international security in the Post-Cold War era, little highlights would be given on National security and collective security because they help influence international security basically.

National Security

National security is the ability of a nation to protect its internal value from perceived threats. It is more of a state security. Wolfers asserts that national security is the protection of values previously required. It can further be explained as the protection of interests through whatever means possible of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of a nation state. Quite apart from legal considerations, the question of when to use force in armed intervention is an important national security matter. Legal restrictions are often overlooked when national interests are compelling.¹⁹ It is more or less a state's personal goal. National security in good measure can be represented as a component of regional security, and through it as an element of international security.

Collective Security

Collective security which is also another segment or aspect of security is the idea that if one state behaves aggressively, other states have a legal right to enforce

international law against aggression by taking collective action to stop it.²⁰ Collective security seeks to regulate international behavior not only by deterring aggressors but also by transforming the competitive nature of state interactions while a collective security system works best under conditions where there is at least some national amity between the large powers collective security can help to alleviate the security dilemma faced by states and to demilitarizes interstate competition.²¹

The idea of collective security was a cornerstone of the League of Nations established in 1920 after World War 1 (1914 – 1918). The league was an attempt to institutionalize multilateral efforts towards maintenance of security and prevention of the awful carnage that had just been experienced during world war 1.²²

The formation of the United Nations Organization. An organization which created principles on how to spread international peace and security in the Post-Cold War era, was also rooted on the promotion of collective security as a result of World War II. It was with the end of World War II, that the term international security was fully recognized and also became the job of the United Nations Organizations to promote such. Traditionally, international security is seen as the point at which military considerations are required to affect national security due to concerns among the international community. Often most directly related to interstate conflict.

From the above explanations, it can be inferred that both national security and collective security help influence international security. Basically, for

international security to stand on its own, national security has to be tended to, for instance, a country who is among an international community to offer to help in certain circumstances has to put the national or home state into consideration. Collective security help in tackling any issues which concern peace and security internationally especially with collective action. An organization or group of persons can produce collective action.

Security after the Cold War

With the end of the Cold War in 1989-91, confrontation between the two superpowers disappeared and beats of partnership started springing up. Bipolarity was replaced with a unipolar order which implied a new security agenda.

Internationally, major wars were now fought in an asymmetrical manner, that is between the only remaining superpower; the United States, supported by its associates, partly on behalf of international society against international law breakers like Iraq and Taliban regimes. For the first time ever major wars like the Gulf and the Afghanistan anti-terror war were fought by forces authorized by what could be called “international society”.²³

Realists deny that international politics have changed fundamentally. They point out that the initial post-cold war euphoria over a potential new age of peace and harmony was shattered by Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and the ensuing Gulf

war, the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia and the many wars on the periphery of the former Soviet Union.

Moreover, realists argue that the absence of war does not mean that peace has broken out. State craft continues to follow Fredrick the Great's instruments". The possibility of war lurks in the background during many diplomatic interactions.²⁴

The amount of violent conflict in Europe since 1989 has exceeded the level of violence that prevailed during the cold war. The wars accompanying the splintering of the former Yugoslavia have killed hundreds of thousands of people and made millions more refugees. There has been considerable violence in the former republics of the Soviet Union (for example Georgia, Moldova, Armenia and Azerbaijan, Tajikistan and Chechnya in the Russian federation) and civil strife in Albania, Greece and Turkey have gone to the bank of war over their competing claims in Aegean.²⁵

Finally, in definition of security, it is pertinent to note that there is an inextricable link between peace and security. Peace and security are therefore two sides of the same coin. One cannot exist without the other. Both peace and security are mutually re-enforcing. The absence of peace means the absence of security. Likewise the existence of peace invariably means the existence of security. Although peace and security have different types, forms and segments, they are both heading to the same direction.

Endnotes

1. B. Khemando, *Buddism and Peace: Dictionary of Word Origins*, (Calcutta: Bloomsburg Lazoprint, 1995), p. 387.
2. Shedrack Gaya, *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa* (Spectrum Books: Ibadan Nigeria), p. 3.
3. Ibid., p. 4.
4. Ibid., p.4
5. Ibid., p.5.
6. Ibid., p.5.
7. E.O.S. Iyamu, L.I. Salami, *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution*, (Nigeria: Otoghagua Ent. The Guide Press, 2011), p. 39, 40.
8. Shedrack Gaya, *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa* (Spectrum Books: Ibadan Nigeria), p. 10.
9. Iyamu, Salami, *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution*, p. 40.
10. Ibid., p. 41.
11. Faculty of Humanities, “The Logic of Democratic Peace Theory in the Post Cold War Era: International Relations”, Binus University.
12. Ibid., p.1.
13. Ibid., p.1.
14. Ibid., p.1.

15. Lawrence Onoda, *Peace Keeping and International Security in a Changing World*, (Plateau State: Mono Expressions Ltd., 1996), p. 20.
16. Ibid., p. 22.
17. Shedrack Gaya, *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa* (Spectrum Books: Ibadan Nigeria), p. 22.
18. Ibid., p. 23.
19. Paul R. Viotti, *International Relations and World Politics*, (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey : Pearson Education Inc, 4th Edition), p. 187.
20. Ibid., p. 70.
21. Craig A. Synder *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, (New York: Routledge 1999), p. 108.
22. Ibid., p. 207.
23. Berttei Hurlin, Kristensen, *International Relations: International Security*, (Copenhagen, Denmark: Danish Institute of International Affairs, Vol. 11).
24. Ibid., p.2.
25. Craig A. Synder, *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, (New York: Routledge 1999), p. 69.

CHAPTER THREE

INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS AND COOPERATIONS IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

introduction

This chapter largely entails the threats that were still on ground after the cold war (1991 -2001) and the attempts that were made to curb these threats. Although the cold war was a major threat to peace and security in the international system, its end did not completely mean the demise of threats that were still lingering around the atmosphere of peace and security. Such threats included the possession of arms and nuclear weapons and an upsurge of regional conflicts.¹

The chapter not only covers the threats to peace and security in the post- cold war era, it also covers attempts that were taken to tackle and reduce such threats or tensions that were still lingering around majorly between the previous contenders of the cold war united states and soviet union whom Russia had become its successor. These threats also incurred the intervention of various international organizations and Non international organizations.

One of the most remarkable threat was the possession of arms and nuclear weapons, even with the demise of the cold war both previous cold war contenders, united states and Russia were still possessing arms and weapons that could lead to

destruction for it was such possession that heightened the imbalance of peace and security in the international system. It was a case whereby the total destruction of one nation by another could take place and the results of such destruction could be far worse than expected. This clearly implied how sophisticated and disastrous those weapons could be.

