

Leila F. Delovarova\*, Alibek B. Yermekov

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

\*e-mail: delovarova@mail.ru

## PROSPECTS FOR THE FORMATION OF A COLLECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM IN ASIA: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH THE EUROPEAN SECURITY SYSTEM. OPPORTUNITIES FOR KAZAKHSTANI DIPLOMACY

At the current stage of transformation of international relations, within the framework of Asian geopolitics, there is a need to create collective security institutions. The main current model is the European system of collective security, the experience of which is important for Asia. The security system in Asia is characterized by the fact that it is still dominated by elements of the classical Westphalian model of international relations, namely nation-states. For the formation of a collective security system, several certain factors play an important role, among which we can mention the military-technical component, polarity, as well as the socialization factor. This article, within the framework of the study, points out that the key role is played by these three factors. The formation of such a security system is also important for diplomacy in Kazakhstan, which is the initiator and promoter of CICA, an international forum for strengthening cooperation aimed at ensuring peace, security, and stability in Asia.

Although in the short term, the formation of a collective security system in Asia seems unlikely, there are all the prerequisites and potential in the medium or long term.

**Keywords:** collective security, bipolarity, Asia, Kazakhstani diplomacy, institutionalization

Л.Ф. Деловарова\*, А.Б.Ермеков

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

\*e-mail: delovarova@mail.ru

### Азиядағы ұжымдық қауіпсіздік жүйесін қалыптастыру перспективалары: еуропалық қауіпсіздік жүйесімен салыстырмалы талдау. Қазақстандық дипломатия үшін мүмкіндіктері

Халықаралық қатынастарды трансформациялаудың қазіргі кезеңінде азиялық геосаясат шеңберінде ұжымдық қауіпсіздік институттарын құру қажеттілігі туындайды. Қазіргі уақытта жұмыс істеп тұрған негізгі модель-тәжірибесі Азия үшін маңызды еуропалық Ұжымдық қауіпсіздік жүйесі. Азиядағы қауіпсіздік жүйесі халықаралық қатынастардың классикалық вестфалиялық моделінің элементтері, атап айтқанда ұлт-мемлекет әлі де басым болуымен сипатталады. Ұжымдық қауіпсіздік жүйесін қалыптастыру үшін бірқатар нақты факторлар маңызды рөл атқарады, олардың ішінде әскери-техникалық компонентті, полярлықты, сондай-ақ әлеуметтену факторын атап өтуге болады. Бұл мақала зерттеу аясында көрсетілген үш фактор шешуші рөл атқаратынын атап өтті. Мұндай қауіпсіздік жүйесін қалыптастыру Азиядағы бейбітшілікті, қауіпсіздік пен тұрақтылықты қамтамасыз етуге бағытталған ынтымақтастықты нығайту жөніндегі халықаралық форум – АӨСШК(Азиядағы өзара іс-қимыл және сенім шаралары жөніндегі кеңес) бастамашысы және промоутері болып табылатын Қазақстан дипломатиясы үшін де маңызды.

Қысқа мерзімді перспективада Азиядағы Ұжымдық қауіпсіздік жүйесін қалыптастыру екіталай болып көрінгенімен, орта мерзімді немесе ұзақ мерзімді перспективада барлық алғышарттар мен әлеует бар.

**Түйін сөздер:** Ұжымдық қауіпсіздік, биполярлық, Азия, Қазақстан дипломатиясы, институттандыру

Л.Ф. Деловарова\*, А.Б.Ермеков

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

\*e-mail: delovarova@mail.ru

**Перспективы формирования системы коллективной безопасности в Азии:  
сравнительный анализ с европейской системой безопасности.  
Возможности для казахстанской дипломатии**

На современном этапе трансформации международных отношений, в рамках азиатской геополитики, существует необходимость создания институтов коллективной безопасности. Основной действующей моделью сейчас является европейская система коллективной безопасности, опыт которой важен для Азии. Система безопасности в Азии, характеризуется тем, что в ней все еще доминируют элементы классической Вестфальской модели международных отношений, а именно нации-государства. Для формирования системы коллективной безопасности, важную роль играет ряд определенных факторов, среди которых можно отметить военно-техническую составляющую, полярность, а также фактор социализации. Данная статья, в рамках исследования, отмечает, что ключевую роль играют именно три обозначенных фактора. Формирование такой системы безопасности также важно и для дипломатии Казахстана, который является инициатором и промоутером СВМДА – международного форума по укреплению сотрудничества, направленного на обеспечение мира, безопасности и стабильности в Азии.

Хотя на краткосрочную перспективу, формирование системы коллективной безопасности в Азии, представляется маловероятным, но тем не менее, существуют все предпосылки и потенциал в среднесрочной, либо в долгосрочной перспективе.

Ключевые слова: коллективная безопасность, биполярность, Азия, дипломатия Казахстана, институционализация

## **Introduction**

At the current stage of transformation of the system of international relations, it can be noted that the main military-political and strategic trends of the 21st century are formed in Asia. China's geopolitical rise caused by China's military modernization and global economic expansion, as well as Beijing's creation of a China-centric institutional model (Atlantic Council, 2021) have led to the rising trends of the security dilemma. The security dilemma is inherently prone to conflict to some degree (Christensen, 1999), and the security system in Asia is now characterized by militarized conflict (Cliff, 2020).

Trends of multipolarity in the system of international relations, have led to increased processes and potential destabilization of the international order. Under such conditions, there is a need to create and form new or additional collective security institutions.

