Daniel Martsenyuk

Identifying the discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy in the context of post-Soviet sub-regional integration (EurAsEC and GUAM as a case study)

_____

Abstract

Integration on the post-Soviet area is a controversial issue. Countries that used to constitute single socialistic state became independent and faced the situation when they had to fend for themselves, elaborate new identities, and state policies in the social, political, and economic spheres. It is obvious that in spite of the initial impulse of centrifugal force in the relations with the neighbors, post-Soviet states' leaders understood that it is in their interest to establish and support relations with the states that have similar identity presented with common history, values, and political will. The main consequence of that understanding is the establishment of the sub-regional integration and cooperation organizations.

I claim that the two politically polar sub-regional organizations on the post-Soviet area as Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC) on the one hand and Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova (GUAM) on the other hand, can be examined from the point of view of the Constructivist school of international relations with the use of cultures of anarchy concept created by Alexander Wendt.

The chosen tool for analysis is the discourse analysis. In the present thesis research, I will identify discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy within the sub-regional integration and cooperation organizations. For that assessment, I will analyze the official documents, press releases, articles in mass media and speeches of the officials of these institutes.

The results of my studies allow me to argue that collaboration of states within different organizations is reflected in a friend, mutual-aid and common benefit Kantian culture of anarchy.

List of contents

Introduction

The present thesis is aimed at identifying the different aspects of constructivist Kantian culture of anarchy discourse within the relation between members of two sub-regional integration organizations on post-Soviet area: EurAsEC and GUAM.

In general, the world today abides by the rules established by the process of globalization. It has initiated two major tendencies, such as integration and regionalization. Integration emerged when the states began to realize that sacrificing part of their sovereignty is in their interest that would allow the achievement of the common profit and other benefits; on the other hand this happens not in every state of the world, but in a group of states that have common history, culture, geographical location, identity, interests, giving life to the idea of regionalization. There is a lot of research devoted to the international integration organizations as European Union (EU), NAFTA, Mecrcosur and etc.

Emergence of such coherent units is really an astounding event as there was a serious shift from the policy of sovereignty and autarchy to the ideas and practices of supranational institutes, common market, and international division of labor.

The collapse of Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War brought to life fifteen independent states. Twelve of them united in the Commonwealth of Independent States (the CIS). Although, the efficiency of the organization is still contested by many scholars, as there has been no real interest for cooperation in this organization, it may be considered as a first attempt of integrating post-Soviet states. Lack of any tangible results encouraged contemplations to change the situation, because of the numerous consultations and negotiations the doctrine of multi-level and multi-speed integration was defined.[1] This doctrine speculated that integration of the countries with the common interests and goals within the CIS is possible. It resulted in the creation of the number of sub-regional integration organizations: i.e. Russia and Belarus Union; Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC), Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova (GUAM) etc.

It worth mentioning, that the organizations listed above are not so well known outside post-Soviet area, and, mostly, researched by the Russian scientists who formed their world-view during the Soviet times and/or during the transitional period of the 1990ies. Therefore, this research might give an impulse to more thorough and less biased by political realism study of the topic.

---

[1] S. Khilman, "Raznoskorostnaya i Raznourovnevaya Integratsiya," in *Vestnik Mezhparlamentskoy Assamblei SNG*, 5:1997, pp. 18-21.

Despite the number of post-Soviet sub-regional organizations, they not so often become the subject of study. What is scarcer is the research from the perspective of theories of international relations. The majority of studies view the topic in the context of research of Russian foreign policy on post-Soviet area or in the context of Realist approach. Simply said, they see all processes focusing mainly on the structure of international system using the "Rationalist" logics. This approach based mainly on the approach of explaining things focusing on how system constitutes behavior of the actors, and by doing so ignoring the idea of identities and interests.

The school of international relations that would include identities and interests is the Constructivist school of international relations. Unlike Rationalists, Constructivists believe that constant process of reflecting and interpretation of the surrounding environment is the main factor that defines the reality in its factual and normative manifestations.[2] Thereby, not the system dictates the behavior of actors, but the domestic policies of a state.[3]

One of the basic ideas of the constructivist theory is intersubjectivity, the idea that replaces the terms of positivism, such as mentality or social consciousness. Constructivism resigns from the idea of collective reason. This school promotes the collective knowledge. According to intersubjective ideas, the environment becomes an objective reality because the majority of people share them.[4] Constructivist thinking and constitution of the surrounding environment is closely tied to the linguistic concepts as speech act theories and discourse analysis.

Now the post-Soviet integration experiences very eventful period firstly, because there is a number of actions that are aimed at presenting of common interests. Secondly, these common interests are pursued in different sub-regional organizations that share their own identities. Most demonstrative examples are Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC) and Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova (GUAM). These two most organizations are completely opposite in their identities.

EurAsEC has been functional for ten years now. It unites Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan in the fields of economy and customs. In a series of international agreements, this institution follows the logic of the European Customs and Economical Union. There has been a lot of work done in order to promote common customs policies. In the end of November 2009, member-states agreed to adopt common

---

[2] K. M. Fierk, "Constructivism" *in International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University press 2007, p. 167
[3] Fierk 2007 p.168
[4] Fierk 2007

customs regulation removing internal borders and strengthening the external that went into force in January 2010. In the framework of this organization a lot of harmonization of law and politics has been done.

GUAM was created in 1997 in Washington during the 50-year anniversary of the NATO. From the very beginning, the political cooperation was put forward. In term of their cooperation, states decided to promote alternative (to Russia's) routs of hydrocarbonates and took steps that would assure the successful entry to NATO.

Despite the serious influence of political aspect, both regional organizations have aims of establishing cooperation and\or integration. Nevertheless, what cultures of anarchy exist in them?

Studies of Alexander Wendt on identity, interests, and cultures of anarchy allow conducting present research. Following the constructivist logics, we can successfully identify what discourse of Wendt's cultures of anarchy that exist on the post-Soviet area. Analyzing official documents, speeches, articles and other sources of information we can identify these discourses. The Kantian culture of anarchy views the other states as a friend, while the Hobbesian and Lockean cultures treat others as enemies and rivals respectively.

The chosen method of study is the discourse analysis.

The goal of research lies in the identifying the discourse of Wendt's Kantian culture of anarchy in the framework of integration on post-Soviet area basing upon the research of two sub-regional organizations: EurAsEC and GUAM.

The objectives of the research aimed at:

-following the collapse of the Soviet Union and disclosing the process of the emergence of sub-regional organizations on post-Soviet area;

-highlighting key notions of the Wendt's cultures of anarchy concept;

-using the discourse analysis method to analyze the texts of the official documents, articles and reports in mass media, reports and speeches delivered by the officials of the integration organizations to trace the signs of the cultures of anarchy discourses;

The object of my research is the integration on the post-Soviet area. The subjects are institutions of sub-regional integration, - EurAsEC and GUAM.

The design of the thesis is founded on the series of sources and literature of the many prominent scholars of the international relations theory. In order to draw up a constructivist view on the relations between the post-Soviet integration organizations works of the Alexander Wendt "Social Theory of International Politics" and his article in the *International organization* magazine called "Anarchy is what the states make of it"

were used. In order to sketch a discourse analysis research method the monograph of Michel Foucault "Archeology of Knowledge" was researched. That book explains the term discourse as well as the ways this analysis may be conducted. Additional reading for the Discourse analysis is the article of Teun A. van Dijk in *Journal of Communication* called "Discourse Analysis: Its Development and Application to the Structure of News". It contains practical ways of analyzing the news.

In order to find data for the research of the post-Soviet integration culture of anarchy discourse I visited web-sites of the organizations to find the information devoted to the events that happened in them as well as the documents that were signed by the members of the organization or were released by administrative bodies of these communities. Another step was the information presented by the "*Nezavisimaya Gazeta*" as its journalists devoted many articles to the events in states and sub-regional organizations on post-Soviet area and the World in general. There are also many articles devoted to GUAM and EurAsEC countries making the search for Kantian culture of anarchy possible.

Some of the interesting articles were found in economy and politics magazines sections of the national library of republic of Karelia such as *"Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'"* and *"Mezhdunarodnaya Ekonomika i Mezhdunarodnye Otnoshenia"*. The important roles in explanation of EurAsEC cooperation have the book and articles written by the Secretary-General of the organization Gregory Rapota called *"Economicheskoe prityazhenie"* or Economic Attraction.

The present research consists of introduction, main part of three chapters, and the conclusion. The first section is devoted to the problem of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the creation of the CIS, and, later, the creation of the sub-regional integration organizations as EurAsEC and GUAM. The second chapter devoted to the theoretical explanation of the Constructivism theory and the Wendt's three cultures of anarchy. Substantial place in the section is devoted to the discourse analysis and its ways of analyzing the reality. The third section is devoted to analysis of the selected organizations from the perspective of the discourse analysis. That will finally allow defining the discourse existing of culture of anarchy.

Chapter 1. Historical background of post-Soviet integration

This chapter will be devoted to the issues of historical backgrounds of the emergence of regional integration organizations on the post-Soviet area. This task should be fulfilled in order to explain why the integration within different frameworks became possible. First, how possible was the collapse of the Soviet Union. Secondly, what encouraged the process of creation of the first post-Soviet cooperation Organization, - the Commonwealth of Independent States (the CIS). This body in its evolution was inspired by the multi-speed and multi-level integration doctrine that in its turn allowed the emergence of various sub-regional organizations as GUAM and EurAsEC. Thirdly, the goal of this chapter lies in tracing the origins of listed above organizations and defining events that led them to the political union and coherent international organizations.

1.1. Collapse of the USSR and creation of the CIS

1.1.1. Collapse of the USSR

In the 80-ies of the XX century, it became obvious that the USSR was exhausted by the constant arms race with the United States and the clash with the capitalist West. The ideological crisis became obvious. What is more important, the growing through ages social discontent started to show up. The planned economy could not allocate enough financial resources for the continuation of the competition against the West, because of it was ineffective. Influenced by the listed challenges the new general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and later the president of the Soviet Union, - Mikhail Gorbachev tried to reform the situation. He developed the policy of "New Thinking" declaring the principals of "Perestroika" and "Glasnost'".[5] Following this policy, the political activity of the population stated growing fast and it inspired the growth of the mass movements and organizations. However, these reforms did not result in elimination of crisis in the state.[6] Authorities of the Soviet republics started to understand that values of the Communism did not answer their own interests.

In the period of 1989-1991 reached its top the main problem of the soviet economy, the persistent commodity shortfall. All basic merchandise goods, except bread,

---

[5] M. Gorbachev, *"Perestroika i Novoe Myshlenie dlya SSSR I Vsego Mira,"* Moscow: International Relations 1987, pp. 45-48

[6] J. Boffa. *"Ot SSSR do Rossii. Istoriya neokonchenogo krizisa 1964-1994,"* (www-document) Originally published in 2003. (http://www.scepsis.ru/library/id_809.html)

disappeared from the circulation. Soviet people experienced ratiocination of supplies in form of tickets. All this was caused by the high ineffectiveness of planned economy that could not satisfy the need for mass consumption goods. This role was taken by the shadow economy that did not bring any income to the state. In the 1991, the demographical crisis began as the death rate exceeded the birth rate.

16th of December 1986 was marked by the first in history protest of the Soviet republic against the appointment of its head. The act of protest took place in Alma-Ata after Moscow tried to appoint its protégé, Kolbin to the post of the first Secretary of central committee of the Kazakh Soviet republic. It seems that this appointment initiated strong identity crisis in this Middle East republic as Kolbin was not related to the Kazakhstan and was the head of regional committee of Ulyanovsk. Ulyanovsk was the Soviet republic 500 km north from the Kazakhstan border. This protest was suppressed by the government troops, and some of its participants went "missing" or got in prison. Both these events were named as "Zheltokstan".

In spite of these forms of protest, there was no organized movement or party in the middle Asia that had the aim of gaining independence as identity of the Union of "brother's peoples" still existed. Among Muslim republics, except Azerbaijani National Front, there was only one movement for independence – "Ittifak" created by Fausia Bairamova. It existed in one of the regions of Volga River – Tatarstan. Since 1989, it stood for transformation of Tatarstan to the independent state.[7] It could be concluded that all the events of nationalism outbreak could be possible, because of drawback of influence of the political center. Similar to the effect of "snowball" emergence of these tendencies in one region brought them to life in another, creating the discourse of new non-Soviet identity.

Under the influence of nationalist and separatist moods in public, on seventh of February 1990 Central Committee of Soviet Union declared the weakening of the political authority monopoly. This was an attempt of the political system to adapt for the change. In a few weeks first in history, democratic elections took place. Liberals and nationalists took many sits in the parliaments of Soviet republics.

The result of this action could be considered the "parade of sovereignties". The term appeared in 1990-1991, when all Soviet republics and many autonomous republics adopted declarations of sovereignty and challenged priority of USSR law above the Republican. The situation deteriorated, when the "war of laws" began and local powers demanded the control over local economies, including refusal of paying taxes in Soviet and

---

[7] P. Palazhchenko, L. Puchkova "Prizchiny Raspada," in *Soyuz Mog Bit' Sokhranen. Belaya kniga: Documenty i Facty o Reformatsii I Sokhranenii Mnogonatsional'nogo Gosudarstva*, Moscow 2007. – pp.112-115

Federal budgets. These conflicts cut many economical ties and connections that damaged economy of the USSR.[8] Fragmentation tendencies nourished the new independent identity in the Soviet republics.

All the attempts of Mikhail Gorbachev to save the USSR were undermined after the election of the Boris Eltsin on the 29th of May in 1990 on the post of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of RSFSR. The elections were held in the stuborn struggle. Eltsin was elected after the third attempt and with the advantage of three votes over candidate of the conservative part of Supreme Soviet Ivan Polozkov.[9]

Russia was the part of the USSR as one of the Soviet Republics and presented the majority of Soviet population, territory, economic and military potential. Central bodies of RSFSR were situated in Moscow as those of the Soviet Union, although traditionally they were considered secondary to the Soviet.