The attempt to reduce or stop the possession of such arms and weapons was introduced through the implementation of arms control and disarmament programs and treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union. This process was heavily carried out through the introduction of various treaties like the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START), the Treaty of Open Skies and the Disarmament of Ex-Soviet Republics, ABM Treaty, and the Missile Data Sharing Proposal.²

Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START)

The treaty was an arms control negotiation between the United States and the Soviet Union for the control and reduction of weapons of mass destruction which was seen as a threat to humanity during and after the Cold War. The treaty was known as START1 and START2. START1 was signed by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1991 and it was followed by the conclusion of the START2 between the United States and Russia in 1993.³ Before the introduction of the START treaty, several attempts have been made for the initiation of arms control between the United States and the Soviet Union like the introduction of the SALT treaty in the 1970s.

which was also a negotiation between United States and Soviet Union demonstrated by Ronald Reagan of the United States but Moscow abandon talks in 1983.⁴

In 1991, President George H.W. Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev met in Moscow and signed the first START agreement, which required the two countries to reduce their total number of nuclear warheads and bombs by one third. A second START agreement signed by President Bush and Russian president Boris Yeltsin in 1993 called for further reductions in strategic weapons. START 2 therefore translated to an overall fifty percent reduction in nuclear weapons, limiting each country to a total of between 3,000 3,500 strategic weapons. The United States ratified the START 2 agreement in 1996, Russia followed suit in 2000⁵. The treaty also limited the number of inter-continental ballistic missile(ICBMs) and their Launch Facilities (Missile Silos) and warheads; Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs), their launchers and warheads; and heavy bombers and their weapons.⁶

Open Skies and Ex-Soviet Republics Disarm

The Treaty of Open Skies were signed by the United States, newly independent Russia, and twenty-five other countries in march 1992, which allows members to conduct scheduled reconnaissance flights over another's territory. Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine sign the Lisbon Protocol to the START agreement in May, committing the newly independent states to transferring the former Soviet

nuclear arsenals to Russia. The U.S. government provides billions of dollars to fund the denuclearization process through its Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. The weapons handover is completed by the end of 1996.⁷

Anti-Ballistic Missiles (ABM) Treaty Amended

To strengthen the ABM treaty of 1972, U.S. President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin ink a joint statement in March 1997 that delineates between strategic and nonstrategic, or theater, missile defense systems. Russia ratifies the agreement in 2000, but the measure is never sent to the U.S. senate.⁸

Missile Data Sharing Proposal

To implement the arms control agreements, the United States and Russia propose the creation of an early-warning, pre-launch notification system that would reduce the risk of an inadvertent missile launch. The proposal was first floated in 1998 by Boris Yeltsin, who suggested the data-sharing center should be located on Russian territory. Washington and Moscow sign a memorandum of agreement on the center in 2000.⁹

Regional Conflicts

Another threat to international peace and security in the post- cold war era was that of regional conflicts. In contrast to the cold war these conflicts was no longer between states but within states. Such conflicts were highly categorized by

ethnic tensions and strive for nationalism in pursuit of independence. One of the major conflicts that drew the concern of the international system was the Balkan crisis. These crisis erupted from the breakup of the former communist Yugoslav nation which was made of six republics; Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro and Macedonia. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1999 these republics were driven by the need for self -determination in respect to independence.

Some of these republics efforts to gain independence led to severe conflicts that threatened the peace and security in the post - cold war era. Such conflicts were the Bosnia crisis of 1992-1995 and the Kosovo crisis of 1998-1999. These two crisis will be the case study which will solely cover the activities of the former cold war contenders, the United States and Russia. It is based on whether there was an attempt to promote peace or fuel the conflict.

Bosnia- Herzegovina Crisis 1992-1995

The Bosnian republic was an ethnically and religiously diverse republic made up different people. It was Bosnia's Muslims and Bosnia's Croats who opted for independence but their will was undermine by Bosnia's Serbs who wanted the republic under their control. The determination by the Bosnia Serbs to have total control of the Bosnian republic led to the siege of Sarajevo and also resulted struggle to get basic necessities by residents and the death of over 10,000 residents by sniping and shelling by the Serbs.¹⁰ After such act, the Serbs embarked on ethnic cleansing,

over 20,000 Muslim women were raped. In July 1995 Bosnian Serb forces took over the UN protected “safe area” of Srebrenica in eastern Bosnia and massacred up to 8,000 Muslim men and boys.¹¹ This evil acts drew the concern of more regional Cooperation most especially NATO.

United States Involvement in the Bosnia Conflicts

Firstly, united states were reluctant to be involved in the Yugoslav crisis also in an election year, George Bush president of united states was reluctant to become engaged in a protracted conflict overseas, especially one that might lead to heavy American casualties.¹² It was the Clinton administration that had a tougher stance on the war. Before the intervention of the united states the united nations were already trying to curb the conflicts and pushed forward the Vance Owen plan but the united states refuted this plan because it promoted the ethnic cleansing by the Serbs. Clinton administration advocated for the use of air-strikes against the Serbs to halt the siege of Sarajevo.¹³ But this demand met strong opposition from her allies and most especially Russia. The role played by the United States for the promotion of peace in the Bosnia crisis was majorly through the actions of NATO.

NATO the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was an instrument used by the United States during the cold war but after the cold war her policies changed. NATO shifted into promoting peace and security and the Bosnia crisis was one of her first task immediately after the cold war. NATO.s involvement in the Bosnia crisis began

in the second half of 1992 as a supporting body to the United Nations. This was clearly demonstrated in the enforcement of embargo on Bosnia whereby, NATO secured some ships and airplanes for the conduct of maritime and air- surveillance to Operation Sharp Guard.¹⁴ NATO's aircraft operated under very restricted rules of engagement because of the great concerns about the safety of the troops, deployed on the ground.¹⁵ NATO also offer support to the United Nation Peace Keeping Force UNPROFOR to deter attacks in safe areas around the cities of Srebrenica, Sarajevo.

