SECURITY STRATEGY AS A FACTOR IN THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

Erbolat SERGAZIN

M.A. (Political Science),
Senior Lecturer of the Political Science Department of
the L.N. Gumilev Eurasian National University
(Astana, Kazakhstan)

Zhanar ESIMOVA

D.Sc. (Hist.), Acting Associate Professor, Department of
Eurasian Studies of the L.N. Gumilev Eurasian National University
(Astana, Kazakhstan)

Aygul KOZHAKHMETOVA

Ph.D. (Law), Associate Professor, Department of Economic Theory and
Law of the S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical University
(Astana, Kazakhstan)

Manshuk MUKASHEVA

Ph.D. (Philol.), Head of the Journalism Department of
the H. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University
(Atyrau, Kazakhstan)

A B S T R A C T

The paper discusses the issues and methods of international relations objective accomplishment by contemporary states, which strive for interstate cooperation based on the principles of collaboration, equality and trust, using various instruments of foreign policy influence. Interdisciplinary research that involves the extensive use of systems analysis is currently being conducted in the course of studying security issues.

The issue of a state's sustainable development is linked inseparably to the issue of security and is one of the potentially efficient concepts for supporting the stability of the international relations system.

KEYWORDS: *national security, neorealism, globalism, regionalism, constructivism, sustainable development concept.*

I n t r o d u c t i o n

Ensuring national security and protection of national interests in international relations is one of the strategic issues for a modern state in elaborating its foreign policy. This is the way in which state sovereignty is expressed and realized, implying its right to act independently on the international arena and determine its foreign policy in its best interests.

There are security threats in the modern world that are related to targeted influence on the economic and military potential, social development, information sphere and other spheres of a state's activities.

The evolution of Kazakhstan's security policy as a long-term program that promotes state and national interests is contingent on the implementation of strategic national priorities that involve executing innovative transformation, preserving territorial integrity and state sovereignty. In the context of world crisis, the objective of reinforcing national and regional security becomes a priority, since there are increased threats of sociopolitical destabilization and growing difficulties in the realization of people's constitutional rights and freedoms.

In the face of new challenges, internal and external threats to the political stability of the Kazakhstan society, it seems appropriate to examine political interactions between different actors in the political process, who construe threats to both security and the mechanisms of its maintenance differently. This affects the elaboration of political strategy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the context of the changing geopolitical and social sphere.

Under new geopolitical circumstances, characterized by tangible shifts in world order, the examination of problems of international security, information security, cybersecurity, illegal migration, climate change, sustainable development, along with a number of other security issues is becoming particularly poignant. A deep and multidimensional analysis of issues in national, regional and international security in their intrinsic association with the political strategy of the Republic of Kazakhstan is required.

In turn, implementation of national interests is considered a priority, an essential part of the security system formation concept. The detection of significant sociopolitical challenges, threats and risks of both traditional and non-traditional nature is a categorical imperative of efficient modern policy, which is treated as an opportunity and capacity to manage conflicting interaction in a context of restrictions.

 An integrated analysis of mechanisms that ensure national and regional safety includes an investigation of apparent and latent processes that create additional threats connected to activities of various subjects with divergent objectives.

Different approaches used for the examination of a phenomenon as significant as security mutually enrich each other and create an opportunity for an integrative scientific paradigm, the key to which may be the different levels of politological analysis: macropolitics, micropolitics, behaviorism, ethno-methodology and discourse analysis, allowing to refer to a poly-paradigm politological analysis of a society's sociopolitical security.

1. The Concept of Security in the Context of International Relations in the 21st Century

Since the emergence of states, political thought has examined expressions of various threats, dangers, everything that harms the state or is capable of disturbing the stability of a political system. Danger is characterized by a condition where a possibility of damage to the system emerges. In the

deliberation on the evolution of the concept of security one can trace the expansion of an understanding of security from a narrow idea of political security to national security, once again separating the concepts of state and national security.