With the election of Boris Eltsin as the head of these bodies, RSFSR chose the course for declaration of its independence and recognition of independence of the rest of the Soviet republics that created the opportunity to remove Mikhail Gorbachev and disperse all Soviet establishments, securing the identity different from the Soviet.

Eltsin's Aspiration to the removal of existing regime resulted in adoption of State Independence declaration on the 12th of June 1990 by Supreme Soviet of RSFSR that declared the priority of Russian law over the Soviet Union's. After that, the process of rapid collapse of USSR came to the active phase as the bodies of power of the Soviet Union started to lose control over the state. The "parade of sovereignties" strengthened. On the post of the Chairman of Supreme Soviet Eltsin achieved the establishment of the post of President of the RSFSR and on 12th of June he won general elections for the post.

Several state and party activists with the creeds of saving the unity of the country and restoration of strict state-party control over all spheres of life tried to start a coup d'état known as State Committee of Emergency situations. (SCES) It is also known as "August putsch" of the 19th of August 1991. The defeat of putsch in fact led to the total collapse of central power of the USSR, re-submission of governmental bodies to republican leaders and mass downfall of the Union.

In course of a month one after another declared their independence almost all the Soviet republics. Some of them, in order to give legitimacy to these decisions held referendums on independence. Some autonomous republics beyond Russia did the same and later they were called non-acknowledged states.

[8] P. Palazhchenko, L. Puchkova 2007 p.118
[9] P. Palazhchenko, L. Puchkova 2007 p.121.

All this promulgated overall process of new identity building. States that used to be the part of the single state followed their interest to maximize their profits, form their own governments, and define their own policies.

Not the least role in the collapse of Soviet Union had the events and actions that took place outside the borders of Soviet Union – in the dimension of international relations. The unification of Germany led to the mass collapse of pro-soviet regimes in Eastern Europe in 1989. On the 9th of December of 1990, the ex-leader of the labor union "Solidarity" Lekh Valensa was elected to power. These events prove the actual collapse of former Soviet influence. Very important psychological role was played by Romanian revolution of 1989 where in distinction to the other countries of Eastern Europe communists were removed by force and the president-dictator Ceausescu with his wife was executed by shooting on the sentence of military court. In the beginning of 90-ies, de-facto ceased its existence organization of Warsaw pact. Soviet identity disappears in the Eastern Europe.

Great influence had the actions of the USA and its NATO allies against their Other. Aggressive policy of President Reagan led to mass drop of prices on energy resources that had a huge part of Soviet budget. Political pressure on Soviet Union was razed.[10]

On 28th of October 1991 R. Khasbulatov is elected on the post of the Chairman of Supreme Soviet of RSFSR. In addition, on the 6th of November 1991 by the decree of President of RSFSR, Eltsin ceased the activity of Communist party of Soviet Union and the Russian Federation was born. Referendum in Ukraine was held on 1st of December of 1991. The supporters of independence won in historically pro-Russian region – Crimea and according to some politicians, including Eltsin, it made impossible to preserve Soviet Union in any form.

Proposal to create the Union of Sovereign States on 9th of December of 1991 as a confederation with the capital in Minsk was adopted only by seven republics, - Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

Drawing a brief conclusion it should be said that in the end of the 1980ies Soviet Union faced the situation when Soviet identity was undermined by a number of tendencies in its republics that decided to conduct their own policies based on their interests. New identity appears "non-Soviet" identity. Soviet Union is the Other now.

---

[10] S. Cohen, *"The Question of Questions": why the Soviet Union is gone?"* Moscow 2007. p. 87-94

1.1.2. Creation of the CIS

By the beginning of December 1991, the USSR in fact consisted of two republics - Kazakhstan and Russia, supreme soviets of which did not declare independence. Questioned was the legitimacy of independence of three republics, - Belarus, Kirgizia, Tajikistan that declared independence without holding a referendum. Legitimating independence required something more serious, the document that would fix the status of the State as well as construct new institutionalized identity. For that reason on 6th of September 1991 State Council of the USSR started working on the project of Commonwealth of Independent States. On 7th of December in Belovezhskaya grove in Belarus leaders of Russia – president Eltsin, President of Ukraine – President Kravchuk, and Belarus – Chairman of Supreme Soviet of Belarus – Shushkevitch declared the halt of existence of the USSR as "subject of international law and geopolitical reality". Upon its creation, the Commonwealth of Independent States was declared open for joining of former members of the USSR and other states. The CIS agreement defined basic principles of cooperation and formulated the sphere of joined actions through coordinating bodies of the Commonwealth. Members of the agreement guaranteed all norms and obligations that followed from international agreements of the former USSR. On 21th of December of 1991 in Alma-Ata heads of 9 republics: Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine signed the declaration of creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Later Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Moldova adhered to the treaty. In general, twelve of fifteen former, excluding the Baltic States, entered the Commonwealth. The CIS created the identity of not a single state, but the community of states.

On 25th of December President of the USSR resigned. In addition, the next day Supreme Soviet of the USSR declared about its dissolution. The USSR republics entered a new step - existence as the independent states.

The collapse of the Soviet Union was the result of the whole series of important factors. Economic, political, and social crises led to weakening of the role of central bodies of power in the Soviet Union. In the final analysis, this led to rise of nationalism in Soviet republics, created new identities that tried to satisfy their basic interests as survival. All the Satellite countries chose the different course for the western values. Created in 1991 Commonwealth of Independent States formally fixed the independence of former Soviet republics.

The Commonwealth of Independent States (the CIS) emerged as direct result of the collapse of the USSR and tendencies that dominated in its republics. Composition of the organization allows the CIS to address a wide degree of problems that are general for all member-states, because of their recent belonging to a single Socialistic state. However, transformation of the CIS into something more than a tool of "Civilized divorce" is being very problematic. In order to understand why the cooperation in frames of the CIS has turned out to be ineffective we need to trace the character of the organization and note efforts to improve relations within the organization. Key importance has the doctrine of "multi-speed" and "multi-level" integration that explains and stimulates cooperation within the frameworks of sub-regional organizations. Especially among those that have similar or relatively close identities.

Original founding acts and the CIS charter do not have any characteristics of juridical nature of the Commonwealth and do not define its legal status. The CIS charter[11] includes the formula that has a negative sense: "the Commonwealth is not a state and do not have any supranational powers". However, appropriate assessment cannot be limited to denial, it should include positive solution.[12]

With the development and improvement of the organization structure of the CIS, especially after adoption of charter and bringing into force its norms the legal character of the organization started to shape.

The Commonwealth was created by separate states and based upon the principle of their sovereign equality. Exactly this circumstance is meant in assessment of derivative legal personality of the international organization. The charter of the Commonwealth fixes functions of the CIS and its goals and field of joined action of member-states and exactly these traits that characterize functional legal personality of the international organization. The organization has fixed organizational structure, branched structure of powers that act as coordinating interstate, intergovernmental, and interdepartmental institutions. However, in the Charter only member-states are considered as subjects of international law,[13] there are enough grounds to define the legal status of the CIS as regional international organization and actor of international relations. The council of heads of state in December 1993 decided to adopt some measures on providing international recognition of the Commonwealth and its charter bodies. One of the measures was the appeal to the

---

[11] *"Charter of Commonwealth of Independent States,"* 1993.
[12] P. Tsygankov, "Sodruzhistvo Nezavisimykh Gosudarstv" in *Mezhdunarodnie Otnosheniya: Teorii, Konflicty, Dizheniya, Organizatsii* ed. P. Tsygankov G. Drobot, M. Lebedeva, Moscow 2008 p. 284
[13] Charter of the Commonwealth of Independent States 1993

Secretary-General of the UN with the proposal to provide the CIS with the status of observer in United Nations General Assembly. Such a resolution reached United Nations General Assembly in March 1994.[14]

However, it is very important to separate formal, contractual achievements of cooperation from those that were achieved in practice. Adoption and composition of agreements within the CIS were based upon the positive experience of process of European integration that was based primarily on the theories of integration, though real compliance with the contractual agreements in the framework of the whole CIS is practically absent. In practice, states that achieved independence in the beginning of 90ies were not interested in integration within the framework of the whole CIS because they had other interests and new established identities. The universal organization was not enough for unity of states. In fact, it was created to do the opposite that is to decide the political course independent from Others.

The situation is that named countries had to focus on their internal social and economical interests. The states did not have statehood experience and they needed to concentrate their efforts to gain some of it. Besides, the whole series of countries had to resolve problems in the matters of preserving the territorial integrity and to eliminate separatism that would endanger the existent of state. In the beginning of 90ies, on the territories of the CIS countries there were series of separatist armed conflicts that had the goal of secession from the state territories that they belonged to during the soviet times. Vivid examples of that are Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia, Transdniestria conflict in Moldova and south Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia.

Lack of any tangible results encouraged contemplations to change the situation, what resulted in the doctrine of "multi-level and multi-speed integration". This doctrine speculated that integration of the countries with the common interests and goals within the CIS is possible. It resulted in the creation of the number of sub-regional integration organizations: i.e. Russia and Belarus Union, Eurasian Economic community (EurAsEC), Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova (GUAM) etc.

The collapse of the Soviet Union was a controversial issue as the country was torn apart by the series of strong disintegration processes that were founded on the non-Soviet identities. Existing soviet government could not effectively solve many economic, social, political, cultural problems and as a result, the once single international actor transformed into the 15 independent states. Twelve of them united in the framework of the CIS, but as

---

[14] P. Tsygankov, "Sodruzhistvo Nezavisimykh Gosudarstv" in *Mezhdunarodnie Otnosheniya: Teorii, Konflicty, Dizheniya, Organizatsii* ed. P. Tsygankov G. Drobot, M. Lebedeva, Moscow 2008 pp. 285-286

the practice displays this international organization did not turn into any effective tool of cooperation between the post-Soviet countries. After the CIS was established, the newly established states began to pursue their own interests as survival, dominance, economical benefit etc. A doctrine of "multi-speed and multi-level integration" became first step in movement towards the coherent construction of integration institutions as it delivered a discourse of integration within a certain groups of states. One may speculate that actually this micro-level integration is made possible by the similar identities of the states.

1.2. Establishment of Sub-Regional organizations.

1.2.1. Historical backgrounds of EurAsEC cooperation

The first attempt of integration on post-Soviet area was the signature of Economical union treaty in 1993, because it became obvious that the CIS countries could not break through economic crisis and provide tangible economic growth singlehandedly. However, this attempt failed because of the whole series of factors. All countries formed their own market interests that obliged them to seek for other profitable business partners outside the CIS along with the development of mutual relations within the organization and sometimes to form interest groups within local sub-regional organizations. From the very beginning, there were attempts to bow the interests to a search of an alternative trade commodities and partners to those of the Commonwealth. This can be explained by exceeding scale of the organization or aspiration to break through from "chains of former empire".[15]

Interested in opening the custom borders countries could not ignore the fact that they increase the danger of rising expenditure of the capital that supports their present and future possessions as i.e. valuable natural resources. Russia could once again face the re-export problem of its oil, natural gas, and strategically important metals by the other countries. It seems that this kind of threat was understood by Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Azerbaijan. The temptation of striking more profitable deals with western and other foreign countries was too great in order refuse to develop partnership with the former Soviet republics too easily. Differences in labor force costs, profit taxes, rent payments in the Commonwealth countries could inevitably turn out to be more or less serious shock in many countries. Degree and speed of market transformations in Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan were not in an equal state. Moreover, this resulted in a

---

[15] E. Bagramov. "Post-Sovetskaya Integratsya – Realnost' ili Mirazh," in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 11:2003 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in February 2003. (http://www.ng.ru/ideas/2003-03-18/10_sng.html)

series of separate harmonization processes and decisions in course of unlimitedly long negotiations among countries so different in their economic development.[16]

The questions of development of Customs union could not be dictated by temporary conjuncture and political ambitions of the heads of some states and must have been defined by social and economic situation that existed in member-states. Practice demonstrates that declared rate of forming the Customs union of Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, and Tajikistan were unachievable and at the same time did not answer the momentary interests of the states. There were also no rules of establishing this union. The economies of these countries were not ready for total opening of custom borders for mutual trade and hard abidance of the customs barrier policies in relations with foreign partners. No wonder that its participants singlehandedly changed harmonized parameters of outer tariff regulation not only in relations with the foreign countries, but inside the Customs union and the countries cannot agree on coordinated principles on added price taxing as well.[17]

Signed in the framework of the Commonwealth on 25th of November 1998[18] agreement on the principles of levying indirect taxes in exporting and importing goods, craftworks and services created legal field for solving the problems. At the same time, this agreement was not signed by Kazakhstan and Russia. The gradual forming of standard legal base of Customs union experienced also cooperation in the social field.

Governments of Custom union member-states signed agreements on mutual recognition and equivalence of documents on education, degrees, and titles and presented equal rights during entrance in education establishments. The direction of cooperation in the field of assessment of scientific and pedagogical workers and creation of equal condition for defense of theses was also agreed. It was settled that the movement of foreign currency by the citizens of member-states through the internal borders could proceed without limitations and declaration. The goods transferred through the border that had not exceeded limitations on weight, quantity and price were not taxed and levied.

The main achievement of Customs union in 1995, undoubtedly, was the actualization of free trade regime with no fees and limitations that made a great push for trade and had a beneficial effect on the interaction of managing subjects of the States.