The main feature of the security system in Asia is that, unlike the European security system, it has not been fully institutionalized. The security system in Asia is still deeply oriented to the classical Westphalian model, where nation-states play a key role. The European security system has undergone a long process of institutionalization, which manifests itself in elements such as the strategic arms control regime, the socialization of actors in global conflict

during the Cold War (Wendt, 1992), and consequently the creation of conditions for institutionalizing the macro-regional order, in the form of regional structures such as the CSCE/OSCE, NATO and the institutionalization of the NATO-Russia relations. The balance of power, has always been a key element within European politics, since the creation of the Westphalian Order, but since the period of increasing transnationalism in the international system, the politico-military relations, which have always been the priority of the balance of power policy, also began to undergo a process of institutionalization, which subsequently became one of the features of the European security system.

The Asian security system is characterized by the fact that, unlike the European security system during the Cold War, Asia functioned as a second flank in the Soviet American confrontation. Now, given China's role and the dynamics of Sino-American strategic rivalry, there is a need for a collective security system. The presence of an American-centric security system in the form of QUAD and AUKUS alliances cannot fully solve this problem (Kortunov, 2018). Russia's search for new solutions, after the outbreak of military conflict in Ukraine, as well as the factor of India-China strategic rivalry, plays an important role in the emerging dynamics of the security system in Asia. To address destabilizing trends, there is a need to create collective security institutions in

Asia. Of course, the priority will also remain with the nation-states in terms of making key decisions in foreign policy and security matters, but there is nevertheless a need to create several mechanisms and a platform that can contain the escalation of the conflict potential of Asian geopolitics.

In this case, the interests, and actions both of Kazakh and Chinese diplomacy overlap. In its time, in 2014, China put forward the idea of creating a system of collective security in Asia. The former head of Kazakhstan, N. Nazarbayev, also in 2018, proposed the idea of creating an Asian OSCE. In 2022, the 6th CICA summit was held, an initiative of Kazakhstan, which has evolved significantly over 30 years. The summit was notable for the significant diplomatic activity of the meeting participants.

All of this points to the need to accelerate the creation of a collective security system in Asia.

### Literature review

Nowadays, the issues of forming a system of collective security in Asia occupies one of the central positions in academic as well as in political literature. In general, the works of such authors as John Mearsheimer, Ashley Tellis, Istomin, Ohara and others are devoted to this issue. But it should be noted that the focus of the authors who study this issue is mainly aimed at studying the strategic aspects of Sino-American relations, or Indo-Pacific region.

John Mearsheimer views the security issue in Asia through the lens of offensive realism. Explaining China's geopolitical rise, he notes that China's foreign policy behavior is shaped by offensive realism, where the state is forced to accumulate significant power and influence to survive in an anarchic environment (Mearsheimer, 2014). Achieving the maximum level of influence is the highest priority in the idea of the survival of the state. John Mearsheimer sees the problems of security and interaction between powers, in the framework of the formation of spheres of influence, where the author notes the American example, in the framework of the Monroe Doctrine, and the influence of China in the framework of increasing its influence in East Asia.

Another author, Ashley Tellis, examines security issues in the Indo-Pacific region, in the context of the growing strategic rivalry between the US and China. The author notes that the liberalization of the Chinese economy during the period of reforms and China's entry into the global market system, did not lead to the expected political liberalization, i.e.,

evolution of the domestic political system (Tellis, 2020). All this contributed to the preservation of the system and structure of the security dilemma in East Asia, which consolidated the mechanisms of Chinese American strategic rivalry.

Igor Istomin considers the formation of the Indo-Pacific region as a natural part of the security cluster. The author notes that China's geopolitical rise has created the conditions for the formation of a balance of power system, and India's already active involvement in the security system in East Asia. The intensification of Sino-Indian rivalry led to the formation of the foundations of the Indo-Japanese alliance, as well as the inclusion of India in strategic interaction with the United States on security issues (Istomin, 2019). In this case, as the author notes, this led to the transformation of the Asia-Pacific region to the Indo-Pacific security cluster.

Bondji Ohara notes, like several previous authors, that in Asia, after the end of the Cold War, a system of relations developed in which a hegemon remained in East Asia (Ohara, 2016). In this respect, it has also led to the formation of such security structures, in the context of the regional security architecture, as security dilemmas.

But, nevertheless, it is worth noting that the problem of the institutionalization of the security system in Asia has not found such a deep reflection in the academic literature. This problem lies in the fact that the authors focus on the study of the main issues of military and military-political rivalry, but do not consider the prospects for the institutionalization of the security system, as part of the creation of any format of a diplomatic platform, regime, or institutional base.

### Methodology

The theoretical and methodological base of this article is based on the symbiosis of the theory of neorealism (J. Mearsheimer), liberal institutionalism and transnationalism (R. Keohane), along with the review of modern literature on the problems of regional and global security.

Based on the above methodology, the development of a collective security system in Asia can be considered through three main factors: first, these are military-technical aspects, in the context of a geographical dimension; the second is the polarity factor, and the third is the time factor, i.e., the process of socialization.

Military-technical factor. Mearsheimer, in his book *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, points

out that one of the prerequisites for the formation of a European security system was the concentration of a huge number of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops on both sides (Mearsheimer, 395-396, 2014). This military-technical factor has led to the need to institutionalize the system of regional security, even if it is purely technical in nature. This subsequently led to the formation of the CFE Treaty (Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe) as one of the conventional arms control regimes.

