

## АКТУАЛЬНАЯ ТЕМА

### **THE UKRAINE: PERSPECTIVES ON POSSIBILITIES FOR THE FUTURE**

© 2023 Ian Liebenberg

Ian LIEBENBERG is a Professor in Politics at the Faculty of Commerce, Management and Law, University of Namibia (UNAM), Namibia and an extraordinary Professor in Politics at the Faculty of Military Science (FEMS) at Stellenbosch University, South Africa. email: jankalahari@gmail.com

The opinions expressed here are in the author's personal and private capacity and not linked to the above-mentioned tertiary institutions. The opinions expressed in this publication do not purport to reflect the opinions or views of the Journal or its Publisher.

***Abstract:** The author looks into possible pathways to an international resolution of the conflict in the Ukraine. The current conflict in the Ukraine should be seen in the context of developments since the 1054 and the 1400s before the Treaty of Westphalia in the Western calendar. The current historical memory and collective consciousness of the Russians experienced over many years, can be found in the numerous betrayals from the West over a long time. Betrayals of which deep memories still linger and still influence Russian collective historical memory. These collections of socio-historical memories rest on brutal intervention/aggression from the West inflicted in history and cannot be ignored in the current loaded context. The rational way out is negotiations. There is no single sovereignty in Ukraine at stake here. The right to choose your sovereignty should be consistently applied to a divided Ukrainian people. People as a self-defined group, should be given the right to choose their political habitus and their future belonging. The wish for sovereignty has at least two sides and apply to the Eastern Ukraine. Conflict cannot solve the problem. Creative and far-sighted alternatives, even if it looks far-fetched, may well provide new opportunities for peace in the future.*

**Keywords:** Ukraine, Russia, Ukrainian crisis, self-determination, sovereignty

DOI: 10.31132/2412-5717-2023-62-1-5-13

The war in the Ukraine is continuing with disastrous consequences on the globe from East to West, from Eurasia to Africa and Latin America. In the fog and dust of war through ages, the truth is always the first causality and blood continue to flow. There are more ways to look at the conflict in the Ukraine than the dominant Western narrative. Different political lenses can lead to different outcomes. One looming view from the West, especially the USA, is the mantra-like belief that in this conflict there is only one real crook, one villain, one aggressor. History and the reasons for conflict are immensely more complex.

Against the vast collage of history, current views were shaped in the USA (and by extension) some Western minds since at least the Cold War, a term invented in the USA by political leadership, their security advisors and journalists – even historians. Arguably such views of Russia even preceded the so-called “Cold War”, going back to at least the First

World War. Those that hark back to the recognition of the integrity of sovereignty of a specified territory as later recognized by the United Nations (UN) are especially prominent in current political discourse on the issue. The roots of this can be found as far back as the Treaty or Peace of Westphalia (1648) when Europe was torn apart by 30 years of religious wars between Christians with murderously clashing political perspectives. This idea of sovereignty was later re-affirmed by the arguments posed by Woodrow Wilson during the Peace of Versailles after the First World War and the League of Nations established thereafter. It survived into the United Nations (UN) and contemporary international law.

Are there other pathways to an international resolution of the conflict? This side of the argument, calls for a reasonable dialogue and a realist historical focus on the notion of sovereignty or rather right to “sovereignties” at stake here. In this case especially when “new states” in contested territories are haphazardly constructed in the aftermath of political events such as the decline and disaggregation of for example, the Soviet Union at the end of the so-called Cold War. Ukraine is a case in point.

The current conflict in the Ukraine should be seen in the context of developments since the 1054 and the 1400s before the Treaty of Westphalia in the Western calendar. This conflict or “standoff” and drawing a line in the sand by Russia was not unexpected. I am not surprised that Russia (with or without Putin as leader) drew the line looking at geo-politics and the national security interests of post-Cold War Europe, Russia and the consistent eastward drive of the North Atlantic Organisation (NATO), the latter being relentlessly pushed by the USA since at least 2008 with seemingly no European power or leader able or willing to stand up to the pressures from, and direction imposed by the USA. NATO directed by the USA seems to have become more important than peace in Europe and the voice of the USA more important than reasonable politics and the wider world. A prominent international politics theorist, Shrikant Paranjpe, from India mused during 2022 whether there is a move “back to the status quo in Europe”, a classical regression into eternal war politics. He argued this with in mind the Cold War mentality or even earlier to the 1900s with its two world wars that originated in Western Europe or a century earlier when Europe transformed violently into nations states and what Europeans call democracy.