Another step taken by NATO in the involvement in the Bosnia crisis came in February 1994 after the shelling of Sarajevo market place by Bosnia forces which killed 68 people and wounded over 200 others. This act led to an international response and reaction which required the exclusion of heavy weapons around the Bosnian capital as an effort to end its siege. NATO initiated air-strikes for attacks against the heavy weapons positions. To enforce the initiation of air-strikes NATO first gave a ten-day ultimatum to both the Bosnia Serbs and the Bosnian government for the withdrawal of the weapons and compliance with the exclusion zone. If not complied to, heavy weapons found in Sarajevo would be subjected to NATO air-strikes.¹⁶

The Bosnian Serbs didn't allow NATO go free with such strikes, the Bosnian Serbs retaliated by detaining United Nations troops. With this, NATO continued to exercise the use of air-strikes most especially due to the request to United Nations

secretary general. In response more United Nations Peace Keeping Force troops were still detained. This act by the Bosnian Serbs heighten the inability of the United Nations towards the curbing of the Bosnian conflicts.

Due to the fact that attention of the United Nations shifted from the involvement in the Bosnian conflict to the withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Bosnia created a room for NATO to have total control of the conflict instead of waiting for the United Nations before actions were taken.

That as it is , after serious non-compliance with the exclusion zone around Sarajevo, NATO, issued in late May new ultimatum and after the expiration of deadlines launched air attacks.

The targets were ammunition depots and other military sites around the Bosnian Serbs headquarters in Pale, an area close to Sarajevo. In response Bosnian Serbs took UN hostages and used them as human shield, due to this plans had to completely change for the retrieval of air-strikes and negotiation about the fate hostages on the part of UN.¹⁷

It was after the attack on the Markale market place in Sarajevo on 28 august 1995, military action by NATO was taken. NATO launched Operation Deliberate Force on 30 August 1995. NATO and United States dictated the pace of the campaign, no longer UN. Operation Deliberate Force continued till 14 September when a new pose in the attacks occurred and after the Bosnian Serbs fulfilled the

conditions put forward to them, the operation was suspended on 20 September 1995. During the operation 3515 sorties were carried out with 1026 bombs being dropped. The bombing stop three weeks later and on November 21, The Dayton Accords ending the war were initialed. A war which dragged on since the summer of 1991 had ended.¹⁸

Furthermore, NATO continued her involvement through the NATO implementation force IFOR which started its mission in December 1995. The force consisting of about 60,000 military personnel, was to enforce the peace and to facilitate the reconstruction of the country which led to different peace enforcement operation like the Joint Endeavor, Joint Guard and Joint Forge.¹⁹

Russia Intervention in the Bosnia-Herzegovina Conflicts

Russia still recovering from the dissolution of the Soviet Union still wanted to be recognize as a super power and also involve in the resolution of conflicts in former communist Yugoslavia. Russia also played a role in the conflict resolution of the Bosnia crisis. Russia worked hand in hand with the United Nations involvement in the Bosnia crisis most especially with the UNPROFOR. Russia like other allies were against the imposition of air-strikes by NATO and took her own actions whereby before the expiration of the ultimatum given by NATO, Russia moved her UNPROFOR troops from Croatia to Sarajevo which made the Bosnian Serbs agree to the placement of the weapons under UN control. NATO had to restrain from the

use of force as a result of the Russian intervention. It was after the intervention of Russia that the shelling of Sarajevo ceased but the shelling of Gorazde by the Bosnia Serbs angered Russia by April 15 which made her to be in total support of the air-strikes.²⁰

Gradually, Russia's policy shifted to that of opposition towards NATO especially when NATO started gaining total control over the conflict resolution in the Bosnia crisis. Russia felt the United Nations should take total control of the air-strikes instead of NATO. Russia also felt with this, NATO was increasing her expansionist policy to other countries. However, it cannot be denied that Russia still played a role in the conflict resolution in the Bosnia crisis.

Kosovo Conflicts 1998-1999

The next area of regional conflict was the Kosovo conflict of the former Yugoslavia nation. The conflict in Kosovo was between ethnic Albanians and ethnic Serbs. The majority of the region were Albanians by ethnic origin and Muslim by religion. The Serbs desired a Serbia region but the Albanian Muslim majority wanted independence. The Albanians started off with peaceful protests but due to the continuous attacks on Albanian Muslims resorted to violent reprisals led by the rebel Kosovo liberation Army KLA²¹. The continuous attacks from Serbian police and the violent resistance by the Albanians drew the concern of the international community most especially due to the Kosovar Albanians refugees that the conflict produced.

On the aspect of international intervention, the conflict was first regarded as an internal Serbian problem. However in December 1992, the United States informed Serbia that it would not tolerate a violent solution to the situation in Kosovo.²²

The Serbia's reaction became more intense toward Kosovar Albanian independence. On 28 may 1998, the North Atlantic Council set out NATO's two major objectives with respect to the crisis in Kosovo.

NATO's Intervention in the Kosovo Conflicts

NATO establish a special military task force to assist with the emergency of members of the Kosovo Verification Mission. On October 13 1998 the situation worsen. NAC authorized Activation Orders for air-strikes. Which was to make Belgrade withdraw its forces from Kosovo also bringing an end to the violence and taking the refugees home. The air-strikes were called off due to the compliance of president Milosevic after the visit to Belgrade by NATO's secretary general Javier Solana, US envoys Richard Holbrooke and Christopher Hill.²³ After the battles escalated again, NATO issued a strong ultimatum with a threat to the use of air-strikes to both sides in the conflict .This act led to a decision of meeting in Rambouillet and Paris by the two parties leadership but an agreement was not reached. The talks ended in a stalemate and the Serbian attacks in Kosovo escalated again. Although a final round of negotiation was held, Milosevic refused and the commencement was given for air-strikes. NATO on 23 march 1999 enforced its

Operation Allied Force and acted forcefully through the use of air-strikes while the Serbian forces started driving the Albanians out of Kosovo.²⁴

After hard negotiations in the first week of June a diplomatic settlement of the conflict over Kosovo and thus end to NATO's air-campaign was achieved it was the acceptance by the Serbian government of the Chernomyrdin- Ahtsaari Agreement. It represented a formal consent on behalf of Belgrade to all demands put forward by NATO and the international community. The NATO was obliged to end its air power campaign.²⁵

NATO played a remarkable role in the resolution of this conflict most especially through force she engage on a 78-days campaign of air-strikes and also led her own International Security Force KFOR with its mandate of 1999 ²⁶. The force was to provide security, with the task of military operational command and control also the political field of action.

