



## ABSTRACT

While it is obvious that the cold war era was characterized by the interplay of power between two power blocs - the United States and the United Soviet Socialists Republic, the post-cold war era, which has seen the hegemony of the United States, is currently witnessing the gradual rise of Russia, and their relationship in the world today determines the level of global stability. This study examines the Russian/Ukraine crisis and contends that it is merely a symptom of a larger confrontation between two power blocs, the origins of which can only be understood by examining the cold war and post-cold war international security architecture. The study argued that collective security is a significant instrument for

## A N APPRAISAL OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND ITS APPLICATION ON RUSSIAN/UKRAINE CRISIS

**\*ALIYU, TALA SAFIYANU; \*\*MUHAMMAD, MUHAMMAD BATURE; & \*\*\*ABDULLAHI, YUSUF AGWAI**

\*Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. Nasarawa State - Nigeria. \*\*Department of Political Science and Defence Studies, Nigeria Defence Academy, Kaduna – Nigeria. \*\*\*Department of Environmental Science and Management Technology, Federal Polytechnic, Nasawara, Nasarawa State Nigeria.

## Introduction

Modern governments have relied not just on alliances and coalitions to construct and maintain international peace and security, but also on the rules-based system of collective security established by Article 16 of the United Nations Charter (UN) (United Nation, 2016). The article recognizes collective security as a legal right, especially in the case of an attack, countries must cooperate together to stop the invader (United Nation, 2016). Booth (1987) noted that in the absence of meaningful collective security, the international system may be vulnerable to hostile actors. The idea of collective security exemplifies the twentieth-century hope that international institutions might assist to safeguard countries facing armed attack (Arbatov, 2014; Lebow 2018), that an international body pursuing these aims must construct and manage a collective security system that will have a prominent position in conventional international thinking (Lebow, 2018).

Currently, United Nations is now in charge of collective security in the international system (Snyder 1999), and United States (US), United Kingdom (UK), France, Russia, and China are the five permanent members of the UN Security Council who work together to ensure collective security in the international system. However, since the end of the Cold War, national defence has been less of a priority for most countries, as transnational and interstate threats have become more frequent and immediate (Vogt 2009). In the post-Cold War era, the United Nations' strong collective response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 fuelled confidence that collective security would become the international norm, however, this hope was short-lived due to insufficient UN responses to crises in Somalia, Rwanda, and the Balkans, as well as the amateurish nature of multinational UN peacekeeping missions (Snyder 1999).

The current Russian/Ukraine crisis is championed by Russian President Vladimir Putin, who through Russian troops, artillery, armoured vehicles, tanks, and other equipment invaded or attacked Ukraine to challenge the present Ukrainian administration decision of inviting NATO forces to



resolving not only the Russia/Ukraine crisis, it is an ideal mechanism to bring the two power blocs to roundtable discussion in order to achieve global security, thus the paper recommended a regular discussion to make efforts in preventing incidents that could escalate into war.

**Keywords:** Collective Security; Global Peace; Interstate War; Cold War; Proxy War

undertake joint drills and engage in other military cooperation to strengthen Ukraine's defence capacities (Hill, 2022). Despite several attempts at diplomacy to resolve the war between Ukraine and Russia, its political, social, and economic consequences lingered throughout a number of European nations and other parts of the world. (Tampubolon, 2022). The aim of this paper is to discuss the prominence of collective security in the contemporary world security architecture. This will be done by establishing its applications and better approach to resolve Russian and Ukraine invasion.

### **Concept of Collective Security**

Abdullahi (2014) noted that the phrase "collective security" refers to a security system in which nations work together to guarantee security for all by taking collective action against any state within the group that would use force to threaten the current order. According to Claude Jr. (2006), collective security if used loosely, appears to be a synonym of peace or world order while it has also been used to refer to any and all multilateral efforts to deal with the problem of international peace and security, rather than a specifically to the system that gained prominence after the First World War. Roberts and Kingsbury (1993), define collective security as "an arrangement where each state in the system accepts that security of one of them is a concern of all, and agrees to join in a collective response to aggression". It is the League of Nations' founding premise that a threat or attack on one member would be interpreted as an attack on all members. The notion of collective security is a kind of social compact between states, with the objective of stability and peace as the collective-security goal (Blin and Marin, 2009). Kupchan and Kupchan (1995), defines collective security as, "an agreement between states to abide by certain norms and rules to maintain stability and when necessary, band together to stop aggression" Collective security is a 'system of world order in which aggression by any state or group would be met by a collective response' (Kegley and Wittkopf, 1997). It is a system of collective self-regulation' occurring when 'a group of states attempt to reduce security threats by agreeing to collectively punish member states that violate systems' norms' (Downs 1994).

