

EURASIAN UNION FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE OPPONENTS: KAZAKH NATIONALISTS AND WESTERN SKEPTICS

Zhanat Momyunkulov, Dariga Kokeyeva, Yesbayeva Aigerym,
Meiram Sarybayev, Anar Mustafayeva

Department of Turkic and Indian Studies

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University

PO 050040, Al-Farabi av. 71, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Tel: 8-701-676-5919 Email: academ_dep@mail.ru

The research is financed by: at their own expense

Abstract

Re-integration of Kazakhstan with Russia within the Eurasian Union must be considered not only from the Eurasianist or Pro-Russian position, but, it also has to be analyzed from the Europeanskepticism and Kazakh nationalist viewpoint. Only the historical and nationalist approach could explain the true nature of Russian-Kazakh integration relations. The Customs Union and the Common Economic Space should not compromise the political sovereignty of any member countries in any way. Of course Russia will be a dominant party in the newly shaping structure. All decision-making processes are made first of all in Moscow. In this paper we gave basic philosophical components and geopolitical ideologemes of Eurasianism and Eurasian Union, as well as the facts and statistics of Eurasianist or Pro-Russian position. In economic context, Kazakh politicians, academicians and businessmen should always defend the national interests of the Kazakhs. If not, this geopolitical project may lead to the same negative historical results as was the collapse of the USSR. In this paper the authors also tried to prove that for now the Eurasian integration with Russia is not so necessary for Kazakhstan in terms of national economy. The results of the research suggest that Kazakhstan loses economically and politically to Russia in what concerns decision-making, control, regulation and institutionalization.

Key words: Kazakh nationalists, Eurasian Union, integration, interests, European skepticism, historical approach, ideology, Russia, economy, power, regional, USSR, independency.

INTRODUCTION

Kazakhstan has always played significant role in many integration projects and processes in the Eurasian space. Kazakhstan has organized OSCE Summit in Astana in 2010, World Traditional Religious Leaders Congresses, chaired Organization of Islamic cooperation, Organization of Shanghai Cooperation and CICA, held Turkic summits, and initiated Customs Union, CIS, Eurasian Economic Union. Even, the idea of creating of Eurasian Union undoubtedly belongs to Kazakhstan. Now Kazakhstan is a part of Eurasian Union. In this paper the Eurasianism and Eurasian Union is considered from the point of view of the opponents of this idea: Kazakh nationalists and Western skeptics.

Starting from 1 January 2012 Eurasian Economic Space has been working. This geo-economic project includes Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan. From this moment the Eurasian Commission started to operate in Moscow. According to the Agreements of Eurasian Economic Space all of above-mentioned countries will enter into more intensive and active integration. Kyrgyzstan, Armenia and Tajikistan plan to be integrated with Russia too. After the twenty years of free journey, Kazakhstan decided to be integrated and to be closer economically with Russia. This means that some of the newly gained independence of Kazakh nation might be sacrificed for the unclear project which is to be a part of something bigger and greater.

Initially, Customs Union was created as a first step to the Eurasian Union. The Eurasian Economic Space that works now, is planned to be turned into Eurasian Economic Union by 2015. Even though, USSR will not be reconstructed, it is known that something close to that is supposed to be created again. This Eurasianism will obviously strengthen Russia's potential resources and reinforce its weakened back. Despite of President N. Nazarbayev's sincere and idealist dream of re-construction of something ideal between USSR and European Union, for now, it is far from being an ideal union in terms of national interests of its smaller members, pro-Russian nature of the union, big brother-little brothers' relations, strategic aims of the reunion etc. Possibility of that Russia will return to its old sphere of influence is high. Nevertheless, as an ethnic Kazakh we hope that, this time, the more democratic structure, fair and open interstate economic system might be re-created.

Research Questions

What are the real purposes of the Eurasian Union? This big question that we have been studying in the last period is about the possible impacts that Kazakhstan's entry in the Eurasian Union could create for our region in the future. As we already live in the Common Eurasian Space for two years, we easily understand the first impacts of the mentioned union on the economic situation, especially on the general condition of small and medium business in Kazakhstan.

It's very important to understand, how, the Eurasian Union will change the economic situation here, in Kazakhstan. Because it's already obvious that after the integration with Russia, some local companies were closed or bankrupted, some reorganized, some came into very difficult condition by the pressure of more developed Russian producers and better goods. The prices for all goods and products in our market dramatically increased in the last two years. In brief, our prices reached the Russian ones. All these questions have to be researched and analyzed more professionally. The main theory circulates in Kazakh experts' minds is that the integration will might be profitable for all local enterprises and traders in the next decades, despite that, for now, the situation is far from that. But, as young Kazakh academicians, we have checked facts, analyzed possible risks, chances and opportunities of the union for Kazakhstan. The results of our works inspire no real economic dividends for at least next decades. It seems that, it did not worth to be engaged practically from the purely national viewpoint.

