

IRSTI 06.51.77

<https://doi.org/10.26577/CAJSH.2020.v6.i1.04>N.A. Prodanova<sup>1</sup>, K.S. Mukhtarova<sup>2</sup>, G. Baikushikova<sup>3</sup>, K. Tursynbek<sup>4</sup><sup>1</sup>Plekhanov State University, Moscow, Russia<sup>2</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,<sup>3</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,<sup>4</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

e-mail: gulnara.baikushikova@gmail.com

### The role of regional cooperation in ensuring the environmental safety of central asian countries

**Abstract.** Issues of environmental safety and sustainable development, including land degradation and soil pollution and efforts to combat these processes, are relevant for the region. At the beginning of the 21st century, new environmental security challenges are becoming even more relevant. A significant proportion of these challenges are global environmental problems. Security - the threat of land depletion and degradation, the huge unresolved complex water-energy problems, loss of the gene pool and biological diversity, other risks associated with ill-conceived and dangerous experiments in the field of creating new bio-environmental instruments. In these conditions, environmental safety becomes an integral part of the national security strategy of any state, and solutions environmental issues are turning into one of the core elements of any international integration association.

**Key words:** Central Asia, environmental safety, cooperation, water, sustainable development.

**Introduction.** Issues of preserving the environment, the formation of an environment favorable for humans are among the most acute, and from about the end of the 20th century they have been characterized as one of the new challenges to humanity. In the writings of modern scholars and in discussions at scientific forums, it is often thought that, despite the fact that a lot of international environmental conventions have been adopted and modern national legislation in this area has been sufficiently developed, all this does not bring the expected result: so far environmental legislation is not so effective. In this case, I recall the words of a prominent expert in the field of international environmental law, Professor O.S, Kolbasov that environmental law should play a colossal historical role - to become a counterbalance to the rest of the law, standing guard over property wealth and its associated power.

Indeed, for thousands of years mankind enriched by natural resources has built such a system of its management, which is mainly based on the extensive consumption of natural resources and still barbaric attitude to nature. Internationally, often devel-

oped countries transfer the so-called “dirty production” to developing countries, from there they get energy sources (oil, gas, uranium), while leaving their own pantries for their efficient development by descendants. In turn, developing countries do not have the opportunity to acquire modern environmentally friendly technologies, do not have free financial resources to carry out appropriate environmental health measures, and continue to irrationally use natural resources.

As a result, environmental degradation has reached such proportions that in the modern world, since about the second half of the 20th century, special attention has been paid to solving environmental problems. This is due to the fact that, despite the difference in geographical, climatic and economic conditions, there are general environmental problems that threaten not only a single state, but also the countries of the region, and even the whole world. These include the global ones: warming (according to other statements, cooling of the climate; destruction of wildlife and, as a result, degradation of the earth’s surface, irreversible loss of flora and fauna; disappearance of the largest water bodies (Aral) and,

on the contrary, the onset of the ocean on land, etc.

**Literature review.** In the beginning, it should be emphasized that there is no consensus on a clear definition of environmental security. The Millennium Project of the United Nations has made five different definitions since 1996 consisting of the environmental concerns, their potential dangers and the targeted fields of protection (Zurlini and Müller, 2008, p. 1352; AC/UNU Millennium Project, No Date). The Commonwealth of Independent States (1997) defined environmental security as “the state of protection of vital interests of the individual, society, natural environment from threats resulting from anthropogenic and natural impacts on the environment”. US Department of Defence (Environmental Security Report, 1996) and NATO Science Program (Science for Peace and Security Report, 1997) underlined the problems related to environmental security. Jon Barnett (‘Now What?’ Seminar, 1997) referred to environmental security as “the proactive minimization of anthropogenic threats to the functional integrity of the biosphere and thus to its interdependent human component” (Zurlini & Müller, 2008, p. 1352). Belluck, Hull, Benjamin, Alcorn and Linkov (2006, p. 3) defined environmental security as “guarding against environmental degradation in order to preserve or protect human, material, and natural resources at scales ranging from global to local”. Zurlini and Müller (2008, p. 1351) stated it as “the major challenge concerns the global environmental change, focusing on the interactions between ecosystems and mankind, the effects of global environmental change on environmental degradation, the effects of increasing social request for resources, ecosystem services, and environmental goods”.

According to Edward Grumbine (2018, p. 792), the term environmental security, in this sense, represents “efforts to inject interdisciplinary understanding of ecological and social concerns into international deliberations.” Likewise, Zurlini and Müller (2008, p. 1354) mention environmental security as the intersection of social and ecological capitals. As it can be noticed from the above-mentioned definitions, the social component of environmental security is characterized not by the state but by the human. According to Zwierlein (2018, p. 3), environmental security, hence, challenges the ‘state-based’ approach of traditional political sciences. However, the problem here is that the concept of security is traditionally seen as a synonym for national security and

territorial integrity (Kirchner, 2015, p. 1) and therefore, attached to a set of confrontational practices associated with the state and the military (Trombetta, 2008, p. 586). The opponents, at this point, argued that the logic of security is fixed and inflexible and therefore, the linkages between the environment and security is not possible.

**Material and Methods.** According to Copenhagen School, security is not a fixed notion and it cannot be narrowed only to the logic of war. If a political community constructs an issue in the domain of security then it becomes a security issue and the way of dealing with it also changes. “Security in this perspective is not a value or a condition but a form of social practice” (Trombetta, 2008, p. 588). Environmental security constructs the environmental problems as severe threats to human security and all life on earth. In this construction, it highlights the notion of ‘human security’ as the major actor and object of security studies. For Dyer (2001, p. 442), it downplays the role of the nation-state, which was traditionally been the referent of international relations and in this context, territoriality goes out of the window. As Trombetta (2008, p. 588) adverts, environmental security constrains the legitimization of new actors and instruments to develop new forms of security governance. Brown (1977) and Wilson (1983) claims armed forces are incapable of meeting the new challenges and nation-centred realpolitik would not deliver solutions to climate change. Thus, the concept of environmental security acknowledges the need for a new definition of security above and beyond its military and state component. Attempts to redefine the concept of security resulted in the introduction of the concept ‘common security’ by the Independent Commission on Security and Disarmament Issues (ICSDI) in 1982.

As it can be realised, the literature goes through a discussion about the theorization of the concepts but there are gaps and uncertainties when it comes to reality: how to manage crisis and security when the environmental problems rigorously hit. Starting from this point, a further study in this area could potentially link a crisis scenario, sea-level rise in the Netherlands, with environmental security. To be more precise, when sea-level rises some of the territories which belong to the Netherlands could disappear. What is significant in this topic is that the main building block of national security is ‘sovereignty over delineated territory’ and territory lost due to