Another significant factor is the element of polarity. The Cold War, as a bipolar model, created a need for the institutionalization of the security system. The experience of the history of international relations has shown that a bipolar order or balance of power based on a bipolar distribution of spheres of influence is one of the stable elements (Mearsheimer, 398-399, 2014). Multipolarity and unipolarity, on the contrary, demonstrate conflicting characteristics, in which the development of collective security institutions does not seem to be valid. During the period of the unipolar USA, after the fall of the social bloc, there was no such level of powers that could provide direct opposition. For example, Primakov proposed back in the 90s to create a counterbalance to US influence in the form of an alliance of China, Russia and India. But, China's policy at that time was aimed at integrating into world markets, and in the South Asian region, there was no direct threat to India from China (Volkhonsky, 1998).

Multipolarity, we will consider on the basis of historical examples, which seems to be a more conflict environment. Here, it is necessary to distinguish between the foreign policy behavior of states: either it is aimed at a single policy of nation-states, within the framework of the classical Westphalian model, or politics is aimed at maintaining the established order.

The globalization of international relations has had a significant impact on the evolution of the international order, and, accordingly, on the transformation of the behavior of states. As RAND analysts note, now a direct clash between the great powers seems unlikely, and the main confrontation between them takes place along the lines of wars or conflicts in gray zones (Mazarr, 2022).

Multipolarity has historically been characterized by the instability of the international order. Then comes the bipolar model, which shows great stability. The process of institutionalization in Europe began within the framework of the bipolar model of the Cold War, and the third factor is the factor of socialization. Socialization as a product of

time can in any case lead to the institutionalization of the security system. The problem, or rather the specificity of the Sino-American strategic rivalry, is that it is not determined by nuclear rivalry. According to experts, the factor of socialization of the nuclear confrontation between the US and the USSR played a key role in the formation of a system of strategic stability (Joeck, 1997).

The problem of the modern security system, in the context of the formation of a collective security system, is that geo-economics (not necessarily in the sense of a zero-sum game) has become the main instrument of state policy in the period after the end of the Cold War, because, in the context of the trans nationalization of international relations, hard security issues no longer play a central role (Keohane, 1984), (Nye, 2014). Theoretically, these conditions will not contribute to the formation of a collective security system, because collective security institutions are primarily aimed at solving hard security issues, hence there is a certain dysfunction of NATO in the period after the end of the Cold War.

Thus, subjectively, within the framework of the European experience, we observe three prerequisites that shaped the formation of an institutionalized security system: first, the military-technical factor; second, polarity; third, socialization. But, along with this, it is necessary to consider the unique experience and subjective factors of the given process.

### **Institutionalization of the security system in Europe**

A feature of the security system in Europe is that it has gone through a process of institutionalization. Within the historical dimension, the institutionalization of the security system in Europe took place in three main stages. In this case, we will consider the period from the beginning of the Cold War and the formation of the bipolar order as a natural chronological line in terms of the formation of modern security patterns. In general, the process of institutionalization of the security system in Europe can be considered in three stages.

Stage one. Beginning of the Cold War. During this period, a system of alliances was formed in the form of military-political blocs – NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The goal of the North Atlantic Alliance is to contain the Soviet threat and, in general, the military-political and military containment of the Soviet Union. The central link in terms of NATO structure is Article 5 of the Treaty,

which states that an attack on one of the member countries of the alliance is considered an attack on the entire alliance. The Soviet Union, in response to the creation of NATO, creates its own system of collective security in the form of the Warsaw Pact. In general, the ideological division of Europe is being consolidated. At the same time, nuclear weapons begin to play a key role in the emerging strategy, and the revolution in military affairs has broad military-strategic consequences.

Stage two. The beginning of the process of institutionalization. The military confrontation in Europe leads to the need to resolve several issues that have remained unresolved since the period after the end of World War II. The political leadership of the Soviet Union and the United States came to the need to organize detente, which led to the policy of détente. In this case, the military-strategic factor also played an important role: by the end of the 1960s, the parties came to realize that both the USSR and the United States had an equal number of strategic nuclear weapons, which led to the formation of such security patterns as mutually assured destruction, as well as to the formation of strategic stability system (Fenenko, 2013). In military-political terms, after the Berlin Crisis of 1961, the Soviet Union abandoned its policy of expansion in Western Europe and shifted its main strategic focus to the third world countries (Cohen, 2017). Between the Soviet Union and the United States, a strategic arms control regime is being formed, initially in the form of the ABM (Missile Defense) and SALT-I (Strategic Arms Limitation) treaties. Then, at the diplomatic level, in the late 60s. The Soviet Union and the United States come to the need to form an institutional system of regional security.

At the same time, in connection with the formation of the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe), the process of institutionalization of the European security system begins.

The OSCE is not a monotonous organization; its functioning changed with the period of various geopolitical transformations and processes. In general, the functioning of the OSCE can be divided into three main periods:

First, the Cold War 1975-1990. At that time, the activity of the CSCE was dominated by a geopolitical approach, the purpose of which was to consolidate the status quo within the framework of the post-war world order. The meeting itself acted within the framework of the regime and was necessary to organize a negotiating platform to resolve the development or escalate potential conflicts.

Second, «unipolar moment», 1990-2010/14. This period is characterized by the collapse of the global bipolar world order, based on the Soviet American confrontation. Although the expert community does not give preference to the OSCE as an effective institution of the collective security system, nevertheless, the OSCE ensured the further institutionalization of the European security system, namely, it provided a platform for the expansion of Western neoliberal institutions, the EU and NATO. After the end of the Cold War, the “third dimension”, namely the “human dimension”, which was responsible for human rights, increased in the functioning of the OSCE. The strengthening of this direction contributed to the expansion of neoliberal institutions to the East, namely with the inclusion of former member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in NATO and the EU. Thus, the OSCE ensured the expansion of neoliberal institutions to the East during the Clinton presidency.