McClean (1996) stated that the success of collective security depends on the following; a) states must accept the status quo, including current state borders, and use armed action exclusively to defend other states or their own territory b) nations must agree on what constitutes aggression and when member states are required to protect one or more states, c) all member nations, particularly powerful ones, must commit their military forces and resources to preventing attack, or supply the necessary resources in time for another member state or states to do so. Even for remote countries where other states have little or no interest, this must be done, d) all member nations must avoid and desist from violating sanctions that may benefit belligerent states. According to Kupchan and Kupchan (1995), collective security exists when states conform to certain norms and rules to prevent major war and when necessary, stop acts of aggression. They noted that competition between states contribute towards international stability (that is, balance of power), which should be harnessed within a regulated system instead of having "unregulated, self-help balancing predicated on the notion of each for his own. In a nutshell, they argue that having some kind of collective security agency to handle rivalry and conflicts between nations is preferable than having none at all.



In sum, collective security is a specialized instrument of international policy in the sense that, it is not only intended to prevent the arbitrary and aggressive use of force or provide enforcement mechanisms for the whole body of international law but also assumes the centre piece of world order is the restraint of military action rather than the guarantee of respect for all legal obligations. It also assumes that this ideal (that is, restraint of military action) may be achieved or at least approximated by a reformation of international policy without changing the structure of international system. Collective Security is a conception whereby the nation-states of the world, under the auspices of an international organization like the United Nations, agree to deter or prevent and collectively restrain the use of force to take effective collective measures for threats to peace (Adedoyin, 2004; (Ubelejit, 2014).

### **Theorizing Collective Security**

Collective security theory emphasized on specialized instrument of international politics in the sense that, it is not only intended to prevent the arbitrary and aggressive use of force or provide enforcement mechanisms for the whole body of international law but also assumes the centre piece of world order is the restraint of military action rather than the guarantee of respect for all legal obligations. Organski (1958) lists five basic assumptions underlying the theory of collective security, they include a)that in an armed conflict, member nation-states will be able to agree on which nation is the aggressor, b)all member nation-states are equally committed to contain and constrain the aggression, irrespective of its source or origin, c)all member nation-states have identical freedom of action and ability to join in proceedings against the aggressor, d)the cumulative power of the cooperating members of the alliance for collective security will be adequate and sufficient to overpower the might of the aggressor, e). Furthermore, Claude Jr. (2006) points out that the theory of collective security is less heavily dependent on a set of assumptions about the nature and causes of war and thus claims to be applicable to wider variety of belligerent (confrontational) situations, assuming that not all wars occur from similar type of causes. The rational appeal suggested by collective security theory to potential belligerents is the use of diplomatic, economic, and military sanctions as tools for inducing rational decision to avoid 'threatened damage' to national self-interest (Claude Jr. 2006). To this end, the objective of collective security is to inhibit war through the threat of collective action. The theory of collective security is based on certain basic conditions, which are required for its effective applications. Henry Kissinger (1992) observed that collective security requires each state to share responsibility for every other state's security. It is such that insecurity of one state makes all states less secure.

However, Mearscheimer (1991) criticizes collective security theory for the following reasons. He argues that, the theory of collective security is an incomplete theory because it does not provide a satisfactory explanation for how states overcome their fears and learn to trust one another. In other words, it is too ideal. He also argues that it assumes too easily the satisfaction of an extraordinarily complex network of requirements. Mearscheimer argues on the contrary that states have abundant reasons to doubt that collective security will work when aggression seems likely. States that ignore balance of power will perform worse than others. He also argues that collective security has little support from historical record. That peacekeeping has no role to play in disputes between great powers, and since it cannot use coercion, is powerless. To him, concerts often emerge in the aftermath of great wars and are merely a matter of classical balance of power which is why they only last as long as the balance of power does not change.