For instance, Hobbes had already underscored that the main objective of the state is "maintaining the good of the people," while its main goal is primarily "maintaining security," since before states emerged, society was plagued by "the war of all against all."[1] John Locke wrote that the state "is bound to govern by established standing laws... And all this to be directed to no other end but the peace, safety, and public good of the people."[2]

Up to this day the term "security" has not been defined clearly, but, as a rule, security was taken to mean a certain relative level of protection from external forms of aggression.[3] However, from the 1980s on, a new understanding of state security has been emerging. An expanded interpretation has come to succeed the traditional concept. Besides the military and political segments, security should also encompass the economic, environmental, social, cultural, informational, and other elements of security.[4]

Thus, the modern thought expands the interpretation of this concept in several directions—from national security towards the security of certain groups and individuals; from national security towards the security of the entire world system; from exclusively military security towards political, economic, social, environmental varieties, etc.

An example of an expanded interpretation of the concept of security is served by the definition of security for the 21st century proposed by the United Nations in 1994: "Human security is not just the security of a state, it is the security of a nation; it is not just the security attained as a result of possessing weapons, it is the security attained as a result of development. It is not just state security, it is the security of each person in their home and in the workplace; it is not just the protection from conflicts between states, it is protection from conflicts between peoples."[5]

The basis for the development of human society and simultaneously for its destabilization is provided by the contradiction between a person's subjective expectations and objective socioeconomic conditions. This contradiction gives rise to a universal threat to the individual, family and society. R. Yanovskiy notes that "potential conflict due to this contradiction contains the threat of world politics becoming increasingly more uncontrollable, thus generating a huge political,"[6] as well as other types of chaos.

2. National Security as the Fundamental Principle of Modern Statehood

With the existing variability of security types, national security holds the leading position in the political agenda of any country. The significance of a specific type of national security is determined by objective factors:

---

[1] Th. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Penguin Books, 1968 (First Published 1651), Ch. XIII.

[2] J. Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, in ten volumes, Vol. V, W. Sharpe and Son, London, 1823, p. 161, available at [http://www.yorku.ca/comninel/courses/3025pdf/Locke.pdf].

[3] See: O.A. Kolobova, *Zapad: novye izmereniia natsionalnoi i mezhdunarodnoi bezopasnosti*, NNGU, Nizhniy Novgorod, 1997, p. 7.

[4] See: A. Vavilov, "Ekologicheskaia bezopasnost i ustoichivoe razvitie Rossii," *Mezhdunarodnaia zhizn*, No. 8, 2002, p. 86.

[5] Quoted from: R.G. Yanovskiy, *Globalnye izmeneniia i sotsialnaia bezopasnost*, Akademia, Moscow, 1999, p. 15.

[6] Ibid., p. 16.

(1) the extent to which it is required by individuals, social groups, societies, states, the world community for the purpose of maintaining and developing themselves, as well as vital facilities and values;

(2) growing vulnerability of people and vital facilities, unless efforts are invested in its reinforcement;

(3) existence of a wide range of extreme threats that this security system should counter.[7]

Every state has national interests and aims to implement them. These interests may coincide or contradict each other, leading to conflict and competition among countries on the international arena. But it is difficult to argue with the conclusion that deems the main objective of any strategy to be invariable for any entity of international relations—it is the maintenance of the security of the individual, society and the state.[8]

Problematizing the concept of national security, Barry Buzan discusses its internal contradictions, where national security is set against individual security. The author points out the paradoxical nature of the modern state, which, on the one hand, aims to maintain the security of individuals, and not allow them to slip into a "natural state."[9] On the other hand, since it "claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force,*"[10] the state becomes a threat to the individual.

Barry Buzan also notes that national states are not exclusive or unconditional actors, citing military political blocs, international organizations, etc. as an example. It is becoming an apparent fact that national security, on the other hand, is juxtaposed to international security.