Third, the period in the post-unipolar moment, 2010/14 – to the present time. The OSCE began to be characterized by crisis phenomena, after the completion of the expansion of Western institutions, the functioning of the OSCE came to a standstill. The OSCE, to a greater extent, has become an instrument of control and monitoring of elections in the post-Soviet countries, whose activities were limited mainly by bureaucratic aspects. After the outbreak of the conflict in Ukraine in 2014, and then the military conflict in 2022, the OSCE failed to significantly influence the situation in connection with the settlement of the conflict, and its activities remained in the shadow of the geopolitics of the leading states of the region.

Therefore, in the case of the OSCE, firstly, the creation of organizations was dictated by the trends of détente during the Cold War periods, in the first half of the 1970s and in the second half of the 1980s. Second, the failure of the OSCE to resolve the conflict in Ukraine and then prevent a war suggests that the prerogative of foreign policy remains with the nation-states. Moreover, during the period of the “unipolar moment”, Europe adhered to broad autonomy from the United States, which is expressed in the “strategic autonomy” of the EU. Although Russian-American relations were influenced by the Cold War, the Franco-German core of the EU was quite loyal to Russia, and even in general, the US itself recognized Russia’s traditional sphere of influence in the post-Soviet space (Stent, 2014). Especially the «strategic autonomy» of the EU was expressed during the first phase of the

Russian-Ukrainian conflict (2014-2022), when, despite the sanctions, the EU maintained close trade and economic relations with Russia.

Therefore, we can assume that the CSCE/OSCE phenomenon laid the foundation for the institutionalization of the security system in Europe, but at the same time, this organization reflected the dominance of market trends. Thus, the CSCE/OSCE has become an expression of the historical product of détente in Soviet American relations. Most characteristically, the Russian American detente after the conflict in South Ossetia was more expressed in the desire to maintain a balance of power, recognizing the Russian Federation as a sphere of influence in the post-Soviet geopolitical space (Stent, 2014).

Another important element that laid the foundation for the institutionalization of the security system in Europe is the evolution of Russia-NATO relations. After the end of the Cold War, there was a need to institutionalize the relationship between the two subjects of international relations. In 1997, the Founding Act of Cooperation between Russia and NATO was signed. According to these agreements, NATO pledged not to maintain a significant number of troops on the territory of the new member countries of the alliance, and not to keep nuclear weapons on their territory (Goldgeir, McFaul, 2009).

The first most critical moment in relations between NATO and the Russian Federation was the expansion of NATO to the East. In general, the institutionalization of relations between NATO and the Russian Federation was more formalized and reflected the political trends that existed between the US and the Russian Federation (Stent, 2014).

In general, after the proclamation of the new NATO doctrine, relations between the Russian Federation and the Alliance experienced a few crises, reflecting the political spectrum of changes, but in general, despite the crisis moments, within the framework of bilateral relations, the strategic relations between Russia and NATO, at a deeper level, developed quite well. Here, it is necessary to understand the deeper transcendent processes and the logic of political processes in different geopolitical eras. Strategically, the Soviet Union, during the Cold War, existed in the form of a global superpower, and its national interests, as well as strategic narratives, were determined precisely at the global level. Russia, on the contrary, due to its geopolitical potential is a regional power (Mazarr, 2022), and its main goal was to contain those processes that are directed against the reduction of

traditional Russian influence (Mearsheimer, 2014).

The functionality of NATO during the Cold War and in the post-bipolar period differ from each other. NATO, during the existence of the Cold War, was in a state of «instrument», i.e., a military-technical organization that was aimed at containing the Soviet threat. Now, NATO acts as an institution, that is, the likelihood of a war between the alliance and Russia is unlikely, and the existence of an institution is needed more to maintain peace between the member countries of the alliance than against Russia. In a semantic sense, an institution means the existence of a systematized relationship between the parties, expressed in the format of collective security, i.e., kind of institutional framework. Thus, some experts note that the spectrum of perception of Russia as a key threat is significantly different – France and the Netherlands do not see Russia as a threat, Germany and the UK perceive it at an average level, and only Poland and the Baltic countries give priority in terms of perception of Russia as the main source of threat (Meijer, Brooks, 2021).

Thus, the process of formation and institutionalization of the system of collective security in Europe went through several stages, during which the evolution of the activities of the main structures of this system took place. Along with a certain stability of this system, it must be recognized that an alternative system of collective security is needed in Asia due to the specifics of the development of modern international relations and the role of non-European actors.

### **Prerequisites and conditions for the formation of a collective security system in Asia**

Within the framework of the theory of international relations in the current conditions of transformation and change in geopolitical realities, it is possible to separate some prerequisites and conditions for the formation of collective security institutions in Asia.

In general, within the framework of the Asian vision, we can distinguish the following options for the formation of the foundations of the security system:

- Cold War and decolonization, during this historical process, Asian states were formed that adopted the structure of the classical model of the Westphalian system of nation-states;
- The period after the end of the bipolar order and the beginning of the unipolar moment. This period is characterized by the steady economic

growth of Asian states, as well as the growth of their technological viability;

- Increasing conflict potential in Asia and more broadly with the involvement of other actors and regions;

- China's geopolitical rise in 2000/10s. This period is characterized by the intensification of the process of securitization in Asia, namely, in terms of the fact that the process of institutionalization of the Asian security system is taking place. Namely, China's economic growth and the implementation of its military program led to the intensification of the process of securitization and then the institutionalization of the security system.

