



РУХАНИ
ЖАҒЫРУ



Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ БІЛІМ - 2018»
XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ

XIII Международная научная конференция
студентов и молодых ученых
«НАУКА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ - 2018»

The XIII International Scientific Conference
for Students and Young Scientists
«SCIENCE AND EDUCATION - 2018»



12th April 2018, Astana

**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ**

**Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«Ғылым және білім - 2018»
атты XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
XIII Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2018»**

**PROCEEDINGS
of the XIII International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2018»**

2018 жыл 12 сәуір

Астана

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

Ғ 96

Ғ 96

«Ғылым және білім – 2018» атты студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = XIII Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2018» = The XIII International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2018». – Астана: <http://www.enu.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie/>, 2018. – 7513 стр. (қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша).

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия
ұлттық университеті, 2018

operations in Afghanistan and the withdrawal of US troops;

✓ The USA in the format of C5+1 is considered as important factor for the development of Central Asian countries.

Failures:

✓ The countries of Central Asia failed to make significant progress towards a democratic, open society based on a market economy, the rule of law and respect for human rights. On the contrary, in all these areas there is a rollback;

✓ The US project to connect Central Asia with Afghanistan and Pakistan through the New Silk Road has not yet moved from a dead center;

✓ Promotion of closer economic integration and security cooperation led by the United States in the region was insignificant.

Literature::

1. Eugene Rumer, Richard Sokolsky, Paul Stronski. US Policy in Central Asia 3.0. Exclusive. 2016, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/01/25/u.s.-policy-toward-central-asia-3.0-pub-62556> (Access: 1.03.2018)
2. V.N.Zemskov. Strategy of US in CA. Center of Euroatlantic Security. 2013
3. William Burns. Silk Road Trade and Investment: New Pathways for U.S.-Central Asia Economic Ties. Remarks at U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, DC, October 7, 2009, <https://2009-2017.state.gov/p/us/rm/2009a/130389.htm> (Access: 5.03.2018)
4. Oliker, O. and D. Schlapak, U.S. Interests in Central Asia: Policy Priorities and Military Roles (RAND: Santa Monica, Cal. 2005).
5. Energy Information Administration, FACTS Global Energy. Washington D.C.: 2012
6. Kavalski, E., The New Central Asia: The Regional Impact of International Actors. Singapore: World Scientific, 2010.

UDK 341.1

COMPARATIVE INTEGRATION: A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE EURASIAN ECONOMIC UNION (EAEU) AND THE COMMON MARKET OF THE SOUTH (MERCOSUR)

Bolysbekova M.K.

memoldir@yandex.kz

2 Year PhD student, 6D020200-International Relations Specialty, L.N.Gumilyov ENU, Astana, Kazakhstan

Scientific Advisor – A.N. Zholdasbekova

Nowadays the development of Eurasian integration in geostrategic location is subject of interest of national as well as foreign researchers. The strengths and weaknesses of the EAEU are determined on the basis of comparison. Therefore, it would be appropriate to compare the bloc with the organization with similar features, like Mercosur, and to learn from its experiences. Regions' states have common historical, political, economic and social backgrounds. In addition, both blocs have dominant lingua franca. Here arises a question about possibility to compare these blocs.

Modern integration processes are developing within the framework of formal models of regionalization, differing in the degree of equality or asymmetry of economic potentials of members of integration. In particular: the model of common center (ex.: EU), the model of the dominant party (ex.: leading TNCs in NAFTA), and model of intergovernmental agreements (EAEU, MERCOSUR, ASEAN). At this point, this paper shall discuss briefly the historical background of the Eurasian Economic Union and the Common Market of the South.

After the collapse of USSR former Soviet republics protested to reintegration initiatives, but

regional cooperation schemes have been launching since late 1990s with a little progress. Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia are in favor of integration and are vehicles of these processes; when poorer states like Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan pursue economic and security interests from a closer ties with Russia, as well as Armenia looks for security and economic linkages with Russia for resolution of border issues with Azerbaijan and for geographical proximity to Turkey.

Russia aims to use integration projects as a platform for restoration of its leading role in Central Eurasia and to confirm its status of a superpower in multi-polar world order. Moreover, Russia tries to benefit economically from the integration projects by redeeming its markets lost to the China, EU and the US.