According to the 1999 agreement, the organization of five countries eased the customs control inside the organization and agreed upon the steps of activating economic

---

[16] E. Bagramov 2003
[17] E. Bagramov 2003
[18] N. Shumsky, "Integration in CIS: problems and prospects" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economonka i Mezhdunarodnie Otnoshenia* 1999:11 p.78

and trade cooperation. Measures of general customs tariff and principles of application of defense measures were founded. The ways of strengthening the interaction of national financial systems were defined. In order to form single legal space partners defined the directions to harmonize the law systems.[19]

Along with that in 1999 it was clear that opportunities of improving and strengthening of cooperation within the group of five countries is limited in the form it existed as the organization was without a proper legalization and, in practice, without an official name. Sharper became the question of abiding by agreements signed by the partner states. There was a general discontent with the speed and depth of interaction.[20]

On the session of the interstate council of the five countries in Minsk on 23rd of May, Russian delegation expressed the opinion to radically increase the effectiveness of cooperation and proposed an initiative to create on the base of the group a fully-fledged interstate economical organization with the accurate structure and effective mechanism. This proposal found full understanding and support of the partners. Special intergovernmental workgroup was assigned to prepare the project of the charter documents of the future organization. One of the achievements of states is the identity formed on the economy. Later it was called Eurasian Economic Community or EurAsEC.

1.2.2. Historical backgrounds of GUAM cooperation

Cooperation of delegation of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine began in 1996 in Vienna on the conference devoted to question of Common Armed Forces in Europe Delegations made the joined declaration of heads of state of four countries.

On the 10th of October 1997, presidents of four countries met in Strasbourg during the Summit of European Council and reported on the mutual interest of developing bilateral and regional cooperation, European, and regional security of political and economical contacts.

In joined communiqué, presidents of four countries underlined the importance of cooperation of these countries in the creation of Eurasian and trans-caucuses transport corridor as well as drew attention to the efforts of strengthening four-side cooperation. Heads of state also agreed to act jointly to surpass barriers that may emerge in front of

---

[19] A. Maryshev, "Ot Tamozhennogo Soyuza k Evrazi'skomy Economicheskomu Soobshestvu," in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economika*, (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=10559)
[20] R. Alekseev, Mikhailov V. "Eurasian Economic Community" in *International Life*, 11 (2000) p.33

them in XXI century.[21] However, the cooperation in the framework of defined goals from the very beginning was not so active and leaders evidently had not shifted from political rhetoric to political action.

Nonetheless, on the 24th of April 1999 GUAM extended to five members after the Uzbekistan joined the organization. It happened on the summit devoted to the 50-year anniversary of NATO that took place in Washington. As the result of the conference the joined statement of heads of state was made where they declared goals to develop their cooperation in the framework of North-Atlantic Partnership Council and NATO program "Partnership for peace", in order to fight against ethnics intolerance and separatism. According to the results of international conference that took place in Baku on 7-8th of September 1998, states decided to widen the cooperation within the development of transport corridor Europe-Caucasus-Asia (TRASECA).[22] In fact, it has become the first declaration of cooperation in the framework of transit cooperation.

During summit in Yalta in 2001 Presidents of countries discussed the transit corridor that would allow transporting oil and gas in Poland passing Russia. Signed on that summit Yalta charter of GUAM[23] became an important step in the development of the organization as there question of development and effective functioning and support of security of the transport communications that go through the territory of member states had been discussed.

And the main priorities of the countries were declared 1) support of social and economic development; 2) strengthening of the trade connections; 3) development and effective use of transport communications and its infrastructure in the interest of the GUAM countries; 4) strengthening of regional security in all spheres of life; 5) struggle against terrorism, organized crime and drug trafficking.[24]

After the collapse of the Soviet Union newly, emerged states had to establish their own identities, interests and based on them political courses. Although they all became members of the CIS, this organization could not provide the effective means of cooperation and harmonization of interests. As some say, the Commonwealth was created for the peaceful "divorce" of the Soviet republics. Later in context of "multi-speed and multi-level" integration, states had chosen their identities. Two great examples for analysis are

---

[21] *"Joint Communiqué of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine,"* Strasbourg, 10 of October 1997.
[22] *"Declaration of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan,"* Washington, 24 April 1999
[23] *"Yalta GUUAM Charter,"* Ukraine, 7 June 2001
[24] Ibid

EurAsEC and GUAM as they united two different groups of states where cooperation is founded on different identities and interests.

Chapter 2. Theory and method

The purpose of this chapter lies within the disclosure of the theoretical approach to the issue of the post-Soviet sub-regional integration and the principles of organization of international and intergovernmental relations as well as the procedure of construction and emergence of interests, values, identities and relations. It worth mentioning that one of the key schools of the International Relations theory, - the Constructivism mainly tries to display how many central aspects of international relations are socially constructed. In other words, that they are being formed by constant processes of social practice and interaction. The constructivist paradigm emerged as an answer to structuralist theories of neorealism and neoliberalism.

2.1. Constructivist school of international relations

The school of constructivism emerged in the second part of the XX century. Moreover, by the late 1980ies it became one of the mainstream theories of International Relations. The pioneer papers by famous scholars that developed the theory during recent decades include: "What Makes the World Hang Together?"[25] by John Ruggie, "World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations"[26] by Nicholas Onuf "Rules, Norms and Decisions"[27] by Frederich Kratochwil and "Social Theory of International Politics"[28] by Alexander Wendt.

Making a focus on how does language and rhetoric construct the social reality of the international system, constructivists have more peaceful and optimistic view on the process of international relations than versions of realism that is loyal to a purely materialist ontology.[29]

---

[25] J. Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge" in *International Organization*, 52 (4) 1998.
[26] N. Onuf, *"World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations,"* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989
[27] F. Kratochwil, *"Rules, Norms and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs,"* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1989
[28] A. Wendt, *"Social Theory of International Politics",* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999
[29] K. M. Fierk, "Constructivism" in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity,* Oxford: Oxford University press 2007 p 170

Perhaps the most significant contribution to the theory was presented by Alexander Wendt as he has applied the ideas of social constructivism to the field of international relations. Social constructivism is the sociological theory of knowledge that considers how social phenomena develop in social context. His article "Anarchy is What States Make of It: the Social Construction of Power Politics"[30] in *International Organization* laid the theoretical basis for contesting what he believed to be a flaw that neorealists and neoliberalists shared, - a loyalty to the materialism. He attempted to show that such an important realist concept as "power politics" can be socially constructed, and by that displaying that, it is not given by nature and therefore is able to be transformed by human practice.

Wendt sees a fundamental principle of constructivist social theory in behavior of people toward objects, including other actors, based on the meanings that the objects have for them. He develops the concept of a "structure of identity and interest" and show that no particular one follows logically from anarchy.[31] This approach is substantially important for the present research, as these two organizations have identities and interests ignored by the "Structuralism" theories. Declaring these principles he uses Herbert Blumer's "The Methodological Position of Symbolic Interactionism"[32] and as this work about human behaviors Wendt makes note that he assumes that a theoretically productive analogy can be made between individuals and states. I agree with this idea and I want to claim that actually analogy can be also made with the international institutions as we can still talk about Interests and Identities here.

2.1.1. Wendt on identity

States act differently toward enemies than they act toward friends because enemies represent a threat and friends do not. Anarchy and the distribution of power can be considered insufficient to differentiate which is which. The distribution of power may always affect calculations of a state, but how it does that depends on the intersubjective understandings and expectations, or how it is called, on the "distribution of knowledge," that constitute their conceptions of Self and Other.[33]

---

[30] A. Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: the Social Construction of Power Politics" in *International Organization* (46:2, Spring 1992)
[31] Wendt 1992. pp. 396-397
[32] H. Blumer, *"Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method,"* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969 p. 2.
[33] Wendt 1992, p. 397

Wendt gives several examples for that: "If society 'forgets' what a university is, the powers and practices of professor and student cease to exist; if the United States and Soviet Union decide that they are no longer enemies, 'the cold war is over.' It is collective meanings that constitute the structures which organize our actions."[34] Actors acquire relatively stable identities, role-specific understandings, and expectancies about self, - by taking part in such collective meanings. Identities are inherently relational and A. Wendt quotes argument of Peter Berger: "Identity, with its appropriate attachments of psychological reality, is always identity within a specific, socially constructed."[35]

According to social constructivism every person has many identities linked to one's institutional roles i.e. brother, son, teacher, and citizen. Likewise, a state might have various identities as "sovereign," "leader of the free world," "imperial power," and so on.[36] The peculiarities of particular identities vary, but each identity is an inherently social definition of the actor grounded in the theories that actors collectively hold about themselves and one another and which constitute the structure of the social world. [37]

In his main work, "Social Theory of International Politics" Wendt speculates more about the identities and he believes that 'identity is at base a subjective or unit-level quality, rooted in actor's self-understanding'.[38] He adds that actually identity is constituted by internal and external factors so at the same time there are several kinds of identities: like personal or corporate, type, role, and the collective. The points that interest us here in context of post-Soviet integration are the corporate that mean the identities constructed by the self-organizing[39] and homeostatic structures that make actors to individual entities and the collective identity where group have single identity[40], although Wendt argues that it does not necessary mean that states can form them, he does not deny that it may be possible.

In the context of integration organizations, there is a present notion of identity. If there was no such notion, it would not possible to speak of any idea of integration at all. In terms of GUAM and EurAsEC integration present strong institutions that allow states to have their own common collective identities. It allows us to say that post-Soviet sub-

---

[34] Wendt 1992, p. 397
[35] P. Berger, "Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge," in *European Journal of Sociology,* vol.7, no. 1, 1966 pp. 32-40
[36] P. Berger 1966 p.111
[37] A. Wendt 1992, p. 398
[38] A. Wendt, "*Social Theory of International Politics*", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, p. 224
[39] Wendt 1999, pp. 224-225
[40] Wendt 1999, p. 230

regional integration answers the identity criteria of Constructivist school of International Relations.

2.1.2. Wendt on interests

As A. Wendt considers, identities are the basis of interests. Actors not necessarily have a "portfolio" of interests that they bear independent of social context, on the opposite they express their interests in the process of defining situation.[41] For more thorough definition Wendt quotes Nelson Foote: "Motivation . . . refer[s] to the degree to which a human being, as a participant in the ongoing social process in which he necessarily finds himself, defines a problematic situation as calling for the performance of a particular act, with more or less anticipated consummations and consequences, and thereby his organism releases the energy appropriate to performing it."[42]

As author of "Anarchy is what the states make of it" puts it, - sometimes situations are unprecedented in individual's experience and in these situations we have to perform a construction of their meaning and by that our interests by analogy or invent them from the very beginning. More often, they have so called routine qualities in which we assign meanings based on institutionally defined roles.[43] He gives an example: if to say that professors have an "interest" in teaching, research, or going on leave, we are saying that to function in the role identity of "professor," they have to define certain situations as calling for certain actions. The absence or failure of roles makes defining situations and interests more difficult, and identity confusion may result. "This seemed to be happening in the United States and the former Soviet Union: without the cold war's mutual attributions of threat and hostility to define their identities, these states seem unsure of what their "interests" should be".[44]

Wendt believes that institution is a stable set or "structure" of identities and interests: These structures being often codified in formal rules and norms, but have motivational force only in virtue of actors' socialization to and participation in collective knowledge. Institutions considered being fundamentally cognitive entities that do not exist apart from actors' ideas about how the world works. This does not necessarily mean that institutions are not real or objective, that they are "nothing but" beliefs. As collective knowledge, they are experienced as having an existence "over and above the individuals

---

[41] Wendt 1992, p. 398
[42] N. Foote, "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation," in *American Sociological Review* 16 (February 1951), p. 15
[43] Wendt 1992, p. 398
[44] Wendt 1992, pp. 398-399

who happen to embody them at the moment."[45] In this context, institutions come to confront individuals as more or less coercive social facts, but they are still a function of what actors collectively "know."[46] This approach should be and will be taken into account during the study of post-Soviet regional integration as it sees the institution as constitutive structure and do not take it for granted.

Identities and such collective cognitions do not exist apart from each other they are "mutually constitutive." Institutionalization is a process of internalizing new identities and interests, not something occurring outside them and affecting only behavior. Socialization is a process that not only influences the behavior, but also an important element of cognition. Understood in this way, institutions may be cooperative or conflicting, a point that sometimes is lost in scholarship on international regimes, which tends to equalize institutions with cooperation. There are important differences between conflicting and cooperative institutions to be sure, but all relatively stable self-other relation, - even those of enemies are defined intersubjectively.[47]

Self-help is an institution, one of various structures of identity and interest that may exist under anarchy. Processes of identity-formation in the conditions of the anarchy actors are concerned primarily with preservation or "security" of the self. Concepts of security therefore differ in the extent to which and the manner in which the self is identified cognitively with the other, and Wendt suggests that it is upon this cognitive variation that the meaning of anarchy and the distribution of power depends.[48]

Wendt's approach later gave birth to a new generation of international relations scholars that study a wide range of topics and from a perspective of constructivism as well as inspired the present work. Further development of the approach took place in his main work Social Theory of International Politics.

In that book, he develops the interest idea and presents the basic or 'objective' interests of actors of international relations. He identifies four basic interests. Three of them he borrows from George and Keohane:[49] the physical survival that means survival of the complex[50], autonomy that denotes the idea of actor that can exercise power and authority on its own territory[51], and economic well-being that is maintenance of mode of

[45] Cit. Berger and Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, p. 58.
[46] Wendt 1992, p. 399
[47] Ibid
[48] Wendt 1992, p. 400
[49] Cit. George and Keohane (1980)
[50] Wendt 1999. – p.235
[51] Ibid

reproduction of resource base and economic growth[52]. The fourth interest that Wendt puts into play is the collective self-esteem. This term refers to the group's need to feel good about itself, for respect and status.[53] Author of that concept argues that actually, the need for that self-esteem dictates behavior of actors and negative image may lead states to self-assertion and/or aggression. Positive image results in respect and cooperation to Other.[54] All these interests defined, primarily, for the state actors, but I believe that an analogy may be drawn from a single state actor to an international organization as they are both socially constructed.

Constructivism is often considered as an alternative to the two leading theories of international relations neorealist and neoliberalism, but it is not inevitably conflicting with them. Wendt shares with them some important assumptions such as the existence of anarchy and the inmost place of states in the international system. Nonetheless, Wendt views anarchy in cultural rather than materialist terms. He also offers a refined theoretical defense of the assumption of a state as actor in international relations theory.