The original research questions that we already have are as follow: What are the main purposes of the theoretical bases of the Eurasianism? How Kazakhstan will be able to benefit from the Eurasian Union practically and pragmatically? The specific research questions are as follow: What will be the effect of the integration in regard to the national policy or political independence of Kazakhstan? How will the integration of Kazakhstan with Russia impact on the national economy of the former?

Kazakh Nationalists' Viewpoint

First of all, the history of Eurasianism, the negative and positive effects from the integration with Russia, have to be tested and studied again. The theoretical bases and purposes of the integration will directly concern the national policy or political independence of Kazakhstan. The most interesting question is about the practical results and effects from the Eurasian Union for Kazakhstan. Theoretically, Eurasianism is a product of classical Russian thinkers and strategists from 19-th and 20-th centuries. Theoretical base of the ideology of Eurasianism was enhancement and expansion of Russia into the whole Eurasian space. By virtue of their strong rational culture and cold-blooded mentality Russians could implement their dream of Eurasianist expansion and creating the Biggest Super Power in the world. USSR may be interpreted as an unsuccessful example of implementation of Eurasianism in terms of national, ideological, spiritual, humanitarian, democratic and economic values.

Kazakhs as a nation have passed through this integration once before in the USSR era. When we look at history of USSR, we clearly see it was mainly or characteristically built on bloodshed, repression, humiliation, lies and crimes. But, at the same time, USSR made big contribution to development of science, technology, military, culture, geopolitics, economy and policy not only in Central Asia, but, in the whole world. USSR is a prototype of Eurasian Union in any way. This fact points out to the controversial and contradictory character of any Russia-led integration projects no matter in the past or in the future. Russia always has a deficit of political elite which is able to lead to establishment of democratic, free and fair system for all the nations in Russia itself or on the Eurasian space. In the Russia-led USSR integration freedom of speech and faith was always suppressed. It is historically proved. In comparison with the experience of European Union in integration, there is a serious lack of spiritual, democratic, intellectual and humanitarian values in the so-called Eurasian Union. Who can give us guaranty that history of USSR won't be repeated?

Nevertheless, Kazakh people historically have some appreciable benefits from the integration with USSR. Russia is always was an open window to the Europe for Central Asian nations for the last decades and centuries. Western science, culture, technology, knowledge, literature and even music reached Kazakhstan through the Russian interpretation. It's the first privilege and benefit from our close relationships with the Great Northern Neighbor. The second benefit was that all the infrastructure problems of the region were partly solved in the Soviet period.

As for the negative aspects of the integration, Kazakhs were very close to lose themselves totally as a nation or ethnic group. The economic, cultural, traditional, linguistic, psychological, intellectual and spiritual aspects of Kazakhs' life were under pressure of the powerful and aggressive ideological machine of the Soviet system. Kazakh culture and language were methodically and systematically subjected to total suppression and even, annihilation. Economically and politically, Kazakhstan was absolutely dependent on Moscow's decisions and preferences. For example, all of the strategically important plants and industrial entrepreneurship were deliberately built in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. Kazakhstan was made just a supplier of some unimportant products, foods and goods for consumption of more technically and industrially developed Western regions. This is why, after the 20 years of declared independence, Kazakh leader Nursultan Nazarbayev was urged to recognize the fact that the country can not live apart from Russia both economically and industrially, at least, in the next few decades.

As President N. Nazarbayev said Eurasian Union will help Kazakhstan to become as independent on natural resources as Russia is. Relying on Russian technical support, industrial

experience, military aid, economic ties, intellectual and cultural impact, Kazakhstan really might be seen as a beneficiary. According to the authors of Neo-Eurasianism, both Russian and Kazakh markets may benefit from each other in terms of goods, services and employers exchange, i.e. mutual use of trade privileges and economic opportunities.

Pro-Russian and Eurasianist vision.

Pro-Russian and Eurasianist vision is predominant, but still theoretically and practically insufficient. Pro-Russian experts and politicians try to point out to the advantageous economic dividends and political privileges of the already working Eurasian Union for Kazakhstan in the regional context of geo-economic and geo-political developments. According to them Eurasian Union is the most important and realistic project for closer integration of the Eurasian nations, which is seriously considered as a common answer for new challenges and threats of modern period of history such as world financial crisis international terrorism. According to Pro-Russian experts integration within the Eurasian Union gives to Kazakhstan a lot of economic privileges and undoubtedly strengthens its positions in world policy.