The only surprise around the intensification of the conflict is that it came to this juggernaut only in 2022. One would have expected it in 2008 or 2014 when those populations and parts of the Ukraine that wanted to go back to Russia or the Slavic *habitus* declared themselves independent, thus similarly seeking their sovereignty-in-choice as to where they want to belong (a wish that then also appeals to international law to recognize the sovereignty of other Ukrainians to have a right to self-determination and sovereignty). No one seems to have the far-sighted recognition of two legitimate sides to the coin of sovereignty related to the “new” post 1990 Ukraine. No surprises here but a harbinger of conflict to come – a very predictable ongoing and intensifying conflict.

Due to the dominance of Western media, most people, including journalists, in our immediate environment choose to access only Western media outlets, most are caught up in the “Forever or Eternal Northwest-bound Gaze”. White is right, the West is best and obviously Cowboy and Robocop movie style, the West was won (and always) win fair and square. The easy switch from a Cold War Mentality (CWM) – or shall we rather call it a Cold War Myopia (CWM) – to a fear, even deep-seated hate, for the East within the collective western psyche, is seemingly eternal, perhaps DNA rooted.

After the Second World War, NATO was established to counter “the Eastern threat” from the Soviet Union (the origins of all evil in the eyes of the West and especially the USA from then through to Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Reagan, Bush 1 and 2, Clinton, Obama, Trump and Biden. Noticeably during the declared Cold War, there was also so-called Communist

China, another major “threat” from the East and USA nuclear weapons in case of a nuclear fallout were aimed at both the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China. Should these “Communists” be disobedient to the USA and NATO as extension of USA hegemonic power, doomsday was to visit them and their entire populations simultaneously. NATO under USA leadership was established before the Warsaw Pact and that the Warsaw Pact was but a reaction to NATO with its eyes steadily turned East.

The East remained the enemy throughout. The USA as a World Policeman declared itself as the global good. Many believed the seemingly omnipotent USA logic presented as the final truth, the only interpretation of the world in political terms. Inherent conservatism and religiosity (“God Bless America”) the search for undisputable world hegemony and capitalism incorporated, played and plays its role too. The well-known author, Gwynne Dyer, could not have been more correct when he summarized the USA’s mentality, actions, military projection and the dangerous future outcomes thereof in his book, *Future Tense*, released circa 2014.

Few people seem to remember that the USA was the aggressor in numerous conflicts since the early 1950s, frequently violently ignoring the sovereignty of numerous nations on the globe. Even fewer remember what the losses were for those on the losing side, including those that fought for their sovereignty and choice of regime. Fear, greed, hate and arrogance intertwined in the USA mindset and their “Coalition of the Willing”. Taking a cue from Dyer, the USA is since 2002 gradually slipping on the spectrum of (megalomaniac) world policeman to a dangerous international rogue and by sheer military size intimidate even its own “friends” in Europe.

The USA mindset and action undermined long term visionary global political foresight during the Cold War and since the “end” of the Cold War. This nexus further led to an intellectual deficit when it comes to the analysis of international politics and now the case of the Ukraine conflict. Lack of wider exposure carried over from ideologically driven old guard journalists to younger ones, plays a role too. Social media with clashing and emotive fragments of politics and an immense amount of fake news intertwined in a toxic mix of hyper-imagination, is not bettering the situation. On the contrary. Education or lack thereof and ignorance about history plays a role too. Humans seem to have the innate ability to veer towards myopia rather than a wider reading of political developments. Eurocentrism and racism play a role. In the midst of the current debate no one is talking about or against the destructive and dehumanizing conflict in Yemen (with UK support and UK based military companies), or the Kosovo bombings by NATO instigated by the USA and the UK in the 1990s. Or the toppling of Iraq during the second Iraqi War. Or the permanent destabilization of Lebanon over decades by apartheid Israel that led to a failed economy. Or the destruction of a stable and sovereign state, Libya in 2011. Or, Apartheid-Israel suppressing Palestinian wishes for a sovereign state ever since 1948 with the killing of Palestinians continuing unabatedly, the incident of increasing oppression of Palestinian people (January 2023). But then these people shot to smithereens, their cities reduced to ash, were not white, North American or European; they were and are Slavs, Berbers, Muslims, Arabs, Blacks, Muslims, “Easterners” or “terrorists”. Hitler seems to be alive and well and definitely not, contrary to Western propaganda, only in the “East”.