Despite these points of criticisms and weaknesses of theory of collective security, it cannot be denied that the system has not been totally meaningless and without positive features. It has brought into vision the idea and possibility of collective steps for the preservation of world peace through crisis management in the event of a war. The chances for a more purposeful and successful use of Collective Security in this post-cold war world have brightened. Currently it is being operationalized in several different parts of the world. Indeed, Collective Security constitutes a modern device of crisis management. All the members of community of



nations are expected to act and save the humankind from the scourge of war and aggression and to use the collective security theory for this purpose. Apart from its being instrumental to the establishment of regional security arrangement, the collective security concept has also been adopted in many instances around the world to maintain international peace and security, a responsibility which is generally referred to as peacekeeping, peace-making, and peace support and in some instances peace enforcement operations.

### **Overview of Russian/Ukraine War**

The current conflict in Ukraine is a hybrid proxy war between the ex-Soviet power, Russia, and the Western allied forces, lead United States. It is fought with special forces, drones, and even social media campaigns of disinformation, or fake news, that only create chaos and kindle up debates among people worldwide that do not always understand the reality of the situation (Topor, 2022; Hill, 2022). Yet, if one seeks to understand the current situation one must understand the strategic history of the Soviet, or Russian, conflict with the West. The end of the Second World War is a good starting point to understand the 2022 Ukrainian crisis. After the Allied forces won, the two major powers of the United States and the Soviet Union, both in terms of strategy and in terms of ideology, entered a new world order – the world shifted from a situation of multi-polarity (prior to the First World War) to a bi-polar situation (Topor, 2022). Even if one was stronger than the other, both great powers dictated the global arena. In an attempt to prevent a situation in which one power would rise above the other, both begun strengthening themselves with allies. In April 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded as a precautionary measure to the rise of the Soviet Union and as a mediation mechanism to prevent further conflicts between European members (Khalifa, 2022). Following that strategic logic, and after Western Germany joined NATO in May 1955, the Soviet Union, in its turn, established the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO), commonly known as the Warsaw Pact. Generally, NATO was built of Western and Central European countries, as well as the United States and Canada, and the Warsaw Pact consisted of the Soviet Union, including Eastern Europe (Hill, 2022). The whole logic behind these pacts was simple - collective security. That is, an attack on one ally would be considered an attack on all.

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO had not faded away but grew stronger, a fact that signalled other world powers to prepare themselves as well. In 1949 twelve members established NATO, including the United States, the United Kingdom and France. Turkey joined in 1952. [Western] Germany joined in 1955, Poland in 1999. In 2004 seven more countries joined NATO, many of whom were in the Soviet sphere of influence. North Macedonia joined in March 2020, making NATO a thirty-state pact. Thus, Russia gradually lost its influence over extensive parts of Europe and consequently, its influence over the world (Khalifa, 2022). Ukraine became an independent country in August 1991 but has been under the Russian sphere of influence ever since. Both in the Orange Revolution (2004-2005) and in the Maidan Revolution (2013-2014) Ukrainian Politics were the battle ground – the West pushed for one candidate and Russia pushed for another. Ukrainian Politics and ground became the proxy upon which powers conflict each other (Topor, 2022; Hill, 2022). In 2008 NATO begun officially discussing about Ukraine’s membership but was pushed back by Russia. As pro-Western candidates were favored since 2014, Ukraine also attempted to join the European Union, an economic pact which Russia perceived as no less dangerous for its global position as NATO itself. In an attempt to push back Western pressure and influence over Ukraine, Russia had annexed the area of Crimea in early 2014. Additionally, the regions of Donetsk and Luthanski, referred to as the Donbass region, declared their separation from Ukraine as most of the population were pro-Russian and as Russia had pushed pro-Russian administration in the Donbass (Topor, 2022; Hill, 2022).

In the current Ukrainian matter, one can assume that if the West had not pushed over Ukraine, attempting to recruit it to NATO, Russia would not have invaded Ukraine in 2022. Therefore, while Russia attempts to preserve or boost its global influence, it is the United States that also attempts to preserve its global hegemony. Taylor (2022) noted the on-going war is viewed in terms of Putin’s opposition to NATO expansion



that risks Ukraine becoming westernized. Russia as historically considered Ukraine to be a soviet allied state, that wing to the event in the recent past that saw Georgia, a formerly soviet-state becoming westernized, Russia, through his current leader, Vladimir Putin, is opposed to a repetition of a similar incident with Ukraine. That is, the conflict is largely fuelled by the current aggressive actions between Russia and the West, which have historical roots (Taylor, 2022). In addition, Konoplyov (2022) stated that the economy of Russia, in recent years, specifically from 2019 to presently, is being negatively affected characterized by a reduced growth of less than 1.5 percent annually, as result, Putin's popular rating has reduced to about 60 percent (Konoplyov, 2022). Therefore, Putin is thus concerned that the problem of Russia's economic growth is thus not a temporary issue rather a systemic problem.