- Prospects for the formation of a bipolar or multipolar system in the new geopolitical realities, which are indicated in the framework of the Chinese American strategic rivalry.

It should be noted that the main security trends were still outlined in the RAND analytical report in the 90s. (Istomin, 2019). It predicted the security trends that took shape during the intensification of Sino-American rivalry during the Trump-Biden period. In general, it seems that the security system in Asia is being shaped within or in the context of trends in structural realism. The first attempts at institutionalizing the shell were made under the Obama administration as part of the "Pivot to Asia" or "Rebalancing" doctrine (Tellis, 2020). The main milestone of this doctrine was that there is a need to resolve a number of problems of a regional nature (DoD, 2013). The "Rebalancing" doctrine radically rejected the application of a realistic approach to regional relations, as former Secretary of State H. Clinton repeatedly spoke out (Tellis, 2020). The next stage in the development of the Asian security system falls on the Trump presidency. Under Trump, the US rejected the institutional approach and focused on the formation of a system of alliances as a deterrent, where the Indo-Pacific Doctrine and the alliance in the form of QUAD became the product of Trump's US foreign policy in Asia. The Indo-Pacific Doctrine clearly pointed to China as a strategic rival and a revisionist power (DoD, 2019). It is also important to note that, as Kortunov points out, the US has formed a security framework, i.e. security system in the form of alliances (2018), which is expressed in the form of QUAD and AUKUS alliances.

At the moment, the system of alliances in Asia, although it has an institutional shell, it is based on the mechanism of the balance of power. There is a clear line here, in the form of the dominance of

pro-American security institutions. Therefore, the security system in Asia is still in the process of institutionalization.

Modern conflicts lie in Asia, and the existence of collective security institutions is necessary to be able to regulate these forms of conflict on a diplomatic basis. A feature of collective security institutions is conflict containment. Moreover, collective security is characterized by the universal principle of security for all. Collective security cannot provide absolute protection for all its members, but nevertheless limits the likelihood of hostilities (Claude, 1984, p. 356/58).

Collective security creates such a set of mechanisms, or a system, in which the activity of that member of the system that violates this international order is authorized. Another significant element of the collective security system is the principle of collective defense (Claude, 1984, 360), where one example is Article 5 of the North Atlantic Alliance. But, within the framework of the Asian security system, this approach seems unlikely in the case of a collective security system. Ainsie Claude, the founding author of the theories of collective security, argues that the internal features of the collective security system are distinguished: inward-oriented security, and security that is directed outward (Claude, 1984, 372).

It is obvious that the security system in Europe during the Cold War, within the framework of the CSCE, was externally oriented, since the functioning of the CSCE was aimed at maintaining a rational balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, as well as at preserving and promoting the foreign policy interests of the USA and the USSR, in context of the existence of the CSCE. Also, in this context, we can consider the example of NATO. The North Atlantic Alliance, during the Cold War, was an institution of collective security, the functioning of which was directed at an external enemy, against the Soviet Union. All the doctrines, as well as the military preparations of the alliance, were directed against the possible military expansion of the USSR. After the end of the Cold War, NATO continued to play the role of a collective security institution, but the quality of the institutions themselves evolved in the new geopolitical realities. The security of NATO member countries is no longer directed against a specific enemy, but it ensures security within the member countries of the alliance. The existence of NATO ensures the order and security of the member countries of the alliance, as a carrier and fundamental structure of security. It is worth noting that in the

new NATO doctrines, in the period after the end of the Cold War, nation-states are not marked as key sources of threats, but to a greater extent, the spectrum of threats is characterized by transnational or non-state actors. Therefore, the evolution of NATO as a collective security institution during the Cold War, and NATO during the existence of a unipolar moment, can serve as a classic example.

In Asia, of course, due to the strategic landscape of the region and the geopolitical mechanisms that shape it, the creation of a collective security system directed inward is impossible. In the new geopolitical realities, the institutions of the security system in Asia will be aimed at creating and shaping rational institutional mechanisms that can contain the likelihood of a war or conflict regulation.

Another important historical example is the CSCE/OSCE. The CSCE was a product of détente in Soviet American negotiations, and established a set of norms that shaped the institutional framework for interactions between the superpowers. Asia now also needs to develop the foundations of a collective security system, but, nevertheless, there are various historical and geopolitical prerequisites for the emerging processes. In general, based on a few historical backgrounds, especially in the form of the Cold War, we can make several comparisons that will lead to certain conclusions. So, for example, the author of neoclassical realism, John Mearsheimer, notes that the main factor that led to the formation of a European security system (Mearsheimer notes a mixture of geographical and military factors that helped prevent war in Europe) was the concentration of large armed forces from NATO and the Warsaw Pact which created the basis for the institutionalization of the regional security system. Another, no less significant factor is that the nuclear strategy, and the strategic arms control regime, formed the basis of the security system in Europe.

In Asia, the opposite situation exists. As part of the concentration of large conventional forces, as noted by American experts, there is a problem of the tyranny of distance, which means the vast distances of the region (CSIS, 2015). In Europe, during the Cold War, the main points of contact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact were along the line of the eastern Mediterranean, Germany, and Norway. The security system in Asia, on the contrary, is multipolar. In this respect, the term «multipolarity» does not precisely mean the presence of three or more powers, but rather means the presence of many conflicts and participants in these conflicts.