The idea of creation of Eurasian Union has been formulated for the first time in Moscow University in 1994. It is very symbolic that the idea has been articulated by the Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev instead of any Russian policymaker or ideologist. Nazarbayev's idea of creation of Eurasian Union was a genius prevision of how the Post-Soviet countries might develop and where they might move towards and reach in the following few decades. Before the collapse of the USSR, in the years of *Perestroika*, Nazarbayev was seen as one of the possible or potential candidates for taking office after Gorbachev's quit from power. At that time, future Kazakh President was seriously considered by the many in Kremlin as the most ambitious, charismatic, competent, self-confident and young politician who could lead the USSR forward and save the *Derzhava* (Super-Power) from the collapse and chaos. But, fortunately or unfortunately, the things went wrong way owing to the critical changes, unstable condition and turmoil took place in Russia and other Soviet countries.

«Philosophy» of Eurasianism

Almost all of the Post-Soviet states have suffered a lot from the chaotic developments followed by the collapse of USSR such as deep economic crisis, break-up of natural economic relations and industrial ties, ethnic and social conflicts, crimes, migrations, instability, deficit of necessary foods and products, poverty, psychological disorientation and spiritual vacuum and so on. Despite of above-mentioned negative effects of that early period of independence of Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev could see the opportunities, necessary for CIS countries' economic integration and structural integrity.

Nazarbayev had predicted in that period of uncertainty that the centrifugal forces will, in the end, be replaced by the centripetal ones. He was right, USSR existed no more, but, Moscow had still have a potential. In his book *«At the crossroad of the centuries»*, published in 1996, Nazarbayev writes that, in that difficult period of time, in the early 90's nobody could imagine that it is possible to preserve and strengthen the national independence of country, and at the same time to take part in integration projects in the frame of Post-Soviet states. Since that time nothing important has been changed in the mind of the author of Eurasian Union project. If one looks profoundly into the evolution of Nazarbayev's political ideas, it is easy to see that from the beginning he has been carrying, cherishing and having the idea of Eurasian Union on his agenda as an alternative for other geo-political scenarios developed by Washington or Beijing concerning the future of post-Soviet, especially, Central Asia region.

Eurasian Union was the only rational decision for choosing between well-known Russia and radical US and closed China. It was historically important for Kazakhstan to preserve the

strategic balance of powers in Eurasia, to avoid very radical destabilizing changes, to conserve the existing geo-political status-quo. It is obvious that, Nazarbayev was sure that, no one from the Western developed countries comes to Kazakhstan with sincere intention and gives it what it really needs: available and easy credits, technical advises, high technologies, practical knowledges, moral support and so on. There was no foreign country, ready to grant to Kazakhstan something for free.

According to Nazarbayev, in the early period, no one could believe, or even, imagine that one can combine his national sovereignty with re-integration process with some of the Post-Soviet states. In other words, traces of old great sub-national and sub-regional structures, interstate and interregional ties and links could not disappear so quickly and easily in a few decades. Disintegrated parts of USSR could not be seen as just its remains or ruins, and thus could not be forgotten forever, since, it was once so global and overwhelming phenomenon.

Such a great phenomenon must have its inertia, leave its released energy and be transformed into something practical and viable. It is rule of physics. Some of fragmented parts or just remains of USSR can be re-organized and re-integrated under the more democratic, fair, free and open values, more modern, coordinated and equal principles and rules. The whole system may be reset, criteria, ideology and rationale must be changed, and something different, compact and positive can be designed instead. Why not?

According to Eurasianists, one has to give a second chance for Eurasian integration, if, the intentions and aims are defensive and humanistic, not offensive and aggressive. The fatal mistakes, miscalculations and lessons from the Soviet era might be taken into consideration, equal rights of the nations throughout the Eurasia must be respected, national interests of the participant states ought to be paid attention to, if, the strategists and ideologists of Eurasianism want to create sustainable, strong, dynamic and attractive power of united Eurasian Union.

Nazarbayev as a father of Neo-Eurasianism, and founder of CIS, could clearly see the inter-dependent, inter-penetrative, mutually beneficial character and potential of the relations of CIS-member counties. Nazarbayev is sure that, re-integration of some countries in the Post-Soviet space will not necessarily exclude or annul the national interests of member-states. The President has stated that the idea of *Eurasian Pragmatism* will be the distinctive competence of the Union. From this point of view, Eurasian integration will mainly give positive effects and fruitful results in the long-term future. Integration will vivify and activate economic relations between the CIS countries, renew and motivate the trade ties and business links, increase the common turnover, boost the macroeconomic situation and raise the GDP level.