The war between the two countries also has far-reaching consequences, especially regarding global social, political and economic environment (Okoro, Ndubuisi, & Ogwu, (2020). For example Orhan, (2022) argued that the conflict between Russia and Ukraine will affect the global economy via three main channels: financial sanctions, increase of commodity prices and supply chain disruptions. It is also observed that the continuation of the war has led a significant rise in inflation among major European economies during the invasion, the increase in the price of essential commodities is evident worldwide Maurya, Bansal, and Mishra, 2023). Furthermore, Shumilova, Tockner, Sukhodolov, et al, (2023) analysed the multifaceted impacts of the conflict on freshwater resources and water infrastructure, and identified the negative consequences for the availability and quality of freshwater resources for the civilian population. The study argued that many water infrastructures such as dams at reservoirs, water supply and treatment systems and subsurface mines have been impacted or are at risk from military actions, therefore concluded that the continuation of the conflict will have multiple negative implication on a global scale, hampering energy and food security. **The degeneration of the war would be injurious to the global market, trade routes, economy and Foreign Direct Investment.** Kola (2023) revealed that the current war has caused a significant setback to Foreign Direct Investment and trade relations, and it has undermined both bilateral and multilateral trade relations and cut off supply chains, markets, and value chains that have long existed before the crisis amongst countries across the globe. The study recommended that world leaders should do everything possible to restore peace between these two countries because it will do the world better than their selfish desires.

#### **Collective Security and Russian/Ukraine Crisis**

The world generally is concerned about security, be it on individual basis (states acting alone) or collectively (states coming together to protect each other) (Anderson, 2009). Collective Security borders on the issue of rationality for a variety of international organisations such as the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), amongst others, to protect and uphold local, regional and international peace and security. The security operates inside the international system such as, for example, the United Nations, with collective security concepts included in the UN Charter (Snyder 1999). The United Nations (UN) system of collective security is based on the cooperation of the UN Security Council's five permanent members, notably the United States (US), the United Kingdom (UK), France, Russia, and China. The United Nations in maintaining international peace and security, take collective measures to acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and this can be done either by the Security Council of the United Nations or the regional and sub-regional collective security bodies (United Nations World Governance Reports, 2012; Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014). The United Nations is tasked with upholding collective security in the contemporary international order and with authorising or sanctioning the use of armed force against other states. Article 1 of the UN Charter showed that effective collective actions must be taken for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and the suppression of acts of the aggressor or other breaches of peace. According to Article 43 of the United Nations Charter, members of the organisation must make armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rites of passage, necessary for the



maintenance of international peace and security to the security council under special circumstances (Ejiwale, 2019).

In Collective Security, all states are encouraged to pursue collective security by mutual interests rather than selfish motivations. For the operational mechanism to work, any enforcement action sanctioned by the collective security body must involve at least one state who would not have acted if the system was not in place (Ebegbulem, 2011). Since the commencement of the aggression of Russia in Ukraine, in recent time, various international organizations, such as United Nation (UN), European Union (EU), North Atlantic Trade Union (NATO), among others have been introducing structures that would forestall the war, the organizations are encouraging and promoting peace among the warring parties in the war. Though, there is remarkable progress, but there are still more to do to curtail the war. Douhan (2022) stated that in compliance with the responsibility conferred on the U N Security council to maintain international security and peace in adherence to Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, UNSC has been involved in helping address the on-going Russia-Ukraine crisis. The study argued that UNSC considering a variety of matters of concerns pertaining to the causes of the war and its associated effects. In essence, Douhan (2022) suggests promotion of active participation of the involved parties in the conflict to inform a thorough, full, and inclusive investigation into the problem to come up with effective proposal on how to address the war. Additionally, UNSC should strived to provide a discussion forum by considering the positions of states in regards to the concerns and without blaming any of the involved parties, rather promoting objectivity, neutrality, and impartiality in addressing the conflict (Douhan, 2022).

