



Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ БІЛІМ - 2018»
XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ

XIII Международная научная конференция
студентов и молодых ученых
«НАУКА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ - 2018»

The XIII International Scientific Conference
for Students and Young Scientists
«SCIENCE AND EDUCATION - 2018»



12th April 2018, Astana

**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ**

**Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«Ғылым және білім - 2018»
атты XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
XIII Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2018»**

**PROCEEDINGS
of the XIII International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2018»**

2018 жыл 12 сәуір

Астана

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

Ғ 96

Ғ 96

«Ғылым және білім – 2018» атты студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = XIII Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2018» = The XIII International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2018». – Астана: <http://www.enu.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie/>, 2018. – 7513 стр. (қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша).

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия
ұлттық университеті, 2018

**UNNOTICED HUMANITARIAN CRISIS: DESPERATE SITUATION OF MYANMAR
ROHINGYA**

Suleimenov N.

nsuleimenov@nu.edu.kz

2st course Master of International Relations, L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana,
Kazakhstan

Scientific Advisor –A.N. Zholdasbekova

In the light of the recent widespread refugee crisis related to the humanitarian catastrophes in Libya, Syria, Iraq and neighboring regions, most of the world community neither noticed nor paid enough attention to the crisis taking place in Myanmar. Many politicians around the world covered this issue and condemned the government of Myanmar, but there were few significant actions to stop the violence. Existence of more than hundred thousands of refugees and internally displaced people, systematic tortures, massacres and persecutions of mostly Muslim population of Rohingya in the buddhist Myanmar had almost zero impact on the everyday international relations. The aim of this work thus to consider the responses of major international actors to this crisis and analyze whether there were enough things done. In order to do that I am going to choose appropriate definitions of humanitarian crisis and humanitarian intervention. Then I am going to consider the crisis itself by referring to humanitarian aid organizations and famous news agencies. After that I will cover responses made by the United Nations, the United States, Russia, China and other important actors of humanitarian intervention and compare them to the responses made by them towards Syrian crisis. I state that, considering similarities and differences of the crises, the Myanmar case was heavily underrated and absence of threat of humanitarian intervention by any major power was incomprehensible.

In order to analyze human sufferings we need to have specific definitions criteria. One of the biggest problems here is that there are no clear definitions of humanitarian crisis and intervention. Different groups, organizations and political scientists suggest wide variety of humanitarian crisis definitions, therefore, different parties use their own version of humanitarian crisis when faced with crisis. These differences contain nature of a crisis, its scale and causes, etc. World Vision, for instance, claims that “complex emergency” is a combination of natural disasters and man-made disasters or solely man-made disasters¹. Moreover, the emergency also includes high level violence, deaths and refugees; shortage water and food; weakening of social, political and economic structure of societies or states. Here the man-made disasters mean any emergency resulting from human activities, including armed conflicts. I ignored those the crisis definitions which did not include human activities, because analyzing the situation of Rohingya does not require me to focus on them.

Supporting the previous definition, Humanitarian Coalition adds the following points: in times of complex emergencies there can be political and military limitations for humanitarian aid and potential risks for aid workers in crisis areas². For instance, there were crises when the desperate conditions of civilians worsened by the fact that governmental or local forces prohibited the incoming aid³. Moreover, there were also cases when humanitarian convoys were attacked by different sides of conflicts resulting in the injuries and deaths of humanitarian workers⁴.

Nevertheless, the problem of the previous definitions is that they do not give exact number of suffering people required to call a situation as humanitarian crisis. In times of massive tensions or conflicts each side of the conflict tries to minimize negative consequences of its actions and exaggerate opposing sides' actions in order to avoid backlash from the world community. The similar situation is correct for external players who support different sides of the conflict. For instance, United States and its allies covered the fact that they dealt with terrorist groups and Russia did not plead guilty to kill civilians in bombings in the Syrian crisis⁵ ⁶. The UN Charter, the

Responsibility to protect or any other universally or generally recognized document does not provide scale of tensions under which situation could be called as crisis. It is all about the desperate condition of groups of people and societies, but there is nothing about the amount of deaths, injuries or internally and externally displaced people. There are, however, situations when there exists ethnic cleansing, genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Most of the world agrees that there is a humanitarian crisis in these situations, but even this classification ignores the number of casualties required to react. Therefore, in order to solve this problem I decided to combine the definitions of civil war and humanitarian crisis, thus solve the scale problem. Meredith Reid Sarkees states that interstate conflict or tension can be a civil war, if per each year of the conflict there are at least 1,000 deaths⁷. This supports the situation of Rohingya, where there were more than 6000 dead people and almost a half million people fled in several months of tensions in 2017⁸.