By the early 1980s, it became extremely difficult to describe the concept of national security in terms of a number of processes that occur inside and outside of the state. During that period, the perception of the world order and the system of values associated with the preceding structures is altered. "Globalization has become a very powerful metaphor for the sense that the world is becoming increasingly integrated and interconnected. The prevailing image of globalization is one of a global flood of money, people, images, values, and ideas, overflowing the old system of national barriers that sought to preserve state autonomy and control. Indeed, globalization has been increasingly seen as the most important external influence on both the character of societies and dominant patterns of governance."[11]

Acknowledgement of globalization processes, extreme interdependence of states, the "spillover effect," as well as the emergence of supra-national executive structures have placed the familiar concepts of national sovereignty, national interests and national borders in more complicated relationships than they were previously engaged in.[12]

Certain states today have included issues of global nature in their national security strategy, such as reinforcing global security in the health care sphere, shaping a global economic order, counteracting climate change, etc.[13]

---

[7] See: V. Serebriannikov, "Politicheskaia bezopasnost," *Svobodnaia mysl*, No. 1, 1997, p. 19.

[8] See: S.S. Antiushin, "'Bezopasnost' i 'natsionalnaia bezopasnost' v sovremennom politologicheskom diskurse," *Sotsialno-gumanitarnye znaniia*, No. 6, 2011, pp. 21-24.

[9] B. Buzan, *People, States & Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1983.

[10] M. Weber, "Politics as a Vocation," in: *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Transl. and edited by H.H. Gerth, C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, New York, 1946, pp. 77-128.

[11] A. Hurrell, *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, p. 196.

[12] See: D. Held, A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, J. Perraton, *Global Transformations, Politics, Economics and Culture*, Blackwell Publisher, Cambridge, 1999, p. 9.

[13] See: *National Security Strategy of USA-2015*, available at [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf].

Simultaneously, the Copenhagen school of security research managed to propose a fundamentally new approach to the security phenomenon, as well as to develop a set of instruments for studying the processes that came to be called securitization. The phenomenon of security began to be examined very extensively, and security research was no longer confined to the international relations context.

3. The Concept of
National Security in the Context of
Main International Relations Theories

The unfolding global processes require reflection from the stance of new analytical approaches, which are capable of ensuring the conceptualization of formation mechanisms of new structures within the international relations system, which go beyond the state-centric approach framework.

In the last decade of the 20th century, four major theoretical directions have emerged and still retain their influence in researching the issue of security in international relations, namely, neorealism, globalism, regionalism and constructivism.[14]

3.1. National Security
from the Neorealism Standpoint

Neorealism is marked by the state-centric approach and the priority of the concept of superpower polarization in the international relations system, specifically the ideas of bipolarity, unipolarity, and other polarity combinations of the world order structure. The logic of the neorealist security theories is based on an understanding of the international security structure that legitimizes the idea of changes in the power correlation structure in the post-Cold War period globalization context.

The priority of global-level political analysis remains undisputable for neorealism. The range of the researched changes is limited by this level's framework. This is reflected in the aggregate of these theories' conceptual tools, which is restricted by the choice between the concepts of unipolarity and multipolarity. Operationalization of the security concept on two levels, both systemic and state, is characteristic of neorealism, wherein the systemic level is the conclusive one for all of the definitions developed within this theoretical direction.

The underlying premises of the neorealist research on security of the early 21st century are the ideas of:

— the prospects of decreasing the world community's attention to human rights issues;

— the growing tendency towards increasing the legitimacy level of actions aimed against world terrorism;

---

[14] For more details, see: V.N. Lukin, T.V. Musienko, "Traditsionnye i novye paradigmy bezopasnosti: sravnitelny analiz," available at [http://credonew.ru/content/view/589/31//].

— the reinforced role of the state and national policy in fortification of national borders and territories, as well as measures on maintaining national security, expanding the state participation in controlling various types of activities;

— various behavior models for the U.S. as the only superpower that determines the international political agenda in the context of its own security risk management strategy.

