Chapter 4

Conclusion

This chapter will conclude all findings made in the previous chapters and combine them. In this chapter, every finding found from the earlier chapters before this one will be served in a brief yet most explanatory way possible. It will be concluded holding to the Research Questions and data used to write the analysis.

The event of Crimea takes over is pretty brief and quick. It starts at the peak of strain between pro-Russian and pro-European citizen of Ukraine in 2013. Yanukovych decided not to sign a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DDCTFA) with the European Union in the sake of keeping close relationship with Russia, this decision sparked protest that later put Yanukovych down from his position as president. The clashes become more severe and reach it peaks on February 20 where hundreds of people were shot by snipers under Yanukovych order. Yanukovych and several people of importance escaped Ukraine on 22nd of February. Deeming that there’s no point for them to ‘protect’ their relationship with Ukraine any longer, Russian government created a referendum whether if the people of Crimea are in favor to the reunification or
not. The Moscow claims that a 97.6% vote, which was held in March 16, were in favor. The reunification itself is officially done in March 18 2014, condemned by most part of the world.

The first conclusion to be made that Russia did occupy Crimea instead of just annexing it. It is said on Article 42 of the 1907 Hague Regulations that a “territory is considered occupied when it is actually placed under the authority of hostile army,” and Russia had allegedly send in 150,000 soldiers to Crimea in the beginning of the take-over, which allegedly turns it into occupation and added more later in the event. The proof that soldiers had come marching into Crimea from the Russia comes from NATO.

The second conclusion is that NATO did not balance of power Russia, as there is no anarchical system in the East Europe. The disagreement and lack of trust between Russia and NATO shows us that Russia views the current East Europe security structure is incapable and not effective, it fails to resolve problems but instead creates new ones. The lack of response coming from NATO also seems to be the key point to as why Putin sees that Russia needs to be the one who rules in the Eastern Europe. It shows that instead of anarchical system, Russia wants a hierarchal system where they stand above Eastern Europe states. In this case, balance of power fails to be used to explain the situation, sure Russia takes Crimea as their own for their fear of NATO extending their power, but it also shows that they see NATO as below them, as incapable to ‘protect’ East Europe as they promise.
While Russia outright takes Crimea over in a mean to show their domination and hegemonic power, NATO, as a collective security organization, had taken a rather softer approach. Marsheimer once argued that the more powerful a state is compared to their competitor, which in this case is NATO to Russia, the less likely they would be attacked. His argument is proved right as US Secretary of State John Kerry had said that NATO’s preference over this matter was for them to take the diplomatic route and to not attack in anyway. The fact that Russia’s troop had not withdrawn from Ukrainian border also further proof that this takeover is out of force, not the will of Crimean.

The last conclusion is that NATO fails to balance of power not only because there is no anarchical system, the way they responded to Russia occupation shows that they actually understand that Russia is the hegemon and therefore they would not do much against them. Even with all the concern showed by NATO, it seems as if they are not taking any actual movement in fighting for their belief other than simply helping Ukraine to shape up their military. The North Atlantic Council (NAC) however straighten up by saying that none of NATO’s members is attacked by Russia and that they will seek a peaceful resolution and urged the Russian Federation to de-escalate the situation instead, in which Putin is set in escalating dominance. NATO also claims that they will delay a series of cooperation with Russia, which seems rather unnecessary as they miss their strategic purpose. The lack of reaction from NATO pushes Russia to continue on building up their power and even threatens to move into Eastern Europe.
Their fear of losing Crimea to NATO makes them to decide thing on their own, further strengthening Marsheimer argument of state refusing to have collective security and prefer to pursue the steps that leads them into becoming the region hegemon. Even if in the future NATO ever had the chance to recruit Ukraine, they would not be able to place their naval power around Crimea, further proving the point that Russia had successfully become the hegemony of East Europe.
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