

Vasilyeva Natalia Alekseevna
Lagutina Maria Lvovna

The Concept of Eurasian Economic Union as a New Integration Paradigm

Vasilyeva Natalia Alekseevna — Saint-Petersburg State University
 Faculty of International Relations
 Professor of Chair of World Politics
 Doctor of Science (Philosophy)
 Contacts: nbasil@sir.edu

Lagutina Maria Lvovna — Saint-Petersburg State University
 Faculty of International Relations
 Associate Professor of Chair of World Politics
 PhD in Political Sciences
 Contacts: manipolis@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problem of definition of the main theoretical components of a new integration paradigm. The Eurasian economical union is regarded as an example of this paradigm based on the global regionalization concept, multipolar world order and core area/heartland concept.

KEY WORDS

Eurasian economical union, global regionalization, geopolitics, eurasianism, core area, multipolar world order.

Eurasian Economic Union (Eurasian Economic Community) is one of the top priorities of the Russian foreign policy. However, there is a great deal of skepticism among Russian and foreign experts as to the finalizing the establishment of this Union by 2015. The main reason for that, as the authors see it, is the lack of clear strategy and theoretical basis of the new Eurasian integration. Therefore the authors of the article think it is necessary to define the main theoretical components of the newly developing integration paradigm¹ with Eurasian Economic Union project as an example.

On the one hand the terms “Eurasian Space”, “Eurasian Civilization”, etc. integrated into the Russian political lexicon are based on well-developed concept (the works of the classical Russian school of

Eurasianism by L. Gumilev et al.). On the other hand, with respect to the modern Eurasian integration policy in the global world, these ideas are in many ways archaic. Modern Eurasian space does not fit into the historic boundaries of the Soviet past and under the influence of transnational processes acquires new contours in terms of space and time — neo-Eurasian space. In the circumstances, it seems essential to formulate theoretical concept of the new Eurasian integration.

In fact, so far only in three articles by its “founding fathers” N. Nazarbayev, V. Putin and A. Lukashenko the Eurasian Economic Union project is conceptually substantiated by the new global thinking.² Thus,

² N. A. Nazarbayev The Eurasian Union: From the Idea to the future history // Izvestia 25 October 2011 URL: <http://izvestia.ru/news/504908>; V. Putin New Integrational Project for Eurasia: the future born today // Izvestia, 3 October 2011. URL: <http://izvestia.ru/news/502761> A. Lukashenko On prospects of our integration // Izvestia, 17 October 2011. URL: <http://izvestia.ru/news/504081>.

¹ Paradigm (from Greek *paradeigma* — example, pattern) is a complex of scientific achievements recognized by all scientists at a certain time period, a basis and a pattern for further research. (ref. Thomas Kuhn. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962)

Nazarbayev's conceptual considerations are based on the thesis that the XXI century formed objective conditions for the successful Eurasian integration in the context of the world processes of the global regionalization.¹ Theoretical basis of Russia President Putin's stand on the Eurasian Economic Union project is the concept of the multipolar world order where the Eurasian Union is seen as one of the world poles and an effective link between Europe and Asian-Pacific region. The objective actually is to introduce the Eurasian Union to the world arena as one of the leading actors of the world integration processes, gradually forming it as a global region. We can speak about a conceptual project defined by the following principles: the principle of "globality", the principle of "unity in diversity" as the basis of the inter-civilizational dialogue on the Eurasian continent, active cooperation with the neighbors of the Eurasian Union as a mechanism of the modernization of the Greater neo-Eurasian space ("Eurasian neighborhood"), the principle of "multi-rate and multi-level integration" as a tool of multichannel cooperation of the participants of Eurasian integration ("open regionalism").²

In his turn, Belarus president A. Lukashenko in one of his programming speeches also stated that he sees the Eurasian Union project as a link between the European Union and Asian economies.³ To his mind, Common Eurasian Space should be regarded as "only the first though powerful and global step". This being said, the Belarus leader emphasized the essential novelty of the union formed. "Many people think that

establishing the Eurasian Union, politicians of our countries are looking back to the past. Like, for Kazakhstan the conception of Eurasianism is a kind of reincarnation of the Chengis Khan's steppe empire, for Moscow — the revival of the Russian Empire, while for Belarus it is a return to the renovated USSR <...> It is being formed not as a new edition of the old empires but as an integration association of the XXI century".⁴ Thus, in the opinion of the "founding fathers" of the Eurasian Economic Union, the concept of global regionalization, multipolar world order and a geopolitical concept of the core area constitute theoretical basis of the modern neo-Eurasian integration.