As for Putin's popular article, published in 2011 in *Izvestia* newspaper, it was a continuation of Nazarbayev's Eurasian idea, but, in some extent, it was formulated in a harder style, strict and direct manner, explicitly implying pro-Russian character of the future union. This subject is out of our discussion. Putin said that creation of a common economic space is the most important event in post-Soviet space since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As for ideology of the Union, there is nothing clear yet. Some Eurasianists point out that the basic instrument for creation of Eurasian ideology of the union, may be Russia's predominance in cultural and information spheres of life throughout the regions. This important question is not answered yet. Nevertheless, as Kazakh leader said, there are many factors which can unite and bring post-Soviet counties, even Eurasian nations together. For now, common ideology of the integration is not formulated or formed; it has some uncertain and unclear features.

«Russia as a solution»

According to Eurasianists Russia is an only correct solution. The question is why Russia? There are two basic reasons of why the integration with Russia is a priority for Kazakhstan. First of them supposes more cooperation and interpenetration economically. Second one means more protection from Russia militarily. The security challenges in Central Asia are as follows: China's growing economic and political influence, international terrorism and religious extremism from the South, especially, it will be gaining certain actuality when ISAF forces will leave Afghanistan in 2014, foretelling future tensions and potential conflicts.

First of all, Russia is still one of the principal actors in global affairs, which has officially denied the bi-polar world model, and embraced the multi-polar world model as an only convenient way of future development of the world. Russia is more developed technologically than Kazakhstan. Russia is one of the attractive intellectual, cultural, economic, military powers in the Eurasian space. Russia is a historical neighbor of our country in the past six centuries. Two countries have the longest border in the world. Russia uses something like Soft power in regard to Kazakhstan: it totally controls our information space; Russian culture dominates in our cultural life, Russian language is still an «ideal model» for thinking globally, professionally, scientifically and technically.

In fact, Russian is the de facto business language of Kazakhstan, and it allows for more horizontal and vertical integration between Russian and Kazakhstani firms. Russia is still the main military power in the region that can guarantee the stability and security not only in Central Asia, but, in Eurasia too. In the countries of Central Asia, except Kazakhstan, Russia is seen a real economic sponsor and only savior from the existing threats and challenges. It is the mentality of post-Soviet nations and peoples. Unfortunately, there are still no alternatives for Russia-made technologies, inventions, products, goods, decisions, models, methods in Central Asia, including Kazakhstan. So, why should we deny the obvious fact that we are already partially or significantly dependent on Russia in many cases? Is there any better idea of regional economic integration?

Many politicians in the world suffer from Russiaphobia. It is wrong or comic for stating that Russia is bad or good, negative or positive, ideal or evil. These dualistic approaches and outdated prejudices, formed in Cold War times need to be reconsidered. Furthermore, Russia is an organic and inseparable, even fundamental part of the world, such as Germany, India or China. Now, it is the most convenient time to understand the fact that the modern Russia is a respectable power, which will not disappear suddenly or surrender before the difficulties in the near future. As a *second category super-power* it needs rethinking, re-organization, transformation, reformation and re-integration.

For Kazakhstan, being a member of Eurasian Union means to be part of something bigger and stronger, to be militarily supported and protected by Russian anti-missile system, military equipment and armaments, radars and satellites and so on. Membership in the union means domestic stability and security in Kazakhstan. Defensive doctrine of Kazakhstan is an inalienable part of Russia-dominated Eurasian security system. Russia has the largest contingent of commando forces in the world, which are ready to land on any spot of Central Asia at any time, if necessary. Now, the priority behind Russian foreign policy is creation of Eurasian Union. Russia, on the other hand, has taken an approach to the region that seeks to build on previous glory.

Geopolitics: Russia plus China in Central Asia

What about China and US policy in Eurasia? *Central Asia is a delicious and biggest cake given by the Heaven to China.* This is words of one of the key political and military officials of

China. All of the Central Asian nations, especially Turkic ones, have unconcealed fear from China. Chinaphobia is a key element of typical attitude (towards the Great East Neighbor) in Kazakhstan as well. As one Kazakh proverb say: *When black Chinesees will come, then blond Russians will seem your own father*. Historically, Turkic tribes and nations of Central Asia have been perceived as the principal strategic rival for China in the early medieval periods. Now, Eurasian space is predominated by Russia and China.

From the other side, Eurasian Union is a reaction for growing impact and pressure of China in Central Asia. One must choose between two threats: Russia or China? It is ironic that both of them are the biggest economic partners of Kazakhstan. As another Kazakh proverb says: *The old, but well-known adversary is better than the unknown new one*. This proverb points out to the balance of powers in the region from old time. This is why Russia has been accepted by Kazakhs as a counterweight against China's impact in Central Asia.