Russia intervention in the Kosovo conflict

Russia's intervention in Kosovo must not be left out. Russia intervene under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council. Russia was against the air power campaign by NATO. Russia didn't like the fact that NATO was acting on her own accord especially when NATO alliance was giving itself a new role in operations while also exercising influence in the regions. Because of this, NATO

involvement in Kosovo without the UN Security council approval was UN imaginable for Russia diplomacy.²⁷

With this, the National Security advisor Brzezinski suggested a secret deal with Milosevic which was hatched in late May and early June, at the supposed height of Russian-NATO cooperation. On June 10 and 11, as NATO planned its entrance into Kosovo, two hundred Russian soldiers dashed from their base in Bosnia, through Serbia and into Kosovo where they took over the Pristina airport. This act that was done by Russia shocked NATO commanders who wanted to respond with a vigorous military riposte but lieutenant General Michael Jackson refuse commander Wesley Clark order for such retaliation, saying “I won’t start World War III for you”. In the end of all this Russia secret motive failed when Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania refused to allow Russia to use their airspace to fly in reinforcements. With this, Russia had to ultimately accept NATO’s refusal to give them their own distinct peace keeping sector in post-war Kosovo. ²⁸

From this it can be ascertain that Russia’s role in the resolution of the Kosovo conflict wasn’t taken solely it was under the actions of NATO which Russia wasn’t happy about.

Effects of the regional conflicts

The effects of the Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Kosovo conflict had drastic effects on both regions. Such effects were the loss of lives and properties, refugee crisis, economic crisis and humanitarian crisis.

On the part of Bosnia, it is estimated that more than 100,000 were killed and two million people, more than half of the population were forced to flee their homes. Thousands of Bosnia women were systematically raped. The worst atrocity of the war occurred in 1995 when Srebrenica came under attack, more than 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys were executed by Serb forces in an act of genocide. The rest of the town's women were driven out.

In regard to Kosovo conflict, it was more of a refugee issue, the ethnic Albanians fled the region due to the crisis. The refugee problem was one of the major Issue that drew the concern of the international community.

To sum up everything that has been stated so far, the conflicts in the post-cold war era was drawn up from different arena, from the issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and regional conflicts, such conflicts were the Bosnia-Herzegovina crisis 1992-1995 an the Kosovo conflict 1998-1999. These two issues were majorly conflicts that affected the post-cold war era internationally and attempts and solutions were put forward to solve such conflicts which posed as

threats to the international system. Such attempts to solve these conflicts were mostly played out by the previous contenders of the cold war, the United States and the Soviet surviving state of Russia.

Endnotes

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Annual Report of Japan’s Diplomatic Activities, (Japan: Diplomatic Bluebook, 1990), p. 1.
2. Council on Foreign Relations, U.S. Russia Nuclear Arms Control, (US: CFR 1946-2021) http://www.cfr.org/timeline/US.rusia_nuclear_arms_control accessed December 30, 2022).
3. Papers Relating to Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties, 1991 and 1993, United States, Archives, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520.
4. Ibid., p. 1.
5. Ibid., p. 1.
6. Minute Man Missile National Historic Site”, Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 1991”, National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/article/stat-treat-1991.htm>.
7. Council on Foreign Relations, U.S – Russia Nuclear Arms Control, (US: CFR 1949 – 2021), http://www.cfr.org/timeline/US.rusia_nuclear_arms_control (accessed December, 30, 2022).
8. Ibid., p.20.
9. Ibid., p.20.
10. Agence France-Presse, “The 1990s Balkan Wars in Key Dates”, VOA News, November 22, 2017.

http://voanews.com/amp/timeline_of_balkan_wars/4129662html (accessed January, 17, 2023).

11. Ibid.
12. Pavel Baev et al, *The Implications of the Yugoslav Crisis for Western Europe's Foreign Relations*, (Western European Union: Challot Papers, 1994), p. 15.
13. Ibid., p. 18.
14. Nadia Boyaddieva, "NATO on the Balkans: Patterns of Peace-Keeping in the Post-Cold War Era". (The Cases of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo), (Bulgaria: SOFIA, 2003), p. 17.
15. Ibid., p. 18.
16. Ibid., p. 19.
17. Ibid., p. 21.
18. John Robinson. Wilson "Reaching to Atrocities: United States Foreign Policy and Humanitarian Intervention in the 1990s", (BSC. Oregon University, 2005), p. 80.
19. R. Cody Phillips "Bosnian Herzegovina: The U.S. Army's Role in Peace Enforcement Operations 1995 – 2004", (US, Army Center of Military History CMH Pub 70 – 97 – 1), p. 3.
20. Boyaddieva, NATO on the Balkans: Patterns of Peace-Keeping in the Post-Cold War Era; The Cases of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo", p. 20.

21. Ibid., p. 35.
22. Ibid., p. 35.
23. Ibid., p. 37.
24. Ibid., p. 37.
25. Ibid., p. 40.
26. Ibid., p. 41. Muhamed Jashari, “The Position of Russian Diplomacy towards the Kosovo Issue (1998 – 1999)”, International Journal of Historical Researches, Vol. 7, 2022, p. 1620.
27. Jim Mokhiber, Why Did Milosevic Give Up?, (America: Pbs Foundation, 1995- 2014), <https://www.Pbs.org/wgbh/Pagges/Frontire/Shows/Kosovo/Highting/giveup.html> (accessed January 17, 2023).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE AFTERMATH OF THE COLD WAR ON UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

Introduction

This chapter solely covers the aftermath of the cold war of the two major superpowers, Soviet Union and the United States of America whom were the major powers involved in the cold war. After the cold war, policies of both powers changed. The situation of the aftermath of the cold war created a new pattern for the Soviet Union and United States. Both powers implemented new policies and had to undergo various changes that would change their system and welcome new forms of policies and organizations. During the cold war, the United States and the Soviet Union routinely aided leaders and governments they though favored them in the East West conflict, underwriting budgets and providing assistance that leaders could use to buy off or repress political opponents or to pursue policies that enriched their particular ethnic or tribal group at the expense of others. With the end of the cold war, however, the United States and Russia largely lost interest in most poor countries and the flow of foreign aid dried up.¹

During the cold war, many possible United Nations activities were frustrated by the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. The end of the cold war witness a revival of UN peace keeping activity. Cooperation between the United

States and Russia allowed a UN authorized United States – led coalition of reverse Iraq’s annexation of Kuwait in 1991.²

Rapid, unanticipated changes in world politics often create uncertainty about the global future. To optimists, the tides of change that swept across the world following the collapse of communism signified” the end of mankind’s ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of government”. To pessimism, these sea changes suggested not history’s end, but its resumption. Both groups configuration of power that presented new and difficult changes and challenges.³

Changes in the United States of America

America after the cold war entered a new phase of unipolar order. Unipolar as a term, refers to the concentration of power in a single preponderant state. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States stood alone at the summit of the international hierarchy.