The main acute conflicts in Asia now lie in the East China, South China Seas, on the border between India and China, in the Indian Ocean, as well as in the Korean Peninsula. But, therefore, the security system in Asia is different in that it is characterized by the presence of many conflicts that are not so significant and they do not determine the main dynamics of security. For example, the dispute between the Philippines and Malaysia does not determine the underlying security dynamic, say, then the dispute between China and India over the disputed regions of Doklam and Arunachal Pradesh.

In general, it can be noted that the security system in Asia, on the technical side, is characterized by the presence of many conflicts, where 17 conflicts can be counted (Cliff, 2020). So, technically, this is a multipolarity factor. On the other hand, the general background in which the security system in Asia is being formed is bipolarity, i.e. intensification of the Sino-American strategic rivalry.

In this case, it is also necessary to consider the factor of the polarity of the international system. The idea of polarity was set forth by Kenneth Waltz, within the framework of his ideas of structural realism. The most acceptable form of polarity, i.e. stable, the bipolar model is considered, because both unipolarity and multipolarity are prone to confrontational tendencies. The bipolar model, to a greater extent, reflects more stable connections, in terms of the formed order (Waltz, 1964). But it is worth making a distinction between the classical model of international relations of the Cold War period, where military force was the determining factor, and also within the framework of the modern system of international relations, where globalization washes away the classical mechanisms of the balance of power, within the framework of polarity. But, in general, within the framework of the collective security system, it is bipolarity that creates the basis and platform for the development of the collective security system, where one of the most remarkable examples is the CSCE. The CSCE was created during the Cold War, the existence of a bipolar order. Also, another no less significant factor, and even on the contrary, reinforcing, is the existence of the polarities themselves. After all, American military activity in the system of local conflicts in the post-bipolar period became possible precisely due to the absence of another pole, in the form of the Soviet Union, it was bipolarity in this period that was the basis for the stability of the international system. At one time, during the US military activity during the unipolar moment,



a number of experts noted that the conditions of bipolarity would not allow these trends to form.

Within the framework of polarity, as one of the strategic prerequisites for the formation of a collective security system, one can also refer to John Mearsheimer. He notes that states, to survive in an anarchist system, seek to maximize their influence at the international level. This leads to the creation of a sphere of influence, where the author highlights a classic example, in the form of the Monroe Doctrine, when the United States declared the Western Hemisphere its sphere of influence (Mearsheimer, 2014, pp. 366-367). In this case, the example of polarity can also be applied to the Sino-US strategic rivalry. The future of Eurasia, or its present, today may look like this: when the Indo-Pacific region will be under the American protector, and the regions of inner Eurasia under the Chinese, in the form of such a Chinese presence as the SCO and the Belt and Road. Therefore, the formation of the foundations of a bipolar order, in the form of Sino-American strategic rivalry, can lead to the formation of the foundations of a collective security system in Asia.

The problem of the modern security system in Asia is that it is predominantly American-centric, where the system of alliances QUAD, AUKUS and the whole doctrine of the Indo-Pacific region is oriented towards the United States. In this regard, the foreign policy steps taken by the Obama administration were more successful in becoming a system of collective security, since they gave priority to the institutional platform of cooperation (Istomin, 2017).

Another, no less significant factor is the process of socialization. In the history of Asia, there have been no cases when the parties reached the climax of the conflict, or any acute situations, especially with the use of nuclear weapons, except for several cases, in the form of periodic crises on the Korean Peninsula, the Indo-Pakistani crisis in the early 2000s, and historically, the Sino-Soviet border conflict of 1969. Here, as a process of socialization, the nuclear factor of the DPRK stands out, but the problem with the DPRK is that North Korea is only able to influence at the regional level, so a nuclear crisis cannot lead to institutionalization this problem, because Pyongyang does not claim to be a superpower. The main problem of the security system in Asia is that it is only going through the process of socialization. One example is the periodic Sino-Indian clashes in Tibet. The peculiarity of the Chinese strategy is that it does not use direct military force to solve political

problems. Beijing's military strength is largely auxiliary (RAND, 2007). Thus, the formation of a system of collective security in Asia has deep roots, serious prerequisites for its development in the new geopolitical and geo-economic conditions.

### **Prospects for the formation of an Asian security system and the role of Kazakhstan diplomacy**

In the context of the formation and process of institutionalization in Asia, it is necessary to seriously consider the initiative of Kazakhstan – the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia. The development of the CICA is like the evolution of the OSCE. The OSCE initially functioned as a regional regime, then evolved into a full-fledged organization.

Considering the geopolitical rise of China, and the processes of a foreign policy nature that it generates, as well as the changed geopolitical situation in Asia and around Central Asia, it is necessary to institutionalize the Asian security system. Here it is important to note the statement of the head of Kazakhstan about CICA: “I want to emphasize that we are not creating a new organization but are moving to a new stage of institutional development. Raising the status of the meeting will strengthen the increased role of Asia in world affairs and bring the interaction of member states to a new level,” said President of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev (Kuzekbay, 2022). Therefore, for Kazakhstani diplomacy, a unique opportunity arises for the implementation of its strategic initiatives. Astana can actively promote its foreign policy narratives between Moscow and Beijing, as well as Delhi, to implement this initiative. Moreover, this will enable Kazakhstan to reach a new level of interaction with regional and global actors on a wide range of issues.