Later he develops the anarchy concept as he introduces different cultures of anarchy that apart from systematic approach using the cultural approach and shows how different states see each other enemies, either rivals or friends as fundamental determinant. He characterizes these relations as Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian.

2.1.3. Three cultures of anarchy

Most of the identity approaches share implicit assumptions of the nature of the Self-Other relations. These assumptions in turn have their impact on an analysis of identity politics. In context of post-Soviet integration there could be a pluralistic understanding as these two institutes could possibly have different approaches to 1) relations to states within their integration organization 2) relation to the countries from the other integration organizations 3) relations between each other in different aspects of relations. Nonetheless, I truly believe that some these understandings may be omitted and the present research should be focus mainly within the specific culture that exists in general relations between Actors within the specific organization. Review of other listed above cultures of relations could deserve an individual research.

The cultures of anarchy are argued to contain shared ideas and role structures with reference to which states expect each other to behave in certain ways. Distinct cultures of

---

[52] Wendt 1999, p. 236
[53] Ibid
[54] Wendt 1999, p. 237

anarchy are founded on actors' ideas about the nature and roles of the Self and the Other. A state actor may consider its Other as an enemy (Hobbesian), rival (Lockean), or friend (Kantian). In other words, Wendt is interested in defining the different roles attributed to the Other in different cultures of anarchy.

The Hobbesian culture of anarchy. This culture is closely connected with the realist theory, and uses classic idea of "War of all against all". According to this concept, the Other takes the form of an Enemy, which in turn constitutes the Self as ultimately insecure subject that constantly, will try to achieve security. The actors reason that enmity lies in a property of the whole international system rather than just of individual actor. State actors perceive their external environment as if hostile actors surrounded them. The enemy is an Other who does not recognize the right of the Self to exist in that system as an autonomous being, and therefore, will not willingly limit its violence towards the Self. Representing the Other as an enemy also implies that coming to terms with that enemy is necessarily a matter of power and survival depends largely on military capability and politics is a matter of preparing for the worst-case scenario. Other's intentions are clearly to kill or enslave the opponent. Enmity concept also means that enemy does not recognize the right of self to exist as a free subject at all and therefore seeks to "revise" the latter's life and identity. In identity terms, the Self is forced to mirror back the representations it has attributed to the Other.[55]

The Lockean culture of anarchy. The role structure of the Lockean culture is based on rivalry rather than enmity. Political actors within states consider and represent other states as rivals rather than enemies. The distinction between an enemy and rival specifically pertains to the perceived scope of the Other's intentions, in particular to whether the Other is trying to destroy, enslave, or essentially alter the Self or rather trying to 'steal' from the Self. The Other in Lockean anarchy is an actor who recognizes the right of the Self to exist as a free subject and who does not seek to change the life and liberty of the Self. Identity political representations of the Other are therefore potentially not threatening for existence. Rivals expect each other to act as if they recognized their sovereignty, their "life and liberty", as a right, and therefore not try to conquer or dominate them.[56] "Rivalry is the right for sovereignty." Very important tendency of Lockean anarchy is that neutrality is recognized and states can resolve their differences without resorting to the violence.

---

[55] Wendt 1999, p. 260-261
[56] Wendt 1999, pp.279-280

Lockean culture create four individualizing criteria: it defines the criteria for membership in the system, which determines what kinds of "individuals" have standing and are therefore part of the distribution of interests; the second constitutive effect of the Lockean culture, which is determining what kinds of type identities get recognized as individuals; the third way in which Lockean culture constitutes states as individuals relates to their collective or social identities. In their interactions within the Lockean, culture states tend to be self-interested, but this is not true when it comes to the Lockean culture itself. Part of what it means to fully internalize a culture is that actors identify with it and therefore feel a sense of loyalty and obligation to the group that the culture defines. This relates to the final effect of the Lockean culture, which is in sense to obscure the preceding three effects and constitute states as "possessive" individuals instead. A consequence is that it becomes much more difficult to see why people should have any responsibility for each other's welfare, and thus to engage in collective action within the group.[57]

The Kantian culture of anarchy is based on a role structure of friendship rather that rivalry or enmity. Friendship is a role structure within which the states expect the others to settle disputes without waging war, or alternatively they expect the other states to fight as a team if the security of any other member of the team is threatened by a third party. States thus have a shared knowledge about each other's peaceful intentions. Whereas in the Lockean anarchy the relative military capabilities still matter, within the Kantian culture other forms of power take central position. If the Kantian anarchy is deeply internalized the boundaries of the Self are extended to include the Other, so that the security of the Other also becomes a property of the Self.

Wendt tries to use the term friendship in terms where the structure within which states expect each other to observe two simple rules: 1) disputes will be settled without war or the threat of war (the rule of non-violence); 2) they will fight as a team if the security of any one is threatened a third party (the rule of mutual aid).[58]

The two rules of friendship generate the macro-level logics and tendencies associated with "pluralistic security communities" and "collective security." Karl Deutsch and his associates defined a pluralistic security community as a system of states in which "there is real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way.[59] Wendt adds three points to these rules that may be crucial for selecting the appropriate culture of anarchy within

---

[57] Wendt 1999, pp. 291-294
[58] Wendt 1999, pp. 298-299
[59] Ibid

EurAsEC and GUAM integration. Non-violence might be accompanied by the indifference to the fate of the Other giving the example that states agree to live in peace, but go the different ways.[60] This example may give importance to the omitting research of culture between the two organizations as there different identities between them and at the same time (as there no empirical data) they do not directly interfere with the interests of each other.

Very important point listed in the definition of Kantian culture of anarchy when the idea of global security is shifted to a lesser entity as the sub-systems or security complexes.[61] Another notable idea is that Wendt explains is that states collaborate within a certain community because they do not feel the individual threats, but because they believe in team approach to security.[62] Therefore, this allows arguing that Eurasian Economic Community and GUAM states are unite also by the principal of collective thinking or the collective identity that would protect their own interest.

Idea of integration is further developed within the Kantian culture of anarchy. The friendship among states is seen also a strategy that states choose in order to obtain the benefit for the individual. If to apply this concept to the integration it is obvious that taking part in collective organizations is also pushes states to cooperate with each other so the mutual benefit is a part of their own.[63] The border between the Self and the Other is diluted.

In his later work "Why a World State is Inevitable"[64] A. Wendt further develops the concept of the cultures of anarchy. He speculates on how the process of movement from Hobbesian culture of anarchy to Kantian culture reflects the construction of a world state.

In the article, Wendt argues that the process of world state construction goes through the five stages of recognition. Each stage imposes the constraints for the system that in long term creates freedom on global level.[65]

The process of world state construction includes five stages, each responding to the instabilities of the one before — a system of states, a society of states, world society, collective security, and the world state.

The collective security stage is the one that is defined by the Kantian culture of anarchy. At that level, states recognize each other's sovereignty and practice non-violent

---

[60] Wendt 1999, p 299
[61] Wendt 1999, p. 301
[62] Ibid
[63] Wendt 1999, p. 304-305
[64] A. Wendt, "Why a World State is Inevitable" in *European Journal of International Relations*, December 2003, vol. 9 no. 4, pp. 512-513
[65] Wendt 2003, p.517

dispute resolution and they defend against the threats together. Actors have well developed sense of collective identity and they solve problems with the respect to common interests.[66]

Wendt sees this level in regional cooperation: "Although today we are far having from such an identity on a global scale, its benefits have already been demonstrated at the regional level"[67].

In my research, I will try to prove the existence of Wendt's cultures of anarchy. I believe that objects of study are international sub-regional organizations continuing Wendt's understanding of Herbert Blumer idea states can be the reflection of an individual. Therefore, I claim that international institution can be reflection of an individual or state as well. There is something I would like to add up, joining up in the integration organization creates a more or less cohesive unit with single policy and politics or, at least, a will to follow single politics. As Wendt suggests actually the relations within the Institution can be not only cooperative, but also quarrelsome. Despite the importance of the questions and matters of relations between the state-member themselves the most interesting case for study is the shifts, actions, and policies of the organizations on the whole or actors within them for the cause aims and goals of the institution. My other claim is that the relations between members of the organization do reflect their attitude to the Other sub-regional organization.

With the applying of these concepts on the post-Soviet area, it should be noted that the relations between post-Soviet states are tense but it not necessarily means conflict and rarely end up in the military conflict or local war. In focus of international institutions, identity there is no military confrontation between the EurAsEC and GUAM. In section devoted to Kantian culture of anarchy, Wendt stated that there is a close connection of enmity and amity in international relations as well as states within a single organization answer two 'friendship' concepts of mutual aid and non-violence meaning that Hobbesian and Lockean cultures of anarchy are not applicable to the framework of inner community relations.

Situation is different in the discourse of the Kantian culture. Generally, GUAM states declared goals of democracy building and establishment of customs union. Another common interest here is the aspiration of entering NATO and gaining profits for export of hydrocarbonates.

Different interests and identities are within the relations within the EurAsEC, as the countries are interested in development of common economy. The agreement for customs

---

[66] Wendt 2003, p. 521
[67] Op.cit Ibid.

union was signed and there is a lot of progress in creating of the common economic area. In case of Eurasian Economic Community, we can speak of relatively successful example of economic integration and community building. It can be said that the spirit of integration was borrowed from the theories of European integration. The acting chairperson of the EurAsEC, Gregory Rapota, often declared this idea. It is obvious; that EurAsEC became a subject of influence of the EU, as it sometimes considered as non-political tool it is still considered the most successful example of integration on post-Soviet area, not only in economic sphere, but also in the context of politics and decision-making. As in the EU, the power instrument of EurAsEC is chiefly economic and not military or political. Dominating culture of anarchy in that organization is the Kantian idea of a friend as the countries work with each other in order to achieve common benefit. Examples for that are customs union, and functioning pipeline system that are used for the transit of hydrocarbonates from Middle Asia to Europe. In the relation towards the competing bloc spreads to the relations with the Other, there is still a Kantian culture of anarchy as there is no tendency of stealing something from the Other as in Lockean.

EurAsEC and GUAM present an example for regional collective security presented by Wendt's later works. It should be emphasized that these two organizations exist to promote soft collective security with the respect to classic security.

To sum up, the Wendt social theory of international relation is applicable for analysis of sub-regional integration organization as both EurAsEC and GUAM have their own interests and identities. That reflects their attitude to Self and the Other. Idea of Kantian culture of anarchy is also very interesting and applicable in context of my research and the goal of my research is to identify the Kantian culture of anarchy discourse based upon the official texts, reports, news articles etc. Overall, GUAM and EurAsEC are communities constructed on common interests as economic benefit and formidable self-esteem as well as common identity of a groups united under common values. The chosen tool is the discourse analysis a will be described more thoroughly in the next paragraph.

2.2. Discourse Analysis

This part of the present research is devoted to the methodology. Its aim is in providing basic information of the research method used by the constructivist school of international relations – the discourse analysis. Initially that theory emerged as a research method used in linguistics and corresponding with it theories, but on the edge of XIX and

XX centuries the linguistics took a substantial step as the present theory was later used as a tool by the Constructivists with the preservation of the original title. Constructivists equipped the discourse analysis later it evolved to the context of the International relations theory.

2.2.1. What is discourse?

Using these logics, this research could succeed in defining the culture of anarchy of the post-Soviet international organizations in establishing of cooperation and integration. Analysis of official documents, speeches, and other sources of information could show even not so obvious information.

The idea of discourse emerged some time ago and in traditional understanding discourse means a specific type of language object with a relation to other taken-for-granted language objects such as clause and sentence.[68] Discourse can be understood as an organized and structured unit of language larger than a sentence. The analytic aim is to identify the constructing units of the larger structure and describe the typical ways in which the constructed units are combined to form the larger structure.[69] For example, a paragraph suits this definition of discourse. Scholars that were studying the paragraph tried to identify its constructing parts and describe how those parts are put together to create larger language objects.[70] This approach to discourse is identified as "structural" or "formal".[71]

Contemporary understanding has not abandoned formalism completely, but there has been a steady move away from it over the past decades. New understanding of discourse is defined in functional terms. Fairclough maintained that discourse is use of language seen as a form of social practices.[72] Schiffrin believed in a functional perspective that "discourse is a language in use" so it should be thought as a type of language object, but rather as a language event.[73] Schiffrin thought that focus on language use introduces factors that are largely absent from formal approaches to discourse such as purpose and context. He observed that a functionalist definition of discourse emphasizes the way patterns of talk are put into use for certain purposes in particular contexts.[74] Another important factor in a functionalist approach is the effect and now it is important not what a

---

[68] J. Jasinski, *"Discourse analysis,"* London, 1985 p. 170

[69] Z. Harris, *"Methods in structural linguistics,"* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951

[70] F. Christensen, "A generative rhetoric of the paragraph," in College composition and communication, 16 (1965) pp.144-156 pp.144-156

[71] Jasinski, 1985, p. 170

[72] N. Fairclough, *"Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language",* London: Longman, 1995 p. 7

[73] Schiffrin, D. *"Approaches to discourse"*, Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1994, pp. 31-32

[74] Ibid

language event means but what it does. Although purpose of discourse is important factor of thinking of it as an event does not predetermine the possible effects of a discursive events. Discourse produces multiple effects,[75] not all them (even the most of which) are result of purpose.[76]

Foucault emphasized that "discourses are composed of signs…, what they do is more than use these signs to designate things".[77] Discourse also "systematically form the objects of which they speak".[78] One of the thing that makes defining discourse difficult is the idea that discourse is used to define by the concept of discourse.