America was the only country with the military, economic and cultural assets to be a decisive player in any part of the world it chose. Her military was not just stronger than anybody’s, it was stronger than everybody’s, with defense expenditures eventually exceeding all countries combined.⁴

Complementing America's military might was its economic strength with less than 5 percent of global population, the United States accounted for almost a third of the global gross domestic product and tow-fifth of the entire world's spending on research and development. Furthermore, America wielded enormous soft power (the ability of a country to get what it wants in international affairs through attractiveness of its culture, political ideals, and policies) as a source of popular culture and the hub of global communications, through which its values spread all over the world. In the words of former French foreign minister Hubert Vedine, the United Stated was not simply a superpower, it was a hyper power.⁵

United States began the new millennium with hopes of peace and prosperity. From Washington's perspective, a safe, prosperous world was emerging under its leadership. When Al Qaeda operatives crashed hijacked airliners into the world trade counter and pentagon, they shattered widespread optimism about the prospects for the twenty-first century. Progress no longer seemed inevitable, a matter of steady, predictable advances towards a bright promising future.⁶

The confluence of enormous military, economic and cultural power on American soil after the cold war gave the United States the ability to launch its so called "global war on terror".

American state started acting in a unilateral manner; rather than working with others, United States took independent actions.⁷

The absence of serious threats to American security gives the United States wide latitude in making foreign policy choices.⁸ A dominant power acts internationally only when the spirit moves it. For instance, the Gulf war wasn't a threat to American security but Kuwait, she since America had foreign economic interest in Kuwait, America was forced to intervene.

After the end of the cold war, America became the dominating superpower of the international system in the field of geo-strategy, economic, political and ideological discourse on a global magnitude.

On ideological aspect, America's ideology has been based on liberalism that even after the cold war, she continued the widespread of this ideology. The dominance of liberalism in the US was due to her success of her economic growth and international isolation. Due to the steady economic growth, American awareness of the role of power in domestic politics was dulled by the absence of class conflict. Due to its international isolation, American awareness of the role of power in foreign politics was dulled by the absence of external threats.⁹

American liberalism apply domestic policies in her involvement in international relations also on foreign and defense policy issues. Liberalism urge the adoptions of a whole series of domestic reforms, like the adoption of international free trade, industrialization of underdeveloped areas and the outlawing of war".¹⁰

The United States still spearheaded military intervention after the cold war in an effort to reduce the chance of serious conflict for instance, the Bush Administration had to build an international coalition through the UN to impose a blockade and eventually dislodge Iraqi forces from Kuwait.¹¹

In the field of Geo-strategy, America still stand a ground Geo-strategy is based on physical control points, with the party controlling these points having a strategic advantage. The dominance of the aircraft carrier – with its weapons and battle group for aerial, naval and submarine warfare – terms the aircraft carrier into an artificial geostrategic space. In other words, if the basic assumption of classic geo-strategy is that achieving military and political advantage necessitates control of vital geographical areas, then the battle necessitates control of vital geographical areas, then the battle group may be moved almost anywhere in the world.¹²

The United States maintains a global outlook requiring its involvement throughout the world. Her aircraft is able to project power without being physically present in a country's territory. One illustration is the operation of aircraft carriers as the beginning of operation. Ending freedom in October 2001. The goal of the operation was to topple the Taliban regime. This geo-strategy demonstrated America's military might after the cold war.¹³

Politically, American expanded democracy assistance budgets and encompassed a diverse portfolio of American foreign aid, from electoral support to

institutional building and good governance. Her democracy programs, gained political and diplomatic measures to induce and strengthen the democratic norm.

This was the case for the George H. W. Bush administration which acted promptly to assist democratization in Poland and Hungary, and supported transitions after the end of Soviet Union in 1991, including Russia.

Democracy promotion gained even more strength with the changes in U.S. foreign policy after 9/11 terrorist attacks, September 2001. America's mission to fight communism during the cold war reedited in terms of the global war on terror after the 9/11 crisis.¹⁴ it was pointed out that the Bush administration made strong rhetorical commitments to democracy promotion as a security response to 9/11, that eventually translated in practice into the Freedom Agenda. Freedom and democracy are eternally right and their global expansion a guarantee of US security.¹⁵

Changes in the Soviet Union during the Post-Cold War era.

The conditions of Soviet Union after the Cold War was quite disturbing. The Soviet Union was succeeded by a loose federation similar to the European community and known as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), led by the most powerful of the sovereign republic called Russia. Most importantly was the economic situation which grew more catastrophic, and ethnic tensions also persisted. The contemporary president Yeltsin of Russia stood forth as the most decisive leader of an extremely difficult transition era.¹⁶

Apparently, the sudden collapse of a vast multinational empire and superpower was virtually unprecedented in world history.

The Warsaw Treaty Organization dissolved and most soviet troops withdrew from Eastern Europe, spared by generous financial aid from Germany. With the end of the formidable soviet bloc in Eastern Europe, warmer relations were established between a pending Soviet Union and Western European countries.

The removal of soviet and influence from Eastern Europe marked a startling reshuffling of power. Cuba's Fidel Castro, still defiantly communist but isolated and vulnerable, saw soviet aid to his battered economy disappear. North Korea's aging hardline dictator, Kim li sung shock by Gorbachev's overtones to prosperous South Korea, moved toward accommodation with South Communist Vietnam, deprived of Soviet aid, turned increasingly towards the United States.¹⁸

The Common Wealth of Independent State

The formation of CIS was staged on December 8, 1991, by the president of the republics of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus in Minsk. When they declared that Soviet Union no longer existed and announced formation of a common wealth of independent states. These states urged establishment of coordinating bodies for foreign affairs, defense and their economy.¹⁹

On the aspect of currency, ruble was to be formed as the common currency and the common wealth was to remain open to all former soviet republics and outside countries sharing the aims and principles of this agreement.

They pledged to fulfill soviet international obligations and to ensure unified control over Soviet nuclear weapons.

They also agreed to carryout coordinated radical economic reforms and create market economies. Consequently, all former soviet republics had joined except George then torn by a violent struggle between her leader and an opposition group.²⁰

The soviet seat at the United Nations was assumed by Russia, and foreign governments recognized the former soviet republics as independent countries.²¹

The republic leaders agreed to establish governing councils of president and prime ministers of their respective state as the chief coordinating bodies of the common wealth.