The authors of this article think it's necessary to substantiate these conceptual approaches which amount to the theoretical constituents of the new emerging paradigm of integration of the XXI century.

The concept of global regionalization

The beginning of the second decade of the XXI century is marked by highly dynamic realization of the global integration project in different parts of the world. The multiple meanings of the regional transformations are reflected in the emergence of supranational institutions, development of the cross-borderness principles and a tendency to frame multiple-vector grounds for integration. These tendencies develop within new world political phenomena — global regions. In other words, one of the trends of the modern development is the transformation of the space coordinates of the world politics, modification of the geopolitical landscape of the world system in the XXI century through two processes — globalization and regionalization. In the discourse of research there appeared a new concept — i.e. *global regionalization (regional globalization)* where local and global processes do not exclude each other, but rather complement each other.

¹ N. A. Nazarbayev. The Eurasian Union: From the Idea to the future history // Izvestia, 25 October 2011. URL: <http://izvestia.ru/news/504908>

² V. Putin. Eurasian Union is an Open Project. URL: [http://izvestia.ru/news/502761](http://www.kpe.ru/sobytiya-i-mneniya/ocenka-tendencii-s-pozicii-kob/2728-putin-es-eto-otkritiy-proekt; V. Putin New Integrational Project for Eurasia: the future, born today // Izvestia, 3 October 2011. URL: <a href=)

³ A. Lukashenko. The Eurasian Union Is formed for the Integration of the EU and Asian Economies. 2 July 2012. URL: <http://vz.ru/news/2012/7/2/586530.html>

⁴ Ibid.

Having this in mind, it is appropriate to refer to the claim of N. Kosolapov, a Russian researcher stating that in fact, in the modern circumstances of the global restructuring of the world system a new architecture of regions is being formed that will define life and development of the world in the decades to come. It is global in territory and in organizing all previously emerged and formed major areas within the boundaries of this architecture.

The specific features of the global regionalization are multiactorness, cross-borderness and transparency which altogether mean not just traditional interstate integration but the formation of intricately structured net synergy between state, society and business. The idea of Russian scholar Y.A. Abramov that the global regionalization “changes both geopolitical and geo-economic structures of the world” sounds reasonable. An important aspect of the analysis of the global regionalization phenomenon is the definition of the ratio of regionalization to the globalization since it is the globalization that is traditionally regarded as a key determinant of the international regulation forms development. This sphere of world politics research is marked by the extreme variety of approaches which nevertheless can be combined into three main hypotheses:

- regionalization is the means of countries resistance to the trends accompanying globalization in different spheres including economics;
- regionalization is one of the mechanisms of the global world order formation;
- regionalization is one of the lines of the globalization processes.

The transitional mode of current stage of the world development is defined by the major change of the established concepts and categories one of which is the “region”. In the last few decades, under conditions of unprecedented stepping up and acceleration of global processes concerning all spheres of global society, the phenomenon and accordingly the notion of “region” underwent considerable transformation which manifested itself in the transition from territorial dimension to the dimension of space.

Thus, A. D. Voskresensky illustrates, in a sense, classical approach to the notion of “region”: Region is a certain territory representing complicated territorial and economic, national and cultural complex that can be characterized by existence, intensity, diversity and interdependence of phenomena, expressed through specific homogeneity of geographical, natural and economic, social and historical, national and cultural conditions providing the grounds for defining a territory”. This definition brings into focus the territorial factor, leaving out virtual global-regional net characteristics of the modern world.