Three principal problems are top-priority for the modern neorealist studies of international relations and risks linked to international terrorism: the proliferation of mass destruction weapons and the threat of their utilization by terrorist groups; the risk of implementing military methods in resolving the issue of maintaining security from any types of threats; civilizational conflict, whose outlines are determined by the principal patterns of cultural differentiation.

3.2. Globalism and National Security: A New Approach to Familiar Concepts

The second vector of international politics security research is represented by globalization theories. In international relations theories globalism is the antithesis of the neorealist theories and of the concept that assigns a static character to the international politics system structure.

The methodological basis for globalization theories is primarily provided by both cultural and political/economic approaches. Globalist security theories are characterized by the concept of deterritorialization of world politics as a basic premise. In this regard, there is a certain conceptual affinity between the liberal and Marxist versions of globalist theories, which are equally focused on the growing role of economic and transnational integration, thus the decreasing significance of territoriality and the role of the state in the world political sphere.

According to the globalist theories' logic, the state and the state power system are no longer priority subjects for the political analysis of world politics. Accordingly, the activities of non-state-affiliated actors and structures should also be included in the political analysis sphere. Proceeding from the thesis of the complicated interrelation between the state and non-state actors and systems coexisting in world politics, the need for an integrated approach is postulated, an approach that would move beyond the state-centric approach to analyzing security problems and international terrorism risks.

The substantiation of the independent role that transnational formations (corporations, non-state social and political organizations, on the one hand, and intergovernmental/international organizations and regimes, on the other) hold in world politics is the key idea of globalist theories.

Studies conducted in the globalist theory context focus on the problem of the influence that the networks, that form the interactive structure of diverse world policy actors at different levels, have on the reconsideration of the territorial sovereignty principle as the foundation of the international relations system. In globalist theories, unlike neorealist theories, the state is interpreted as merely an element of these networks, which does not always fulfill network control functions. Globalist theories proclaim the growing influence of network structures, which exert a certain pressure and impact on the state, rather than the influence of the state itself.

Appraising the nature of the connection between globalization and security, the proponents of globalism substantiate the idea that the issue of security in the modern world is growing more complicated under the influence of globalization. This is accompanied by the simultaneous weakening of the state's role in ensuring security, along with the depletion of efficient control mechanisms and implementation of corresponding strategies. In this light, globalists are proposing a thesis of a great-

er efficiency of political strategies that stipulate state cooperation in the security sphere, particularly at the regional level.

Special attention is paid by the proponents of this approach to the analysis of the globalization mechanisms in general, as well as its particular aspects, such as financial globalization, liberalization of international economic activities and trade.

The sphere of globalist research of international relations' security risks is shaped by the following issues: economic security and the instability of the liberal international economic order; the threat to economic security and the stability of the liberal international economic order posed by transnational organized crime.

3.3. Regionalism as an Attempt to Reconceptualize World Order

The third vector in the international relations theory is represented by the regionalist theoretical perspective. Regionalist security theories proceed from two theoretical assumptions.

- The first rests on the idea of reducing the confrontation between superpowers and the new characteristic of contemporary world politics, which is linked to the modification of the structure of political interests and the majority of countries' loss of interest in the struggle for global domination.

- The second comprises the interpretation of the post-Cold War international relations structure as characterized by the domination of national interests in assuring the maintenance of the state's dynamic development, which promotes non-participation in military campaigns and strategic confrontation in conflict zones.

This standpoint suggests an objective of revising military and political relations in a way that leaves no possibility of interference in the superpowers' internal affairs.

Thus, the regionalist tradition in the interpretation of security is distinguished by the emphasis on the basic premise, which contains the postulate of the significance of regional security dynamics as an element of the entire world security system.

Regionalism is characterized by both neorealism and globalism. Concurrently, regionalism is marked by a regional, rather than global, level of political analysis. Specifically, it is regionalism that represents the segment of international relations theory that offers truly constructive prerequisites for the formation of a complex approach, which would combine the most constructive ideas and technologies of different approaches.