According to the leaders of Neo-Eurasianism, one of the possible biggest aims and effects of Eurasian Union is to connect European Union with China. Russia can reemerge as a leading global power by creating a new bloc of states that will balance the European Union in the West and a Chinese-led Asia in the East. It is very global task for Russia, is not it? Furthermore, the main direction of this union is to reach Europe through Eurasian Union, created by Russia, Kazakhstan and Belarus. Why does the European vector of Eurasian Union irritate the US so much? Because of huge energy and hidden potential that have Eurasian emerging powers like Russia, China, India, Iran and so on. Asia is awakening.

Eurasia poses difficulties for relations between the United States and Russia. After the NATO coalition forces' withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2014, Russia will be engaged in the resolution of new security challenges for its allies in Central Asia, particularly in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

By 2015, Washington will have both the military and diplomatic resources available to turn the attention to the Eurasian region. The American strategic approach to Eurasia is to «work together to create a new Silk Road, an international web and network of economic and transit connections». This strategy was previous State Secretary Clinton's number-one policy priority for Central and South Asia. As for China's Eurasian policy in Central Asia is that to open up a modern version of the Silk Road and find out new resources of energy for its booming economy and growing needs.

As for Kazakhstan, it is urged to maneuvering between the Eurasian giants on one side, and the Western world of the US and EU, on the other. Multi-vector external policy of Kazakhstan actually means to balance on the controversies of Great powers and to implement policy of neutralism and conformism.

Economic aspects of integration

As regional integration proceeds in much of the world, the post-Soviet space remains disintegrated so far. A lack of horizontal trading links and isolation from CIS markets contribute to the region's persistent underdevelopment. As Putin said, membership in the Eurasian Union, apart from direct economic benefits, will enable its members to integrate into Europe faster and from a much stronger position. Economic integration within Eurasia has potential benefits for many regional states, not only Kazakhstan. First of all, the central direction and cardinal dimension of the Union is supposed to be an economic re-integration based on the principles of equality, partnership and profitability. Integration is also supposed to ensure free move of products, services and working forces.

As we know, in the Soviet times, most of the strategically important factories and plants, technologic parks and clusters were deliberately built in the Western (Slavic republics) regions of USSR. As for other «less important» regions such as Kazakhstan, it was specialized in production of foods (milk, meat, and wheat), consumer goods, raw materials and some less important extra details of more complex equipment and systems. As a result, Kazakhstan's economy was totally dependent on the technically more developed Western regions. This interdependent nature of relations of Kazakhstan with Russia and Belarus is a strong base for closer economic relationship and co-ordinated political and military partnership. Thus, Kazakhstan not only wants to renew its once disconnected ties with Russia, but, also aims at more active and intensive integration with it.

So, let's answer to the question «What are the principal economic privileges of the Eurasian integration?». From the moment of creation (2010) of Customs Union between Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan commercial borders has been opened, necessary legislative rules and bases have been ensured, common turnover has increased. Kazakhstan's exports to Customs Union countries has augmented two times from 2009.

Integration supposes co-ordinated tax and customs rules for all participants of the common market. It also means that Kazakhstan's narrow and modest market will be opened to the Russian more qualitative products with low prices. Kazakh businessmen already have an easy access to the 140-million Russian market, benefit from the tax reduction and customs preferences. Integration also gives major opportunities for transfer of more developed and sophisticated goods, commodities, materials, vehicles, technologies, armaments and different types of equipment from Russia.

In brief, Kazakh entrepreneurs have now more access to the 10 times bigger Russian markets. According to Astana, philosophy of the Eurasian integration was designed to reach the Europe through Russia. As economists state, GDP growth, macroeconomic strengthening, business activity and general recovery may be listed as positive results of the Eurasian integration process. According to Nur-Otan Party officials, since January 2012, the total volume of turnover of products between the three member-states of Eurasian Union has increased by 30-40% in less than one year period. As one of the positive results of 2012 was the fact that Kazakhstan's export of manufactured (finished) goods and products to the markets of Eurasian Union have augmented up to 23,8% (4 Billion dollars). These concrete figures give us an optimistic view of the future of Eurasian Union.

Statistical «facts» of Eurasianists.

Total volume of exports of manufactured goods Kazakhstan in has doubled and reached 24,4 Billion dollars. This is the highest indicator throughout the independence of Kazakhstan. Total commercial turnover of Kazakhstan has increased by 7,5% (135,5 Billions of dollar) by the end of 2012. Exports has increased by 5,2% and imports by 12,6%. It is worth to note that 74% (68,3 Billion dollars) of Kazakhstan's exports is consisted of raw materials or primary products. The structure of these exported materials is as follows: raw petroleum (84%), minerals and concentrate (5%), petroleum gas (3%), wheat (3%) and so on.