In the academic community there are different opinions of such characteristic of the region as ‘territory’. Geographical unity is not a determining feature. Thus, in the concept of new regionalism there are completely opposite attitudes to the criteria of the region formation. Some experts regard regions as political entities not determined by geographical factors. According to A. Hurrell, there are no “natural” regions and their definition vary depending on the matter in hand. Thus, the functional principle comes to the forefront which provides grounds for the rejection of strictly geographic approach while defining a region. Proponents of social constructivism argue that the most important feature of a region is its perception (by government, civil society and business) which in its turn depends on the change of norms and identities. In fact, new regionalism tends to break the tethers of the cartographic method and not to take into account the geographic feature while forming regions. This approach suggests that “regions are activities aimed at the achievement of our theoretical goals, that’s why region formation is conditioned by intellectual and political necessity’. So when defining a region the notion of space appears innovative and in this context space does not have distinct territorial constants and can incorporate region characteristics not pegged to the geographical map. Space is a structure filling a region in the process of regionalization which is especially the case when forming “global regions’, but space

can exceed the territorial basis of a region and this possibility should not be ignored when considering the notion of “global region”. Hence, we think a region can be defined as an entity not confined within the bounds of a territory. On the basis of this definition it is possible to speak of a global dimension of a region which means cross-border nature of a region and its participation as a single entity in the micro political processes.

Thus, a “global region” is a structured space whose main characteristics are both traditional factors (geographical, historical, civilizational and cultural) and new factors of the postmodern era (networking, communicational, virtual, etc.).

In the process of global regionalization, integration relationships are also subject to qualitative transformation. In this connection, it is important to take into account the concept of generation change of the forms of the regional integration. We tend to agree with L. Van Langenhove who singles out three generations:

Economic regionalism based on free trade zone converted then into a customs union, common market and, eventually, an economic union.;

New regionalism meaning integration in political and social aspects

Third generation regionalism allowing the integration of foreign policy doctrines and, respectively, the development of interregional links).

Actually, the territorial state principle gives way to the principle of global territorial interrelation. In the XXI century, we can see the transformation of the classical kind of territorial integration of countries (in the form of international regions) guided solely by their national interests to global-regional integration of the main actors of the global politics and economics with the supranational interest coming to the forefront.

The authors agree with N.I. Kosolapov who argues that it is necessary to distinguish distinctly between the notions of

“integration” and “regionalization” since integrational policy doesn’t necessarily lead to the co-management as a supranational factor in the global regions development while regionalization is precisely the result of the supranational political development. The objective trend in the integration in the modern world called into being a new special phenomenon of “supranationality”. It’s possible to say that the development of the integrational spacial forms of the world political processes in early XXI century predetermines new world approaches to the interrelation of actors that are beginning to build up relations on supranational principles. Supranational ideology can shift balances of power in the world as it is about the growing influence of regional integrational unions and international inter-government organizations.

Thus, global regionalization is regarded as one of the main trends of the current global development resulting in the formation of global regions. New region forms are spaces that include different kinds of cooperation between governmental and non-governmental actors in different spheres and on different levels. In other words, we observe a transition from regional integrational groupings to global supranational institutions founded on the cooperation of states, businesses and civil society which represents a brand new state of the modern integrational processes and can be defined as the “conglomerational” form of integration. In this context, it seems necessary to regard the emerging Eurasian Union as a new generation of integrational cooperation that fits into the trend of global regionalization in this century.

The concept of multipolar world order presupposes simultaneous existence of several influential centers in the United Global System. According to many forecasts, the world order with new poles emerging will change soon and convert into the collective system of administration, based upon international law and equal security of all states. Thus, the multipolar model of the world order means a world that is characterized by several poles or centers of comparable corresponding potentials.

Multipolar approach to the world order found its way into the regulatory legal acts of two leading states, Russia and China. For example, in the concept of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation it is stated that "International relations go through a transitional period, which basically leads to the formation of the polycentric international system. It is a complicated process accompanied by the boost in the turbulence of the economic and political development on the global and regional levels"¹. So the current Russian foreign policy rests on the idea of the construction of a multipolar world which is in agreement with the geopolitical project of the Eurasian Economic Union.

The concept of a multipolar world has been developed in the last decades by the scholars of different countries. Therewith the majority of modern theorists define the concept of 'pole' as a "center of power" solely understood in accordance with the traditional participants of the international relations, i. e. states and their unions. However, in the context of global regionalization, the current system of international relations goes through qualitative transformation: national states give way to global regions or region-states?? (E. g. European Union, etc.). The multipolar world actually represents a system of global regions which means according to I. V. Zeleneva the formation of regional centers of economic, political and culture-civilizational character".