Of course, this is also important for other CICA participants. For Russia, this is a new process of institutionalizing its security foundations; for China, this is the expansion of its diplomatic and institutional influence; for India, this is an attempt to balance between Russia and China; geopolitical prerequisites already exist. In any case, there is a need to promote and institutionalize the security system in Asia. But it should be noted that Kazakh diplomacy points to aspects of a non-military plan, most likely, given the fact that while the participants in the process are not yet ready to discuss more sensitive issues of a military nature and significant issues of military-political security, therefore, several

main points were proposed, within the framework of the 6th CICA Summit in Astana (Akorda, 2022):

- Establishment of the CICA Council on Sustainable Connectivity, the importance of the economic dimension;
- Transformation of the CICA Financial Summit;
- Establishment of environmental dimension;
- Food Security Institution.

At the same time, all these aspects are important in the context of the discussion of topical security issues and the formation of a collective vision of security.

The geopolitical factor plays an important role in the development of the institutional security structure in Asia. As part of the growing Sino-American confrontation, there is a need for China to create alternative institutions in relation to the United States. For China, prospects are opening up within the framework of the SCO, the Belt and Road, as well as in the possible evolution of the CICA. Prospects are also opening up for Kazakh diplomacy, in the context of geopolitical instability, and the interest of the parties.

But it is obvious that the geopolitical situation in Central Asia will have an impact on the transformation of the CICA. China has developed three main strategic directions as part of its broad foreign policy strategy:

- Belt and Road as the main geo-economic mechanism of influence;
- SCO as a means of deepening China's influence within Eurasia;
- CICA as a means of institutionalizing the security system in Asia, under the possible auspices of Beijing.

A feature of these organizations, of a large-scale nature, their problem is that they are opportunistic, that is, institutionalization will not lead to a serious change in the quality of functioning in the field of security in Asia. Another aspect that is very important is the strengthening of the diplomatic platforms that these organizations represent. This will help curb destructive tendencies if they arise and promote coordinated decisions.

## Conclusion

Thus, the formation of a collective security system in Asia has serious prerequisites and prospects. In many ways, current security trends and patterns determine the European security system, which has evolved and institutionalized over almost seventy years. Today Asia is becoming a separate

serious geopolitical dimension. The formation of a system of collective security in Asia, in general, is influenced by several specific factors. The proposed military-technical factor, whose influence was significant in Europe and contributed to curbing the likelihood of a war between the parties, is not so effective in Asia. In Asia, this factor, according to Mearsheimer, is absent due to geographical aspects, the so-called spatial tyranny of the region. If we take the classic military-technical factor, then, of course, China, India, North Korea, the United States and Russia – all participants have sufficient potential.

The second is the factor of polarity, namely bipolarity. It should be noted that it was the formation of the CSCE as an institution of collective security that took shape during the existence of the bipolar model. During the period of the unipolar model, there is no need for the hegemon to create institutions of collective security, especially in the context of interaction with other powers. Here, it is necessary to understand the contextual meaning, namely, that the collective security system in the unipolar model has a place to be, and it is also turned inside its participants, where we perfectly see an example of the evolution of the CSCE in the OSCE, as well as the fact that NATO, in the post-bipolar period has become an institution of collective security, directed more inward than outward.

Under the new conditions, the prerequisites for the formation of a system of collective security in Asia are emerging. In terms of structural realism, the security system in Asia is US-centric, within the existing QUAD and AUKUS alliances. China, due to the peculiarities of its foreign policy, and the main emphasis on geo-economic mechanisms, does not appeal to the creation of any formats of military alliances. Along with this, the geo-economic and subsequently institutional strengthening of China in Eurasia, within the framework of the projects it is implementing, in particular the Belt and Road and participation in the SCO, leads to the formation of a model of a bipolar system. There is the formation of two poles within the international system. But, I would like to note that the formation of a collective security system within the framework of a bipolar model is unlikely. The contours of complex multipolarity are more and more visible.

The third factor is the factor of socialization. In any case, it is worth noting that conflicts will take place within the international system. The socialization factor played an important role in the formation and formation of the European security system during the Cold War. The basis of this factor

is the constant development of communication, negotiations and diplomacy. This factor is also very important for Asia, where there is a large conflict potential, and, possibly, with the threat of indirect use of nuclear weapons as a key moral and psychological element. The only aspect that can reduce the significant role of the socialization factor is the evolved system of international relations, where war is not the business of great powers, and the conflict potential of the international system is determined more by the system of local conflicts. Conflicts and crises along the main line of polarity – between the US and China, are most likely to be diplomatic in nature without a direct military clash.

Under these conditions, it is necessary to single out the role of CICA as an initiative of Kazakhstan, which has undergone a certain evolution of a full-fledged organization with established institutions and a solid circle of participants. Being a multinational platform of modern diplomacy for expanding cooperation in order to strengthen peace, security and stability in Asia, the CICA has a serious multi-aspect agenda in the field of security and enormous potential. Along with this, CICA is a serious diplomatic success of Kazakhstan, which will allow not only to promote the regional and global security agenda, but also to promote inter-regional detente in complex geopolitical and geo-economic realities.