Belarus participates in regional projects under the pressure of Russia. But at the same time in the framework of integration unions Belarus hopes to secure steady supply of oil and to collect revenue from sales in full measure. In this regard, Minsk focuses on the common market for oil.

Kazakhstan's objective in forming integration associations is consolidation of its position in an increasingly competitive world. Kazakhstan sees unions as means of achieving economic goals.

Despite of existent intentions for integration trans-boundary trade and travel were difficult due to diverse economic and trade policies. Regional trade shrunk, only Customs officers extracted a profit.

Recent project for creating a customs union between Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia was declared in August 2006. Resume of Eurasian integration in different manner than previous initiatives was hard of belief. However, the political statements were implemented quickly, institutional and legal basis were upgraded with the emphasis on international rules and practice, Russia's regional hegemony was inhibited in a framework of multilateral institutions.

States adopted a Common Code in November 2009 that altered national laws of member states. The Customs Union established in January 2010. Since July 2010 Common Code came into a force and Commission of the CU started functioning. [1, 132]

An idea about the formation of a Single Economic Space (SES) was discussed simultaneously in 2009. Subsequently member states carried out institutional adjustment and established SES in January 2012. The free movement of capital is to be implemented gradually, when common technical standards and measures related to elimination of barriers to trade have been already enforced.

Provisions of CU and SES evolved hand in hand with Russia's accession to the WTO in 2012. States made commitments to comply with WTO regime in the framework of existing and future agreements, including incidents with non-WTO members and the WTO norms rules over provisions of the CU.

Moreover, in January 2012 supranational body Eurasian Economic Court was set up. Governments as well as actors in economy may bring to Court matters related to unfair treatment, violation of competition policy and equal business conditions. A month later Eurasian Economic Commission was launched replacing the Commission of the CU. Commission is authorized to regulate functioning of CU and SES, to which the parties delegated their national powers in the fields of customs policy and collaboration within SES.

In 2012 Russian Academy of Foreign Trade introduced a first draft on Eurasian Economic Union. Project was subsequently finalized by experts of the Eurasian Economic Commission and key executive authorities of the member states. During the 2012 and 2014 were hold 5 rounds of negotiations on the refinement of the project. Finally, Treaty establishing Eurasian Economic Union was signed on 29 May 2014, in Astana by heads of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia. The next section of this work is devoted to explaining the institutions of the EAEU.

Institutional base of the bloc enlisted in founding document and since has not been changed and consists of Supreme Eurasian Economic Council, Eurasian Intergovernmental Council, Eurasian Economic Commission and of Court of the Eurasian Economic Union [2].

The 19th and 20th centuries were filled with unsettled territorial conflicts of two largest economies of the Ibero-American region Argentina and Brazil. Foreign policies of both countries were characterized by promotion of national priorities and pressure of armed forces. Thereby

mutual distrust was prevalent without discussion of the demands for closer political, economic or cultural ties. In 1970s conflicts emerged over the water resources use of the Parana River exacerbated bilateral relations.

The negotiations of October 1979 altered situation. Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay signed Acordo Tripartite ending the disputes. Thus, the treaty established positive relations between Argentina and Brazil. Better political relations would promise political stability and democratic governance and consequently re-establish international credibility, but not promptly lead to evolution of economic relations. In early 1980s both countries faced political instabilities caused by the pressure of democratization as they were led by authoritarian regimes. This together with foreign debt crisis of 1982 impeded the widening of existing organizations as well as the formation of new integration processes.

Nevertheless, re-democratization projects in Brazil (1985) and Argentina (1983) put them together again. Each state had a clear view of the targets the new democracy had to reach. Argentina aimed to modernize the economy and incorporating the democratic values in favor of human rights, while for Brazil it was to reset development model and to raise the profile, as well as improvement of financial and administrative policies. [3, 5]

In the mid-1980s, Argentina and Brazil concluded to set up an integration project which was narrow in scope. Initial cooperation covered political issues and cluster approaches to harmonize their economies on a complementary basis. Countries aimed to promote mutual support for democratization and to seize anti-democratic issues based on military–nationalist platforms. There also signed agreements that pursue explicitly economic objectives to support the primary political and security goals.