There is a significant increase in the export of intermediate goods such as copper cathodes, tin-plates, frictionless bearings, railroad locomotives, heating oil, accumulators and distillates. Exports also contain conserved meat, sugar confectionary, carbides and phosphinates. Imports contain finished products like pipes, fittings for piping, covers and tires, insulating wires (leads), machines, pumps, rail buses, bulldozers, cars, petrochemicals, etc.

Methodical Questions

Is Eurasianism a Re-Sovetization of the Eurasia? But, what about the smaller volume of Kazakh economy and less competitiveness of Kazakh companies in comparison with Russian ones? Kazakh people already see the influence of integration with Russia, as prices for foods and products has critically increased in the last couple of years, expenditures for different services including common transport has rocketed, Kazakh companies weakened and lost their positions in domestic market.

Will Russian minds or bodies seriously take into consideration what their Kazakh counterparts recommend or advise in regard to the integration processes and procedures? It is understandable that, in the Eurasian union Russia will have more to say and will control all the processes including institutionalization, customs procedures, tax regulation, benefits and profits distribution and other important aspects of mutual integration. So, was it worth deepening integration with Russia?

Euroscpticism

There were a number of substantial steps towards more integration the Customs Union. However, as write westernexperts, implementation of the integration remains only in papers. According to Katharina Hoffmann, Eurasian Union has little integration potential and has few to offer to the newly independent states. As for Putin, he successfully used the idea of Eurasian Union just as a political tool in his electoral / presidential campaign. Yet, the emphasis of the leaders of three authoritarian regimes on democracy, freedom, and free-market principles are hardly to be believed in.

Hoffmann says despite all the promises and declarations this union was not realized yet. Since 2010, customs issues have been dealt with under the common customs code, with only 48 out of 90 agreements having been ratified so far. According to specialists, the Customs Union did not bring substantial changes to customs regulations.

Another authorhints at the interesting point, that Putin has stolen the idea of Eurasian Union from Nazarbayev and declare himself as a father of Neo-Eurasianism or a founder of Eurasian Union. Initially, the Eurasian Commission's office were planned to be opened in Astana, but Moscow insisted on having it in the latter. Union's capital can only be in Moscow, nowhere else. That's Moscow.

As for the main reasons for Belarus's participation in the union has been to strengthen its own position in international trade. By means of the Customs Union, Belarus wants to benefit from the same trade conditions as Russia and Kazakhstan have. The three states created Single Economic Space for harmonization of common policy in energy, transport, and communication, as well as the establishment of comprehensive free movement of capital and workers. But, Eurasian commission which was formed by the deputy prime ministers of the three countries, however, remained far behind European Union model in terms of competencies and lacks set of conditions. It is an intergovernmental organ without competencies of its own.

According to above-mentioned Hoffmann, Eurasian Union mainly reflects the characteristics of earlier integration projects in terms of integration plans, structure, and the relationship between stated and realized intentions. Eurasian membership is now explained by short-term political and material gains. What is lacking in this case is the willingness of Russia to give up sovereign rights, which is necessary for long-term integration. This troika's initiative for an integrated customs union as the predecessor to an economic union in the post-Soviet space is

not new. There was a CIS Economic Union in 1994. The second serious attempting step was a EurAsEC in 2000.

According to some of the Eurasia researchers, boosting the dynamics of integration will hardly be achieved without substantially changing the integration concept. Anyway, despite of its limited implementation, some practical achievements of Eurasian Union allow us to look at it with no emotions. The Customs Union is for the first time attracting interest.

According to one of the western experts the extent of the Union's effective integration will depend on the willingness of its members to accept the negative implications of multilateral integration projects for their countries' sovereignty. Russia's economic and political predominance in the CU will continue to create tensions between member nations. Russia will have to take into account the long-term national interests of Kazakhstan and Belarus.

A complete implementation of the Eurasian Union is unlikely to happen, though; it may be enlarged by inclusion of Tajikistan, Armenia and Kyrgyzstan. Ukraine and Moldova will also have a certain limited interest in the Eurasian Economic Union as well.

If Eurasian Union will pursue the goal of aiming primarily for the accession of new members in order to expand its own sphere, then achieving integration goals will be difficult. At the same time, it is likely that the Russia's Eurasian Union will struggle to find new members among the recently independent states. The new union has to refuse to be a USSR-style Empire which means Strong Russia and weak others. But, it seems that, as was always the case in the history, Russia fails to be a tolerant, wise and fair Soft Power.

At the last meeting in Minsk, October 2013 Kazakh leader claimed about the monopoly of Russian enterprises and official bodies in terms of custom and protection procedures. Kazakh businessmen have no access to the Russian markets because of protection measures from Russian side. Nazarbayev knows that Kazakhstani companies have little chance to win in combat with Russian companies, but, he has a hope that someday Kazakh products will be demanded in Russian economic space.

