



ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ТҰҢҒЫШ ПРЕЗИДЕНТІ - ЕЛБАСЫНЫҢ ҚОРЫ

«ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ БІЛІМ – 2017»

студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
XII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
XII Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«НАУКА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ – 2017»

PROCEEDINGS
of the XII International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«SCIENCE AND EDUCATION - 2017»



14th April 2017, Astana



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

**«Ғылым және білім - 2017»
студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
XII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
XII Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2017»**

**PROCEEDINGS
of the XII International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2017»**

2017 жыл 14 сәуір

Астана

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

Ғ 96

Ғ 96

«Ғылым және білім – 2017» студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың XII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = The XII International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2017» = XII Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2017». – Астана: <http://www.enu.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie/>, 2017. – 7466 стр. (қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша).

ISBN 978-9965-31-827-6

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 978-9965-31-827-6

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия
ұлттық университеті, 2017

is determined by the fact that they are very active participants in modern international relations due to their specific and attractive geopolitical and geoeconomic status. Thus, within the regional situation in Central Asia and around it remains difficult: in addition to the internal problems of the region local, regional and global interests intertwined in a complex knot, which significantly complicates the geopolitical picture in Central Asia. It depends not only on the nature of the relationship between the Central Asian countries themselves, but also to a large extent on the policy of the great powers, whose interests are very high in the region.

Literature:

- 1 Brzezinski Zb. The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. SA5IC.,-2010.-256 p.
- 2 Mackinder H. J. The Geographical Pivot of History. *The Geographical journal* Vol. 23, No. 4 (Apr., 1904), p. 421-437
- 3 Мюллер Ф. Надежность снабжения. Риски международного энергоснабжения // *International Politik.* – 2003.-№2.-С.5-8.
- 4 Пять сценариев будущих границ Центральной Азии // http://russiancouncil.ru/inner/?id_4=1715#top
- 5 Mandelbaum M. Central Asia and the world: Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan. – New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1994. – 251 p.
- 6 Oliver Roy. The New Central Asia : Geopolitics and the Birth of Nations / Roy, Olivier - London; New York : I.B. Tauris, 2000 . - 222 p.
- 7 Нопкirk P. The Great Game [Text]: On Secret Service in High Asia / P. Нопkirk - London : John Murray, 2006 . - 562 p.
- 8 Жумалы Р. Геополитика Центральной Азии / - Алматы : [Б. и.], 2006 . - 515 с.
- 9 Акио Кавато. Экономика будет определять основные черты геополитики: рассуждение о ситуации в Центральной Азии // *Вестник КазНУ им. Аль-Фараби. Серия международные отношения и международное право .* - 2012. - № 4(60). - С. 65-69.
- 10 Лаумулин М.Т. Центральная Азия в зарубежной политологии и мировой геополитике. КИСИ при Президенте РК, 2009.– 437 с.
- 11 Лаумулин М.Т. Куда дрейфует Центральная Азия? / М. Лаумулин Библиогр.: с. // *Казахстан в глобальных процессах.* - 2013. - № 3. - С. 12-31
- 12 Прокофьев И. О балансе геополитических интересов в Центральной Азии // *Сотрудничество стран ЦА и США по обеспечению безопасности в регионе. Материалы международной конференции.-Алматы: ИМЭП, 2005 г.-С.34-36.*
- 13 Центральная Азия: основные направления и перспективы развития в условиях глобализации: материалы международной научной конференции 15-16 мая.- Тегеран; Бишкек, 2008.- 564 с.
- 14 Rustem Kulnazarov. New Geopolitical Role of Central Asia within Foreign Policy Interests of World Powers // *Asian Social Science; Vol. 11, No. 12; 2015.-125 p.*

УДК3271-925.7/9

FEATURES OF EAST ASIAN REGIONALISM

Omirserikova Dilara Zhalelovna

1995dilyara@mail.ru

A fourth year student at Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov,

Faculty of International Relations, major - “Area Studies”

Research Supervisor – Marmontova T.V.

