THEORETICAL BASES OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN SECURITY SPHERE BETWEEN THE EUROPEN UNION AND CENTRAL ASIA

Elmira Serikovna Taukebayeva[1]
Madiyar Ualievich Zhumabekov[1]
Askar Berdiyarovich Saparov[2]

[1]M.Auezov South-Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan
[2]Tashkent State Agrarian University 1st year student of the Faculty of Agrology and Business, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: elt_s@mail.ru, berdiyarsaparov@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the detailed consideration of the basic reasons and impediments of cooperation of these two regions in the sphere of security, explained in theories of different political scientists. The authors study the concepts ‘security’ and ‘international relations’ through the diverse perceptions and approaches, considering their evolution, which is directly connected with expansion of international system’s scope, the development of which has been promoted by the success in the sphere of communication system development, improvement of military technology, growth of industry and trade. These theories are the basis of understanding how the necessity of protection of national state interests and national security of the newly independent states of Central Asia and the EU, which just recently started to conduct a unified foreign policy, reflected on the effectiveness of security cooperation of two regions.

Keywords: international cooperation, security, European Union, Central Asia, realism, liberalism

INTRODUCTION

The relations between Central Asian countries and the EU is an objective, appropriate and at the same time a relatively new factor of world policy, which has appeared on the grounds of the formation of the EU as a unified entity and recently incipient international activity of countries, united in the term ‘Central Asia’. The development of relations on a multilateral and bilateral level (one of the EU state with one of Central Asian state, the EU with separately taken Central Asian state, the EU with all Central Asian states) presumes an elaboration of conceptual approach of the EU and Central Asian countries to each other. It is specified by geopolitical and geostrategical situation, difference of national interests, belonging to different civilizations and unequal international status of both regions as actors of international arena.

Let us refer to the basic reasons and impediments of cooperation of these two regions in the sphere of security, explained in theories of different authors.

METHODOLOGY

General methodological principles were used for the study of international relation theories in the security sphere. This allowed conducting an objective study of this form of relations. They are the following: political and philosophical methods of cognition of reality, political methods of analyzing socio-political phenomena, as well as sociological, systemic, comparative, structural-functional and content analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One of the basic notions in theory and practice of foreign policy of states and interstate relations is a national interest. Consideration of national interests by a state is reflected in its choice of initial parameters of geopolitical, military-strategic, economic, diplomatic and culture-historic character of foreign policy formation. It also allows elaborating priorities in the sphere of international relations by a state.

Nowadays the coincidence of states' interests is a frequent phenomenon. Political and economic interdependence of states, deepening internationalization of production, nuclear and ecological threat of mankind's survival conduce to a greater intersection of interests, to an increase of common grounds of states in various issues of modern life, including security sphere.

Diverse perceptions and approaches in research of the concept 'security' correspond to specific values and threats. Their evolution is connected with expansion of international system's scope, the development of which has been promoted by the success in the sphere of communication system development, improvement of military technology, growth of industry and trade.

The term 'security' was introduced into academic discourse in 1920-1930's [1]. Nowadays the term security is interpreted as "absence of circumstances or factors able to break off the existence of one or another system in that or another significant characteristics, i.e. cause damage to it" [2]. This broad explication of a phenomenon is a result of broad theoretical debates among representatives of the Security studies, which had taken place during the 90's of XX century and continuing with less intensity in the beginning of a new century. The debates have resulted in over-comprehension of the term 'security'. Some participants of debates started to work over alternative variants of cooperation of states for the purpose of solution or overcoming of classical dilemma of security [3].

The reality made the mankind to come to a conclusion that international security prevails over national security, which is powerless in avoidance of nuclear catastrophe. International security in contrast to national security presumes that security of one state tightly connected with security of other states, or at least with security of one other state. Since states are interdependent in their interests of security, security of one state depends on foreign political activity of other state and vice versa.

The most important peculiarity of regional systems, which is intermediate between global international and state systems, is a complex of security [4]. Buzan B. asserts that neighboring states turn to be so tightly interrelated with each other in the issues of security, that national security of one of them cannot be separated from national securities of others. The basis of the structure of any regional subsystem is composed by two factors: distribution of powers among actors and relations of friendliness or hostility between them. Both factors are affected by manipulation from the great powers [4].

Many researchers consider that modern international order is an international disorder. Discussions on polarity, centricity, power, supremacy, international law etc. have not decided one of the most important issues of international relations – problem of peace and security. Interstate war loses a historical perspective, as governments exhaust reserves of reasons, justifying forwarding of numerous troops outside their borders.

The notions of national, regional and international security are becoming more inter-correlated [5]. Modern Eurasia is good example of it. As for the regional security, we see here all basic models of regional security regimes: common (general) security, collective security and cooperative security (based on cooperation). The last one is based on diplomatic measures in security guaranteeing. The role of preventive diplomacy, trust measures, dialogue and multilateral forms of cooperation, consultations is significant for that regime of security.

The term ‘international cooperation’ is implied as a process of interaction of two or more participating parts, when violent use is excluded and mutual search for realization of common interests prevails [6]. The result of this cooperation cannot be halved, it can be either positive one, when interests of both parts are satisfied, or negative one, when there is no consent between them.

The distinct position concerning the possibility of international cooperation as a whole has been expressed by representatives of political realism: the established institutions have been considered as instruments of realization of interests of the minority of powerful states, and cases of behavior, determinated by institutions, have

been considered as coincidence of interests [7]. Scepticism regarding cooperation remained even after the Second World War.