Mill's Method of Difference

As a result of our work, we have used Mill's Method of Difference. This Method suggests that initially there should be common features or similar peculiarities of something (characteristics of a phenomenon or regularity) and also there should be a reason for different outcome or results. So, we have studied the future possible benefits for Russia and Kazakhstan in the integration process in Eurasian Economic Union.

Results of Research

The similar characteristics is as follows: From January 2012 both states are the equal active members of Common Economic Space which is the Eurasian Union's predecessor. Both of Russia and Kazakhstan are the main initiators and biggest players in the integration project. The first ideologist of Neo-Eurasianism is Kazakh leader N. Nazarbayev (1994) and from autumn 2011 it's used by Russia's leader V. Putin in his election campaign. Both states are strongest economies and geopolitical leaders in post-Soviet space. Russia is first economy in CIS with GDP level of \$1.850 trillion (2011), and 9th in the world. Kazakhstan is a second economic

power in post-Soviet region with of \$180.0 trillion (2011), 51st in the world. Both are the most populous countries in the region: population of Russia in 2012 is 142.8 million people; population of Kazakhstan is 16.6 million people.

According to Method of difference, different outcome must be pointed out. Owing to the giant size of its economic power, significant capacity of productive forces, more developed technical and technological opportunities, imperial position, expansionist strategy and hard foreign policy, most influential information and intelligential policy and language policy Russia undoubtedly and uncompromisingly will as usually use Hard Power and its obvious privileges in the processes of organization, management, decision-making, strategies and institutionalization and so on. As for Kazakhstan, it will only lose in term of customs regulations (for example, Kazakhstan has already lost nearly 300 million dollars in the first half of 2012), prices for all goods and products including benzene, public facilities, foods, transportation expenses, services, education costs, cars has abruptly and dramatically rocketed in 2010-2012 from the moment Customs Union started to operate.

Since then life standards in Kazakhstan lowered, protest moods emerged, Kazakh nationalism increased, risks of international conflicts intensified, local firms and entrepreneurship closed and so on. It's clear that appropriate authorities of Kazakhstan agree with every suggestions and plans of Moscow-based Eurasian Committee concerning the future development of interstate bodies or supranational structures. No national interests in integration are considered in a proper manner.

Conclusion

According to Pro-Russian and Eurasianist position, Eurasian Union is not a panacea for all woes for Kazakhstan, but this integration project will serve to simplify and facilitate Kazakhstan's faster and easier entry into the global economy. Unfortunately, Kazakhstan's economy still depends on the export of natural resources and raw materials. The economic strategy of Kazakhstan is to be one of the 30 most developed countries by 2050. It will be successfully realized, if, we will skillfully benefit from our historically close relations with Big Russia. Only competitive capacity of Kazakhstani enterprises and industries, cost competitiveness of our products and wares might save us from more economic dependence form Russia. Kazakh officials assert that Kazakhstan in parallel with closer ties to Eurasian Union (theoretically) may develop new type of economy, based on the best of Soviet, Russian, Western, Asian and Kazakh economic principles and humanistic values. Eurasian Economic Union can be as a springboard for Kazakhstan's economic leap in the future.

According to Euroscepticism and Kazakh Nationalist viewpoints, it is possible that the union has been designed for prolongation of the political status-quo in Kazakhstan (Russia's predominance and super-presidential system), conservation of political stability with one dominating party system, strong state economic management, systemic corruption based on tribalism and state bureaucracy, Russian-thinking population's predominance in socio-economic life, restriction of any national rhetoric, only copying of Russia-made styles in every sphere including economy and technology, laws and rules, in short, more dependence on Russia. Thus, we can conclude, that many basic questions that concern the Eurasian union and of course, national interests of Kazakh people still remain unclear. Only history shall prove whether this integration was convenient for us or not. In this paper we tried to look at the Eurasian Union from the viewpoint of Kazakh nationalism and European skepticism. This approach has right to exist. As, without a constructive criticism any idea or project will not survive or develop.

References

Katharina Hoffmann. (2012) Eurasian Union - a New Name for an Old Integration Idea. *Russian Analytical Digest*, 112, 4-11

Olga Shumylo-Tapiola. (2012). The Eurasian Customs Union: Friend or Foe of the EU? *Report Of Carnegie Endowment For International Peace*, 12-19

Rilka Dragneva and Kataryna Wolczuk. (2012). Russia, the Eurasian Customs Union and the EU: Cooperation, Stagnation or Rivalry? *Chatham House report*, 7-8

Nursultan.Nazarbayev. (2011). Eurasian Union: From the Idea to the History of Future. *Egemen Kazakhstan newspaper*, 1-2

Ilya Zlatkin. (2012). A Sovereign Surge, Not a Soviet Resurgence: The Mutualism of Eurasian Reintegration. *The journal of Russian and Asian Studies*. 13, 2-7

Customs Union of Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan: The Issues of Formation and the Prospects of Development (*International Scientific and Practical Conference*), (2011).