The concept of East Asia as a region is a relatively new one. Two decades after the Second World War, there was no "East Asia" in existence because of the shadows of the Cold War and of

regional hot wars such as wars in Vietnam and the Korean peninsula. However, East Asia used to refer to a sub-region of Asia that includes China, Korea, Japan and Vietnam. For example, in the preface of *East Asia: A New History*, Murphey defines "East Asia is the single most populous unit of the world, comprising China, Korea, Vietnam and Japan". Culturally, East Asia has been used to refer to the grouping of countries that have long shared together the Chinese cultural sphere. For Ravenhill (2002, p. 174), "the concept of 'East Asia' has conventionally referred only to those states of Confucian heritage". These understandings of East Asia as a region have excluded other countries located in Southeast Asia. Not until the 1990s did the concept of East Asia as a region that included both Northeast Asian and Southeast Asian countries become widespread. The proposal of the East Asian Economic Group (EAEG, downgraded to the East Asian Economic Caucus EAEC) by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir was a starting point for a strong conceptual framework for East Asia as a whole. The initiation of ASEAN plus Three and the first East Asia Summit in 2005 have strongly acknowledged a new concept of East Asia. As a result, the concept of East Asia is widely used for the region that includes both ten ASEAN members and three Northeast Asian countries of China, Japan and Republic of Korea. But what "region" and "regionalism" refer to is still an unanswered question and it invites us first to examine the theoretical explanations of regionalism.

Regionalism: Old and New. Regionalism is not a new phenomenon in world politics. Some scholars hold that regionalism can be traced back before the Second World War. However, most literature of regionalism has focused on regionalism since the end of World War II and divided it into two waves, commonly known as "old regionalism" or the first wave of regionalism and "new regionalism" or the second wave of regionalism. Old regionalism started from the late 1950s through early 1970s and new regionalism has emerged since the late 1970s (Hwee, 2005). These two waves of regionalism after World War II have different origin and characteristics.

Old Regionalism arose in the context of the Cold War and the bipolar world structure in which powers were vying for influences. Under the analysis of Hettne (2000, p. 66), old regionalism had certain characteristics. First, geopolitical imperatives were initial forces for old regionalism instead of economic needs. The United States and Soviet Union were vying for influence by imposing their influence on a certain region and attempted to restrain each other. Second, European regionalism and CMEA show that old regionalism was designed as a "from above" model - by the super powers: the United States took the key role in creating European regionalism while the Soviet Union was the architect of CMEA. Third, old regionalism was "closed" regionalism which favored protectionism. This feature of old regionalism might be explained by the bipolar world structure during the Cold War which was characterized by rivalry rather than cooperation. The last characteristic of old regionalism was specific-objective oriented and concerned with "formally sovereign states".

New Regionalism. In fact, the end of the Cold War has produced "a new attitude toward international cooperation" and the growth of regional organizations which contributed to regional cooperation. New regionalism grew up from a multi-polar world order in which the influence of the two former superpowers degraded into a regional level rather than a global level as they were in the time of bipolar international system. Second, new regionalism was designed in a so-called "from below" model. The enlargement of EU and ASEAN are good examples of this feature. Third, in terms of participants, new regionalism has attracted not only formally sovereign states but also international and regional organizations. Fourth, unlike the specific-objective oriented old regionalism, new regionalism covers more areas in cooperation. Therefore, new regionalism is a comprehensive and multilateral process. Finally, new regionalism is an "open" regionalism. Because of the diversity of participants, global issues, outward-oriented policies of many countries and economic interdependence, new regionalism is sometimes referred as an "outward-looking focus on external links with other regions" (Hwee, 2005, p. 2). Evidently, new regionalism is more complex than old regionalism. The transformation from old regionalism into new regionalism was the transformation from a bipolar world order into a multi-polar one.

The review of "regionalism" has provided a theoretical background

and shown differences between old and new regionalism. Based on this theoretical background, East Asia is a "region" and regionalism in East Asia has been developing through formal cooperation among states, flows of people and cultural values and the like. East Asia regionalism belongs to new regionalism.

East Asian regionalism at a crossroad. There are several principal characteristics of Asian regionalism (on the example of East Asia): the prevalence of traditional approaches in relation to states; Building intra-regional and extra-regional trade agreements, financial institutions on the principle of the Asian network style, market-driven network style. The ineffectiveness of legal norms, deep ideological and cultural differences in Asia, the fear of formal supranational institutions, the threat of loss of sovereignty (new colonialism), as well as the transit status of regimes hamper the formation of a complex of regional security. The absence of military organizations is compensated by bilateral agreements between members of the East Asian region and the presence of superpowers in the region - the United States, as well as a major regional power-Japan. The role of China in the region is characterized as an economic penetration with the establishment of cultural and economic hegemony.