Sinambela and Arsyad (2023) highlight the steps taken by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to assist end the war in Russia and Ukraine. The study showed that OSCE has appointed a special envoy tasked with visiting and monitoring the situation in Ukraine to provide on-time recommendations on regular basis as per the problems that unfold and how to timely and aptly respond to them depending on their uniqueness and the involved actors. In helping reduce the severity of the war, the envoy has embraced several measures including conducting bilateral talks with the parties involved in the war and establishing national dialogue programs (Sinambela and Arsyad 2023). Overall, the OSCE, through its special envoy to address the crisis presently taking place in Ukraine, has called the conflicting parties for consultation and cooperation as regards to the prevailing unusual military activities threatening not only the regional but also the international peace. In sum, Sinambela and Arsyad (2023) strongly convinced that both Russia-Ukraine should embrace consultation and cooperation in addressing the war, through unconditional, but mutually beneficial dialogue between these two nations as the best way to solve the war. Tytarchuk and Khylyko (2022) asserted that North Atlantic Trade Organization NATO has vehemently condemned breaches of international law committed by Russia. It has thus expressed its support for Ukraine by calling upon Russia to honor its international commitment by coming into negotiation with Ukraine and discussing issues within the NATO-Russia council tailored towards ending the ongoing war (Tytarchuk&Khylyko, 2022). Furthermore the study reported that though NATO had previously contemplated the option to apply military measures in Ukraine against the Russian federation, it rather concluded that the organization limited itself only to disapproving the Russian-affiliated activities as a measure to solving the conflict. In addition Mahilaj, (2023) examined the role of European Union (EU) in helping to solve the Russia-Ukraine war. The study showed that EU has adopted some measures on ceased negotiations with Russia on visa, trade, and partnership related issues, and that EU has announced its readiness in suspending the participation of Russia in the proposed G8 plan, the suspension has been upheld until Russia agrees to the settlement of the conflict presently prevailing in Ukraine with finality (Mahilaj, 2023). Most of the aforementioned resolutions were not adhered to by parties involved, as fighting continued in that region, till today, the efforts appear ineffective. However, the war still remains a threat to global peace and security, and thus demands an immediate cessation of hostilities.



### **Application of Collective Security to Curtail Russia Excesses in Ukraine**

For collective security to succeed, Claude (1971) argued that several Member States needs to join the system, and any exclusion of Member States with strong, powerful economies and military will reduce the chance of its success. And while collective security is possible to address the Russian/Ukraine war, several prerequisites have to be met for it to work (Claude, 2006). Ebaye, (2019) has developed some principle of Collective Security which can be applied to curtail aggression or war against any nation, in which all the nations are to act collectively work enshrined collective security in the world. The principles include the followings;

- **Device of Power Management**  
Collective Security is a device of power management or crisis management. It seeks to preserve international peace through crisis management in the event of any war or aggression in the world. The excess of Russia in Ukraine is a consequent of poor power management crisis at the level of most especially, the United Nation. Putin, Russian President, noted that all efforts to bring the differences between him and Ukraine failed because the other party did not picture the difference from reasoning. The United Nations, for instance, has failed to manage and prevent the invasion Ukraine. The United Nations or other important institutions in the global arena should device a workable means to bring an end to the war.
- **Collective pooling of powers and resources to end Aggression:**  
To stop Russian excesses, nations must come together under the auspices of United Nation or another international institution to employ either military capability or economic sanction. Collective Security believes that in the event of a violation of international peace by any aggression in any part of the world, all the nations are committed to pool their power and resources for taking effective steps against every aggression for restoring international peace (Ebaye, 2019). Currently, nations and United Nations are not doing enough to pool both economic and military resources to curtail the excesses, the collective powers (economic and military powers) done by few states are not enough. All nations must come together and pool resources together to end the invasion, either military or otherwise.
- **Robust International Institution**  
The existing international institutions, such as United Nations, are currently weak when the dealing powerful countries. United Nations, for instance, has failed to deal with its security council members most at times they are going into wars (Ebaye, 2019). It failed to prevent United States from invading Iraq, also failed to stop Russia in Ukraine. This is attached to the veto powers of these Security Council members, which is virile in the face of other votes. However, there is need to have a robust international institution that is no respecter of any of its members and equally sanctions erring members, whether powerful or not. Collective Security presupposes the existence of an international institution under whose flag a global preponderance of power is created for ending the aggression.
- **Strong Collective Security System is a Deterrent against War:**  
All nations should come together and design a strong collective security system; this is, indeed, an effective strategy and deterrent against a state with aggressive designs. Under a strong collective system, each nation is reminder that any aggression against another nation shall be met by the collective power of all other nations (Ebaye, 2019). As such no nation tries to commit aggression and war because it knows that such an action will invite collective security action against it. This realization acts as a deterrent against any war or aggression would have curtailed Russia from invading Ukraine.