Now let us turn to the definition of humanitarian intervention. There is a vagueness here too. For instance, one group states that humanitarian intervention is a use of military beyond its borders to protect human rights, lives and well-being⁹. Others, however, may claim that there should be non-military means or combination of military and non-military means. I decided to choose the combination of non-military and military means, because economic sanctions and international shaming can have very powerful damaging effect to target states or factions similar to the use of military forces. One of the non-military tools widely used in humanitarian crises, for instance, is banning trade of lethal weapons. In the absence of weapon, one should expect de-escalation of tensions, and most importantly reduction of deaths and injuries.

Another problem is that there is no universally accepted requirement for the actor who intervenes. Any state or party authorized by the United Nations Security Council is widely accepted as legitimate and legal military intervention actor, but there were cases when an unauthorized state or group of states used military intervention in humanitarian crises. NATO bombing Yugoslavia is a good example. Despite official announcements that the interventions were made to protect suffering people, the existence of other actors undermines the universality of humanitarian intervention¹⁰. The fact that Kofi Annan partly supported the NATO intervention also undermines the concept of humanitarian intervention¹¹. However, I am not focusing on state sovereignty concepts here and violation of article 2(4) of the UN Charter by different states is not my concern. The fact that there were several cases of unauthorized military intervention, when the numbers of casualties and refugees grew rapidly, and that the UN General Secretary partly supported unauthorized interventions emphasize the point that similar situation could potentially happen in the case of Myanmar. Therefore, I choose the definition which combines non-authorized and authorized parties' intervention in humanitarian crises.

After choosing appropriate definitions for the analysis we can turn to the crisis in Myanmar. Problems of Rohingya people have been lasting for several decades. Despite living in the territories of Myanmar for at least 2 or 3 centuries, they were not allowed a citizenship of Myanmar¹². Thus, Rohingya minority has been stateless and with minimum rights and protection for several decades, facing increasing hostilities from non-muslim ethnic groups. The government did not work on improving the conditions of Rohingya and de-escalating tensions between buddhist majority and muslim minority.

Absence of any activity from the government led to the widespread refugee crisis. The situation of the stateless and marginalized people became even worse than it had been. Medecins Sans Frontieres, Human Rights Watch, BBC and other humanitarian organizations and news agencies claim that Myanmar government and pro-governmental groups killed almost 7000 Rohingya people, raping many women and girls, allowing the hostile groups to burn almost 300 villages^{13 14}.

International State Crime Initiative at Queen Mary University of London, in turn, states that the government intentional and in organized manner used ethnic cleansing, religious persecutions and genocide¹⁵. The group finds similarities between the Jews of the Nazi Germany and the Rohingya in Myanmar. Both were deprived of most of their rights and opportunities. There existed institutionalized segregation of the minority from other ethnic groups. Moreover, the Myanmar government either sanctioned or ignored many flagrant and apparent unlawful actions and rallies

against the muslim minority. Thus, Rohingya have already experienced “stigmatisation, harassment, isolation, and systematic weakening” - four out of six criteria of genocide.

Considering the very narrow definition of humanitarian crisis and the very broad definition of humanitarian intervention one should expect very firm and aggressive reactions from the world leaders - the narrow definition of crisis decreases the chance of overestimating the situation of Rohingya and the broad definition of intervention allows both authorized and non-authorized actors to intervene much easier.

When considering the responses of the world, the UN human rights chief Zeid Raad al-Hussein heavily criticized the Myanmar government for mistreating its people. He called this situation as “textbook example of ethnic cleansing”¹⁶. In other words, he blamed the country’s officials for conducting one of the most severe crimes in the world. He called for international investigation of this case and finding the guilty. The UN Secretary-General Guterres also lashed out at Myanmar for intentional deteriorating the conditions of Rohingya and ignoring criticisms of the world¹⁷.

Many politicians provided humanitarian aid to refugees and accused the Myanmar government and its de-facto leader Aung San Suu Kyi. Turkey’s PM called the situation “genocide” and called for rapid reaction¹⁸. The United Kingdom and the United States officials also openly criticized the government by calling its actions as crimes against humanity and stopped joint military programs with Myanmar^{19 20}.