In the case of the Ukraine conflict most of the Western leaders slavishly inject their view on their followers seeing the Russians and Putin as only guilty party without any broader historical understanding of world politics or for that matter “European” politics or the complexities of colliding sovereignties. An interview with Tony Blair previous Prime Minister of the UK during April 2022 is one example. Blair suggested no compromise or negotiations with Russia and confirmed that the UK will stand with the USA under all conditions, also in

the Ukraine. So, did the disastrous Prime-Minister of the UK, Boris Johnson, a person with a complete lack of knowledge and intuition of international politics as well as the political sentiments of the British people. Such mentalities are leading to a military conflict of magnitude as the USA are pumping more and more sophisticated weaponry into Ukraine and deployed military advisors on the ground since late April 2022. Simultaneously, the USA is funding mercenary forces to assist (west) Ukraine and the conservative if not war-like leadership there. In the meantime, the wishes of Ukrainians in the East of the country to become as an independent state part of Eurasia, thus within the political ambit of Russia and Belarus and Eurasia. For the West sovereignty as a concept in international law applies to west Ukraine, but not east Ukraine.

If the fear for the West lies in the East, the converse is also true after many trials and tribulations over centuries. Over the past century or a few more (the 1600s – 2022) the West are by far not innocent. On the contrary.

A few historical examples: Under imperialism China had and since then, have the collective memory of how Western colonisers with the USA as belated straggler intervened in Chinese politics since the 1890s and afterwards and several Chinese rebellions proved that such interventions were not then appreciated and most likely will not be tolerated now. For the moment we shall not mention the British (Great Britain's) invasion in Afghanistan in the 1880s and how they had to withdraw tail between the legs from that vast mountainous land. We shall not discuss how India and large tracts of Africa were colonized by Britain, Germany, Portugal, the Netherlands, France, Spain, Belgium and much later Italy under Mussolini. We shall not speak about excesses in Latin-America by the Spanish or the USA in Cuba during the early 1900s. Nor shall we speak about the occupation of Afghanistan since 2002 where the USA and the dwindling "Coalition of the Willing" belatedly discovered that they are not welcome, in fact, should not have been there in the first place. The Afghanistan intervention based on wrong premises turned into a total failure of political and military intelligence. When the USA enacts its (mostly aggressive) foreign policy things turn not to gold, but to poisonous dust and leaves thousands of people dead and mutilated ever since Vietnam. By the way, the Soviet Union had the same experience as the USA in Afghanistan in the 1980s. People can get touchy if you impose your concept of a new order on their right to sovereignty and will resist such impositions. Think about the Palestinian people under the heel of Apartheid-Israel. Needless to say, that when Palestinians resist their brutal occupation and land-theft, they are called "terrorists" just like the Apartheid regime in Pretoria did to its political opponents. The "terrorists" that the apartheid government fought in South Africa and Namibia were fighting a resolute struggle for their national liberation. Apartheid under USA influence and Cold War myopia simply had the political picture fundamentally wrong.

When looking at international politics and violent conflict, it requires one to put on different lenses and see alternative interpretations and new angles. Using different lenses to view history in the current Ukraine conflict may assist in paving the way for finding a solution to the conflict rather than war-drumming and feigned moral outrage. The current historical memory and collective consciousness of the Russians experienced over many years, can be found in the numerous betrayals from the West over a long time. Betrayals of which deep memories still linger and still influence Russian collective historical memory. That is not surprising. These collections of socio-historical memories rest on brutal intervention/aggression from the West inflicted in history and cannot be ignored in the current loaded context with or without President Vladimir Putin as a leader.

*First betrayal, 1812:* The French invasion of Russia under Napoleon Bonaparte and its brutal destructive consequences for the Russian people.

*Second betrayal, 1914 onwards:* After Russia withdrew from the First World War, having fought on the side of Britain, France, Italy and later the USA, these very Western countries following the October Revolution in 1917, turned against the “new Russia/Soviet Union” by supporting the destructive activities of the white partisans (or “White Russians”) that destabilized the Soviet Union for years until the Red Army halted this.

*Third betrayal, 1941:* The invasion of Russia (then Soviet Union) by Adolf Hitler’s armies in 1941 (Operation Barbarossa). In this brutal war of naked aggression, the Russian people lost nearly 22 000 000 people before driving the Germans back to Berlin. In these three cases the danger and the aggressor came consistently and chronically from what can collectively be referred to as the West and left a historical memory baggage with deep emotions.

