

- Q. 4.** Russia and NATO have outrightly opposing stance on how to end Ukraine's war. Trump on the other hand has different stance from NATO leader. Critically analyze the situation and give recommendations.

Q4. Answer.

Divergent Approaches to Ending the Ukraine War: Russia, NATO and Trump

The war in Ukraine has become one of most complex geopolitical conflicts of 21st century. While Russia and NATO maintain outrightly opposing positions on how war should end, former US President Donald Trump presents a markedly different approach from mainstream NATO leadership. These conflicting stances have deepened stalemate

and complicated prospects for sustainable peace.

Russia's Position :

Russia frames Ukraine war as a defensive response to NATO's eastward expansion. From Moscow's perspective, NATO's growing presence near its borders threatens its national security and strategic depth. Consequently, Russia insists that any resolution must include Ukraine's permanent neutrality and recognition of territorial changes, particularly "Crimea" and parts of eastern Ukraine. Therefore, Moscow rejects NATO's demand for a full military withdrawal, viewing it as unrealistic and strategically unacceptable.

NATO's Stance:

NATO's approach is grounded in principles of state sovereignty and international law. The alliance maintains that allowing Russia to retain occupied Ukrainian

territory, would legitimize aggression and destabilize the global order.

As a result, NATO continues to provide military, financial and intelligence support to Ukraine.

However, this strategy faces growing economic and political costs. Despite extensive support, NATO has not achieved a decisive military outcome, raising questions about the long-term sustainability of its approach.

Trump's Divergence:

Donald Trump's stance sharply diverges from NATO consensus. He criticizes extensive US involvement in Ukraine and argues that European allies should bear a greater share of the burden. Trump favors rapid negotiations, even if they involve territorial concessions by Ukraine.

While this approach may reduce immediate costs and shorten the conflict, it risks undermining NATO's unity and credibility. A premature settlement could

embolden future aggression by signalling that military force can alter borders with limited consequences.

Strategic Deadlock and Global Risks:

The contrasting positions have produced a strategic impasse. Russia seeks recognition of its gains, NATO insists on restoring Ukraine's sovereignty and Trump prioritizes expedient compromise. This lack of alignment prolongs the war and increases escalation risks, including wider regional instability.

Moreover, divisions within the Western alliance weaken diplomatic leverage and create uncertainty for Ukraine. Without a coordinated strategy, the conflict risks evolving into a prolonged war of attrition.

Recommendations:

1. NATO should combine military support with structured diplomatic engagement to test Russia's willingness for de-escalation.

2. The US and European allies must address burden-sharing concerns to preserve alliance cohesion.
3. A phased peace framework should prioritize ceasefire and humanitarian measures before final territorial negotiations.

Conclusion:

The Ukraine war persists due to irreconcilable objectives among Russia, NATO and divergent US leadership perspectives. A sustainable resolution requires strategic realism, alliance unity and gradual diplomacy. Without these, the conflict will continue to undermine regional stability and global order.