China, India and Russia, on the other hand, were on the Myanmar’s side^{21 22}. Chinese foreign ministry spokesman Geng Shuang implied that the activities of the Myanmar army during the crisis were justified and pursued stability, and that the international community had to support the Myanmar’s efforts to control its territories. The Indian Prime Minister stated that the Myanmar was fighting extremist groups who wanted to destabilize the country. Therefore, the military forces should not be accused for crimes. In addition, as the permanent members of the Security Council, China and Russia showed willingness to block any UN resolution which criticized the Myanmar government for the desperate conditions of Rohingya.

All the responses are partly similar to what happened in Syria. The sides supporting and criticizing the Myanmar government were almost similar. The reasons why the United Nations and Western and Islamic countries blamed Myanmar were that the latter’s actions were in the list of most severe crimes - persecution of ethnic and religious minority. The government was brutally targeting its religious and ethnic minority, so values of the Western world and religious ties of the Islamic states led to accusation of Myanmar. Similarly, the Western states and many Muslim majority countries criticized Assad and supported the rebels in the case of Syria. Nevertheless, the United States did not take any firm actions in Myanmar. The US intervened in many crises, and if it was necessary, even without the UNSC permission. In Syria we saw that the US funded military training of the rebels and even bombed the governmental forces, but there was nothing remotely similar in the Myanmar case. There are many differences between the Myanmar and Syrian cases- numbers of deaths, injuries and periods. However, the existence hundreds of thousands refugees, thousands of deaths, signs of ethnic cleansing and genocide in several months in Myanmar was a good reason to consider it as civil war and humanitarian crisis. It allowed the use of military, yet the US government decided to react limitedly.

China, Russia and India backed Myanmar, possibly because of two reasons. First, all of them were experiencing problems with ethnic and religious minorities, especially Muslim ones. China is having troubles with Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, India with Kashmir and Russia with Caucasus. The other reason might be that they deny superiority of humanitarian intervention over sovereignty.

In conclusion, we did not see active involvement of the world community in the Rohingya crisis. There were supporters of the Myanmar government which mistreated its people. There were also those who criticized it. Yet the United States and the United Nations did use any powerful means to improve the conditions of the Rohingya people. It is not like the usual actions of the USA that it did not threaten to use military force. It has been lobbying superiority of human rights over state

sovereignty in many crises, but here it remained silent. Thus it is not about people's sufferings but because of something else states decide to intervene.

Literature::

1. World Vision International [Electronic source] / Disaster Management; What is a humanitarian disaster? - Electronic data. ; - World Vision International. 2018 - Access mode: <https://www.wvi.org/>, available. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.
2. Humanitarian Coalition [Electronic source] / What Is a Humanitarian Emergency? - Electronic data. ; - Human, Coal.. 2018 - Access mode: <http://humanitariancoalition.ca> available. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.
3. Kevin Sieff. South Sudan's people are starving, and fighters are blocking aid. «The Washington Post» <https://www.washingtonpost.com> 31.03.2017.
4. Fred McCray. Is it too dangerous for aid workers to be in South Sudan? «The Guardian» <https://www.theguardian.com> 01.11.2016.
5. Quentin Sommerville and Riam Dalati. Raqqa's dirty secret. «BBC» <https://www.bbc.co.uk> 13.11.2017.
6. BBC. Syria war: Russia denies bombing civilians in Deir al-Zour village. «BBC» <https://www.bbc.co.uk> 27.11.2017.
7. Penn State College of the Liberal Arts [Electronic source] / The COW Typology of War: Defining and Categorizing Wars (Version 4 of the Data); by Meredith Reid Sarkees - Electronic data. ; - COW Wars v. 4.0, 1816-2007. 2018 - Access mode: <http://cow.la.psu.edu>, available. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.
8. Poppy McPherson. 6,700 Rohingya Muslims killed in one month in Myanmar, MSF says. «The Guardian» <https://www.theguardian.com> 14.12.2017.
10. Mark S. Stein. Unauthorized humanitarian intervention // Social Philosophy and Policy. – Cambridge, 2004. – № 21(1). – pp. 14-38.
11. Steven Erlanger. Rights Group Says NATO Bombing in Yugoslavia Violated Law. «The New York Times» <https://www.nytimes.com> 08.06.2000.
12. Annan K. Mousavizadeh N. Interventions. A Life in War and Peace. – London: Penguin Books, 2012. – pp. 92-97.
13. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Why Burma's Rohingya Muslims are among the world's most persecuted people. «CBC» <https://www.cbc.ca> 26.05.2015.
14. Human Rights Watch [Electronic source] / All of My Body Was Pain. - Electronic data. ; - Human Rights Watch Report. 2017 - Access mode: <https://www.hrw.org> available. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.
15. BBC. Myanmar Rohingya: What you need to know about the crisis. «CBC» <http://www.bbc.com> 16.01.2018.
16. Queen Mary University of London [Electronic source] / Campaigns of violence towards Rohingya are highly organised and genocidal in intent. - Electronic data. ; - Queen Mary University media news. 2015 - Access mode: <https://www.qmul.ac.uk> available. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.
17. The United Nations News. UN human rights chief points to 'textbook example of ethnic cleansing' in Myanmar. «UN News» <http://www.bbc.com> 11.09.2017.
18. Channel NewsAsia. UN chief hits out at Myanmar army chief over Rohingya comments. «Channel NewsAsia» <https://www.channelnewsasia.com> 27.03.2018.
19. Reuters. Turkish PM calls Rohingya killings in Myanmar 'genocide's. «Reuters» <https://www.reuters.com> 20.12.2017.
20. Mason R. and Stewart R. UK to suspend training of Burmese military over treatment of Rohingya. «The Guardian» <https://www.theguardian.com>. 19.09.2017.
21. The Guardian. US withdraws assistance from Myanmar military amid Rohingya crisis. «The Guardian» <https://www.theguardian.com>. 14.10.2017.
1. 21 The Diplomat [Electronic source] / On Rohingya Issue, Both China and India Back Myanmar Government. - Electronic data. ; - Southeast Asia. 2017 - Access mode:

