

Current Phase of Eurasia Transformation

Larisa N. Goncharova¹

¹ Belgorod University of Cooperation, Economics and Law, Russia, 116a, Sadovaya Street, Belgorod, Russia, 308023
Emails: Ssv@ores.su

ABSTRACT: Since the collapse of the USSR, Eurasia has been involved into some centrifugal processes of establishing integrated structures and altering the development vector. The system “regional Center – regional Periphery” has been imbalanced. The process of restructuring has been progressively becoming spontaneous. It is possible to enhance the formation of three models of the evolution of the Eurasian region, namely, the hegemony model, the model of intermediate ethno-cultural entities and the model of general civilized community. The relationship with such subregions as Moldova, Ukraine, the Caucasus region (the South Caucasus) and Central Asia is the most complicated and specified for the Russian Federation.

Keywords: Eurasia, peripheral-contact area, national security, evolution models, subregions, Moldova, Ukraine, the Caucasus region (the South Caucasus), Central Asia.

INTRODUCTION

Eurasia as social-cultural community combines European and Asian characteristics and comprises particular historically formed ethno-cultural territories as Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Crimea, Transdnistria, Ukraine, White Russia (Belaya Rus), the Russian exclave of Kaliningrad and the Baltics. The new countries have started redefining their historical heritage and ethnical identity precisely on that subregional basis. The previous traditional paradigm oriented on the imperial vertical and allegiance has been modifying within globalization processes and Eurasia transformation. The challenges of the new reality make the integrity of Eurasian states and territories inevitable. The theoretical fundamentals of the study include the research works of Russian and foreign scientists focusing on Eurasia political space transformation and the processes taking place in the region.

Belokrenitskiy V.Y. made a significant contribution into the analysis of the impact of the religious factor on the structure of the processes in Eurasia; Erasov B.S. developed transformation models of some Eurasian regions; Zadokhin A.G. studies closely political processes of Eurasian area. Zbigniew Brzezinski fully explained and supported a particular role of the USA in transformation processes of Eurasia political space and creation of their scenarios. The studies of such researchers as Moshnyaga V., Ilasgchuk D., Sriney F., Zavtur A. as Zverev A. relate to the issue of subregional transformational processes in Moldova and in the Caucasus and require special attention. The implementation of methodical tools of the historical science is especially visible in the work of Torbakov I. (Belokrenickij, 2001; Erasov, 2001; Zadokhin, 1998; Bzhezinskij, 1998; Moshnyaga et al., 1992; Zverev, 1996; Torbakov, 1996). In order to make an overall analysis of the parameters of transformation processes in the political space of Eurasia, we have assessed the preconditions, defined the actors and their impact on the relationship the peripheral-contact area, singled out the potential models of evolution and

showed the specifics of such subregions as Moldova, Ukraine, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

Research Methodologies

To meet the research objectives, we used general theoretical (institutional, historical, systematic, comparative, behavioral) and particularly empirical methods.

MAIN PART

Since the collapse of the USSR, Eurasia was involved into some centrifugal processes of different political vectors when practically each former Soviet republic was building its own strategy of development and security. Moreover, the former Georgian autonomies declared their secession from Georgia and created independent states. Furthermore, various integrated structures including a number of states as CIS, the Russia-Belarus Union, the GUUAM States (Georgia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and the Republic of Moldova), the Central-Asian Union and so on were established. After declaration of the independence, these countries faced a number of challenges, related primarily to the need to formulate appropriate strategy of their further development and security. It must be noted that the interests of Eurasian countries were much diverged on many aspects. It is worth mentioning that Russia as well as the new countries had to overcome their post imperial biases.

Since the collapse of the USSR that was considered to be the State-Organizer of Eurasian regional space, the integration forces significantly weakened and the system “regional Center – regional Periphery” became imbalanced. Moreover, different external forces streamed into Eurasia struggling for utilizing its natural resources. Simultaneously, some actors were attempting to use the potential possibility to enlarge their religious impact on Eurasian people and states and thus to increase their geopolitical status (Belokrenickij, 2001). Thereby, the political process on south and western peripherals of Eurasia obtained a high extent of intensity and a particular character creating instability. Centrifugal tendencies were increasing exactly in the peripheral-contact areas.

