

Inter-Regional Relationship Based on Geo-Economics Requirements

Natalie P. Nikonova, Larisa N. Gorina, Andino Maseleno

Abstract: The aim of this paper was to define Interregional relations as a subject of regulation of international law (on the example of the European Union and the Eurasian Union Based on geo-economics requirements). This was an analytical-logical research. The results of this study showed that the inter-regional relationship can greatly affect international law. Relations between the European Union and the Eurasian Union have caused the inter-regional relations of these two unions to change the nature of international relations and the political and economic relations of the two union states, to the extent that the geo-regional inter-regional laws as International laws are also applicable.

Index Terms: European Union, Eurasian Union, Promising areas.

I. INTRODUCTION

After the Cold War, nations competed in economic formats and with more industrial and commercial tools, a new phase for strategic and geopolitical analysis. Geo-terminology is a novel concept used to explain various ideas. Ideas with a wide range of managerial risks about the competitive position of the state economy, as well as the basic post-Cold War strategic concepts in which economic competition has been influenced by military conflicts in intergovernmental relations [1].

The process of forming the Eurasian Economic Union, rooted in an idea of the 1990s, finally came to an end in 2015, and created a new season for more powerful Eurasian activists with units and other areas. At the most successful time since the formation of this union, the members agreed to apply the same system of tariffs to all non-member countries [2]. At the same time, the formal Eurasian Customs Union was able to form and ultimately provide the regional cooperation environment for the successful formation of the Eurasian Economic Union at a timely manner. Of course, it should not be forgotten that the two major constituent countries of the Union, namely, Kazakhstan, and Russia, despite having an alliance, pursue their own specific goals. Undoubtedly, the decisions of these countries are linked to the production and transfer of energy reserves. The formation of the economic union in this region as one of the key points in the global energy cycle adds to the importance of this issue. In the era of the sovereignty of geo-economic discourse, where the

economy has become more prominent than ever, and the geo-space of the new chapter in international relations has opened, Middle Eastern oil-rich countries like Iran, which have complicated connections with Eurasian countries, feel more committed to analyzing the economic operations of this union.

The Ukrainian crisis and bilateral economic sanctions, after analyzing some observers, led to a political re-assessment of Eurasian relations about closer relations with Moscow [3]. The international and international dimensions of the union and the attention of important actors to its fate have also been strengthened. For this reason, with the formation of this union, geopolitical dynamics have risen in this area, since geopolitics cannot be distinguished from geo-economics. These dynamics and their strategic relationships have been based on the model of economic and trade cooperation of the members of the Union. Intergovernmental cooperation in the new alliance will become more important if we consider that more allies and activists like Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Armenia have entered it, and even the position of China and the simultaneous reaction of Europe in this region and the road or its silk roads will be involved [3].

Since the Eurasia region has always been at the heart of geopolitical developments, the attention of the important actors of this region, especially the Russians, to inter-regional competition has led to a heavy shadow of traditional confrontations over the model of cooperation's and economic alliances of this complex; therefore, in this study To explain the economic and industrial trends of the Eurasian Union, the geo-quantum theoretical framework has been used as a subcategory of general geopolitical theory. At a glance, this macroeconomic framework, the post-Cold War geo-nuclear theory, predicts that states will continue to compete as entities with territorial jurisdiction, not through geopolitical conflicts, but from geoeconomic contradictions [4].

II. METHODOLOGY

This research was an analytical-logical research based on available resources and information.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Eurasian integration was established with the aim of establishing a new

Revised Manuscript Received on December 22, 2018
Natalie P. Nikonova, Tyumen Industrial University, Russia
Larisa N. Gorina, Togliatti State University, Russia
Andino Maseleno Institute of Informatics and Computing Energy,
Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Malaysia
Corresponding author email: uni.state-2019@yandex.ru

framework for cooperation between the remaining Soviet Union countries. Several attempts have been made over the past two decades by the Commonwealth of Independent States to deepen the economic integration. For many countries, the incentive created by the establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States was not aimed at achieving a degree of reintegration, but it was almost a means to stabilize the situation for former members of the Soviet Union to anyone who, according to the previous method (pre-decay period), could Continue on [5].