For that matter, the territory on which the Eurasian Economic Union is being built has always been a center of intricately structured interrelation and cooperation of numerous nations of the Eurasian continent. The last decades of the XX century and the first years of the XXI century are marked with the centrifugal trends which have detrimental effect on the political and economic health of the stated that emerged

as a result of the USSR collapse. That's why in the current circumstances of the second decade of the XXI century, it's necessary to take appropriate steps to accommodate each other not to lose their role in the world politics and economics. It's hard not to agree with A. Kuznetsov who argues that "the path of Eurasian integration will be difficult and thorny and yet there's no alternative. Only geopolitical and geo-economical association can help Eurasia to regain fully fledged personality. And make her an equal economic and political actor in the multipolar world. The alternative case scenario would be a further fragmentation and disintegration with the hardest consequences for our nations".²

The globalistic interpretation of the concept of the Neoeurasian integration is being defined by the modern theories of Russian geopoliticians (e. g. A. Dougin) According to the standpoint of A. Dougin, an ideologist of neo-urasianism, A. Dougin, the concept of Eurasianism in the current circumstances of globalization that goes along the lines of Atlanticism is an integrational project of the opponents of this unipolar globalism. "Eurasianism not only rejects unipolar globalization, it puts forward viable and no less substantiated project of multipolar globalization or alter globalization".³ According to the protagonists of antiglobalism, Eurasianism and even Eurasia as a concept are not strictly confined to the Eurasian continent as a geographical object. Eurasianism is a global strategy that acknowledges the objectivity of globalization and accordingly the end of the epoch of nation states but at the same time puts forward qualitatively different original scenario of globalization. It's neither unipolar world nor single global state with single world government but several global pole zones. In this way the concept of Eurasianism is thought of as

¹ The concept of the Russian Federation Foreign Policy (approved by V.V. Putin, the President of the Russian Federation on 12 February 2013. [Internet resource] Reference mode: URL: http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/6D84DDEDEDBF7DA644257B160051BF7F

² A. Kuznetsov, The Eurasian Union as a Step to the Multi-polar World [Internet resource] URL: <http://geopolitica.ru/Articles/1385>.

³ A. Dougin. *The Eurasian idea in the qualitative space*. [Internet resource]. URL: <http://evrazia.info/modules.php?name=News&file=print&sid=1904>

a theoretical substantiation of multipolar globalization.

The globalist vision of the Neo-Eurasian concept suggests the planet division into four conventional vertical belts, or meridian zones¹ running from North to South, e. g. the American continents constitute Atlantic Meridian Zone where the USA is a central link. In its turn Euro-African Meridian Zone with the European Union as a central link, Russian-Central Asian Meridian Zone (central link — Russia) and Pacific Meridian Zone (China) are defined as Eurasian². It is Eurasian geopolitical and civilizational nature of the last three zones determines, according to A. Dougin, the globalist interpretation of the idea of Eurasian integration in the multipolar world.

In the frames of this discourse on the modelling of global integrational trends, we find interesting a project idea put forward by A. V. Bobrovnikov, a Russian scholar, who identifies two trilateral zones (Northern and Southern). He argues that multipolarity of the modern world facilitates the formation of more sophisticated system of international relations. The modern world is gradually integrating in the boundaries of two large-scale parts — “northern hemisphere” where the major economic and technological potential of the modern world is concentrated, and “southern hemisphere”. Such division of the world is definitely justified since in this case the civilizational aspects of the perception of the globalization processes are seen clearer. In the Northern hemisphere globalization will go in the “Western” way getting social structures of the member states more unified and universal. While in the “Southern” hemisphere the integrational trends will accord with the concept of multipolarity and take into account the peculiarities of the socio-economic and political development of the regions included.

According to A. V. Bobrovnikov, at this stage the “Northern hemisphere” development is marked by the predominance of disintegrational trends connected with the

redistribution of the zones of influence on some territories. The reason for this is that there are three top-rank leaders in this region — the USA, European Union and Japan. They don’t want to yield their positions on the global scene thus urging the formation of “intermediate centers” and slowing down the development of integration processes at a higher level. For example the interests of the USA and Europe clash in the Caribbean, those of the USA and Japan — in East Asia and the USA, Europe and Japan — in the Eastern Europe, CIS, Islamic countries and separately — China and India.