Russia loomed so much larger territorially, politically and economically than other republics that it naturally assumed a role of leadership.

After the Cold War, the state of the Soviet Union economy wasn't palatable, Soviet Union was swimming in financial crisis which drew the attention of (G7) group of seven advanced industrial nations which include United States, Germany,

Japan, Canada, France, Great Britain and Italy announced a twenty-four US billion dollar to stabilize the ruble currency. Also from the international monetary fund (MF) to Russia and other common wealth members.

Socially, there was massive military unemployment; the once largest armed force in the world survived in a dead empire which was bankrupt, humiliated and demoralized after the cold war. The preservation of the army was not intact.²²

The Commonwealth Independent States (CIS) also had issues, they failed to draw up a political charter for the commonwealth or a cohesive plan for economic reform, or to establish unified armed forces.

Unemployment rate increased, increasing numbers of industrial workers were laid off, military plants closed, and exports, imports and industrial output plummeted, leaving most Russians near or below the poverty level.²³

Controversy between Russia and Ukraine, the two most populous republics had controversy over control of the Black sea fleet and possession of the crimes. This controversy threatened to fragment the infant commonwealth.²⁴

After the USSR dissolved, rising national feelings and ethnic tensions threatened to tear apart the Russia federation, which contained at least 39 different nationalities. However, president Yeltsin of Russia scored a major success on March 31, when 18 of 20 main subdivisions of the federation signed a federal treaty creating

a new post-soviet Russian state. The treaty accorded local units considerable political and economic autonomy. The treaty outlined a way of preserving the federation.²⁵

The geopolitical situation of Russia was also transformed by the collapse of the USSR. For the first time in centuries Russia lacked borders with Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan and was without direct contact with the Middle East. Russian foreign policy became strongly pro-western.²⁶

Not everyone accepted the new transformation after the end of the cold war especially on Russia political sphere. There was struggle between president Yeltsin's who was the leader of the newly reformed Russia and the conservative congress of the Russia government who wanted the old ways of the Soviet Union politics.

Commonwealth of Independent States still faced grave problems like border disputes, ethnic disputes, quarrel over the fate of soviet property and the future of the commonwealth economy and the armed forces.

Nonetheless, the 15 ex-soviet republics shared many common interests and were bound by numerous economic links.

The Situation of Post -Communist States in East Central Europe

The collapse of the Soviet Union has a profound effects on the former communist states or the post -communist states. One of the major effects was the

communist ideology. The collapse of Soviet Union and stop the spread of the communist ideology. The idea of communism which had been the brain child of these post communists developments before the end of cold war had cease to exist. These post-communist states had to enter a transformation era after the cold war. New policies has to be formulated.

But this transformation is not going to be easy, especially when communism had governed these states right from their formation. Hence, communism legacies can't be easily eradicated.²⁸

In regard to the legacies of the old system, as Boltuc explains it, even though the formal rules of the game or institutions for example constitutions have changed in these countries, many informal rules or institutions such as norms or behaviors or state- society relations are more difficult to alter and remain as a source of continuity in a state of Russia.

This is clearly seen in the post-communist state of Russia. psychologically, it is difficult for post-communist leaders to follow the west lead especially Russia when not so long ago the Soviet Union was considered to be a superpower that had power and influence on a par with the United States.³⁰

Furthermore, there is still some suspicions on the part of Russia concerning the west motives, especially with the West trying to expand security arrangements (such as NATO) east wards. This is the year of Pax Americana emerging out of the

end of the cold war. Thus Russia has resisted the expansion of NATO and instead emphasized security arrangements that would take into account Russia's position as a great power and somewhat lessen the role of the US.³¹

The post-communist states were socially affected by ethnic division. Without the communist ideology and authoritarian state controls to glue various groups together on a non-ethnic basis, the issue of ethnicity and identity has become one of the most important and potentially destabilizing elements of the post-cold war period.

The post-communist states were economically affected too. The planned economic system that was dominant in east-central Europe and in the former Soviet Union was self-sufficient in nature, meaning that the states in this region participated minimally in international economic interactions. The economies of these post-communist states were tied to one another in such a way that the disintegration of this bloc was especially harsh on the economies of their states, with consequences that vary across the region.

Consequently, the states became eager to join western economic institutions for example, the World Trade Organization (WTO) had expanded their trade and ties with the west, countries in east central Europe have tended to be less interested in reestablishing trade with one another than with western Europe.³²

Another challenge that was encountered by the post-communist states was the development of a National Identity. Emerging from an environment in which

ideology was at the heart of their national identity, these newly independent states of Soviet Union had to redefine themselves. These include territorial integrity, defining one's national identity, defining one's role and place within the larger international arena and defining and allocating priorities to national interests. The collapse of the Soviet Union has made this issue a salient one by creating countries that have never before existed as sovereign entities. This is the case for Russia federation where centrifugal tendencies still threaten its present territorial existence, for example, Moscow continues to be plagued by the Chechnya conflict which brings into question Russia's territorial integrity.³³

After the cold war, Russia's military and security concern were immense and also concerns in the post-soviet era were multidimensional. One central occurs has been to reconfigure the former Soviet Union's military assets, including nuclear weapons, bases and radar facilities. With western support, Russia has worked to become the region's sole nuclear state.³⁴

Russia and the West

Russian policies towards the United states and Western Europe manifest marked changed that in many respects parallel the alternations towards the near abroad. Boris Yeltsin and Andrei Kozyrev president and minister of foreign affairs of Russia initially pursued a liberal pro-western policy, the cornerstone of which was US-Russians relations. These links were based on finishing the negotiations begun

during the Gorbachev period concerning strategic nuclear weapons and on hopes for significant sums of economic assistance.

By mid-to-late 1993 Russia's focus had shifted to Europe and concerns for the new European security architecture.

The reason for Russian shift in policies was as a result of obstacles that obstructed US-Russian relationship. These include Russian disillusionment with the scant amount of aid for the coming from West, Russian arms experts that were seen in the West as destabilizing, Russia's increasingly close relationship with Iraq, the Bosnia issue and lastly, the issue of NATO expansion.³⁵

Nationalism was an attitude of Russia that affected the relationship between Russia and the United States. Nationalism in Russia was driven by both international and domestic forces.

On the international aspect, Russian nationalist sentiments are by uncooperative behavior of many western democracies with aspects to Moscow. After the collapse of Soviet Union, Russian liberals expected that the relationship with the United States would result in the blossoming of trade and massive financial aid. Most especially due to the disturbing issue of Russia economy.³⁶

As a result, the low level of economic aid and the perceived usurpation of international power by the United States put many Moscow officials on the defensive.