In June 1990 US announced its Enterprise Initiative for the Americas, designed to liberalize hemispheric trade and assess debt obligations. This project could threaten the integration process between Brazil and Argentina as well as their interests in region.

Therefore, economic activities became more attractive to policy-makers only in the early 1990s, when states launched their economic liberalization and structural reform processes. The newly-elected democratic governments had vision of consolidating market-oriented reforms through regional integration as in early period societal or business inputs were excluded from the integration policy-making processes. Brazil wished to obtain free market access for its manufacture goods in Argentina, while Argentina intended to remove trade barriers for its agricultural goods in Brazil.

First step on the way to wider integration was signing of Buenos Aires Act in July 1990 between Argentina and Brazil. Since Uruguay and Paraguay share common borders with both Argentina and Brazil, they have served as buffer states between Argentina and Brazil in the 19th and 20th centuries. [4, 188-190] The economies of Uruguay and Paraguay have been subject to influence and combined with the larger economies of Argentina and Brazil. Therefore, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay founded Mercosur in 1991 at the Treaty of Asuncion.

Treaty explicitly founded Mercosur's main purpose as 'economic development with social justice' in the region. Thus, the treaty clearly widened the scope of the cooperation beyond purely trade liberalization goals.

Three features of Mercosur integration: (i) mixed objectives (both economic and political); (ii) exclusively inter-governmental decision-making structure; and (iii) cumulative process of integration. [5, 518]

Basically, Mercosur regionalism was linked to enhancing of each government's liberalizing reforms and adjustment of the region with the globalization process. The ideological superiority of neo-liberalism at the time gave priority to a restricted focus on trade and drove away from institutionalization. In addition, Mercosur's initial political aims of promoting regional security, trust among leaders and foothold of democracy would be inaccessible without economic cooperation.

In 1994 Protocol of Ouro Preto (Brazil) enhanced Asuncion Treaty by establishing institutional foundation of community [6] with Council of the Common Market, Common Market

Group, Mercosur Trade Commission, Joint Parliamentary Commission (no longer a part of the MERCOSUR Institutional Structure), Economic-Social Consultative Forum, Mercosur Administrative Secretariat.

So what are the general patterns of the processes of Latin American and Eurasian integration? First, MERCOSUR and the EAEU are regional integration associations of developing countries. Over the past few decades, the structure of integration associations has undergone major changes in the composition of participants. In the late 1970s, preferential trade agreements for South-South accounted for only 20%, and by 2010 this figure had risen to 60%, which clearly demonstrates the increased integration efforts of developing countries. In general, it can be said that the developed countries are objectively pushing for the integration already achieved high level of productive forces, so it was the developed countries that used to be the flagship of regional integration, and the developing countries joined the RTA (regional trade agreements) in order to get preferential access to the markets of these states. Today, however, integration has a slightly different nature for developing countries. Through the accumulation of economic potentials, developing countries seek to accelerate economic development, overcome the difficulties associated with industrialization and modernization of the economy, attract foreign investment and achieve a more significant position in the world economic hierarchy.

Of course, one can not ignore a number of factors that hamper the development of regional integration with the participation of developing countries. Such factors include: low economic indicators (low level of economic development in comparison with developed countries, low degree of integration of domestic economies); weak infrastructure development, including transport; lack of material resources and financial resources. In addition, integration associations of the South-South type are criticized for the fact that the participants in integration have predominantly the same type in the sectoral structure of the economy, and therefore can hardly complement each other, and this reduces the level of mutual trade [9, p. 125]. Against this, it can be argued that many developing countries that join integration associations are trying to adhere to the doctrine of «open regionalism» at the stage of integration. The essence of the concept of «open regionalism» is to create favorable conditions for extraregional cooperation with third countries. Integration organizations that adhere to this policy give priority to the promotion of external exports and try in every possible way to expand the base of preferential trade agreements with extraregional partners. At the same time, for developing countries, regional integration over time can serve as a good incentive for reforming the structure of the economy and modernizing production, gradually changing the structure of exports in favor of increasing the share of goods with high technological capacity. Participating in regional integration, developing countries are trying to guarantee themselves the advantage of «large-scale collective actors» [10, p. 540] in the system of international relations.