In theory of discourse analysis there is a variety of labels–conversational analysis, speech act analysis, language pragmatics, and ethnography of speaking are some examples are used by scholars working within the strand of discourse analysis.[79] One common idea these scholars share is the need to study the specific instances of situated speech and discursive practice.[80] Such an approach rejected the structuralist view of analysis that emphasized the abstract and disembodied language system over particular speech acts. Discourse analysis scholars committed to carful and detailed description of language in use.[81] Michael Foucault and his associates presented another substantial point, as they were less interested in ordinary language conversation. He restricted his interest to "serious speech acts" and "the plethora of discourse generated by trying to assert truths about objects".[82] In other words, Foucault's analyses concentrated on epistemic course – utterances or other linguistic acts participating in the "language game" of truth and knowledge. Seeing the discourse as a constitutive force Foucault wanted to investigate how discursive practices constitute objects of knowledge. Above that, he interested in institutional forms of discourse and the discourse of institution.[83]

Putting researched above into practice I should note that discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy includes a series of criteria as the relations based on the idea of common interest, mutual aid and benefit, statements made by officials of the member states of integration organization about common policies. Tracing these traits of Kantian culture of anarchy discourse is possible by analyzing linguistic utterances, presented in press,

---

[75] Fairclough 1995 p. 12
[76] Jasinski 1985, p. 170
[77] M. Foucault, *"The archeology of knowledge and discourse on language,"* New York: Pantheon, p. 49
[78] Ibid
[79] Schiffrin 1994
[80] M. Coulthard, *"An introduction to discourse analysis (rev. ed.),"* London: Longman, 1985
[81] Jasinski 1985, p. 171
[82] Foucault 1972, p. 70
[83] Jasinski 1985, p. 172

statements, declarations, interviews of officials. But how the discourse analysis should be conducted? Answer for that question will be debated in the next paragraph.

2.2.2. How to do a discourse analysis

Generally, discourse analysis is a research method that does not involve the use of experimental manipulation or statistics but focuses on conversations and text in an attempt to establish how people construct their reality or views of the world.[84] That means that in conducting research of the material one will be able to practically see that interests of actors of integration communities are constituted by the ideas of common benefit and cooperation. Question that now needed to be answered is how to conduct a discourse analysis.

Fulcher in his work a Guide to Coursework in Psychology gives a brief definition of what is a discourse analysis. He presents it as a way of understanding social interactions when the researcher acknowledges his own bias and position on the issue.[85] The aims of the research may vary. The research begins with a research question that is aimed at a theoretical position. In order to achieve that goal a conversation or piece of text is transcribed and then deconstructed. This involves attempting to identify features in the text, such as discourses.[86]

The analysis is conducted by trying to identify topics in what people say or write. By looking at each utterance, the researcher should ask whether some topic could be abstracted about what is being said. Then the themes abstracted are collated. In doing so, it is usual to cite from the transcription examples of the points author is trying to make.[87] A summary of the findings should be offered as well as a critique of interpretations – the point that it is the only one interpretation of the text.[88]

Teun A. van Dijk argues that developments in the last years within areas as text linguistics and, generally, within the interdisciplinary study of discourse, have possible applications for the systematic analysis of mass media messages. That approach may also stimulate a research paradigm within mass communications that views textual analysis not only as a research method, but also as an autonomous effort toward the construction of a

---

[84] E. Fulcher, *"A Guide to Coursework in Psychology,"* Brighton & Hove: Psychology Press, 2005. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.eamonfulcher.com/discourse_analysis.html#report).
[85] Ibid
[86] Ibid
[87] Ibid
[88] Ibid

theory of media discourse.[89] Van Dijk believes that in an analysis, little attention should be paid to those properties of discourse that can be characterized in terms of linguistic grammar, such as the syntax and semantics of isolated sentences and rather, we should be concerned with more specific textual structures that have been neglected in linguistics. At the same time, one cannot go into the details of stylistic and rhetorical analysis of media discourse. Finally, he will also limit application to news discourse in the press, thereby neglecting TV, film, and radio discourse.[90]

Van Dijk uses term "discourse" for verbal utterances, such as sentences, discourses, texts, or messages. They are usually analyzed first on different levels. The structures at each of these levels are accounted for by specific sub-theories or even sub-disciplines of linguistics. The phonological, morphological, and syntactic expressions manifesting this meaning are sometimes simply called "surface structures."[91] In practice, much of the work in discourse analysis is concentrated on semantic structures that is, on meaning, as earlier works on sentence grammars tended to focus on surface structures.[92]

Van Dijk believes that except three levels, different units of analysis can be distinguished in discourse: individual words, various structures of the clause, whole sentences, sequences of sentences (paragraphs), or whole discourses.[93] He makes an important for the present research conclusion - the overall topic or theme of a discourse, for instance, can be studied only at the semantic level of the discourse as a whole, not at the level of individual words or sentences. There by identifying a discourse of culture of anarchy possible not through analysis of a single document or article, but, the complex of data.

Finally, there are different modes of the manifestation and use of discourse, such as spoken or written/printed discourse, monologues, and dialogues. The various units, categories, dimensions, and levels, along with the rules defining them, will all be called "textual."[94] However, Teun A. van Dijk explains that the discourses are not just isolated linguistic "objects," but are integral parts of communicative acts in some socio-cultural situation, which he called "context." At the boundary of text and context, the pragmatic analysis of discourse is concerned with the dimension of action in which a discourse is

---

[89] T. A. van Dijk, "Discourse Analysis: Its Development and Application to the Structure of News," in *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 33:2 1983, p. 20
[90] Ibid
[91] Van Dijk 1983, p. 23
[92] Ibid
[93] Van Dijk 1983, p. 24
[94] Ibid

taken as some conventional form of social action (promise, threat, question, congratulation), called a "speech act."[95]

It is not so easy to specify what the properties of a discourse are at the various levels and for the respective units and dimensions. Nevertheless, Van Dijk can specify some general characteristics, which then can be further detailed for news discourse.

1. Functionality. If a discourse is taken to be the utterance of a sequence of sentences in some social context, then the various properties of such a discourse are assumed functional with respect to various aspects of the social context.[96] Surface structures and their meanings are produced and understood as indications about characteristics of the speaker (e.g., intentions, wishes, and moods), the relations between speaker and hearer, and the type of social situation. The functionality also holds, therefore, "within" the discourse: the surface structure not only expresses or indicates social structure, but also, and even primarily, is meant to express underlying meaning.[97]

2. Meaningfulness. A textual sequence of sentences is different from a random collection of sentences in the sense that, such a sequence should be meaningful. One of the typical conditions for meaningfulness of a discourse is some kind of unity, which is usually described in terms of local or global coherence. Local coherence means that subsequent clauses and sentences are meaningfully related, because the facts to which they refer are causally related or because the propositions expressed by these clauses or sentences are related.[98] Global coherence pertains to larger parts of the discourse; this kind of global unity is usually described in terms of such notions as "topic" or "theme." Thus, a fragment of a discourse or a whole discourse is considered globally coherent if a topic can be derived from such a fragment. Part of the meaningfulness criterion for discourse is not only that sentences have meaning, but also that they are "about" something. They refer to course is less studied as a form of "social practice" in its own right, for which it is a legitimate aim to make explicit the inherent structures at all levels of analysis.[99]

A discourse analysis first of all, aims at the explication of qualitative data rather than quantitative data. Of course, quantitative measures may well be based on an explicit analysis of a more qualitative kind.[100] Finally, a discourse analysis will be part of a more

---

[95] Op. cit. Van Dijk 1983, p.24
[96] Van Dijk 1983 p. 25
[97] Ibid
[98] Van Dijk 1983, p. 25
[99] Van Dijk 1983, p.26
[100] Op. cit Ibid

embracing cognitive and social theory about the rules and strategies that underlie the production and understanding of media discourse.[101]

Drawing a short conclusion, Constructivist school of international relations could be possibly capable of explaining the logic of integration on post soviet area, as sub-regional organizations seem to have common interests as well as similar identities. Cultures of anarchy concepts also seem to be reflected in the character of the relations between member states of sub regional organizations. It seems that according to the definitions of these anarchies and character of the relations between post-Soviet states it is obvious that most applicable culture is Kantian, but is it truly so? One of the interesting applicable tools for identifying the Kantian culture discourse is the discourse analysis. Using the rules of that method of study, I will analyze texts in newspapers, declarations, official documents in order to identify the "friendship" discourse.

---

[101] Op. cit Van Dijk 1983, p.26

Chapter 3. Defining the Culture of Anarchy

This chapter is devoted to the direct analysis of the data presented by the series of sources like official declarations, speeches, and reports in mass media. The supporting materials for the research are very rich and it required some time for defining the most interesting and informative material. The goal of present research as it was stated in the introduction lies in the attempt to identify the culture of anarchy existing on post-Soviet area.

Based upon the acquired knowledge it is clear that in contemporary world do not necessarily abide by the realist materialistic perception. The idea of identities and interests is very important in shaping the policies and behaviors of international actors such as states. They have their own "physiological" map that defines their policies. The same idea is applicable when we talk about the international organizations. States that construct or join some specific international organization have a definite interest in active participation in its life. It is the main idea of Constructivist school of international relations. All the international organizations that exceed the political dimension do have the common territory, history, culture etc.

The CIS is the great example of that process. Just as it was explained in the first chapter it had been impossible to integrate the whole the Commonwealth, but the cooperation is possible within the definite sub-regions of the post-Soviet area that have common background and interests. Examples here are EurAsEC and GUAM.

The selected tool for conducting the research is the discourse analysis. It presents the principles for the research. Based upon the specific ideas presented in numerous sources the definition of discourse of the existing culture of anarchy can be possible.

I claim that culture of anarchy existing in the EurAsEC and GUAM regions is actually the Kantian as there is a definite success in removing the state borders and building a truly an effective integration organization. Another important idea is that there is no notion of enmity (or killing the Other) as well as rivalry (or stealing from the Other) in the relations between actors *within* the sub regional organizations. Integration itself brings states closer to the blurring the distinction between the Self and the Other, giving credit to the friendship-based culture of anarchy.

Another crucial idea for pinpointing the idea of Kantian culture of anarchy is to link them to the group interests and collective identities presented by Wendt. Idea of group

interests could be of some use in order to explain the nature of culture existing in the EurAsEC and GUAM.

3.1. Identifying Kantian Culture of Anarchy in EurAsEC

The next aim is to try to disclose the pattern of Kantian culture of anarchy within the cooperation in the context of the integration processes in the Eurasian Economic Community.

The first document that should be examined in order to trace the Kantian logic is the "Agreement on establishment of the Eurasian Economic Community" that was signed on 10th of October 2000, with amendments from 25th of January 2006 and 6th of October 2007. This document is the "Charter" for that organization as it states the principals of interaction among actors as well as defines the structure and responsibilities of its bodies, the legal status of organization. Let the law specialists evaluate the role of the institutions and their functions. More important here are the utterances of the attitude towards the purpose of the organization. I will quote most interesting points. The first interesting part is the preamble of that agreement as it was said defines the whole purpose the institute.

> Prompted by *aspiration to provide the dynamic development* by means of harmonization of social-economic transformations, including the *effective use of economic potentials* in order to *improve the level* of life of the peoples…[102]

The very first point sums up the main goal of the organization that is the promotion of the economic cooperation and. If to deconstruct this idea, it is clear that dominating idea is the economical benefit that is to be achieved through the mutual aid and collective action.

> Full of *commitment to increase effectiveness* of interaction with the aim of development *of the integration processes* between peoples and to *deepening mutual cooperation* in various spheres[103]

The second point as follows declares the course for the cooperation and integration that, by the beginning of the 21st century, was a fashionable trend in international relations

---

[102] *"Agreement on establishment of the Eurasian economic community,"* Astana 2000
[103] Op. cit. Ibid

and could be met anywhere from China to South America. What is more important is the actual loyalty to declared principals. It will be examined later in this paragraph. Nevertheless, what is interesting the discourse of cooperation is preserved through the founding document.

> Realizing the necessity of *coordinated actions and integration of states towards the world* economy and international trade systems.[104]

This point is significant in order to promote the idea of Kantian culture of anarchy as the actual attitude of post-Soviet actors to the world trade system. This approach is a shift from the Rivalry to Friendship, because the competition with world economy is counterproductive and would undermine progress and possible economic benefits. One of the traits of Kantian culture is the idea of joining the World Trade Organization. Idea of collective action is preserved.

The Last point is the willingness to follow the commitments of the Customs Union agreement signed in 1995 and common economic area agreement signed in 1999. This willingness had the goal of building up a single customs principals and actually somehow repeat the positive experience of the European Union that, as we know, began as an economic cooperation. Later on, this willingness will be transformed into actual Customs Union with common custom tariff. I will explain that later on, but still the speech act has been successful so far.

Another interesting point of the agreement is declared goals of the Organization:

> EurAsEC is *created for effective promotion* of Customs Union and Common Economic Area as well as fulfillment of other aims and objectives of Agreements on Customs Union, Common Economic Area. Agreement stands for deepening of integration in economic and *humanitarian* spheres.[105]

In short, the creation of the EurAsEC became an important step in resuming the preceding agreements. It became an objective necessity, as fulfillment the requirement of the signed agreements required the creation of organized institution with its own bodies and institution, budget etc. That is truly an achievement because majority of international organizations are created not as necessity, but as a will of political actors to promote

---

[104] *"Agreement on establishment of the Eurasian economic community,"* 2000.
[105] Ibid, op. cit.

cooperation. In other words, EurAsEC is an example of the bottom up integration and not vice versa. Bringing up the Kantian culture of anarchy concept, this statement is very important for these states to satisfy the need for self-esteem, because states are protecting not only their momentary aspiration for profits, but also the benefit of people living on the territories of the member states. The humanitarian sphere brings no financial profit to international actors.

One of the features of "Friendship" culture is the idea of making decisions during the vote; the established principle of consensus vote promotes the democracy issues because the different in their abilities states have the equal rights to make decision. So if the state is not willing to accept the decision it may vote against.