Evolution of Asian regionalism. The beginning of the formation of Asian regionalism can be conditionally determined by the period of the end of World War II, although there is a view that regional concepts existed in the pre-war period. There are two periods of Asian regionalism. The first includes the period immediately after World War II and captures the entire period of the Cold War. This stage is characterized as the period of building regional dynamics under the leadership of "great powers", such as the United States, Britain and Japan. The second phase includes the period after the end of the Cold War. However, the American professor of Indian origin, A. Acharya (Amitav Acharya) believes that the stages of the emergence of Asian regionalism were at least three: 1947-1967. - formation of pan-Asian regionalism; 1967-1990 - the formation of ASEAN and the strengthening of the role of ASEAN; Since 1990 - the emergence of the infrastructure of the "new" Asian regionalism.

The first stage can be defined as Pan Asianism or Macro-Asianism), which was initiated by the First Conference on Asian Relations (Asian Relation Conference 1947) and ends with the formation of ASEAN in 1967. The creation of CEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organization) in 1954 was aimed at containing primarily communist China in the Asian region. Also, the organization provided for an economic aid to the countries of the regions. None of these forms of regionalism could take root in Asia, as long-term viable regional bodies were not created.

The weakness of CEATO was not the only manifestation of the inability of the United States to organize an effective regional unification in Southeast Asia and Asia as a whole.

The second stage of the formation of Asian regionalism is associated with Japan's initiatives in Southeast Asia. The differences from the US, Japan focused on the development of economic ties in the region. In 1966, a new regional organization was created - the Asia-Pacific Council (Asian and Pacific Council-ASPAC). The organization set the task of holding consultations on economic, cultural and social issues. One of the tasks was to confront the Asian socialist countries. ASPAC anticipated a more active role for Japan and Australia. However, this raised concerns among member countries. Subsequently, Japan focused on building a regional regionalism, since any intergovernmental regional organization it headed was not acceptable to most Asian countries. In 1979, with the idea of creating the Pacific Community (Pacific Community), Japan came forward. Initially, the task was to develop economic and cultural cooperation in all countries of the Pacific basin that wished to join. The idea of the Pacific community developed without formal institutional construction. This led to a discussion about the merits of open consultative regionalism, in comparison with the closed one. According to Achary, the idea of the Pacific community found practical application in the creation in 1989 of APEC. Regional integration in Asia was conditioned by the need to solve economic problems within the framework of the formation of transnational economies in this region, as well as the reaction to the interference of external powers in it. Thus, projects were formed in the form of an agreement on trade and development in the Pacific region (Pacific Trade and Development - paftad), Pacific Basin Economic Council. A regional non-

governmental organization that brings together through the national committees of the participating countries over 1200 large companies and Asia - Pacific Economic Cooperation, managed by the middle powers: China, Japan and Australia. Therefore, there was a process of regional models formation, initiated by the interests of the regional and political elites.

new stage of Asian regionalism formation emerged after the end of Cold war. The development of regionalism obtained its continuity in Canberra. 1989, when ASEAN organization on its first summit in Singapore after Cold war determined its new vision of regional cooperation, involving increased security links, creation ASEAN Free trade area and more active multilateral cooperation in Asia Pacific Region in the field of security. ASEAN Regional Forum formation in Bangkok, in 1994 was a continuation of the given initiative. The forum brings together 26 countries. ASEAN Regional Forum was the first multilateral security organization, albeit security is determined not as military and collective self-defense, but joint measures of security, directed on building confidence and conflicts prevention. In parallel there was an idea of East Asian Economic Group Formation based on a response to NAFTA and unified European market formation. Sovereignty, non-interference and denial from great powers leadership were confirmed in the framework of the forum. Asian crisis in 1997 became a crucial moment in the Asian regionalism formation, consequently East Asian summit was established. . In response to the crisis and criticism of the inability of existing Asian organizations such as APEC, ARF, ASEAN to offer an effective response to the economic challenge, the idea of revising ASEAN function arose, including the introduction of new forms of cooperation and financial interaction as well. As a result, new initiative emerged – East Asian Summit with 10 members of ASEAN, China, India, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, The Republic of Korea Constitutive East Asian Summit took place in December, 2005 , Kuala- Lumpur.