In one integration association with the participation of developing countries, there are states with different integration and economic potentials, since weak economies are guided by the motive for inclusion in the production and marketing networks of more developed economies among developing countries, peculiar points of regional growth. Prior to the 1990s, in terms of the formation of integration, approximately the same level of economic development and common borders were considered as the decisive criteria, but new integration blocs, such as MERCOSUR and the EAEU, characterize differentiated economic indicators.

MERCOSUR is an integration association with a pronounced asymmetry between the states entering into it. The volume of Brazil's GDP, the region's largest economy, exceeds Argentina's GDP, the second MERCOSUR economy, by 3.6 times and constitutes 66% of the GDP of the integration bloc. The economies of Paraguay, Uruguay and Bolivia account for only 4.3% of MERCOSUR's GDP. In the EAEU, economic differentiation in terms of GDP is even more acute. The GDP of the Russian Federation is 8.1 times higher than the GDP of Kazakhstan, which is the second largest in the Union in this indicator, and is almost 85% of the total GDP of the member states of the EAEU. At the same time, the small economies of the Union, namely Armenia and Kyrgyzstan, produce only 1% of the GDP of the EAEU.

Some researchers believe that such a colossal difference in economic potential inevitably leads to serious imbalances in the redistribution of trade flows [11, p. 13] and the inequality of dividends from integration for its participants. As a consequence, the economic downturn in large countries inevitably leads to stagnation of the economies of small countries, which depend on the well-being of the economic locomotives of integration groups. While from the other hand this view might not be acceptable as the divergence of the level of economic development can have a positive effect: for a leading economy, countries that are lagging behind in the level of economic development become a profitable investment field, which lays a good foundation for the development of its business, and small countries, in turn, get the opportunity to improve and adjust their economic structure. In addition, integration always requires a comprehensive infrastructure upgrade, and therefore generates new infrastructure projects and creates the prerequisites for accelerating economic growth. In this sense, the MERCOSUR activity of the Structural Convergence Fund is designed to finance various projects in the field of transport, electricity, water, health, biofuel development in small countries and the least developed regions.

MERCOSUR and the EAEU can be conditionally referred to «young» integration associations, which are characterized by accelerated formation [12, p. 179] and the flexibility of integration forms. This is due not only to the fact that modern technologies make it possible to significantly simplify the process of integrating political actors, but also with the accumulated global integration experience. Its careful analysis avoids integration errors, neutralizes potential contradictions, and builds new «hybrid» integration forms. Thus, in the 1990s MERCOSUR accomplished a real «integration leap», building the institutions necessary for the functioning of the Customs Union in just four or five years. The EAEU and the preceding CU and CES also developed very dynamically. In the post-Soviet space, the concept of multi-format and multi-speed integration was applied, which contributed to the rapid development of Eurasian integration processes. Similarly, the Asunción Treaty contained a special provision specifying differences in the pace of integration for Paraguay and Uruguay, given that the process of rapprochement between Argentina and Brazil began before the signing of the Common Market Treaty [13, p. 49]. Although now MERCOSUR is traditionally described as the Customs Union, the cooperation of the partners in the merger goes beyond the traditional interaction within the framework of the CU, covering also physical, industrial, energy and humanitarian integration. Eurasian integration is carried out in the forms of the customs union, a single economic space and has signs of building a common market.

Finally, the similarity of regional integration processes in South America and Eurasia is the significant role of the political factor. In Latin America, the core of regional attraction is Brazil, which builds a political course and forms the agenda of regional integration in such a way as to consolidate the status of a regional power and raise its own international prestige by increasing the place of MERCOSUR in the world hierarchy. It can not be denied that Russia is also tacitly positioning itself as an EAEU leader and pursuing certain geopolitical goals, wishing to strengthen ties with its closest neighbors and to act as a united front in the international arena. Close economic cooperation lays the foundation for political rapprochement and increases the likelihood of retention of these states in the orbit of Russian interests.