The question of vote allocation in Integration committee has a direct dependence with the ratio of contributions to the budget of the Organization. It presented in the 40 votes (40% budget contribution) for Russia, 15 for Kazakhstan, 15 for Belarus, 15 for Uzbekistan, 7,5 for Tajikistan, 7,5 Kirgizia. If 2/3 of votes are not cast during the vote, the question is moved to the Interstate council.[106] In general, this represents the idea of integration with the respect of the members of organization where the attitude is a representation of Kantian culture.

One of the representations of Kantian culture is the extent of the agreement that is indefinite. This period corresponds with the Kant's ideas presented in the monograph "To Eternal Peace" that saw the world that exists without a war or military conflict.

Another important document is the declaration of heads of state on establishment of the EurAsEC. The declaration promoted the following idea:

> *This step is an illustration of common political will* of five countries to more
> vigorously follow the way *of mutual multilevel cooperation* with a prospect of the
> actual *integration*.[107]

This speech act actually displays the intention of the leaders of the states to actually follow the agreement on creation of the EurAsEC. It is an additional repetition of the idea of economic cooperation and ideas of developing integration of the member-states. This is another hint to the commitment to the establishment of relations based on principles of respect and mutual understanding. The point that makes this idea credible is that it was made by state officials and declared publicly for the hearing of the whole world.

---

[106] *"Agreement on establishment of the Eurasian economic community,"* 2000. op. cit.
[107] *"Declaration of heads of state on establishment of the EurAsEC,"* Astana, 2000 op cit.

The interaction of our countries in trade and economy spheres has reached *a step when mutual trade tariff and quantitate limits are canceled* and most articles of goods have common customs tariffs and coordinated non-tariff regulations. *Trade regimes with the common relations to the third countries are elaborated*. Moreover a serious steps in the humanitarian spheres have been made that would allow more *seriously content the needs of our peoples* in the fields of education, culture, healthcare and social rights.[108]

This article gives the understanding of the idea of cooperation in humanitarian dimension making focus on not only the inter-state relations, but also the requirements of common people that can also benefit from the break of the Customs barriers. There are some utterances that is somehow being declarative, that presented the commitment to achievement of some goals in future i.e. the structural changes in the economies of the member-states.

For instance the section of questions on the EurAsEC website have the article "What is EurAsEC" and the answer on that question today (2010) is the same that the principals of the organization that were adopted in 2000. There are core ideas that preserved through the whole evolution of the Eurasian Economic Community and still the same. This idea renders the point for Kantian culture of anarchy discourse:

EurAsEC is created with an outlook for economic cooperation, the mutual development of trade, effective development of the customs union and the common economic space, and the coordination of actions of member states to *integrate themselves into the world economy and the international trade system*.

One of the chief activity vectors of the Organization is to secure dynamic economic development for the Community's nations by harmonizing socioeconomic changes while effectively using their economic potentials in the interest of raising the living standards of the peoples.[109]

This is another declaration for the self-esteem of the members of the organization. Integration to internationally recognized values is declared, rendering the sub regional organization loyal to dominating international trends.

---

[108] *"Declaration of heads of state on establishment of the EurAsEC,"* 2000 op cit.

[109] Information about EurAsEC. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.evrazes.com/en/about/questionanswer)

According to the researcher of economic margins Taksubaev[110] the volumes of trade barter of Central Asian partners including Russia increased for 25% during 2000-2002 and exceeded 8 billion dollars (Russian exports – 3,92, imports – 4,15 billion). It means that after a diving fall of 90-ies because of the series of objective criteria and subjective mistakes situation stabilized. The problem is that the private investments to the economy of the region are still weak, though there are 350 joined companies with the Russian capital.[111]

According to that article the idea of commitment to economic cooperation was active and true, as the member-state economies experienced the multiplicative effect that brought states closer together in relations within the Kantian culture of anarchy.

Another speech act that I would like to study in the context of the present research is the article written by the Boris Gryzlov the speaker of Russian upper chamber of Parliament it was devoted to the functionality of the inter-parliamentary assembly of EurAsEC member-states. This official could add something up to the nature of the relations between members as well as accomplishments of the organization, in general.

Along with the declaration of the achievement of the series of agreements on transport, energy, budget he declared active and rapid development of the organization and economies of the members-states. According to statistics, the trade exchange in 2004 has reached 26,5 billion dollars that is two and a half times higher than it was in 2000. That can be another point to the idea of common benefit of states that united under the banners of Eurasian Economic Community. The conclusion that common benefit discourse is presented can be made from that information:

> Temporary world subjects to the processes of globalization that brings to life the number of integration communities that try to benefit from the changes in the world economy. One of the bright examples is the EurAsEC.[112]

Gryzlov declares that there are many integration organizations on the post-Soviet area, but he renders EurAsEC as the most effective institute. By doing so, he makes the great composition of the positive self-esteem of that organization.

The serious problems identified by the Speaker are the differences in the national legal systems that provide difficulties in the rapid development of all the trends essential

---

[110] A. Taksubaev "Rossiya i Tsentral'naya Aziya," in *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn'*, 3:1999, p.94-101
[111] Taksubaev 1999, p. 98
[112] B. Gryzlov "O Deyatel'sosti Mezhparlamentskoy Assamblei Gosudarstv-chlenov EvrAzES" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economika*, (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2004 (Available at.: http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=20615)

for the creation of the customs union. Still this idea shows that actually, there is no attempt to change them according to i.e. Russian legal system and there is an aspiration to harmonize principals of the organization. Some general rules have been elaborated and the unification of the legal systems of member states becomes possible. The idea of harmonization itself presents truly an ideal for the Kantian culture of anarchy, because it presents the idea for common identity.

Interesting was the declaration of Vladimir Putin on the date of creation of EurAsEC in Astana University named after the representative of the Eurasianism theory Leo Gumilev:

Constitutive impulse that brings the Eurasian ideas is the most important today. We construct truly equal relations on the area of Commonwealth of the Independent States[113].

This point is interesting for several reasons. Firstly, the declaration of significance of the Eurasian ideas, they are presented in a very specific connection between peoples of Eurasia who have common history, culture etc. Some ideas similar to the identities and interests were researched by Alexander Wendt. They represent the core of the constructivist school of international relations. Secondly, the declaration of ideas of equality that later on were confirmed was said by probably the most influential politician of the present time.

Later on, the very important event had taken place. The two organizations that could position some rivalry in their relations have decided to cease the competition and unite for the purpose of common benefit because their functions and membership of these organizations somehow collided, - EurAsEC and Organization of Central Asian Cooperation (OCAC). These two organizations united on the same territories, but had different identities. Later on a serious identity shift took place and organizations united. Though the OCAC was created earlier than EurAsEC, it included only the central Asian republics. Leader of Kazakhstan concluded:

That union allows excluding the duplication of functions of these organizations. That reduces financial and temporal expenditures. Such changes may also occur to

---

[113] V. Putin, Speech given in the University named by L.N.Gumilev, Astana. 2000

another organization – Common Economic Area (CAE) as it has the same goals. These changes will answer the political, economic interests of our states.[114]

In a sense, this union is an embodiment of shift of possible Lockean political trends in the Eurasian Economic Community area to the Kantian, declaring the power of the cooperation and aspiration to common benefit. Another idea was uttered by the Kirgizian president Kurmanbek Bakiev:

CIS area experiences the integration processes, and as it grows stronger, they shift from quantity to quality.[115]

This is another idea that proves the changes in the effectiveness that take place on the territory of the Commonwealth. Giving yet another example of perception of the Other as friend.

Other very demonstrative speech acts were made by Grigory Rapota the President of the Eurasian Economic Community. First one, is devoted to the activities of interstate council and integration committee in 2005. In this article, Rapota underlines the importance of signed protocol to agreement on non-visa regime between the member-states. Effect of that cannot be overestimated; it provides opportunities for free movement of labor-force. This step moves forward and provides an example of desecuritization as the security issues that might have been connected with the cancelation of the visa regimes are resolved and that gave further development to trust between nations.[116]

The question raised by Rapota was actual progress of fulfilling the common Customs tariff that would allow creating the Customs union. The President states the idea that if the Customs union will be created it would allow an important conduct of effective cooperation in terms of EurAsEC. What is more important, he states the necessity of giving the EurAsEC some supranational functions. That would be very difficult political economical and physiological step.[117]

---

[114] D. Sobakina, "TsAS Obyedinyaetsya s EvrAzES", in *Polieconomika*, 2005 (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.politcom.ru/article.php?id=1506)
[115] Ibid.
[116] G. Rapota "O Deyatel'nosti Mezhgosudarstvennogo Soveta i Integratsionnogo Komiteta v 2005 godu" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economika*, 2006. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=20614)
[117] Ibid

This idea is once again repeated by Rapota in the book EurAsEC: Economic attraction.[118] He believes that if the Eurasian Economic community would acquire supranational functions the process of integration and cooperation will advance more effectively. For the post-Soviet area that would mean a huge step forward, in particular it would mean a loyalty to the integration ideas of the European Union that have been a raw models for post-Soviet integration for so many years. A note for the sake of present research, - movement to this type of institution means a great deal of trust between the members, showing the Friend pattern in the relations between actors or a Kantian culture of anarchy. Later on, this idea will find its application in context of forming the Customs Union.

One of the Kazakhstan journalists states that by 2006, Customs union procedures will be finished and three locomotive countries Russia, Kazakhstan, and Belarus will enter the Customs union uniting 83% of territory and industrial potential of former USSR.[119] Actually the process took longer than expected as the Customs Union was formed later in 2009.

Once again, Rapota declared the idea of harmonization of Customs tariff as a final frontier to the Customs union:

Creation of the Customs union would require a series of harmonization procedures as well as specific body that would regulate customs policies. The regulating body in fact will become the *supranational body* that would act in specific boundaries. Member-states of the Customs union will no longer deal with the matters of the customs regulations.[120]

As it was already said there will be no inner customs borders bringing states of the EurAsEC closer together.

Another Kazakh reporter presents the process of acceptation of Uzbekistan to the organization paying much attention to the matters of pipelines that would be joined to Russian pipeline system. Uzbekistan would also join the visa free regime.[121]

---

[118] G. Rapota, "*EvrAzES: Ekonomicheskoye Prityazhenie*," Moscow, 2005
[119] Sh. Guseinov, "EvrAzES – alternativa VTO" in *Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostey*, 2006 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2006. (http://www.apn.kz/opinions/print5332.htm)
[120] Ibid
[121] R. Ahmetov, "EvrAzES I 'Bratstvo' Truby," in *Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostey*, 21:2006 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2006. (Available at: http://www.apn.kz/opinions/print535.htm)

During the negotiation on the question of the acceptance, the Director General of "Gazprom" Alexei Miller went to Tashkent and reached an agreement of buying 9 billion of natural gas on the price of 60 dollars per thousand of cubic meters.

At first, it seemed just as an additional profit for the Russian Federation and dominance of Lockean ideas of "stealing" from a "rival". But! The actual result of that agreement is beneficial for both Russian Federation and Uzbekistan as the selling price for the Asian republic was 20 dollars higher.[122]

The actual result for the summit in 2006 were agreements between Uzbekistan oil and gas companies and Gazprom that exceeded one and a half billion dollars that would include operations for exploratory efforts and the development of recently discovered oil and gas deposits. Uzbekistan is the second largest exporter for natural gas on post-Soviet area and in top ten of the world's largest gas mining states.[123]

The same interesting effect is seen in the gas export for Turkmenistan the price for Turkmenian gas was raised for 20-25 dollars per thousand cubic meters. That brought profit to the members of the EurAsEC. What was attention grabbing during the energy crisis between Russia and Ukraine, Russian Federation included to the negotiations of gas prices the interests of the Central Asian partners. All the prices were adopted in 2006. In 2008, European pricing system was adopted and since then price is approximately 145-150 dollars per thousand of cubic meters.[124]

What is motivating is that Central Asian partners tend to be loyal to the identity of EurAsEC integration as cooperation in the gas question with Russia, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan lose approximately 4 billion dollars that would had been made the investment in alternative routes of hydro carbonates interesting.[125]

At last probably the most important achievement and evidence of the Kantian culture of anarchy in the context of the EurAsEC cooperation was the adoption of the Customs union on the 27 of November 2009 that actually proved the success of integration discourse that declared loyalty to ideas of integration and concepts of creation of supranational institutions.

So as a result, Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan will have common Customs tariffs and no internal customs regulations, in other terms, bringing the integration closer to the post-Soviet area. Leaders of these states decided that they would help other members of

---

[122] Ahmetov 2006

[123] Ibid

[124] "Tseny na gaz" in *Neft' Rossii, analytical portal*, 2008 (www-document 29.11.2010) (Available at: http://www.oilru.com/news/69595/)

[125] Ibid

EurAsEC to join the Customs regulations. These rules entered into the force on 1st of January 2010.

Another interesting step for cooperation and spirit of trust was the discussion of the ways of overcoming the financial crisis in member-states of EurAsEC. In the end, Dmitry Medvedev concluded:

On the post-Soviet, area the EurAsEC is the only structure that swiftly moves towards the aims of integration.[126]

That phrase is the best way to describe the actual state of relations between the members of the Eurasian Economic community. The initial goals have been achieved; the next step is the creation of Common Economic Area. Results of analysis of the data show that actually the dominating culture of anarchy is the Kantian one. States in the present organization try to achieve common benefits. They perceive the Other i.e. member-states of EurAsEC as friends. These states cooperate with the common collective interest of achieving common benefit. For that, common benefit states help each other. In other terms, the discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy is identified in terms of the EurAsEC cooperation and that concludes the one of the objectives of the research.

3.2. Identifying Kantian Culture of Anarchy in GUAM

Purpose of that paragraph lies in proving that relations that dominate within the GUAM follow the logic of the Kantian culture of anarchy where the actors consider the Other as a friend. In case of GUAM organization, states that historically had close relations with each other established trustful relations with NATO. In other words, I will try to prove that GUAM policies are aimed at achieving common profit and other benefits. Four states decided to promote economic cooperation, hard security in context of regional ethnic conflicts. My claim is that actual cooperation within the GUAM is an attempt to unite on the principals of providing security with the interest of survival and economic benefit. There are a serious numbers of local ethnic conflicts in all the member states of GUAM that could jeopardize the existence of affiliated states. Overall, these interests and identities dictate the discourse Kantian culture of anarchy.