A quick flashback is relevant here: It is worthwhile to recall the *Helsinki Final Act* of 1975, whereby the Soviet Union and all its satellite states committed themselves to respect and observe basic human rights. Likewise, these protocols applied to Western states too. Implicitly this agreement still stands.

On a more mundane, yet serious level: In this conflict, it is not only the Russians shooting and killing. The Ukrainians, their imported mercenaries from a variety of interesting countries and aligned special forces are shooting back. After years of strengthening the Ukrainian military with no single Western European objection then. No objection also recently from EU leadership to another \$ 800 000 000 in arms support announced by Biden of the USA in late 2022. Come to think of it; killing is not a one-sided affair as some are suggesting in these hideous times. There are collateral and human losses on both sides. No simplification can argue this away. The mass-delivery of anti-aircraft missile systems, long range missiles and soon tanks to the Ukraine, further bedevils the situation prolonging pain, death, destruction, instability and spurring on a conflict because no other options to manage or resolve the conflict are considered. The war drums remain beating in Washington.

*More betrayals, 1995 onwards:* The next series of broken promises interpreted by the Russians (not only Medvedev and Putin) from 1995 (at the latest) onwards, especially 2008 and 2014 are worth mentioning. From the Russian perspective the Minsk 1 and 2 agreements signed in 2014 and 2015 presumably allowed a consensus on sovereign choices for the Eastern Ukraine, also in favour of “Slavic belonging”. For pro-West leaders in the Ukraine, it was a green light to push Eastwards. The USA needless to say in maintain global hegemony was more than prepared to assist by all means possible. And everyone knew and is knowing what USA “support” means since 1960. Dangerous clashing perspectives ahead ...

Henry Kissinger, US Secretary of State (1973–1977), rightly observed as far back as 2014, that: “Far too often the Ukraine issue is posed as a showdown between West and East, but if the Ukraine (or two Ukraine’s – *my insertion*) ... should survive, it should serve as a bridge (between the West and the East)”. He used several examples to make the point that from the Russian perspective, Ukraine (or at least the eastern part thereof) can never be just “a foreign country” starting as early as the times of Kievan-Rus (1054–1132) and with examples of the Battle of Poltava in 1709. Kissinger eloquently pointed out that even dissidents such as Solzhenitsyn and Joseph Brodsky insisted that Ukraine is an “integral part of Russian history and indeed, of Russia”. Part of the problem he argued, was the post-1992 Ukrainian leaders in a newly declared independent country, “not surprisingly, did not learn the art of compromise, even less of a historical perspective”. Kissinger predicted that a Ukraine joining NATO would exacerbate tensions and rising myopic destructive military conflict. Kissinger also advised that EU states take a more pro-active stance around negotiations at the time. Saying this, in fact, he implied that Europe takes control over its own destiny and become the Captain of their own soul and history (Remember former President of South Africa advising himself, his

country and those caring for humanity and the globe to be able to say that “I am the captain of my Soul”. It did not happen in Europe and seemingly through collective European hesitancy is not happening yet. Kissinger suggested this way back in 2014. Apparently, little lessons have been learnt and even less advice taken – a deficit in reading security interests and historical evolutions in international politics is ruling supreme in the USA and Europe, with some latecomer Scandinavian countries as part of the strategic intellectual and security strategy gap.

In the early 1990s President Ronald Reagan of the USA announced extatically that “This Man (Gorbachev), has broken down the Wall”, with reference to the crumbling Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union to become the Russian Federation. The Reagan administration promised not to expand NATO. In the meantime, the Warsaw Pact as defence against NATO aggression was dismantled. This was but one of many broken promises – or in stronger terms – as viewed from the Russian side, a series of betrayals.

NATO strongly supported by the USA as hegemonic partner/global policeman was to start its creep eastward. Note that there was no more a Warsaw Pact, so the question can rightly be asked, “Against which conceivable threat or enemy was NATO necessary? Africa? Russia? The “terrorists and barbarians”? “Primitive” Africans? The Arab people? Latin-America? The “Far Eastern” countries? Iran? North Korea, the latter hardly a threat to Europe even if it has a few nuclear bombs”.