- Aggression/war is the enemy and not the State which commits it:  
In curtailing the excesses, the aggression/invasion should be of primary concern and not Russia. The essence is to eliminate causes and nature of the invasion and bring peace. Collective Security regards 'aggression' or 'war' as the enemy and not the state which may resort to war or aggression. A collective security action is limited to the elimination of war, aggression or threat of war or aggression. It does not stand for the elimination of the state which commits aggression. Its sole concern is to get the aggression vacated, to prevent the aggressor to gain out of its aggression, to restore the health of the victim of aggression, and to restore international peace and security (Ebaye, 2019). Collective Security stands for securing international peace and security collective efforts of all the nations. Security is the common objective of all the nations and it has to be secured through collective efforts of all.

### **Conclusion**

The response to international conflicts, most importantly Russian invasion in Ukraine, lies in collective security: working together, sometimes as leaders, sometimes as partners, with friends and allies. Collective security does not mean ceding sovereignty to an international institution, such as UN or any other institution, it means by working together with others, states can affect important outcomes at a price their public opinion is prepared to support. While some have urged the relevance of security theory, especially armed intervention, then it must be to preserve and protect international peace and security. Collective security offers to all states as a mechanism to counter the threats to international peace and security. The collective principle can; however, obviously work only if the commitment is broadly shared. The United Nation remains the major organization with sufficient legitimacy to address the Russian/Ukraine crisis through a collective security that is premise on collective confidence and good faith, while the collective confidence is the principles by which it is governed, and good faith is the means by which it seeks to be ensured.

The paper, therefore, recommends that the structure of the permanent representative in the UNSC should be reviewed every ten years also the proposed structure should aim at making the system more balanced in terms of economic, political, and military based. Additionally, a better relationship between Russia and the West will also be advantageous to Ukraine, while the opposite is not automatically true. Ukraine can have a trade relationship with both the West and Russia. However, it would be better that Ukraine does not become member of NATO, at least as long as no durable solution has been worked out with Russia, and a neutral Ukraine is also recommended by realists. Furthermore government officials of Russian, Ukraine and countries of the west should meet more regularly and make efforts to prevent incidents that could escalate into war, this same applies to arms control initiatives in the conventional, nuclear, or ballistic missile defence realm. Also Russia can also be included into the country in the Euro-Atlantic security architecture in order to create a proper collective security organization.

### **References**

- Anderson, K. (2009). United Nations Collective Security and the United States Security Guarantee in an Age of Rising Multipolarity: The Security Council as the Talking Shop of the Nations; *Chicago Journal of International Law*
- Aleksovski, S., Bakreski, O and Avramovska, B. (2014). Collective Security – The Role of International Organizations- Implications in International Security Order; *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy* Vol 5 No 27 December 2014
- Axelrod, R., and Hamilton, D. H. (1981). The Evolution of Cooperation, *Science, New Series*, Vol. 211, No. 4489. (Mar. 27, 1981), pp. 1390-1396.
- Arbatova, E., and Dynkin, U. (2016) 'Collapse of the World Order?', *Russia in Global Affairs*, 23 September [online]





**TIMBOU-AFRICA ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS**  
**AUGUST, 2023 EDITIONS, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF:**  
**AFRICAN SUSTAINABLE DEV. RESEARCH VOL.14**