---

[126] Press release of the EurAsEC session of interstate Council. 2009. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.evrazes.com/news/date/27-11-2009)

To begin with the joined statement by the Presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine on 10th of October 1997 who signed joined communiqué where they declared the mutual interest in constructing the relations including bilateral and regional cooperation, regional security, political and economic contacts. During the meeting, the Presidents stressed the importance of the four-nation cooperation in establishing a Eurasian, Trans-Caucasus transportation corridor, considering joint actions taken in this direction it was a sound foundation for fostering friendship and cooperation, neighbor relations and full utilization of existing economic opportunities.[127] Nice aspiration for these countries. In addition, this utterance can explain the necessity for cooperation between named states. What is interesting is the idea of transport corridor that would include alternative routes of hydrocarbonates in an attempt to more or less maximize their common profits. This is truly a criterion for a Kantian culture of anarchy.

The next point dictates the need for positive self-esteem for member states, as in the communiqué Presidents underscored:

"The need for *strengthening* quadrilateral cooperation for the s*ake of a stable and secure Europe* was guided by the principles of *respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and inviolability of state frontiers, mutual respect, cooperation, democracy, supremacy of law, and respect for human rights.*"[128]

Some of these interests are dictated by the concern of survival as in the worst case the separatists could take away some parts of the state territory damaging the sovereignty.

Other interesting point here is the idea of close cooperation within the framework of the OSCE, other European, and Atlantic structures, including the recently established Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace NATO Program. Logic of creating a security community can be read here. Cooperation with these organizations attempted to preserve the territorial integrity and strengthen security.

In 1999, a declaration of leaders of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan was made. This declaration was delivered because the Uzbekistan decided to join the organization.[129]

---

[127] "Joint Communiqué of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine," Strasbourg, 10 of October 1997.
[128] Ibid
[129] "Declaration of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan," Washington, 24 April 1999

Presidents of the GUAM republics noted the long existing peace and cooperation between the republics and commitment to continue these relations and giving positive assessment of the level of relations between the GUAM since 1997. Later on states declare loyalty to the basic principles of international law such as principle of inviolability of borders and state territory. One of the demonstrative features of that declaration pays much attention to the question of combating the separatism and ethnic intolerance. That question is a sore question as the GUUAM states have many issues connected with the unsettled and frozen conflicts. Solution of these problems would be beneficial for all of them. Unfortunately, these territorial issues were not settled. With this declaration, the GUUAM identity expanded.

One of the security community building ideas was the declaration to promote nuclear non-proliferation treaties. This was another step required to promote the aspiration to the positive image of the organization.

Other securitization idea of that declaration lies within the promotion of the idea of enhancing cooperation with the NATO partnership for peace program that gives prospect for these countries to enter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

> Considering the *importance of* development of *secure* and *economically effective* transport corridor Europe-Caucuses-Asia for the whole world, stability, and cooperation as well as bloom of Nations and Peoples of the Member-States…[130]

This statement remains controversial because, first of all, it declares the insecurity of existing transport routs. Nevertheless, what is impressive here is that the actual aspiration to economically effective transport corridor project was achieved although it still needed to increase the volumes of transportation in order to become effective. Considering this fact, this was more than an utterance of political declaration. Second important idea considered is the idea of importance of this corridor for the stability of the whole world. Even today, many hydrocarbonates go through the "Southern stream". These five countries have some influence on the flow of hydrocarbonates to Europe and other regions of the world rendering utterance true. Lastly, it is really an issue that these statements were made in the capital of the Unite States on the fifty-year celebration of the NATO establishment. Truly, the values freedom and democracy are shared by the GUUAM cooperation.

---

[130] "Declaration of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan," 1999

In a research, document by NATO officials regarding the regional security the idea of the Caucasus 2001[131] it was believed that NATO should take a more low-key approach. Serious role had the seminar on the regional cooperation in energy security in the Caucasus took place in Azerbaijan in 2000, which covered the environmental, economic and civil aspects of energy security.

It must be *stressed* that when it comes to *promoting cooperation* in the Caucasus, other regional groupings, such as the OSCE and *the GUUAM,* should take the lead. However, NATO continues to play a role, encouraging the development of common solutions among countries facing mutual challenges.[132]

In general, the stake for the GUUAM is clear here. NATO researchers are interested in a project that has prospects. As it was stated "three states are geopolitically especially important: Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine".[133] Azerbaijan could function as a corridor for Western access to the energy-rich Caspian Sea basin and Central Asia. Conversely, a subdued Azerbaijan would mean that Central Asia is sealed off from the outside world and, thus, rendered politically vulnerable to Russian pressures for reintegration. Uzbekistan, nationally the most populous of the Central Asian states, represents a major obstacle to any possible renewed Russian control over the region. Its independence is critical to the survival of the other Central Asian states. Most important, however, is Ukraine. As the EU and NATO expand, Ukraine will eventually be in the position to choose whether it wishes to be part of either organization. It is likely that, in order to reinforce its separate status, Ukraine will wish to join both, once they border with it. Once its own internal transformation begins, it will qualify for the membership. Although that will take some time, it is not too early for the West—to further enhance its economic and security ties with Kiev. Research pointed the decade of 2010-2020 as a reasonable timeframe for the initiation of Ukraine's progressive inclusion.[134] It is obvious that attempts of integrating within the GUUAM block is perspective for its members as they could join the global community and be a part of Kantian culture security community of NATO or integration community of EU. Later the plan of inclusion of Ukraine was halted because of the economic and political instabilities.

---

[131] J. Appathurai, "Promoting regional security," (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2001 (www.nato.int/docu/review/2001/0103-03.htm)
[132] Ibid op. cit.
[133] Ibid op. cit.
[134] Ibid op. cit

In 2001, the official creation of the GUUAM organization[135] took place in Yalta and its goals and objectives were stated. Giving tribute to two declarations of 1997 and 1999, they decided to actually embody the cooperation creating the institutions.

The objectives for cooperation that were chosen: promoting social and economic development; strengthening and expanding trade and economic links; development and effective use of the transport and communication arteries with its corresponding infrastructure situated on the territories of member-states; strengthening of the regional security in all spheres; developing relations in the fields of science, culture and humanitarian scope; interacting in the framework of international organizations; combating international terrorism, organized crime and drug trafficking.

The atmosphere of securitization is preserved here as well, but here can be seen something else, i.e. the creed to support the economic relations and trade between these states. It is interesting that integration took a new step as the fields of cooperation increased with new sectors.

Organization structure included two bodies: the Annual Meeting of the Heads of State as the GUUAM utmost body. It has the power to make decisions on the principle directions of political, economic, and humanitarian cooperation, the establishment of the GUUAM specialized bodies and coordination of positions regarding urgent international life issues of mutual interest. GUUAM operational body is the Committee of National Coordinators (CNC); it consists of national coordinators, one from each Member State, who are appointed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The CNC coordinates the activities among Member States within the GUUAM and ensures preparation of the Meetings of the Heads of State and the Sessions of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs.[136]

The institutional structure of the organization is a bit simple, but still a practical embodiment of cooperation in organization with common interests. This idea finds its support in history of its functionality as statements were made by the heads of state and Council of National Coordinators become chosen as national strategies.

On November 14 after 09/11 attack on the Unites States of America GUUAM, states and the US made a joined statement. Declaring that:

---

[135] "Yalta GUUAM Charter," Ukraine, 7 June 2001
[136] Ibid

The United States and the GUUAM states *stand united* against terrorism and *together resolutely denounce* the barbaric acts of terrorism […] *The attacks represented* an attack *not only against* the United States, but on the *whole international community* […] recognizing the threat of terrorism, have reiterated their continued support for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, as well as democratic developments of GUUAM states.

The point here is that the link between terrorism and support for territorial integrity was made in the context of the sad events of International business center attack. There is continuing support of the securitization idea and security community building. In fact, cooperation with the USA became one of the uniting factors for GUAM states.

Later on, the cooperation within the GUAM actually did produce some results for organization. In the period of 2001 to the end of 2002, the US-GUAM relations enter a new phase. That also explained that relation between the USA and Russia improved significantly.

The interesting and informative document adopted within the organization was the GUUAM-US Framework Program of Trade and Transport Facilitation, Ensuring Border and Customs Control, Combating Terrorism, Organized Crime and Drug Trafficking[137] positioning tribute to the Kantian culture of anarchy.

It was signed in 2002 and incorporated the idea of creation of the GUAM Virtual Center that would be an embodiment of single information space for exchange of the data, related to the antiterrorist activities and proposals, regarding the realization of the projects for strengthening cooperation as well as interaction of the GUAM states in the border and custom issues.

The Virtual Center supported and initiated information programs, which reflected assessment of the operative situation in the region. The Center strived to incorporate effective joint programs in the law enforcement sphere, using capabilities and competences of each member state. The Virtual Center planned to set up possibility of automated access to the information using advanced information technologies and distributed database.

Once again, the idea that we see here is the steady work on the security issues in attempts to find solution of hard and soft security issues like terrorism and organized crime. What is necessary to note here is the important role of the United States in this

---

[137] *"GUAM-US Framework Program of Trade and Transport Facilitation, Ensuring Border and Customs Control, Combating Terrorism, Organized Crime and Drug Trafficking,"* Washington, 2002

agreement. A joined declaration of states to cooperate in the past resulted in a series of steps to create collective identity and interests.

Another event that required the changes within the GUAM cooperation took place in 2005. Uzbekistan decided that it would have more fortune and progress while being a part of something different. That year Uzbekistan leaves and enters Kantian culture driven Eurasian Economic Community giving a serious blow to the interest of constructing the alternative hydrocarbonate transport corridor. It worth mentioning that this event might be read as a point for the Lockean culture of anarchy, but it is possible within the Kantian culture, because, actually, there is no act of stealing. Uzbekistan decided that it would benefit more in the framework of EurAsEC embodying the notion: Do not harm, both Self and Other.

After Uzbekistan left the GUAM, the remaining states needed something to be done. Soon in April, they adopted the Chisinau Declaration of the GUAM Heads of States "In the name of democracy, stability, and development"[138]. The states have something interesting in their rhetoric as they declared course for European integration that can be explained by the idea that states that remained in GUAM tend to be closer to Europe than to Asia, with the Uzbekistan gone, of course. In this declaration, GUAM welcomed the enlargement of the European Union, and expressed readiness for closer cooperation based on European norms and standards. Another section was devoted to traditional issues of fighting terrorism, separatism, crime fighting and humanitarian cooperation, - their common interests.

> Confirming the policy of *deepening* integration of the GUAM states to *European values*, establishing *partner relationships with the European Union and NATO* with the purpose of creating a common security, economic and transport space, and declare their intention to closely cooperate in these areas. Confirming the intention to *continue mutually beneficial cooperation with the USA* and developing the closest relations with organizations and states sharing these principles and goals of GUAM.[139]

This point sums up the general purpose of the GUAM states cooperation. The new name given to GUAM because of this declaration was "GUAM - Organization for

---

[138] "Chisinau Declaration of the GUAM Heads of States "In the name of democracy, stability and development," Chisinau, 2005
[139] Ibid op. cit.

Democracy and Economic Development". The economic development of the region was stated in the agreement on establishing a Free trade area it also supported the use of the transit potential of states that would guarantee a reliable supply of energy carriers, efficient and safe operation of transport corridors. In the future, this would facilitate the strengthening of European integration and the promotion of international security, the development of trade and economic relations along East-West routes, and improvement of transport communication infrastructure in the strategically important for region.[140] Giving more attention to the values of democracy and what is more important the mutually beneficial economic cooperation.

Discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy is preserved through the evolution of the organization. The very effective sphere of cooperation is the development of the transport corridor, the pipes were built, but to the year of 2010, the real volumes of transport actually did not meet the required estimates for profitable operation.

Another important document was signed in 2006. It was the Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM. It is in force today. Moreover, it further strengthened the Discourse of cooperation with the respect to common interests and the common identity.

> Guided by universally recognized norms and principles of international law, concerning the maintenance of peace, security, and the development of good neighborly and friendly relations among the states, declared in the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Helsinki Final Act, the Paris Charter for New Europe and the Charter for European Security of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe…[141]

These very ideas declare the loyalty to universally recognized values of international society the recognition of sovereignty. That is actually a perception of Other as a friend. Another point here is the idea to meet the requirements for positive self-esteem.

> Expressing deep concern regarding unsettled protracted conflicts and increasing number of security threats, including those originating from conflict zones.

---

[140] "Chisinau Declaration of the GUAM Heads of States "In the name of democracy, stability and development," Chisinau, 2005.
[141] "Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM", 2006

Particularly, threats of international terrorism, aggressive separatism, and extremism and other dangerous phenomena related to them…[142]

Another point is the long lasting problem of GUAM states devoted to the unsettled ethnic conflicts that possibly could harm the stability of the states. As it was already told higher, the interest of survival is the basic for all the units of international system.

Promoting democratic values, ensuring rule of law and respect of human rights […] ensuring sustainable development; […] strengthening international and regional security and stability; […] deepening European integration for the establishment of common security space, and expansion of cooperation in economic and humanitarian spheres; […] recognizing development of social and economic, transport, energy, scientific and technical, and humanitarian potential of the Parties; […] loyal to intensification of political interaction and practical cooperation in the fields of mutual interest.[143]

Goals of that organization reflect all the interest that international actor can possibly have according to the Constructivist school of international relations. What adds up to the notion of the cooperation in the context of corporate identity, combined with the achievement of mutual benefit in economy i.e. trade, customs, etc. It describes the discourse of the Kantian culture of anarchy.