### References

- Anonymous (2021), *The Longer Telegram: Toward A New American China Strategy*. Atlantic Council, P.8
- Christensen T (1999), 'China, the US-Japan alliance, and the security dilemma in East Asia', *International Security*, vol. 23, no. 4, Spring 1999, pp. 49–80.
- Cliff R. (2020), *A New U.S. Strategy for the Indo-Pacific*. Retrieved from The National Bureau of Asian Research Seattle, Washington p.71
- Wendt A. (1992), 'The Social Construction of Power Politics, Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics', *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 2, Spring 1992, pp. 391–425.
- Kortunov A. (2018), *Indo-Pacifika ili Soobshchestvo edinoj sud'by?* Rossijskij sovet po mezhdunarodnym otnosheniyam // <https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/analytics/indo-patsifika-ili-soobshchestvo-edinoy-sudby/>
- Mearsheimer Jh. (2014), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. University of Chicago. W.W. Norton and Company p.33-35
- Tellis A. (2020), *Strategic Asia (2020), U.S.-China Competition for Global Influence*. Edited by Ashley J. Tellis, Alison Szalwinski, and Michael Wills – Washington: The National Bureau of Asian Research. p. 16
- Istomin I. (2019), *Politika SSHA v Indo-Tihookeanskom regione: posledstviya dlya Rossii* // <https://russiancouncil.ru/activity/workingpapers/politika-ssha-v-indo-tihookeanskom-regione-posledstviya-dlya-rossii/>
- Ohara B. (2016), *Struktura obespecheniya bezopasnosti v Severo-Vostochnoj Azii* // <https://carnegiemoscow.org/2016/06/09/ru-pub-63751>
- Volhonskij B. (1998), *KNR otkazalas' vstupit' v svyaz' s Deli i Moskvoy, Kommersant'* // <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/211101>
- Mazarr M. (2022), *Understanding Competition Great Power Rivalry in a Changing International Order – Concepts and Theories*, RAND // <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA1404-1.html>
- Joeck N. (1997), *Maintaining Nuclear Stability in South Asia*, 1st Edition, Routledge, p. 6 – 88
- Keohane R. Nye Js. Jr (2012), *Power and Interdependence*, Fourth Edition, Longman, p.22-23
- Naj Dzh. ml. (2014) *Budushchee vlasti, per. s angl. V.N. Verchenko. – Moskva: AST, 2014. S.- 102-103*
- Fenenko A. (2013), *Sovremennaya mezhdunarodnaya bezopasnost': YAdernyj faktor, otv.red. V.A. Veselov. – M.: ZAO Izdatel'stvo «Aspekt Press», 2013. – S.16*
- Cohen M. (2017), *When Proliferation Causes Peace. The Psychology of Nuclear Crises*, Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C. p. – 109
- Stent A. (2014) *Pochemu SSHA i Rossiya ne slyshat drug druga? Vzglyad Vashingtona na novejschuyu istoriyu rossijsko-amerikanskih otnoshenij / Andzhela Stent; per. s angl. Eleny Lalayan. – M.: Mann, Ivanov i Ferber, 2015 s.- 362*
- Goldgejer Dzh., Makfol M. (2009) *Cel' i sredstva. Politika SSHA v otnoshenii Rossii posle «holodnoj vojny».* – M.: Mezhdunar. otnosheniya, s. 255
- Mirshajmer Dzh. (2014), *Pochemu Zapad povinen v krizise na Ukraine. Rossiya v global'noj politike.* // <https://globalaffairs.ru/articles/pochemu-zapad-povinen-v-krizise-na-ukraine/>
- Meijer H., Brooks S., (2021), *Illusions of Autonomy: Why Europe Cannot Provide for Its Security If the United States Pulls Back*, *International Security* (2021) 45 (4): 7–43.
- Department of Defense: *Sustaining U.S Global Leadership: Priorities for the 21st Century Defense* // [https://archive.defense.gov/news/Defense\\_Strategic\\_Guidance.pdf](https://archive.defense.gov/news/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf)
- State Report: *The Department of Defense. Indo-Pacific Strategy Report. Preparedness, Partnerships, and Promoting a Networked Region* p.16 (2019) Retrieved from <https://media.defense.gov/2019/Jul/01/2002152311/-1/-1/1/DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSEINDO-PACIFIC-STRATEGY-REPORT-2019.PDF>

Claude I. Jr. (1984), *Collective Security as an Approach to Peace, Understanding International Relations*, fifth edition. The Value of Alternative Lenses, McGraw-Hill Custom Publishing; 5th edition, p. 356

CSIS (2015), *Asia-Pacific Rebalance 2025. Capabilities, Presence and Partnerships. An Independent Review of U.S. Defense Strategy in the Asia-Pacific*. Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington D.C. p. – 120

Waltz K. (1964), *The Stability of a Bipolar World*, Daedalus, Summer, 1964, Vol. 93, No. 3, Population, Prediction, Conflict, Existentialism (Summer, 1964), pp. 881-909

Istomin I. (2017), *Politika SSHA v Vostochnoj Azii v period pravleniya administracii D. Trampa* // <https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/analytics/politika-ssha-v-vostochnoy-azii-v-period-pravleniya-administratsii-d-trampa/>

CSIS (2013), Roger Cliff, Mark Burles, Michael S. Chase, Derek Eaton, and Kevin L. Pellpeter. *Entering the Dragon's Lair: Chinese Anti-Access Strategies and Their Implications for the United States*, Project Air Force, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2007, p. 22.

Kuzekbaj A. (2022), *Povyshenie statusa SVMDA vyvedet vzaimodejstvie gosudarstv-chlenov na novyj uroven' – Prezident, Kazinform* // [https://www.inform.kz/ru/povyshenie-statusa-svmda-vyvedet-vzaimodeystvie-gosudarstv-chlenov-na-novyj-uroven-prezident\\_a3990036](https://www.inform.kz/ru/povyshenie-statusa-svmda-vyvedet-vzaimodeystvie-gosudarstv-chlenov-na-novyj-uroven-prezident_a3990036)

Official website [www.akorda.kz](http://www.akorda.kz) (2022) President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev took part in the VI CICA summit // <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/prezident-kasym-zhomart-tokayev-prinyal-uchastie-v-vi-sammite-svmda-1391219>

*This research will be funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant N BR18574168)*