Meanwhile, differentiation remains the leading trend in the development of the modern system of theoretical knowledge of international relations' security issues in the context of globalization. Regionalism, which is the promising vector of theoretical integration with the greatest potential and, possessing the greatest innovative potential in this regard, still competes with both neorealism and globalism on a number of counts.

The divergence between regionalism and neorealism is determined by the persistent conservatism of neorealist theories, which usually target single-level technologies and political analysis schemes, limited to the traditional choice in favor of the systemic level of analysis, consideration of the state as the leading actor in world politics, the preference for purely military political aspects of research and a materialistic interpretation of the events and processes under consideration.

However, mutual corrections exist in the context of both directions of political analysis of international security. In a number of cases neorealists tend to admit that the systemic level does not consistently dominate, and is not unique in the political analysis of security under modern conditions. Regionalists, in turn, include the global level in their multi-level schemes more and more often, in addition to the specific settlement, regional, and inter-regional level.

The dissociation between regionalism and globalism in the international relations theory is less apparent, and not as clearly structured as the divergence between the positions of regionalism and neorealism.

In reality, these discrepancies are more of a proclaimed nature than of a fundamental one. The new wing of modern globalism tends to stem from the idea of dialectic unity of territoriality and deterritorialization.

In fact, both globalists and regionalists tend to agree on a common position in understanding deterritorialization, with regard to the reality of this global trend, on the one hand, and agreeing with the fact that territoriality remains a seminal factor in the dynamics of numerous processes in economic and political sectors of global development, as well as the related security issues, on the other. It is the regional approach that has a more developed empirical and theoretical basis today, which ensures the correct understanding and the reliability of political analysis of the international security dynamics in a contemporary context.

3.4. Constructivism:
A Distinctive Outlook
on the International Arena and
its Participants

Constructivism is the fourth direction that has gained a foothold in the modern theory of international relations. The constructivist approach leaves the traditional problems beyond the scope of political analysis, such as choosing the level of analysis, selecting a particular type of units for the political analysis of security. Researching the behavior of social and political entities emerges as a priority for constructivism.

The advantage offered by constructivism is in its ability to discern and recognize discourses that determine the conceptual basis of organized terrorism and counterterrorism, and the specific implications particular to these discourses, which determine the functioning and the structure of the international relations security system.

One of the seminal issues in the political analysis of security is the identification of the motives of aggression, primarily those linked to religious terrorism. Specifically, constructivist models of political analysis contain the schemes and technologies required for resolving these challenges.

4. National Security as a Priority of
Kazakhstan's Domestic and Foreign Policy

In his Address to the Nation of Kazakhstan on 31 January, 2017 "The Third Modernization of Kazakhstan: Global Competitiveness" the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Naz-

arbayev had stated: "In the context of growing competitiveness and the absence of stability in the world, the value of the Strategy-2050 that I proposed to the people in 2012 is increasing. We have managed to foresee the upcoming challenges. Thanks to the Nurly Zhol economic policy and the National Plan "100 specific steps," we are going through the primary phase of the complicated global transformation with dignity. The situation in the world is changing dynamically. This is the new global reality, and we have to accept it.

"...The state of security is becoming a benchmark of a strong and viable country. The humankind has currently encountered the growth of terrorism. The issues of purging the financing of destructive forces and connections to foreign terrorist organizations are becoming seminal.

"It is crucial to conduct preventive measures in regard to the religious extremist propaganda, including that conducted via the Internet and social media. It is crucial to shape a zero-tolerance approach to any actions associated with radical expressions, especially in the sphere of religious relations within the society. Fighting cybercrime is acquiring greater relevance."[15]

The realization of the intrinsic connection between development and security has led to the formulation of a premise on the possibility of ensuring security via sustainable development.

The transition to sustainable development presumes the ensuring of security in all regards, and total security, as it was noted above, is also implemented by way of sustainable development. Such a close association between the country-wide and world security, on the one hand, and sustainable development on the other, determines the peculiarities of subsequent human existence. All means of exploring the future, including prognostic, futurological, systemic, noospheric, and other approaches that establish the security issue details, should be utilized as the methodological basis of such a perspective.