Mechanism for getting to the declared goals is written in the next article of the Charter:

"In order to achieve these commitments, the Parties shall develop mutually beneficial cooperation, guided by the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of the states, inviolability of their internationally-recognized borders and non-interference in their internal affairs and other universally recognized principles and norms of international law." [144]

---

[142] "*Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM*", 2006
[143] Op.cit. Ibid
[144] Ibid

This mechanism also describes the notions friendly identity i.e. respect to the territorial integrity of the states and other principals of international law. That is a criterion brings more point to the discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy.

The Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM gives a practical extension to the discourse of the Kantian culture of anarchy as points that were declared are in force today and they reflect all the ideas of the friendly perception of the Other.

In 2008 Statement by the Heads of State of the Organization for Democracy and Economic Development – GUAM on development of the GUAM transportation corridor was made and it included the further action for promotion of corridor.[145] That declaration of principles expected the comprehensive use of the transit potential of the GUAM member-states, whose territories constitute a natural corridor between Asia and Europe. If finished it would lead to enhancement of regional significance of the Organization in global integration processes. They recognized the necessity undertaking practical measures to stimulate international passenger traffic and freight services along the route following the historic Great Silk Road and the necessity of full-scale utilization of the advantages of the GUAM Free Trade Area:

> Supporting practically-oriented projects for modernizing infrastructure of the GUAM transportation corridor, including such its components as Baku – Poti/Batumi, Odessa – Chisinau, Chisinau –Western border of Moldova, Kyiv – Western border of Ukraine and international railway ferry between ports of Kerch and Poti/Batumi […] Welcoming the beginning of implementation of a central route of the New Eurasian Transport Initiative (NETI) initiated by the International Road Union (IRU) as well as envisaging development of both Trans-Caspian and Trans-Black-Sea links of the GUAM corridor;

Generally, the document sums up all the cooperation measures of the GUAM states that exist today. It made a shift from securitization issues to the issues of possible economic cooperation. That in its time is a great achievement because the survival interest is most basic and other are less important. That means that basic need is met that allowed movement forward.

---

[145] *"Statement by the Heads of State of the Organization for Democracy and Economic Development – GUAM on development of the GUAM transportation corridor,"* Baku, 30 April 2008

As a conclusion, the character of the GUAM states cooperation is reflected by the discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy. These states have common interests and identities that are reflected in collective action. Evolution of that organization reflects the gradual construction of mutual interests and identities and steady movement from security issues to ideas of economic and humanitarian cooperation.

Generally, both EurAsEC and GUAM states present a role model for Constructivist approach to community building. Points that united countries are interests and individual/collective identities. It is clear that interaction of states in the framework of the international organizations brings mutual benefit as well as satisfies common needs and interests. All the relations within studied organizations are friendly. All the disputes between them are resolved without address to military force or threat of its use. The discourse of Kantian culture of anarchy prevails.

Conclusion

The collapse of the Soviet Union has become truly a modern catastrophe for millions of people who used to live on its territory. Because of political, economic, social, and international factors, the once united country broke into a fifteen independent states, bringing the number of social problems as poverty, crime, terrorism, local conflicts, drop of birth rate, increased fatality etc. All the states experienced Soviet identity crisis and their main interest shifted to the achievement of personal benefits. The structural crisis of the Soviet state became obvious in the middle of 1980ies and by the beginning of 1990ies reached its pike. Some say the collapse could be prevented, but the history shows that aspiration for independence dominated.

The tool for the collapse of the Union was the Commonwealth of Independent States. As some say, i.e. Vladimir Putin: "The CIS has become the instrument of 'Civilized Divorce' of the Soviet republics". There was no actual cooperation within this organization. Still, the organization satisfied the interests of states for independence.

After the euphoria of achieving independence and statehood building the leaders of the newly emerged states understood that, they could not exist by their own, ignoring the bonds that linked them together for so many years. Common benefits could be achieved based on collective action. As a result of such a trend, they tried to use the CIS as a tool for promoting the economic and political interests, but, in practice, that institute could not provide any effective methods of integration and benefit for its members as it should had been. The possible reason for that is the impression that the CIS did not provide the common identity for its members.

The lack of effectiveness resulted in the emergence of the "multi-level and multi-speed integration" that tried to prove that integration within the whole CIS was impossible and the focus should have been shifted to the cooperation within the certain frameworks inside the CIS between states that have common interests, political will, close historical backgrounds. This theory constructed a framework for identity building. This idea gave life to a series of sub-regional integration organizations as Common Economic Area, Eurasian Economic Community, Union state of Russia and Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldova (GUAM), Collective Security Agreement organization etc.

The most interesting subjects for study are the EurAsEC as it presents the organization that copes with the ideals of European integration and the GUAM as a political union that aimed at joining NATO and building the security community.

The paradigm of international relation that was chosen for purpose of the research is the constructivist school of international relations presented by the "Social theory of international relations" by Alexander Wendt. In his book he purposes the idea of Cultures of anarchy: Hobbsean, - where the international actors perceive each other as Enemies, Lockean – where the actors see each other as Rivals, and Kantian where the actors of international relations treat each other as Friends. Most fitting in the context of the post-Soviet integration within EurAsEC and GUAM is the Kantian culture of anarchy as all conflicts are resolved without resorting to war and states provide mutual assistance.

Chosen method of research is the discourse analysis, as it is an effective tool used by Constructivists. This theory first was used in linguistics, but later was incorporated by International Relations. This method of study allows identifying different discourses based on speech acts and texts. It is important what terms, ideas, and intentions are presented.

The aim of the present research lied in identifying the discourse of culture of anarchy within the two of examined organizations using the discourse analysis. As the study displays the cultures that exist within the chosen institutes of international relations is the Kantian.

The EurAsEC and GUAM relations display that actually the existing culture there is Kantian culture of anarchy. Where the Other is seen as friends. Sometimes the Other is becoming the part of the Self. A number of texts and speeches prove that actually the heads of state of selected integration communities tend to promote the idea of the economic integration and cooperation that would be beneficial for all the member of organizations. After a series of steps the agreement between states reached a new level, for example, the Customs Union will be functional on the territory of EurAsEC organization and the tariff regulations will be the same for all the EurAsEC countries. The customs rules that will be common for the whole area are borrowed from the Russian customs rules. This is one of the greatest achievements on the post-Soviet area, showing that not only military or political cooperation is possible. EurAsEC states also try to attain the common interests like the display of positive esteem through declarations to follow internationally recognized values. Generally, EurAsEC is an example of the culture of friendship.

Analyzed texts and speeches prove that existing discourse of anarchy in GUAM states is Kantian. The GUAM countries have shown a dominance of military security idea

as they try to combat instability and eliminate ethnic agitation that could possibly lead to collapse of these states. The constructivist interest here lies within the survival. Another common interest is that actually GUAM states try to maximize their economic benefits as they declared the free trade area agreement. The third interest presented by the display of positive esteem because GUAM countries would like to demonstrate commitment to universally recognized principles of international law.

All the output data allow to argue that discourse of culture of anarchy that exists within the relations between member-states of EurAsEC and GUAM is Kantian culture of anarchy.

Epilogue

The results of the present research and its design have shown that discourse of culture of anarchy existing in the relation between member-states of two organizations is friendly or Kantian. At the same time the present research, do not reflect the cultures of anarchy that could possibly exist in perception of the Other, for example, between GUAM and EurAsEC in the relations to each other. An individual research could be made in that context. Conducting such a research in the framework of the present research was considered, but was refused in order not to puzzle the whole work. Identifying the discourse of relations between two sub regional organizations could be interesting.

Bibliography

Historical Backgrounds Sources

A. Maryshev, "Ot Tamozhennogo Soyuza k Evrazi'skomy Economicheskomu Soobshestvu," in Mezhdunarodnaya Economika, From Customs Union to the Eurasian Economic Community, (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=10559)

Charter of Commonwealth of Independent States, 1993

E. Bagramov. "Post-Sovetskaya Integratsya – Realnost' ili Mirazh," in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 11 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in February 2003. (http://www.ng.ru/ideas/2003-03-18/10_sng.html)

J. Boffa. "Ot SSSR do Rossii. Istoriya neokonchenogo krizisa 1964-1994," (www-document) Originally published in 2003. (http://www.scepsis.ru/library/id_809.html)

M. Gorbachev, *"Perestroika i Novoe Myshlenie dlya SSSR I Vsego Mira,"* Moscow: International Relations 1987

N. Shumsky, "Integration in CIS: problems and prospects" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economonka i Mezhdunarodnie Otnoshenia* 1999:11, p.78

P. Palazhchenko, L. Puchkova "Prizchiny Raspada," in *Soyuz Mog Bit' Sokhranen. Belaya kniga: Documenty i Facty o Reformatsii I Sokhranenii Mnogonatsional'nogo Gosudarstva,* Moscow 2007

P. Tsygankov, "Sodruzhistvo Nezavisimykh Gosudarstv" in *Mezhdunarodnie Otnosheniya: Teorii, Konflicty, Dizheniya, Organizatsii* ed. P. Tsygankov G. Drobot, M. Lebedeva, Moscow 2008

R. Alekseev, Mikhailov V. "Eurasian Economic Community" in *International Life*, 11 (2000)

S. Cohen *"The Question of Questions": why the Soviet Union is gone?"* Moscow 2007.

S. Khilman, "Raznoskorostnaya i Raznourovnevaya Integratsiya," in *Vestnik Mezhparlamentskoy Assamblei SNG*, 5:1997, pp. 18-21.

Theory Sources

A. Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: the Social Construction of Power Politics" in *International Organization* (46:2, Spring 1992)

A. Wendt, "Why a World State is Inevitable" in *European Journal of International Relations*, December 2003, vol. 9 no. 4, p. 491-542

A. Wendt, "*Social Theory of International Politics*", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999

Schiffrin, D. *"Approaches to discourse",* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1994

D. Vanderveken, (Ed). "Essays in Speech Act Theory," (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2001. (http://helios.uta.fi:2065/lib/tampere/Doc?id=10014709&ppg=9)

E. Fulcher, "A Guide to Coursework in Psychology," Brighton & Hove: Psychology Press, 2005. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.eamonfulcher.com/discourse_analysis.html#report)

F. Christensen, "A generative rhetoric of the paragraph," in *College composition and communication*, 16 (1965) pp.144-156

F. Kratochwil, *"Rules, Norms and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs,"* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1989

H. Blumer, *"Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method,"* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969

J. Jasinski, *"Discourse analysis,"* London, 1985

J. Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge" in *International Organization,* 52 (4) 1998

K. M. Fierk, "Constructivism" in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University press 2007

M. Coulthard, *"An introduction to discourse analysis (rev. ed.),"* London: Longman, 1985

M. Foucault, *"The archeology of knowledge and discourse on language,"* New York: Pantheon

N. Fairclough, *"Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language",* London: Longman, 1995

N. Foote, "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation," in *American Sociological Review* 16 (February 1951)

N. Onuf, *"World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations,"* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989

P. Berger, "Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge," in *European Journal of Sociology*, vol.7, no. 1, 1966

T. A. van Dijk, "Discourse Analysis: Its Development and Application to the Structure of News," *in Journal of Communication*, Vol. 33:2 1983

Z. Harris, *"Methods in structural linguistics,"* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951

EurAsEC Case Study Sources

"Tseny na gaz" in *Neft' Rossii, analytical portal*, 2008 (www-document 29.11.2010) (Available at: http://www.oilru.com/news/69595/)

A. Taksubaev "Rossiya i Tsentral'naya Aziya," in *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn'*, 3:1999, pp. 94-101

"Agreement on establishment of the Eurasian economic community", Astana 2000

B. Gryzlov "O Deyatel'sosti Mezhparlamentskoy Assamblei Gosudarstv-chlenov EvrAzES" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economika,* (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2004 (Available at.: http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=20615)

D. Sobakina, "TsAS Obyedinyaetsya s EvrAzES", in *Polieconomika*, 2005 (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.politcom.ru/article.php?id=1506)

"Declaration of heads of state on establishment of the EurAsEC," Astana, 2000

G. Rapota "O Deyatel'nosti Mezhgosudarstvennogo Soveta i Integratsionnogo Komiteta v 2005 godu" in *Mezhdunarodnaya Economika*, 2006. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php3?artid=20614)

G. Rapota, *"EvrAzES: Ekonomicheskoye Prityazhenie,"* Moscow, 2005

Information about EurAsEC. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.evrazes.com/en/about/questionanswer)

Press release of the EurAsEC session of interstate Council. 2009. (www-document 29.11.2010) (http://www.evrazes.com/news/date/27-11-2009)

R. Ahmetov, "EvrAzES I 'Bratstvo' Truby," in *Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostey,* 21:2006 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2006. (Available at: http://www.apn.kz/opinions/print535.htm)

Sh. Guseinov, "EvrAzES – alternativa VTO" in *Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostey,* 2006 (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2006. (http://www.apn.kz/opinions/print5332.htm)

V. Putin, Speech given in the University named by L.N.Gumilev, Astana. 2000

GUAM Case Study Sources

"Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM", 2006

"Chisinau Declaration of the GUAM Heads of States "In the name of democracy, stability and development," Chisinau, 2005

"Declaration of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Uzbekistan," Washington, 24 April 1999

"GUAM-US Framework Program of Trade and Transport Facilitation, Ensuring Border and Customs Control, Combating Terrorism, Organized Crime and Drug Trafficking," Washington, 2002

"Joint Communiqué of presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine," Strasbourg, 10 of October 1997

"Statement by the Heads of State of the Organization for Democracy and Economic Development – GUAM on development of the GUAM transportation corridor," Baku, 30 April 2008

"Yalta GUUAM Charter," Ukraine, 7 June 2001

Charter of Organization for democracy and economic development – GUAM, 2006

J. Appathurai, *"Promoting regional security,"* (www-document 29.11.2010) Originally published in 2001 (www.nato.int/docu/review/2001/0103-03.htm)