Arguably African sovereign states are also seen as a danger to USA hegemony. The US African Command (AFRICOM) and NATO joined in a rabid frenzy to topple Ghadaffi in what was called an “Arab Spring” in 2011. A misnomer of magnitude the term was. Obviously, there was no spring and little democratization followed. Egypt up till today remains a strategic partner and ally of the USA and Apartheid Israel and Egypt is under authoritarian, more specifically military rule, ignored national democratic elections and no one cared afterwards. Libya was an exception. Libya under Ghadaffi was a non-pliant state when it comes to the USA and the West. Libya was not willing to become a client state of the West. Under authoritarian rule, yes. But stable, high educational standards, good health services and assisting African states to reduce their dependence on the IMF and the World Bank. The “Arab Spring” provided the pretext for the USA, AFRICOM, France, the UK and a host of smaller countries including the Netherlands, part of the so-called “Coalition of the Willing”, to topple and kill Ghadaffi thereby reducing Libya to a gutted and failed state (It was said by Western spokespeople, women and men alike that “this man must go”, as Biden also feverishly and emotionally said about Putin in 2022). As corollary consequence these thoughtless acts resulted in a power vacuum in what was once Libya and triggered simultaneously a refugee crisis still ongoing, and instability for years unforeseen in the region and far afield. Shortsighted to the extreme it was, as ex USA President Barak Obama admitted later. Perhaps he should have listened to his Vice-President Hillary Clinton, a hawk in own right who would have easily fitted in the Republican party if it was not for political convenience and opportunism.

In Europe, NATO and their machinations crept eastwards (a creeping self-given mandate or a creepy mission?). It reminds one about the Cold War USA policy of “containment” (encirclement) of the USSR. One can indeed refer to a renewed “containment of a special type” – a hangover mentality since the Cold war and the normal knee jerk reaction against the East, in this case with Russia on the receiving end. No conspiracies here; only mentalities, very deep-seated mentalities.

No real other enemies were in the immediate area and Russian aggression nowhere. During 2008 the USA intervened in Georgia with financial and military support including “specialist” forces. Right on the borders of Russia. The Western creep continued. Poland,

Romania and others joined NATO. If anyone was to feel increasingly beleaguered and under siege, it was Russia and the Russian People. Putin even offered to become part of NATO for reasons unknown before 2010 and was cold shouldered, another act that proved that NATO was seeing Russia as a threat (or Russians as lesser human beings) rather than a future partner – the lingering hate for the East earlier referred to and the “We are the West; We are the Best” mentality ruled supreme.

The UK openly allow the creation of mercenary companies to destabilise Eastern Ukraine. No wish to alleviate the conflict, but clearly actions intended to further stoke conflict and violence. And Russia, the only guilt party? Hardly; things are by far not so simple.

Incidents like the blasts at the Nord Stream Pipelines 1 and 2 raised vexed questions. Russia has since long ago provided oil and gas to her European counterparts. Supplies that are vital to the European nations and earning hard currency for the Russian economy. Would Russia shoot her own feet off to sabotage these vital pipe lines? Hardly. Investigating the blasts include Sweden and Danish experts. What has Sweden to hide? Conceivably Sweden could gain financially out of the blasts. Wide-ranging American sanctions being imposed under USA pressure against Russia worsened things. Perhaps sanctions are hurting Russia but equally sanctions are hurting European economies more than they thought. Were the USA/UK security forces (read: special forces) involved in the Nord Stream blasts? Quite possible. The blasts can be blamed on Russia thus further stereotyping Russia as the supreme culprit and aggressor. That is possible. If the USA was involved, why do so? The USA economy did not feel the punch as hard as European economies. If the USA and/or UK were involved in that shortsighted act of sabotage it is hurting Europeans far more. Seems that the USA has less of a caring mindset for its junior European brothers and sisters in NATO and the EU. In the meantime, tectonic shifts are taking place in global politics. China’s economy got a boost by ever increasing trade with Russia, including oil. India increased oil trade deals with Russia – and not using the USA Dollar. The latter predictably will weaken the US Dollar in the long run and an international turn away from the US Dollar as main currency in Eurasia and the Global South. Seems that the USA with dwindling reserves did not think about the unintended consequences of its own policy. The USA economy will feel eventually the crunch and the USA has far less reserves than global giants such as China. Could it be that through thoughtless action, the USA has triggered the implosion of its economy, which is but “capitalism-on-a-credit card”? The centre will not hold, things are slowly but surely falling apart. The USA and some of its military-like followers are seemingly blissfully unaware of this.

War will not bring a solution. Nor will moral outrages. On the long term, a drawn-out war is destructive. Russian isolation may be broken in unforeseen developments such as increasing trade with India and China and others. Unrest in Europe may follow as fuel prices hike – the comprehensive Russian boycott may in the longer run for Europe a “cut your nose to spite your face”. Likewise, the war will increasingly become a growing strain, worse than now, on the Russo-European economies. And the nettle remains. If sovereignty has two sides, what about Ukrainians that want to belong to the “East”? What should apply to one, should equally apply to the other if we break through this war of words. Realistically spoken, there is only one way out. Negotiations.