R. Jervis distinguished two types of realism: offensive and defensive [8]. The representatives of the first type almost completely exclude the possibility of cooperation. The benefits, turned out of it could be converted into military advantages [9]; this could lead to the strengthening of military power of one of the partners, which is very risky for other partners. The representatives of the second type accentuate on the aspiration of states to provide their security. The motive of their policy is fear, but not the desire to dominate.

In contrast to realists, liberals consider that there are more possibilities for international cooperation. Being in position of complex interdependence, states lose their ability to pursue their one-sided interests effectively, and only international institutions can bring the interstate relations to effectiveness.

Liberal institutionalism relies on the theory of rational behavior, considering actors of world policy as rational ones, facing with the necessity to act in situation of uncertainty, taking into account limits in choice realization. The existence of institutions makes this choice easier. They allow increasing awareness, reducing transaction costs and offering a definite field of possible actions, in other words increasing effectiveness of cooperation relations. In support of the fact that actors prefer cooperation instead of unilateral actions, liberals used a game theory, in particular a model ‘prisoner’s dilemma’.

Axelrod R. asserts that cooperation relations indeed can be in the egoistic world without constrained power, it will happen in conjuncture when actors face with the great probability of repeated interaction and the results of forthcoming interaction have significance in a long-term perspective [10].

If states are involved in repeated interactions, and as a result they are alternately winning and losing, and if they in any event will be forced to re-engage in such interaction, then they will not be interested to leave it and prefer tactics of unilateral actions. In the long term perspective behavior, based on cooperation, according to liberals, is the best strategy. Institutions are designed to increase both the cost for violations and profit from cooperation. Researches, studying game theory, reveal that actors make a conscious choice in favor of the institutions to reduce uncertainty and, thus, weaken the state of anarchy in international system [10]. Flexibility of institutions allows actors to look for more effective models of cooperation. The positive experience of cooperation in the spheres, where consent is easily attained, extends to the spheres, where states usually hardly can find common grounds.

The problems of international cooperation are explained by a theory, which interpret the world processes by clash of culture-civilization blocks. The author of this theory S. Hantington confirms his conclusion by the fact that new conflicts, which emerged after the Cold War, have mainly national slant, and their geography coincides with the border line between Muslim and Christian civilizations, and even more, he asserts that modern conflicts are harbingers of larger scaled clash between West and other world [11]. This theory doesn't attract me as it contradict to my theory where there is a possibility of effective security cooperation of the EU an Central Asia, representatives of different culture-civilization blocks. But it can explain some hardships in its progress. Here we even can say that the differences in political culture, democratic one adherent to the EU and authoritarian adherent to Central Asia, are additional factors, which impede the effectiveness of security cooperation.

CONCLUSION

All the abovementioned theories can be projected on the cooperation of the EU and Central Asia in security sphere. These theories are the basis of understanding how the necessity of protection of national state interests and national security of the newly independent states of Central Asia and the EU, which just recently started to conduct a unified foreign policy, reflected on the effectiveness of security cooperation of two regions. The researches in this field prove that the development of security relations of the EU with Central Asia depends on many factors: the priority of the Central Asian region for the EU in different time periods (basically according to the corresponding Strategies); the misperception in choice of approach towards the Central Asian region; adherence to democratic principles by the Central Asian states; interdependence of interests not only in security but other spheres too.

REFERENCES

1. Sergunin, Alexander (2002): Evolution of the notion 'security' in the theory of international relations / Language. Culture. Activity: East-West: Abstracts of reports of international scientific conference's participants. Naberezhnye Chelny – Nizhny Novgorod, p.214. – Сергунин, Александр (2002): Эволюция понятия «безопасность» в теории международных отношений / Язык. Культура. Деятельность: Восток – Запад: Тезисы докладов участников международной научной конференции. Набережные Челны – Нижний Новгород, С. 214.
2. Makarychev, Andrei (2003): Security as a phenomenon of public policy: common regularities and projections onto Baltic region / Public policy in the sphere of soft security: Baltic dimension. St.Petersburg, p. 67. – Макарычев, Андрей (2003):

Безопасность как феномен публичной политики: общие закономерности и проекции на Балтийский регион / Публичная политика в сфере мягкой безопасности: Балтийское измерение. СПб, С. 67.
3. Krause, Keith in Williams, Michael C. (1996): Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods, in: Mershon International Studies Review, Vol. 40, №2, pp. 229-230.
4. Buzan, Barry (1991): People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era. London.
5. Keohane, Robert O., Martin, Lisa L. (1995): The promise of institutionalist theory, in: International Security, Vol. 20, № 3, p.43.
6. Cygankov, Pavel (1996): International Relations / Tutorial. Moscow: New School, p.47.- Цыганков, Павел (1996): Международные отношения / Учебное пособие. Москва: Новая Школа, С.47
7. Morgenthau, Hans Joachim (1985): Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. 6th edition. New York.
8. Jervis, Robert (1999): Realism, Neoliberalism and Cooperation, in: International Security, Vol. 24, № 1, p. 48.
9. Mearsheimer, John J. (1994/95): The false promise of international institutions, in: International Security, Vol. 19, № 3, pp.5-49.
10. Axelrod, Robert, Keohane, Robert (1985): Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: States and Institutions, in: World Politics, p. 250.
11. Hantington, Samuel P. (1993): The Clash of Civalizations?, in: Foreign Affairs, pp. 22-49.