The growing global interdependence of the world and the diversification of the concept of security have clearly illustrated the need for joint sustainable development and cooperative coexistence of all the world regions.

Today the concept of sustainable development emerged as the logical result of the scientific and socioeconomic development that commenced dynamically in the 1970s, when the issues of limited natural resources, as well as of pollution of environment, which is the foundation of life, economic and any other human activity, were greatly emphasized.

This process was launched by the theory of "the limits to growth,"[16] proposed by U.S. scientists (D. Meadows *et al.*) in the early 1970s, which suggests that if the current tendencies of world population growth, the increase in industrial production, and, as a result, the exponential growth of environmental pollution and the depletion of the planet's natural potential remain in place, a so-called "global catastrophe"[17] will occur.

The emergence of the concept itself had come a long way—from Vladimir Vernadskiy's teaching on the noosphere in the 1920s-1930s and the Roman club reports in the 1970s-1980s to specific events under U.N. auspices. Several milestones may be designated in the formation of the sustainable development concept, which occurred within the structure of the United Nations under the auspices of UNESCO, UNEP and UNECOSOC, namely, the first intergovernmental Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972), and the subsequent conferences in Rio de Janeiro (1982, 1992) and, finally, in Johannesburg (2002).

---

[15] The President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev's Address to the Nation of Kazakhstan, 31 January, 2017 "The Third Modernization of Kazakhstan: Global Competitiveness," available at [www.strategy2050.kz].

[16] D.H. Meadows, J. Randers, D.L. Meadows & W.W. Behrens, *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, Universe Books, 1972.

[17] N. Bostrom, M.M. Cirkovic & M.J. Rees, *Global Catastrophic Risks*, Oxford University Press, 2011.

The seminal role in the primary establishment of the sustainable development concept was played by the June 1972 Stockholm U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, whose decisions were of historic importance for all humankind. That was the first time when measures on resolving environmental deterioration issues were integrated in the government-level agenda.

The emergence of the term "sustainable development" on the international arena is linked to the name of the Prime Minister of Norway Gro Harlem Brundtland, who, in her report "Our Common Future,"[18] which was presented to the U.N. Commission on Environment in 1987, defined sustainable development as such development whereby contemporary needs are satisfied, while the ability of future generations to satisfy their needs is not compromised.

The economic, social and environmental factors form the foundation of the tri-pronged concept of sustainable development.

Thus, we can conclude that the concept of sustainable development in general and its isolated elements are currently inseparable from the concept of security. Moreover, sustainable development of the contemporary international community is the basis of the contemporary international relations system.

In the modern world, when the new world order is still being formed, we view conflicts as the reflection of the volatility of the development of certain international relations' entities. The danger of this process is in that the crisis events stemming from unsustainable development easily transfer over from the national to the regional level, and possess the potential to destabilize the entire global security system.

These tendencies are the most apparent at the regional level, and the Central Asian region is not an exception. Sustainable development of this area has seminal importance due to deficient environment, which includes the water resources' shortage problem, trans-border rivers, as well as the Aral Sea basin, the recovery of which requires several decades.

The social and economic development is complicated by the non-uniform level of development throughout the region, as well as the proximity of Afghanistan, which is unstable on many levels. Drug trafficking to Russia and Europe via the Central Asian countries remains one of the main threats.

We believe that no external forces or efforts would have been able to provoke a new revolution here, with all its consequences, had the socioeconomic situation in the country been stable and sustainable.[19]

The shift in value paradigms, on both personal and social levels, seems to be crucial in the attainment of sustainable development. Ensuring sustainable development requires not only new technologies and investments, but, first and foremost, social innovations, a shift in priorities and civilization development goals, the readiness to reject immediate profit for the sake of future generations.[20]

Kazakhstan is currently intensively implementing its new economic policy Nurly Zhol, the Kazakhstan-2050 Strategy, as well as a modernization of the social consciousness. An active foreign policy, which focuses its efforts on the search for amity and interests that coincide with other countries' and is based on bilateral and multilateral mutually beneficial partner relations, is essential in promoting the sustainable development priorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

---

[18] *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, U.N., 1987.