In the minds of such officials U.S. was unwillingly to help Russia, and also limiting Russia's power as much as possible. Hence there was a highly placed imperative to formulate Russia's national interest and pursue by all necessary means.

Domestically, with the intensifying socioeconomic crisis much of the Russian public espoused an increasingly negative view of the process of democratization the transition to some form of a market oriented economy. Russians began to argue that the governments' policy of economic liberalization had a more ruinous effect on the country's economy than the four years of war against Nazi Germany half a century ago.³⁷

According to the official and rather conservative estimate, the total decline in Russia's GDP from 1991 to 1994 amounted to a cumulative 38 percent. One of the leading Russian daily newspapers, *Izvestiya*, emphasized the sovereignty of problems facing Yeltsin's administration by citing the rapid economic decline.

Russia's population grew dissatisfied with the process and consequences of political reforms and also complete rejection of president Yeltsin's reform policy.³⁸

Russia's nationalism was fueled by legitimate concerns such as decline of Russia diplomatic influence, military strength and most importantly economic power. Many Russians (conservative and nationalist political actors) still see NATO through a historic lens of suspicion and consider the alliance's activities as directed against their country.

In addition to the situation of Russia after the cold war, several ethnic divisions and rivalries long suppressed by the Soviet Union reemerged, both in former soviet republics and Russian federation. These conflicts for example the Chechnya conflict had displaced lives.

Russia's massive military industrial complex lays idle, her currency was no longer highly regarded, same goes to her social welfare which offered at least some protection against personal poverty for the vast majority of its citizens, was on the brink of collapse.³⁹

To sum up everything that has been stated so far, the aftermath of the cold war on the two super powers, United States and the surviving soviet state of Russia yielded different results in various aspects. In respect to United States, she emerged as the world superpower whereby Russia was displaced from such position. Russia began to face several problems which demanded for reforms. The collapse of Soviet Union in 1991 led to the problem of ethnic rivalry and nationalism which posed as threats to Russia. The aftermath on Soviet Union, led to the creation of the common wealth independent states. In respect to United States, she emerged as a World Security power trying to tackle the issue of peace and security most especially with the instrument of NATO. The aftermath of the cold war on both powers welcome the need for cooperation between United States and Russia. United States liberal policies were almost established fully in Russia by the president of Russia Boris Yeltsin.

Endnotes

1. Charles W. Kegley, Jr. Greg A. Raymond, *The Global future: A brief Introduction to World Politics*, 3rd Edition (US: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010, 2006), p. 141.
2. Ibid., p. 169.
3. Ibid., p. 99.
4. Ibid., p. 99.
5. Ibid., p. 99.
6. Ibid., p. 99.
7. Ibid., p. 100.
8. Kenneth N. Waltz, “Structural Realism after the Cold War” *Journal of International Security*, Vol, 25, No. 1 2000, p. 29.
9. Mashhudu G. Ramuhala, “Military Intervention in Africa after the Cold War”, (Stellenboscg University 2010), p. 34.
10. Lee Peterson, *The Cold War and the Change in the Nature of Military Power*, (United States: Proquest LLC 2014), p. 15.
11. Ibid., p. 58.
12. Tal Tovy, *The Changing Nature of Geostrategy 1900-2000: The Evolution of a New Paradigm*, (Alabama: Air University Pres, December, 2015), p. 58.
13. Ibid., p. 58.

14. Centre for American progress Organization, The Lessons Learned for U.S. National Security Policy in the 20 years since 9/11, (U.S 2021), <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/lessons-learned-u-s-national-security-policy-20-years-since-911>
15. Ibid.,p.1
16. David Mackenzie, Michael W. Curran, *A History of Russia; The Soviet Union and beyond*, 4th Edition (California, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, 1991), p. 847.
17. Ibid., p. 855.
18. Ibid., p. 856.
19. Ibid., p. 856.
20. Ibid., p. 856.
21. Ibid., p. 856.
22. Ibid., p. 857.
23. Ibid., p. 857.
24. Ibid., p. 858.
25. Ibid., p. 858.
26. Ibid., p. 859.
27. Ibid., p. 859.

28. Allison Graham, G. Yavlinsky, *Window of Opportunity; The Grand Bargain for Democracy in the Soviet Union*, 1st Edition (Pantheon, October 8, 1991), p. 4.
29. Ibid., p. 4.
30. Ibid., p. 5.
31. Ibid., p. 5.
32. Ibid., p. 6.
33. Ibid., p. 7.
34. Ronald J. Hill, *Post-Communist States in the World Community*, ed. William E. Forry and Roger E. Kanet (Britain: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998), p. 28.
35. Ibid., p. 32.
36. Ibid., p. 46.
37. Ibid., p. 46.
38. Ibid., p.38.
39. Ibid., p. 39.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study clearly examines international peace and security the post- cold war era from 1991 – 2001. It briefly explains the cold war tension of 1945 to 1991 between United States and Russia Soviet Union. The study tries to examine the continuous rise of conflict in the post- cold war era which in contrast with the cold war era. More so, it explains how the tension the cold war was characterized by the proliferation of arms control and different ideologies and how efforts to erase such characteristics were introduced in the post -cold war era. It examines the shift from a bipolar world to a unipolar world with the United States as the driving power of the world. As Francis Fukuyama had proclaimed that the world's age old confrontations were finally at end. The system of liberal capitalism was now universally valued and the bases for the conflict were gone. It also explains how different organizations had sponged up to tackle the conflicts that were threats to international peace and security in the post- cold war era.

Furthermore, it clearly tries to explain the nature of peace and security in the post -cold war. The study also defines peace and security to an extent with different views on peace. According to John Galtung, he posits that peace is not just the absence of war and that war is only one form of violence that other forms of violence could include social conditions which further includes poverty, exclusion,

psychological pressure. Culture of peace is also on expression to define peace. Security was also explained and divided into collective and national security in this work. Lastly peace and security in the post- cold war era was clearly explained.

In addition, the study further emphasizes on the treaties that were placed in order to reduce arms control and also the conflicts that drew international concern. Such as the Bosnia – Herzegovina conflicts and the Kosovo conflicts alongside the effects it had on the regions. And attempts made to tackle such conflicts by the UN and NATO.