Most likely, political administration and global problem solving in the Northern hemisphere will be realized through the cooperation of several centers. Currently, the prevailing trend of the “Southern hemisphere development are the accomplishments of the “new growing giant states” (China, Brazil, India) who advocate equitable cooperation and mutual aid which limits American hegemony and Western unification. Together with the integration links development “North — North” and “South — South” we can see similar processes in the direction “North — South”.

Thus, the planetary scale of the Eurasian union presupposes its perception as a denial of “unipolar globalization” (A. Dougin). According to American political analyst U. D. Mignolo the world integrational processes are the final stage of “global transformation, since 1945”. He sees similarities between modern globalization and the European politics of Westernization of the world since XVI century. “Any concept of “civilization” acquired a worldwide nature. As soon as Europe started its expansion all over the planet and this way suppressed organizations already existing, self-determined and very socially developed (such as China, Islamic World etc.).

Geopolitical concept of the “core area”. Geopolitical analysis of the Eurasian space includes “core area” as one of the fundamental concepts. This term dates back to the first classics of Eurasianism. For example in 1933 in his article “Geographical

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

and geopolitical grounds of Eurasianism” P. Savitsky wrote about Russia as about “core state” and about Eurasia as “core continent”. The modern version of the concept of “core area” was introduced by a Western scholar G. Parke, who defines it as a complex space, including geographical, social and political characteristics, trying to create “its own geopolitical power field”. According to G. Parker, the main feature of a core area is its capability to retain its identity and independence which creates conditions to counteract attempts of its take over by neighbouring geopolitical areas. Thus the scholar sees the world geopolitical map as a combination of several core areas that interact through the so-called “border-zones”. The nature of these zones origin is diverse: geographical, climate, economic, ethno-cultural etc.

When continuing to develop the theory in regard to “core spaces” one can mention the works of the scholars representing the contemporary school of Eurasian geopolitics, who consider different options for interacting of these “core spaces” of Eurasia.

Thus, for instance, O. Ariin maintains that China is the main strategical partner of Russia. While A. Panarin, in his turn, insists that it is India that should become the most significant partner within global Eurasia.

According to A. Dougin, it is necessary to take a complex approach and on these grounds, to design a multilevel system of geopolitical blocks in the Eurasian zone. In this context, the authors of the article, hold the positions close to the one of A. Dougin and also believe that it is necessary to develop a complex mechanism of the cooperation for different Eurasian “core space”, which corresponds to the idea of establishing a Greater Eurasian Union.

Unlike the project of Eurasian Economic Union, whose members are supposedly to become post-soviet republics, Greater Eurasian project implies wider and multi-vector integration with such geopolitical giants (core spaces) as China, India, Iran, Turkey and European Union.

A. Toma, an expert from Belarus, holds an opinion that possible prospects of

founding such a Union can be deduced on the basis of the signed agreements, official visits and joint military trainings¹. Thus, when considering European Union from this point of view, one may easily construe their strong wish to expand political authority on the “subzones” of influence that had traditionally been a sphere of Russia’s integration policy with Russia itself viewed as a part of “core space” of the Eurasian Union. In this light coming to power of nationalist regimes of explicitly anti-Russian tenor in such post-soviet states as Georgia, Ukraine and Moldova triggered intensification of European policy of rapprochement with Eastern neighbours (“The Eastern Partnership” programme).

Moreover, certain members of Russian business circles started to display a firm determination to lobby political strategy of eurointegration. However, such expansion of “core space of EuroWest” would fail to bring any positive results. This way, from Russian scholar A. Kuznetsov’s position “euro-bureaucracy is deadly scared that unfathomed Russia, belonging among other things to a different civilization, would divulge smaller Europe”.

In this respect, a very clear example is Turkey, possessing much more humble economic and political potential than Russia. Brussels, nevertheless, firmly advised Mr. Erdogan’s government, on their unwillingness to see this dynamically developing seventy-million Muslim country among the EU members².

In this regard the project of Euroasian Union might be interpreted as the determination of Russian, Belorussian and Kazakh leadership to strengthen “core space of EuroEast,” which is already brought certain results in the struggle for “subzones of influence”.