[19] See: L.F. Delovarova, "Ustoichivoe razvitie i bezopasnost: vozmozhnye vyzovy dlia Tsentralnoi Azii," *Vestnik KazNu*, No. 2, 2010, pp. 15-17.

[20] See: E. Sinitsyna, "Kontseptsiia ustoichivogo razvitia," available at [http://www.cloudwatcher.ru/analytics/2/view/72/].

C o n c l u s i o n s

By the beginning of the 21st century, the quest to define security and its main reference point has become rather complicated. On the one hand, due to the dramatic expansion of the concept of security and its emergence as an essentially questionable concept—an open-type notion, whose meaning is constantly contested by various types of discourses. On the other hand, this difficulty is contained in the existence of various types of actors, who are attempting to implement security, thus, to form the reference point for security in different ways. Determining the domain of security today within the rigid disciplinary, sectoral or methodological framework is hardly possible, while the threats that emerge as significant to the contemporary actors are shifting too quickly.

The image of security today may be described, first and foremost, as the struggle of various resources grouped around different cases, the main goal of which is the possibility of their securitization. Another definition may be that of the opposition between different actors in the struggle for a legitimate opportunity to conduct their security policy, which grants the authorities the power to determine a certain case as a significant threat.

This order of things, on the one hand, complicates the picture, but, on the other hand, allows to see the concept of security dynamically—to observe how and by whom it is formed, as it acquires varying semantic meanings.[21]

While a scientific solution of the problem allows to determine the essence and the content of the concept of security, the review and analysis of security as a structural element of complex social systems allows to identify the conditions of their functioning.[22] The priority of any country on the contemporary international arena is the implementation of its foreign policy goals, which are based on its national interests.

Although in the contemporary framework military resources are still the main criterion of a country's status, an increasingly greater number of countries is attempting to influence each other with "soft power"—primarily informational and diplomatic resources.[23]

A solution lies in the implementation of common sustainable development principles and the elaboration of different versions for various countries and regions. An urgent need has emerged to prepare long-term strategic programs for simultaneous integrated resolution of demographic problems, settlement policies, state structure, and harmonization of economic activities with the environment.

The concept and the criteria of sustainable development, aimed at establishing harmonious relations between modern civilization and nature, have been thoroughly elaborated by the international scientific community.

Serious theoretical and practical developments in this area do exist, but the isolated efforts have to be integrated. Another, apparently more difficult, problem is to convince the political and economic elite of the need to switch to new development schemes. However, this is also possible, since the dividends from long-term stability outweigh instantaneous benefits and success. Today the ideology and the sustainable development practices are becoming the only alternatives to national and

---

[21] For more details, see: A.N. Yurin, "K poniatiiu bezopasnost: kto i kak opredeliaet ugrozu segodnia?" available at [http://regional-dialogue.com/ru/security/].

[22] See: E.P. Litvinov, "Bezopasnost kak filosofskaia kategoriia," *Prostranstvo i vremia*, On-line Miscellany, No. 7 (1), 2014, pp. 68-71.

[23] See: S.S. Gamidov, "Problemy i puti realizatsii vneshnepoliticheskikh zadach v sovremennoi sisteme mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii," *Privolzhskii nauchnyi vestnik*, No. 11 (39), 2014, pp. 130-131.

religious radicalism, as well as to socioeconomic models inherited by Central Asian countries from the Soviet epoch.[24]

---

[24] See: A. Niyazi, "Konflikty v Tsentralnoi Azii i na Kavkaze kak proiavlenie sistemnykh krizisov 'novogo pokoleniia'," available at [https://www.neweurasia.info/archive/2001/top5/03_28_282.htm].