Aidos Sarym. (2012). Naryshkin Trud. *Vlast Journal*, 21, 38-39

Jeffrey Mankoff. (2012). What a Eurasian Union Means for Washington. *The National Interest*, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/what-eurasian-union-means-washington-6821>

Nikolas K. Gvosdev. (2012). The New Russian Empire. *The National Interest*, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-new-ussr-6783>

Sergey Markedonov. (2012). Putin's Eurasian Aspirations. *The National Interest*. <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/putins-eurasian-aspirations-6973>

Raffaello Pantucci, Alexandros Petersen. (2012). The Clash of Eurasian Grand Strategies. *The National Interest*, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-clash-eurasian-grand-strategies-6863>

Zhanat Momynkulov. (2012). Avrasya Birliği ve Kazakistan. *EkoAvrasya International Journal for Economic and Strategic Researches*. No 18, 14-15

Zhanat Momynkulov was born in 1981 in Almaty region of Kazakhstan. He is a candidate of philosophical science (from 2009) and working as an associate professor at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan. From 2007 to 2011 he was working as a Teaching Staff Member of the Chair of Modern Eastern Languages at the faculty of International Relations. Now he is as a Teaching Staff Member of the Chair of Diplomatic Translation. He is a graduate of Eastern Studies faculty at the same university. In 2005-2008 Zhanat studied in postgraduate studentship program at the Faculty of Political Studies and Philosophy. He is an author of more than 100 articles and papers including Modern Official and Business Turkish, Text-book 2012. He is consultant and specialist of the International Journal of Economic and Strategic Research «EkoAvrasya», Turkey. He is specialized on Central Asia, Eurasia and Middle East issues. Now Zhanat is a deputy-director of Turkish Institute for Eurasian Researches, Almaty. His works were published in Ukraine, Japan, Korea, Turkey, and Russia. Zhanat speaks Arabic, Turkish, English, French, Russian and Kazakh. Below are some of his works: «Batı Kazakistan Bölgesinde

Yaşanan Olayların Arka Planı», «Integration of Turkic States. A New Overlook at the Established View», «Which Challenges Does Humanity Encounter This Century?», «Kazakistan's New Strategy (2013-2050)».

Dariga Kokeyeva was born on the 19 of April 1979 in Kazakhstan, Candidate of Philosophy (PhD), Senior Lecturer at Department of Turkic and Indian studies at al-Farabi Kazakh National University. D.Kokeyeva is an author of more than 40 scientific articles, connected to Philosophy, philology, and policy, religion, particularly Kazakh, Indian and Turkish studies.

Aigerym Yesbayeva was born in 1987 in Almaty region of Kazakhstan. Aigerym graduated of Abay National Pedagogical University, foreign languages faculty, specialist on German and English languages. She has a master degree in Global Economy (2012) and working as an expert of Kazakh-Turkish Institute for Eurasian Researches, Almaty, as well as at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan. She is working as a Teaching Staff Member of the Chair of Economic International Relations at the faculty of International Relations. She is author of more than 25 articles and papers including Eurasian Union's perspectives. She is consultant and specialist of new Journal of Economic Research «Gylym jane biznes» in Kazakhstan. She is specialized on Eurasia, especially, Eurasian Union and Russia. Now Aigerym is a researcher of Turkish Institute for Eurasian Researches, Almaty. Her works were published in Korea, Russia and Kazakhstan. Aigerym speaks English, German, Russian and Kazakh. Below are some of his works: Eurasian Union and Kazakhstan, Arab Countries Policies in Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Research centers as a pedagogical instrument, Egypt and political crisis.

Meiram Sarybayev was born on the 08 of March 1981 in Kazakhstan, PhD (history, world history), director of the training department of general disciplines S. Asfendiyarov Kazakh National Medicine University. Sarybayev Meiram has 18 scientific articles published in magazines such as "Treasury Bulletin" (a series of historical, international relations and international law), "Kogam zhane dauir", "Kazakhstan -Spectrum», «Sprawy Wschodnie» (Poland), as well as in collections of international scientific conferences.

Anar Mustafayeva was born on the 30 of July 1983 in Kazakhstan, PhD, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Arabic and Iranian studies at al-Farabi Kazakh National University. A.Mustafayeva is an author of more than 30 articles and 5 of them are related to a religion, particularly the Islamic religion.