At the same time, we should emphasize that, according to the idea of Eura-

¹ Toma A. Russian-Chinese Union against American “Anaconda Strategy”: [Internet resource] // REGNUM / Geopolitika.ru. 8 September 2012 r.

² A. Kuznetsov, The Eurasian Union as a Step to the Multi-polar World [Internet resource] URL: <http://geopolitika.ru/Articles/1385>.

sian Union designers, there should not be a sign of confrontation with Europe, as: "Economically logic and balanced system of partnership of the Eurasian Union and the EU would be capable of providing for a change of geopolitical and geo-economic configuration of the entire continent and would have obvious positive global effect."¹ Centripetal tendencies of the proposed Eurasian Economic Union may significantly impact the process of rapprochement with this Union and with other influential actors of the regional Eurasian zone.

Following these initiatives, Iran is interested in the establishment of a new integrative alliance of states, which may promote more active flow of commodities along the transportation corridor "North-South."

Thus, Russian experts and their Armenian counterparts have already started discussing a joint project of railway, which will connect Iran and Armenia. In A. Dugin's viewpoint, the Eurasian integration process is prone to depend on the success of drawing an axis between Moscow and Tehran, which will allow combining economic, military, and political and resource capacities of Russia and Iran.

"Iran and Russia are autonomous resourceful regional powers that can work out their own model of organizing the strategic space of core part of Eurasia... Only joint initiative, based on solidarity geopolitical initiative of all these powers to create a new central-Asian federative model is able to convert this complex region into a cooperation zone."²

The most important partner in the integration process is Turkey, which "has many Eurasian components, Western tendencies there are closely interweaved with Eastern ones. Turkey realizes its civilizational otherness from the European Union, specificity of its regional interests, the risks of globalization which includes "desovereignization." as an inherent element. The search for new

strategic partners in the face of Russia and Iran becomes an imperative"³. The modern Turkey is engaged in the process of changing political priorities from "atlantist to continental"⁴

Under these circumstances, Russia enjoys a unique opportunity not only of creating a single economic zone, but to unite Greater Eurasia as well.

At last, as far as China is concerned, its role in the process of neo-Eurasian integration has been controversial in nature so far. On the one hand, China demonstrates some interest to participate in future Eurasian Economic Union. For example, Lifan Lee, a professor of Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, deputy director of SCO research center, believes that: "President Putin might consider the idea of proposing China to become an observing country in the Customs Union, the Single Economic Zone or even of the Eurasian Union".

These integration structures are seen as more focused on promoting cooperation with China and can play a principal part in the process of economic interaction in different segments of Eurasia."⁵ On the other hand, in Chinese public opinion the project receives certain criticism.

Thus, for example, Lifan Lee further stipulates: "Russia strives to maintain its appeal in the capacity of the leader for the countries of the former Soviet Union.<...> While scrutinizing the evolution of the Customs Union in recent years, it should be noted the this Union might as well fail to achieve the defined goal.

Yet, the next term of Vladimir Putin presidency [Author's Note: the article was published before the third term of his presidency] would rather result in a new period of post-Soviet zone development. This period has already been given a capacious

³ Dugin A. The Eurasian Strategy of Turkey [Internet Resource] URL: <http://geopolitica.ru/Articles/215/>

⁴ From the EU to EurAsEC [Internet Resource]. URL: <http://volternews.ru/2012/04/iz-es-v-es/>

⁵ Lifan Li. Vladimir Putin should consider inviting China into the Eurasian Union: [Internet resource]. URL: <http://pda.regnum.ru/news/russia/1550460.html>

¹ V. Putin New Integrational Project for Eurasia: the future, born today // Izvestia, 3 October 2011. URL: <http://izvestia.ru/news/502761>

² A. Dugin What Is the Eurasionism Today? [Internet Resource] URL: <http://evrazia.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1904>

name: "The Soviet Union — version 2.0."¹ Another Chinese scientist Yan Shu, the director of the Institute for Central Asia Research of the University of Langzhou shares Lifan Lee's views and maintains that Russia will possibly give its preferences to the Eurasian Union at the expense of SCO, the latter being perceived by China as a more preferable structure for interaction with the countries of the Central Asia.