In Europe where their political leadership was too weak (or blissfully ignorant) as Kissinger suggested, to challenge the USA hegemonic designs in Europe, things may change. In three polls in Germany conducted last year (2022), more than 60% of German people consider negotiations as a better option than war. In Italy the debate intensifies with many looking for a negotiated settlement, with Turkey as possible facilitator. Indeed, Russia has expressed willingness to explore the options of negotiation already in April 2022. In Portugal,

it is rumoured that the debate also started and that Portuguese political leadership and the security community are discussing other options. If this is so, it is a wise choice by Portugal and a possible example for EU and NATO members.

The situation will have to be negotiated. There is no single sovereignty in Ukraine at stake here. The right to choose your sovereignty should be consistently applied to a divided Ukrainian people. People as a self-defined group, should be given the right to choose their *political habitus* and their future belonging. The wish for sovereignty has at least two sides and apply to the Eastern Ukraine.

During the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution on the matter in 2022 and the massive vote against Russian actions, only two voices of reason emerged. Both implied a wider reading of the history of the historical complexities and pointed towards a rational solution. These voices were China and India, calling for a wider historical perspective and reduction of armed conflict. Many countries (from the global South, especially poorer ones), could not dare to vote in favour of Russia, because their earlier colonial rulers and now new colonial beneficiaries (continued profit and exploitation of poorer states and the economy of dependency and the global development of under-development) would have put a throttling boot on their necks. Think West Africa, think Namibia and South Africa and a host of smaller economically weak countries in the Global South and even north of the equator dependent on their Core States Master's voice.

The rational way out is negotiations. It will be tough. It may include UN supervised referenda (oversight by the international community, the UN) in a divided Ukraine and perhaps even a commitment from a self-imposed hegemon, the USA withdrawing its military presence from Europe to allow an impartial solution. And such a negotiated solution under international UN supervision may require that no USA, European and Russian forces be part of the UN Peace-Keeping forces deployed there to oversee the implementation of such a plan. A plan that is, for for a national referendum in current Ukraine following a cease fire. And if Ukrainians vote in two ways (West-Ukraine versus East Ukraine), the resolution would then be holding elections in both Ukraine's to determine the real leaders, in this case again under UN oversight and peace-keeping forces.

Conflict cannot solve the problem. Creative and far-sighted alternatives, even if it looks far-fetched, may well provide new opportunities for peace in the future. After all, in politics nothing can be predicted and many things are possible.



## УКРАИНА: ВЗГЛЯД ИЗ АФРИКИ НА ВОЗМОЖНЫЕ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ

© 2023 Ян Либенберг

Ян ЛИБЕНБЕРГ, профессор политики Факультета коммерции, менеджмента и права Университета Намибии (UNAM), Намибия, а также экстраординарный профессор политических наук Факультета военных наук (FEMS) Стелленбошского университета в ЮАР. email: jankalahari@gmail.com

Мнения, выраженные в статье, отражают персональное и частное мнение автора и не связаны с позицией упомянутых высших учебных заведений. Положения статьи также не отражают мнения редакции журнала и его издателя.

***Аннотация.** В статье африканского ученого предпринята попытка взглянуть на нынешний украинский кризис под ракурсом широкой исторической ретроспективы, в контексте возникновения и размывания Вестфальской системы международных отношений, формирования исторической памяти россиян в последние два с половиной столетия, многочисленных примеров вероломства (автор пишет «предательства») в отношении России со стороны Запада – от нашествия Наполеона до Минских соглашений. Автор приходит к выводу, что вооруженный конфликт не может привести к разрешению украинского кризиса. Ситуацию придется обсуждать. Речь не идет о едином суверенитете Украины. Право выбора своего суверенитета, по мнению автора, должно быть последовательно применено к разделенному украинскому народу. Людям, как самоопределившейся группе, должно быть предоставлено право выбирать свой политический статус и свою будущую принадлежность. Желание суверенитета имеет как минимум две стороны и касается в равной мере и Восточной Украины. Конфликт не может решить проблему. Креативные и дальновидные альтернативы, даже если они выглядят надуманными, вполне могут открыть новые возможности для мира в будущем.*

**Ключевые слова:** Украина, Россия, украинский кризис, самоопределение, суверенитет

DOI: 10.31132/2412-5717-2023-62-1-5-13