The concept and institutionalization of Eurasian economic integrity has emerged over the past two decades [6]. The independent history of these republics includes not only integration agreements such as the CIS (1991), the Central Asian Economic Forum (1998), the Eurasian Economic Community [7] or the Central Asian Cooperation Organization (2002), but includes The signing of agreements on security and peace is also the result of institutions such as the Conference on Building Crisis and Trust in Asia (CICA) or the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) [8].

The Commonwealth Commercial Code is the root of bilateral trade agreements, which are completed and supplemented periodically. In addition to these bilateral agreements, multilateral agreements were also established within the framework of the CIA with a view to coordinating certain matters. Issues such as the harmonization of customs procedures, rules for determining the origin of commodities, and similar issues were coordinated by multilateral agreements. Due to the need for the adoption of these multilateral trade agreements by the national parliament of the countries, an additional guarantee would be given to governments that viewed cautious deeper integration. As a result of this situation, the obligations of the members under the agreements were very limited [9]. Despite the nature of the CSA regime, many factors have made it clear that CSAS is not capable of becoming an economically high degree of integrity, which, of course, should include elements of trans-nationalism. The same shortcoming has also led to the loss of the opportunity for the CIA to form a political union within the framework of the Commonwealth of Independent States [8].

Considering the many backgrounds in creating unifying space and the many attempts to form alliances in the Eurasia region, we should look at the proposal made by President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Russia in 1994 to create a regional trade bloc as a radical event in the formation of the Eurasian Economic Union [6]. The Nazarbayev proposal, which is the basis for the establishment of an economic alliance in the Soviet Union region, was pursued continuously by Vladimir Putin and followed closely by two other members [10-12]. Although the White Russia, Kazakhstan, and Russia in the 1990s and 2000s, together with other states after the collapse of the Soviet Union, signed a number of treaties to promote regional economic integration, but the only effective body in this area is the Customs Union between the three main countries that Started in 2010 [6].

The Russian, Belarusian, and Kazakhstani customs union was in contrast to earlier free-trade agreements that were created in the CASE. The new SiO₂ was qualitatively different from its predecessors and had a deeper integration level. After two years in 2012, the union entered its second stage of integration. This secondary stage was the common

economic space that was the platform for the third stage of integration. The ultimate goal of this integration was the formation of the Eurasian Economic Union and its implementation in 2015. Theoretical analysis space showed that this three-dimensional integration system is in line with the repetition of the classical perspective of the integration process: from Sieu to a common market based on quadruple freedoms and then leading to the most integrated monetary and economic union. It should not be disregarded that in fact this classical theoretical model in Europe has undergone a fortiori year for the formation of the European Union, but the architects of the Eurasian Economic Union only took five years [9]. From the recent statement of the origins of the emergence of the Eurasian Economic Union, this multi-stage integration model is rooted in stimuli, which are the result of a reversal of geopolitical rivals in the region, and in the main, these rivals play in the form of unions like the European Union with economic instruments.

IV. CONCLUSION

As for the new models of strategic and security analysis, the rivalry between the Eurasian powers and other major international and regional actors has continued to maintain its traditional nature in terms of strategic and geopolitical rivalries. Russia, as the leader and the most famous political unit in the union, still maintains its originality as a geopolitical actor. Kazakhstan, while reassuring its geostrategic position, is attempting to implement development planning models well and maintain its independence in conjunction with multiple alliances. The White Russia, along with its solid ties with Moscow, strives to keep industrial power at the forefront of its state identity. Other units in the Eurasia region, of course, are joining the Economic Union with a series of fears and hopes, and the Europeans look at this dual identity as a bridge to the Eurasian rivals. China, with a competitive, cooperative approach, moves parallel to the process of economic union formation and pursues its economic interests, which is the main strategy for boosting its power.