After examining some of the conflicts that threatened international peace and security in the post -cold war, the aftermath of the cold war on the cold war contenders, United States and Russia was clearly emphasized. The study also emphasizes on how the balance of power shifted from bipolar powers to unipolar power. In regards to United States, it clearly evaluates the changes that took place in United States and Russia immediately after the cold war, how Russia was almost adopting a liberal policy by her president Bosnia Yeltsin but later drifted apart due to suspicious on NATO's expansion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

(a) Archival Materials

Papers Relating to Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties, 1991 and 1993, United States, Archives, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520.

Secondary sources

(a) Books

Allan, T. *The Cold War: Superpower Tensions and Rivalries*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baev, P. et al, *The Implications of the Yugoslav Crisis for Western Europe's Foreign Relations*, Western European Union: Challot Papers, 1994.

Bertei, H. K. *International Relations: International Security*, Denmark: Danish Institute of International Affairs.

Boorstin, K. *A History of the United States*, New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall 1999.

Charles, W., Raymond, A. *The Global future: A brief Introduction to World Politics*, 3rd Edition, US: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010, 2006.

Craig, S. *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, New York: Routledge 1999.

Fraser, S. "Human Security Report", Simon Fraser University: Canada, 2013.

Gaya, S. *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa Ibadan Nigeria*, Nigeria; Spectrum Books,Ibadan.

Graham, Y. *Window of Opportunity; The Grand Bargain for Democracy in the Soviet Union*, 1st Edition Pantheon, 1991.

Grasa, R. Mateos, O. *Conflict Peace and Security in Africa*, Barcelona: Institute Catal a International Per la pau, 2010.

Hill, R. "Post-Communist States in the World Community", edited by William E. Forry and Roger E. Kanet ,Britain: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998.

Hopmann, P. *Building Security in the Post -Cold War Eurasia in Peace Works*, United States Institute of Peace: Washington, September, 1999.

Iyamu, L., Salami, L. *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution*, Nigeria: Otoghagua Ent. The Guide Press, 2011.

Khemando, B. "Buddism and Peace: Dictionary of Word Origins", Calcutta. Bloomsburg Lazoprint, 1995.

Lowe, N. *Modern World History*, Palgrave Master Series, 3rd Edition.

Mackenzie, D., Curran M. *A History of Russia; The Soviet Union and beyond*, 4 Edition California, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, 1991.

Onoda, L. *Peace Keeping and International Security in a Changing World*, Plateau State: Mono Expressions Ltd., 1996.

Peterson, L. *The Cold War and the Change in the Nature of Military Power*, United States: Proquest LLC 2014.

Tovy, T. *The Changing Nature of Geo-strategy 1900-2000: The Evolution of a New Paradigm*, Alabama: Air University Press, December, 2015.

Unger, I. *The United States: The Questions of our Past*, 6th Edition, New Jersey USA Prentice Hall, 1978.

Viotti, P. *International Relations and World Politics*, 4th Edition Upper Saddle River, New Jersey : Pearson Education Inc.

Westad, O. *The Cold War*, New York: Basic Books, 1st edition , 2017.

(b) Articles in Learned Journals

Chuka, E. "Post-Cold War Conflicts" *Global Journal of Human Social Science Interdisciplinary*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 2012.

Jashari, M. “The Position of Russian Diplomacy towards the Kosovo Issue (1998 – 1999)”, International Journal of Historical Researches, Vol. 7, 2022.

Jashari, M. The Position of Russian Diplomacy towards the Kosovo Issue (1998 – 1999), International Journal of Historical Researches, Vol. 7, 2022, p. 1620.

Waltz, K. “Structural Realism after the Cold War” in the journal International Security, Vol, 25, No.1 2000.

Wriligator, M. “Global Security After the Cold War” Journal of Conflict Management and Peace Studies, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1994

Yilmaz, M. “The New World Order”, Alternatives Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol. 7, No. 4, Winter, 2008.

(c) Internet

Agence France-Presse, “The 1990s Balkan Wars in Key Dates”, VOA News, November 22, 2017.

http://voanews.com/amp/timeline_of_balkan_wars/4129662html (accessed January, 17, 2023).

Cold War Historiography Alpha History Com <https://alphahistory.com/coldwar/cold-war-historiography/> accessed on December 15 2021.

Council on Foreign Relations, U.S – Russia Nuclear Arms Control, (US: CFR 1949 – 2021), http://www.cfr.org/timeline/US.rusia_nuclear_arms_control (accessed December, 30, 2022).

Minute Man Missile National Historic Site”, Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 1991”, National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/article/stat-treat-1991.htm>

Mokhiber, J. Why Did Milosevic Give Up?, (America: Pbs Foundation, 1995- 2014), <https://www.Pbs.org/wgbh/Pagges/Frontire/Shows/Kosovo/Highting/giveup.html> (accessed January 17, 2023).

Stephen, D. “Civil Wars and Post Cold War International Order”, Available at <http://amacad.org>. accessed on August 3, 2021.

US History available on <http://www.C.F.usu.org,2014constitutionalrightsfoundation>
Accessed December 15, 2021.

US History available on <http://www.C.F.usu.org,2014constitutionalrightsfoundation>
Accessed December 15, 2021

What is Mutually Destruction? <https://www.thoughtco.com>. Accessed on Saturday January 8.

(d) Unpublished Thesis and Dissertations.p

Faculty of Humanities, “The Logic of Democratic Peace Theory in the Post- Cold War Era: International Relations”, Binus University.

Fraser, S. “Human Security Report”, Simon Fraser University: Canada, 2013.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Annual Report of Japan’s Diplomatic Activities, Japan: Diplomatic Bluebook, 1990.

Nadia, B. *NATO on the Balkans: Patterns of Peace-Keeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. The Cases of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo, Bulgaria: SOFIA, 2003.

Peinado, M. “Culture of Peace Foundation”. Spain

Phillips, C. “Bosnian Herzegovina: The U.S. Army’s Role in Peace Enforcement Operations 1995 – 2004, (US, Army Center of Military History CMH Pub 70 – 97 – 1).

Ramuhala, M. “Military Intervention in Africa after the Cold War”, Stellenbosch University 2010

Simon, F. *Human Security Report*, Canada: Simon Fraser University, 2013, p. 3,4.

Tschirgi, N. “Peace Building as the Link between Security and Development”, New York, December, 2003.

Tschirgi, N. “Security and Development Policies” Bonn, September 2005.

William, M. "The Nature of the Post -Cold War World" March 1993.

Wilson, J. "Reaching to Atrocities: United States Foreign Policy and Humanitarian Intervention in the 1990s. (BSC. Oregon University, 2005).