- Betts, R. K. (1992). Systems for Peace or Causes of War? Collective Security, Arms Control, and the New Europe. *International Security*, 17 (1), 5-43.
- Booth, K. (1987). "Alliances", in Baylis, J et al (eds), *Contemporary Strategy: Theories and Concepts* (2nd ed). New York: Holmes & Meyer.
- Chenoweth, E (2008), "A Contested Threat: The Politics of Security Collaboration for Combating Terrorism", in Wilson, I and J J F Forest (eds), *The Handbook of Defence Politics: International and Comparative Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp 64-75.
- Claude Jr., I. L. (2006). Collective Security as an Approach to Peace. In Donald M. Goldstein, Phil Williams & Jay, M. Sharfritz (Eds.) *Classic readings and contemporary debates in international relations*. Belmont CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 289-302.
- Danchin, P. (2009). *Things Fall Apart: The Concept of Collective Security in International Law*
- DeConde, A. (1957). *Isolation and Security*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Douhan, A. F. (2022). International Organizations and Settlement of the Conflict in Ukraine. *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, 75(1), 195-214.
- Ebaye, S. E. N. (2019). Collective Security and the Twin Principles of the Responsibility to Protect & the Duty to Prevent, A Case Study of the Yugoslav & Somali CRISES; *IJRDO Journal of International Affairs and Global Strategy*
- Hanappi, H. (2022), Russia. *The Background of the Russian Invasion of Ukraine*
- Haas, E.B. (1968). Collective Security and the Future International System. *Monograph Series in World Affairs*, 5 (1), 36-55.
- Hill, F. (2022), Russia's Assault on Ukraine and the International Order: Assessing and Bolstering the Western Response - *Wednesday, Brookings*
- Jordaan, E. (2017). Collective Security in Africa: The Tension between Theory and Practice; *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol 39, No 1
- Lebow, R. N. (2018). *The Rise and Fall of Political Orders*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Khalifa, I. (2022). The Russian-Ukrainian War in the Light of the International Collective Security System and Unilateral Measures
- Kola, B.A. (2023). Does the Russia-Ukraine War Affects Trade Relations and Foreign Direct Investment Flows from Europe into Asia and Africa?. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147- 4478), 12(2), 287-300.
- Kupchan, C.A. (1995). "The Promise of Collective Security", *International Security*, Vol 20, No 1, pp 52-61
- Maurya, P.K., Bansal, R., and Mishra, A.K. (2023). "Russia-Ukraine Conflict and its Impact on Global Inflation: An Event Study-Based Approach", *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. Mearsheimer, J. (2014) 'Why the Ukraine Crisis is the West's Fault', *Foreign Affairs*, 93 (5), pp. 77-89
- McLean, I (1996). *Concise Dictionary of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mahilaj, S. (2023). EU and Cooperation in the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Impacts and Limitations. *ESI Preprints*, 15, 49-49.
- Okoro, I. O., Ndubuisi, J. O., & Ogwu, P. C. A. (2020). The Russia-Ukraine Conflict and its Impact on Contemporary Global Security.
- Orford, A. (1996). *The Politics of Collective Security*, Australian National University, *Michigan Journal of International Law* Volume 17 Issue 2
- Orhan, E. (2022). The Effects of the Russia - Ukraine War on Global Trade. **Journal of International Trade, Logistics And Law**, 8(1), 141-146.
- Shumilova, O., Tockner, K., and Sukhodolov, A. (2023). Impact of the Russia-Ukraine armed conflict on water resources and water infrastructure. *Nat Sustain* 6, 578-586.
- Sinambela, S. I., & Arsyad, R. (2023). The OSCE and the Ukraine Crisis: Cooperation over Conflict. *Journal PIR: Power in International Relations*, 7(2), 174-185
- Snyder, C (1999). "Regional Security Structures", in Snyder, C (ed), *Contemporary Security and Strategy*. New York: Routledge.
- Sutterlin, J. S. (2003). *United Nations and the Maintenance of International Security: A challenge to be met* (2nd ed.). Westport: Praeger.
- Tampubolon, M. (2022). Russia's Invasion of Ukraine and its Impact on Global Geopolitics. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 18(20),
- Topor, L. (2022). Opinion - Strategic Perspectives on the Russia-Ukraine War <https://www.e-ir.info/2022/03/06/opinion-strategic-perspectives-on-the-russia-ukraine-war/>
- Tytarchuk, O., & Khylyko, M. (2022). NATO Involvement in the Handling of the Russia-Ukraine Conflict: Competitive Synergy or 'Freezing' Crisis management. *International Crisis Management: NATO, EU, OSCE and Civil Society*, 87-100.



**TIMBOU-AFRICA ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS**  
**AUGUST, 2023 EDITIONS, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF:**  
**AFRICAN SUSTAINABLE DEV. RESEARCH VOL.14**

- United Nations (2004). United Nations High Level Panel (UNHLP): Report on Threats, Challenges and Change: A/59/565. A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility. December.
- United Nations News Centre (2016). "Withdrawal from International Criminal Court could send 'wrong message' — UN chief", 28 October
- Vogt, M. (2009). "The UN and Africa's Regional Organisations", in Adebajo, A (ed), From Global Apartheid to Global Village: *Africa and the United Nations*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.