The formation of the Eurasian Economic Union and the views of the leading countries. This collection of new forms of formation in the geopolitical rivalry series is evolving between a geographically important region and long-standing geopolitical rivals. This tool is far from military identity and has an economic nature. In this process, government strategies based on economic models developed to enable Eurasian economies and national corporations and private sectors to gain more share of target markets, reach specific technologies, and approach full employment.

While the Eurasian Union has expressed its willingness to cooperate with the European Union, the EU has not yet responded positively. Because the European countries have widespread bilateral ties, and if the Eurasia Union does not propose a serious project, it is unlikely that Europe would show reluctance to cooperate bilaterally. Of course, the permanent representative of Russia in the European Union believes that the European Union's global strategy adopted in 2016 does not even mention the name of Eurasian convergence. He believed that the approach to Eurasian

convergence was formed well before the Ukrainian crisis, and in fact in the years 2012-2013, the European Union carefully stopped all official efforts to communicate with the Eurasian Economic Commission. Of course, Verona's meeting with the idea of a big Eurasia brings together the heads of major Italian and European companies every year. For example, at the 2017 summit, there were 1,000 delegates, including former Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi and former Russian Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, as well as Igor Sechin, Russian oil company. At this year's summit, many delegations, unlike previous years, easily spoke about sanctions and its negative effects, and even Romano Prodi and Grudger Schroeder mistakenly dismissed US policy of separation between Russia and Europe.

According to Tigran Sargsian, chairman of the board of directors of the Eurasian Economic Community Commission, European businessmen are working with the Eurasian Union at the national level, but since the dialogue between the European Union and the Eurasian Union has not taken place, this cooperation cannot take the form.

REFERENCES

1. Sparke, M. (2007), *Geopolitical Fears, Geo-economics Hopes and the responsibilities of Geography*, University of Washington
2. Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, (2015 March), *Expert Seminar: Eastern Partnership countries between the EU and the Eurasian Economic Union: Prospects for trade relations and economic reforms*
3. Dobbs Joseph, (2015 March), *The Eurasian Economic Union: A bridge to nowhere*, European Leadership Network
4. Tuathail, Ó., Dalby, S., and Routledge, P. (2003), *The Geopolitics Reader*, Routledge London and Newyork
5. Ozdemir, M. (2015 April), *Perceiving to become a "strategic partner" on Asian regional integration: Being/not Being a Member of Eurasian Union*, International Conference on Business, Economics and Management, Phuket (Thailand)
6. Courtney, W. (2015 February). *Remarks on the Eurasian Economic union*, Central Asia economic papers No.12, the George Washington University
7. Eurasian Economic Commission, (2015 first 6 month), *Eurasian Economic Integration: Facts and Figures*, Press Office of the Eurasian Economic Commission
8. Mukhamediyev, B., Khitakunov, A. (2015 spring), *European Union and Eurasian Economic union trade relations and their impact on Kazakhstan*, The Macro theme Review.
9. Eastern Europe Studies Centre, (2012), *Eurasian Union: A Challenge for the European Union and Eastern Partnership Countries*, Public Institution Eastern Europe Studies Centre
10. Izotov, A. V. (2015). Factors of the formation and development of relations between the European Union and Russia. Azimuth of Scientific Research: economics and management, (4 (13)).
11. Kaftulin, Yu. A., & Batova, V.N. (2015). ACTIVIZATION OF COOPERATION OF CHINA WITH THE EAEU AS A CONSEQUENCE OF US STRATEGIC "TURNING" IN ASIA. Azimuth of Scientific Research: economics and management, (4 (13)).
12. Gladkov, I.S., & Dubovik, M.V. (2018). Current trends in the economy and foreign trade of the EU at the stage of sanctions. Azimuth of Scientific Research: economics and management, 7 (1 (22)).