Thus, the regional integration processes taking place within the framework of MERCOSUR and the EAEU have significantly changed the geopolitical landscape of the South American and Eurasian continents. Undeniable difficulties on the way to the formation of the Single Economic Space are pushing member countries to the constant search for new forms of integration. The priorities of integration, the development strategy of integration blocks, the subject composition are being transformed. In a relatively short period of time, these blocks managed to achieve significant progress, promptly build an institutional structure and prove their viability. At the same time, both MERCOSUR and the EAEU will have to resolve many unresolved problems. Their further development will depend on how effectively they can eliminate the existing contradictions.

Literature:

1. Бабынина Л.О. Транспортные системы ЕС и ЕврАзЭС: перспективы интеграции //

- ЕврАзЭС и интеграционный опыт ЕС / Отв. ред. М.Г.Носов. Доклады Института Европы № 242. Москва, 2009. – pp. 123-144
2. Договор о Евразийском экономическом союзе. 2014. 29 мая. URL: https://docs.eaeunion.org/docs/ru-ru/0003610/itia_
 3. Bakker F.E. Economic asymmetry and institutional shortfall in Mercosur: predictions for deepening Mercosur integration. 2013. – 62 p.
 4. Oelsner A. Two Sides of the Same Coin: Mutual Perceptions and Security Community in the Case of Argentina and Brazil. In F. Laursen (Ed.), Comparative Regional Integration. Farnham: Ashgate, 2003. – pp. 185-206
 5. Doctor M. Prospects for deepening Mercosur integration: Economic asymmetry and institutional deficits / Review of International Political Economy, 2013. – pp. 515-540
 6. Protocol of Ouro Preto, 1994
 7. Соловаров В.В. Региональное объединение МЕРКОСУР как ответ на вызовы глобализации: Итоги 20 лет интеграции // Известия Уральского государственного экономического университета. Екатеринбург, 2012. № 6. С. 122–127.
 8. Воронина Т.В. Трансформация линейно-стадиальной модели международной экономической интеграции в эпоху глобализации: Причины, формы, следствия // Фундаментальные исследования. Пенза, 2014. № 6. С. 539–543.
 9. Хмелевская Н.Г. Интеграционный вектор экономической политики: Опыт МЕРКОСУР и Тихоокеанского альянса // Российский внешнеэкономический вестник. 2014. № 10. С. 11–20.
 10. Сологуб В.И. Новейшие интеграционные объединения: Понятие и классификация // Научные ведомости Белгородского государственного университета. Серия: История. Политология. Белгород, 2015. Т. 19. № 36 (216). С. 178–182.
 11. Шебанова Н.А. МЕРКОСУР: Правовые аспекты создания и функционирования новой латиноамериканской интеграции // Труды Института государства и права Российской академии наук. 2015. № 3. С. 46–67.

UDC 327

CROSS-NATIONAL COMPARISON OF CRIME STATISTICS OF TURKEY, KAZAKHSTAN AND U.S.

Gaipova A.

araylimgaipova@gmail.com

B.S. Sociology, Middle East Technical University

As loosely as "sociology" is sometimes employed, the word "crime" is treated even more cavalierly in popular speech. In common usage, it is perceived as deviant acts that confront culturally accepted norms and values; acts which endanger persons in society, their beliefs and possessions. Some sources claim rather alternative definition of the crime, stating that the category of crime includes an impressive hard core of acts which, in a general form, have been regarded by most if not all, societies as detrimental to their well-being (Roucek, 1969, p.9). Consequently, it will be fair to say that crime, in a very broad sense of it, is understood, perceived and performed differently in every society, respectively. However, cross-cultural analysis of crime has been a favored method of criminologists to identify the common patterns and trace multiple causes in order to reveal effective approaches for elimination of criminal acts. Such a comparative view on crime presents an opportunity to draw relevant conclusions in relation to the criminal issues, which, subsequently, are navigated towards application in the practice. Thus, in this work a comparative view on crime statistics of Turkey in relation to the most apparent developed country – United States, and progressively developing country – Kazakhstan will be presented. It is a widely known fact that crime differs from any other kind of deviance with harm effect it precludes, i.e. harmful