<https://thediplomat.com>. - Загл. сэкрана. - English.

22. Agence France-Presse at the United Nations. China and Russia oppose UN resolution on Rohingya. «TheGuardian» <https://www.theguardian.com> 24.12.2017.

УДК 327.2.3.

ПОМОЩЬ МВФ В ПРЕОДОЛЕНИИ ФИНАНСОВОГО КРИЗИСА ДЛЯ СТРАН УЧАСТНИЦ ФОНДА

Агубаева Әнел Мұратқызы

Anel_99_27@mail.ru

Студентка 1 курса, специальности 5В020200 –Международные отношения ЕНУ им.

Л.Н.Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

Научный руководитель – к.п.н., доцент А.Ж.Турханова

В данной статье мы хотим рассмотреть то, как международный валютный фонд помогает странам-участницам в период финансового кризиса. Для начала стоит разобраться, что представляет из себя эта организация, ее функции и тд. И так, МВФ(международный валютный фонд)-это межправительственная организация, которая занимается регулированием валютно-кредитных отношений между странами-участницами и предоставлением им финансовой помощи при валютных затруднениях.

МВФ специализируется на предоставлении кратковременных кредитов бедным странам, но также МВФ помогает странам-участницам, если у тех появляется нехватка иностранной валюты с целью покрытия своих финансовых задолженностей. [1]

Нынешний мировой финансовый кризис начался с разрушения в 2007 году американского рынка недвижимости, который определил роль МВФ как основной международной организации по упорядочиванию глобальной финансовой системы. [2. с.136] Мало вероятно, что фонд окажет помощь развитым странам, так как МВФ должен показать, что имеет большое значение на мировой арене и выступить как источник для решения кризиса, а также показать, что является главенствующим координатором макроэкономической политики мира.

Важно отметить, что МВФ специализируется решением экономических проблем и особые усилия производит согласно Уставу по расширению и укреплению экономики стран-участниц. МВФ был задуман, как своеобразное сообщество взаимного кредит, которое помогает странам-участникам справиться с временными финансовыми трудностями. Также, особенностью МВФ в сравнении с другими организациями является тем, что он комбинирует финансовые, консультативные и регулирующие функции.

Согласно Уставу, большое внимание МВФ уделяет на наблюдение за экономической политикой стран-участниц в отношении валютных курсов. На сегодняшний день, в связи со «сменой власти» в МВФ идут разногласия относительно задач, функций и целей МВФ. Корректировка правил предоставления финансовой помощи является инициативой нового руководителя МВФ Хорста Келера. В Уставе Фонда существуют два понятия кредитной деятельности: 1) сделка (transaction) — предоставление валютных средств странам из его ресурсов; 2) операция (operation) — оказание посреднических финансовых и технических услуг за счет заемных средств.

МВФ совершает кредитные операции исключительно с официальными органами —, центральными банками, казначействами, стабилизационными фондами. Страна, которая нуждается в иностранной валюте, совершает покупку (purchase) иностранной валюты, которое начисляется на счет МВФ в центральном банке этой страны. МВФ предоставляет валютные кредиты странам-участницам якобы «под залог» нужных сумм, которые неконвертируют национальные валюты.

Когда срок установленного периода времени истечет, страна-участница обязана