In real life it was challenging to organize cooperation between regional actors. Experts have noted “slow institutionalization” of regional cooperation. Moreover, competition between Japan and China can be clearly seen. USA entry intensified confrontation between the USA and China. Among adopted documents we can distinguish ASEAN charter came into force in 2008. ASEAN Charter declared altering the concept of the organization from cooperation oriented to social oriented structure. Japan initiated Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia – ERIA, the objectives is expert analysis and proposals elaboration on further institutional development of cooperation in the region. In 2012 Declaration about regional reaction on the threat of spread of malaria and measures to increase the effectiveness of antimalarial drugs. An agreement on cooperation in the field of bioresources and energy was signed. American - Chinese relations did not allow states to reach the agreement on the resolution of the dispute in the sea.

In the maze of reconciliation, Indonesia's proposal to turn ASEAN into a security community is bogged down. Nevertheless, the proposal to transform ASEAN by 2020 into a community of the EU type was approved. 1997-1998 crisis significantly undermined processes in South –East Asia. Natural disasters, casualties, terroristic attacks in 2000s demonstrated the abilities of regional structure to cope with challenges on their own. However financial problems are being solved less successfully. It is worthwhile to note that the idea of multilateral zone of free trade in East Asian region was failed. The consensus was in favor of Trans Pacific Partnership led by the USA.

Challenges and threats in Asia or why Asian regionalism is needed. Asian regionalism plays a key role in regional security creation. There are a number of challenges and threats on the agenda of the governments of Asia. Threats can be referred to: internal contradictions (ethnic and religious), geopolitical rivalry between main actors, territorial disputes unsettlement, financial system vulnerability which was significantly undermined by 1997-1998 crisis, unpredictability of regional and global scenes, energy supply security, natural disasters, etc. Security challenges are mainly called by activity of regional and non-regional actors, namely China, Australia and the USA. Indonesia and Vietnam claims on subregional leadership cannot be neglected either.

With the re-emergence of China's economic and military power, fears are connected with the further fate of Asian regionalism. Many scholars suppose that Chinese participation in regional blocks is somehow time-buying tactic until China increase its economic and military power. The

aim of China's regional building might turn into East Asian regionalism without the USA, Australia and India. Additionally USA's role is also important in the sphere of security issues. Japan, South Korea, Australia Thailand and Philippines all have bilateral alliances with the USA. Moreover, The USA is gradually integrating in economic space of the region and building new strategic relations in the region, particularly with India. Japan and Australia are two of main actors, which are growing their power in economic, political and military sphere. They are the most developed countries in the region. The leaders of both states possess their own vision on regionalism development in East Asia. Australia adheres to optimization and rationalization of existed structures in the framework of Asia Pacific cooperation. However there is no assurance that ASEAN countries will accept the given approach. Japanese offers to great extent concern East Asia but do not bring clarity to the future role of the United States, holding the view that the US here will remain the partners of Japan. In what both points of view coincide, it is that membership and activities in regional associations must be full, with great commitments and resources.

Asia regionalism has been becoming the reality in conjunction with growing challenges of regional security in the region. However for attaining this aim Asia countries are expected to vanish their outdated views on sovereignty and non-interference issues, since transnational challenges demand new approaches; conducting harmonizing competing approaches in Asian regionalism building; to implement going Asian institutions beyond the frameworks of Asean way, which was based on non formal, consensus oriented cooperation; regional institutions should broaden their approaches and move on from consultancies to solving of concrete problems.