What is more, this situation, according to Yan Shu, is conducive of rise of tension and lessening of the activity in Sino-Russian bilateral relations at the current stage. He thinks that Russia this way is conducting an active policy of constraining China in the Central Asia.²

From our point of view the real membership of China in the Eurasian Economic Union may be considered only in a remote future if at all. First, we have already been actively integrating with China in SCO; second, we consider that the best model of the participation of China is the format of unofficial regional cooperation similar to ASEAN+3.

Such formats represent the methods of regulation in the sphere of external dimension of establishing regional integration groups in the modern world.

Thus, developing conceptual ideas of the "founding fathers" of the Eurasian Economic Union, the authors of the present article concluded that the concept of global regionalization objectively complies with the processes of integrative rapprochement on the vast territories of the modern world (the European Union, MERCOSUR, ASEAN etc.)

That is why, the project of the Eurasian Economic Union should be viewed as an institution, structuring Eurasian global region. Arising from the second theoretical prerequisite — the concept of multipolar world — the implementation of the project of the Eurasian Union would provide for

strengthening of global political balance, where Greater Eurasian Space serves as a backbone for global politics of the XXI century.

And finally, the third conceptual idea of geopolitical core space provides the grounds for the significance of the Eurasian Union as a bridge between global Europe and global Asia. The theoretical approaches described are in fact reflecting those new processes and phenomena in the World politics and economy that do not match the classical schemes of international integration. They provide grounds for the formation of new integration paradigm. In our view it is the conceptual idea of Eurasian Economic Union, that enables us to go beyond the framework of classical theory and consider neoeurasian space as a unique "research ground".

References

1. *Abramov Yu. A.* Global regionalization: concept justification // Social and humanitarian knowledge. 2008. N 1. P.242–250.
2. *Arin O.* XXI century. The world without Russia. M., 2001.
3. *Bobrovnikov A. N.* Integrative trends and epicenters of development of the XXI century // Latin America. 1997. N 7.
4. *Vasilyeva N. A., Lagutina M. L.* Formation of the Eurasian union in the context of global regionalization // Eurasian economic integration. 2012. N 3 (16).
5. *Voskresensky A. D.* East / West: Regional subsystems and regional problems of the international relations. M.: Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University); Russian political encyclopaedia (ROSPEN), 2002.
6. *Dugin A. G.* The Main Principles of Eurasian Policy // Vestnik of the Chelyabinsk State University. Oriental studies. Eurasianism. Geopolitics. 2002. Vol. 10, N 1.
7. *Zeleneva I. V.* Geopolitics and Geostrategy of Russia (XVIII — the first half of the XIX century). SPb., 2005.
8. *Zeleneva I. V., Markushina N. Yu., Tserpit-skaya O. L.* Studying the Role of Regional Components in the Formation of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. SPb., 2009.
9. *Kosolapov N. A.* Globalization: Territorial and Spacial Aspect // World economy and international relations. 2005. N 6. P.3–13.
10. *Panarin A. S.* Global political forecasting. M., 2001.

¹ Ibid.

² An expert from China: *Russia is holding up SCO development for the sake of the Eurasian Union: [Internet resource]. URL: <http://www.rosbalt.ru/exussr/2012/06/14/992530.html>*

11. *Shchebarova N.N.* Globalization development through liberalization of regional economic relations // Messenger of MGТУ. Vol. 8, N 2. 2005. P. 348–354.
12. *Hemmer Ch., Katzenstein P.* Why Is There No NATO in Asia: Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism // International Organization. 2005.
13. *Hurrell A.* Explaining the Resurgence of Regionalism in World Politics // Review of International Studies. 1995. Vol. 21, N 4.
14. *LeDonne J.P.* The Geopolitical context of Russian Foreign policy: 1700–1917 // Acta Slavicaaaponica. Sapporo. 1994. Vol. 12. P. 4–5.
15. *Parker G.* Geopolitics. Past, Present and Future. London; Washington, 1998.
16. *Van Langenhove L., Costea A.N.* The EU as a Global Actor and the Emergence of 'Third Generation' Regionalism // UNU-CRIS Occasional Papers 0-2005/14. United Nations University, 2005.