To sum up: Asia regionalism study is considered to be important for several reasons. First of all due to immense territory, population, which include nearly half population of the world; growing energy demands; new powers, which have playing a key role in world processes; due to dangers of regional conflicts and military threats; an immense amount of non-traditional threats, such as separatist threats, religious contradictions, criminal activities, environment pollution and natural disasters. The criticism of Asian regional institutions and associations can be focused on the following. First, Asian regional institutions do not play a significant role in resolving the complex and long-standing confrontations that existed in the 20th and 21st centuries. This refers to the conflicts between China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, India and Pakistan. The same can be said about unsettled sea disputes, for example, territorial dispute over the Spratly Islands, between Vietnam, China, Taiwan, Malaysia, the Philippines and Brunei. Secondly, the Asian regional institutions are not able to create mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of conflicts. ASEAN's activities do not go beyond building a trust. Thirdly, there is a failure of building regional trust, which is expressed in a constant arms race in the countries of the region. Military purchases of India and China are growing every year. Fifth, the region is constantly exposed to natural disasters, but there is still no single system and mechanisms for regulating assistance and response to transnational threats, as illegal migration, terrorism, pandemics. Problem solving is being implemented on the national level, or on the basis of bilateral agreements. The region does not have its own peacekeeping forces. Sixthly, the expansion of human rights and the solution of social problems in the countries of the region are at the stage of development, not solutions. Regional integrational processes in Asia are aimed at norms and socialization of formation. In general, over the past 20 years, there has been an upsurge in the development of Asian regionalism. Many experts see this as a number of possibilities. Among them, the great freedom of Asian countries in the choice of ways of development, the absence of serious armed conflicts after 1967, the non-military phase of the majority of unsettled conflicts., The teaching of economic integration processes, the special role of institutions in Asia, which are not only a fact of balance of power, but also form a space Security, moderating it. Finally, the Asian government, with some exceptions, is legitimate and plans a stable future. The driving force behind regionalization in Asia is not an internal, spontaneous understanding of the community, but as a response to the challenges of globalization. Reduction of tariffs, movement of goods, communications, transnational threats require joint coordinated decisions. Integration as a consequence of regionalization in Asia also has concrete forms in the form of integration of technology, financial system, labor market. Regionalization as a

political product can become an opportunity in Asia. For many representatives of the Asian intelligentsia, regionalization is a value that allows achieving greater goals, such as global free trade or global institutions, in accordance with the interests of Asian countries. To great extent the future of regionalism will be influenced by the globalization process and its challenges.

Literature:

1. Hettne B. Beyond the “New Regionalism”// *New Political Economy*. 2005 № 10.4
2. Fawcett L. *Regionalism from Historical Perspective* / ed. By M. Farell, B. Hettne, L. Langenhove // *Global Politics of Regionalism: Theory and Practice*. L., 2005
3. Kent Calder and Min Ye, “Regionalism and Critical Junctures: Explaining the ‘Organization Gap’ in Northeast Asia,” *Journal of East Asia Studies* 4, no. 2 (2004): 191–226.
4. Barry Buzan and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
5. Amitav Acharya, “Will Asia’s Past Be Its Future?” *International Security* 28, no. 3 (Winter 2003/04): 149–164.
6. Richard Baldwin, “Managing the Noodle Bowl: The Fragility of East Asian Regionalism,” Discussion Paper No. 5561, Centre for Economic Policy Research, available at <http://www.cepr.org/pubs/dps/D5561.asp>
7. Peter Katzenstein, “Regionalism in Comparative Perspective,” *Conflict and Cooperation* 31, no. 2 (1996): 123–159. This was incorporated into his coauthored (with Takashi Shiraisi) introduction to *Network Power: Japan and Asia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).
8. Peter J. Katzenstein, “Introduction: Asian Regionalism in Comparative Perspective.” In Katzenstein and Shiraisi, *Network Power*, p. 3

UDC 327.8:(55)

KAZAKHSTAN - IRAN: COOPERATION IN NEW REALITIES

Seitova Assem

Assem1794@gmail.com

Master student of Eurasian National university

after L.N. Gumilyov, Astana, Kazakhstan

Scientific adviser - Serikbayeva A.T.

For Kazakhstan Iran is the significant international partner of strategic importance. In turn, the former conservative and the current reformist leadership of this country have always viewed our republic as an important strategic partner. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of cooperation between our countries in such vital spheres as joint solution of the legal status of the Caspian Sea, regional cooperation, ensuring short and beneficial routes to Kazakhstani goods in the World Ocean, as well as trade and economic cooperation (Iran is one of the main consumers of Kazakhstani Grain, metal and other goods).

The Republic of Kazakhstan and the Islamic Republic of Iran as neighbors and constructive partners continue to develop successful cooperation at such international and regional venues as the United Nations (UN), the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia (CICA), the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) , The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) and others [1].

As it is known, in the positive outcome of the negotiations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the so-called international "six" on the Iranian nuclear program, an important role was played by the mediation mission of Kazakhstan.

The role of Kazakhstan in this process was not limited to logistical and technical assistance. The many-hour meetings of President Nursultan Nazarbayev in Almaty with the international and Iranian delegations in early 2013, the efforts and actions of the Kazakh foreign