As a result, the restructuring process at Periphery became spontaneous, eventually leading to a number of armed ethnical conflicts especially at such contact areas as the south (Central Asia and the Caucasus) and south-western cross-border (Transdnistria) peripherals of Eurasia. The above-said reflects the specifics of the political process at the contact-peripheral area facing regional crisis when the previous system was starting functioning improperly. There is a particular confluence/conjugation of essentially different systems as geographical, cultural, ideological, social and political ones at geosocial spaces of the peripheral-contact area. All cultural systems interact and integrate at the territories of such areas. It has to be taken into account that contact areas of Eurasian region have been building up through historical and social development of Eurasia in accordance with cultural and political processes in the surrounding areas.

The relative assimilation of the culture of peripheral territories could be the result of the policy of the regionally established imperial Center. It could be stipulated not only by inner integration challenges but the necessity of the state security provision. In other words, the culture and psychology of the peripheral-contact area reflect the conjugation process of surrounding states, people and related issues. Therefore, the interactive

specifics of the peripheral-contact area fulfil an extremely important communicative and informational function and provides the movement and necessary sustainability of regional and global systems within their inner instability. The balance of interests in contact areas of Eurasia during the bipolar period maintained stability of security international systems. The collapse of the bipolar system resulted in destabilization at the post-Soviet space.

In geopolitics, there are some inner Eurasian contact areas within the contemporary frontiers of Russia as territories of the Southern Urals, the Northern Caspian, Belgorod-Voronezh region, Stavropol and Kuban, Rostov-on-the-Don and Donbas-Lugansk. Historically, they laid the milestones of the territorial and cultural development of Russia. Therefore, the population of such border areas could focus on various forces or states and take an advantage of their support or contradictions.

A number of armed conflicts on Eurasian periphery can be attributed to the collapse of the regulation system of Eurasian space and its shift from the monostate (the Russian Imperia, the Soviet Union) to the polystate and international form of nationhood. Initially, there had been an escalation of opposition to the former Center not only as the power and state authority holder but also as purveyor of imperial values. The last were frequently associated with the Russian culture agents especially observed at the Baltics and the Republic of Moldova. Alternatively, the Periphery focused on the secession from the USSR and creation of independent states. Nevertheless, the political process of sovereignty promoted the emergence of ethno-cultural markers, which became the substitutes of the supranational ones considered to be related to the period of totalitarianism and national identity suppression.

Actually, there is an opinion that ethnical and national identity in the Soviet Union was “evidently substituted by the Soviet identity”, and the occurrence of the concept of the new historical community comprising the notions of “Soviet people and international friendship” resulted from the myth created by the official ideologists. On the other hand, it would be unreasonable to deny the fact that once there was some kind of consensus and tolerance in interethnic relations and communication, which was supported by administrative, cultural and educational measures. In spite of the unavoidable rhetoric and pompousness, the result was evidently achieved. It is necessary to take into account that double ethnic or supraethnic identity maintained the processes of self-assertion and survival of some ethnical groups (absolute or relative “minors”) within the struggle for being historically or culturally superior or considered as the titular ethnos. The central authority of the USSR consistently carried the policy of balance among ethnical elites by supporting minor ones in the Union republics. Besides, the Russian culture component was growing in the number of some ethnical regions of the USSR significantly influencing upon the balance and stability of local cultural interconnections.

It is worth mentioning that the Soviet State made some extremely rude mistakes in its national policy. The Center focused on supporting loyal titular elites at the expense of growing diversity at personal and group levels, which finally led to the inner social tension and resulted in imbalance in intergroup relationship. Initially, it started as the opposition of the Center-Periphery gradually obtaining value ethnical background culminated in aggravation of historical contradictions and reinforcing old conflicts. The same could be witnessed in the policy of other countries. In other words, mistakes are unavoidable but it is exceedingly required to become more aware of their causes and outcomes.

The periphery of Eurasia was stable during the Soviet period when there was a robust border regime and the balance of forces at the global level. This was supported by the relevant external policy of the USSR maintaining peaceful and good-neighborly relations with surrounding states. For instance, the USSR had sustainable connections with Iran and Turkey despite some ideological and geopolitical contradictions. The stability of peripheral areas was upheld by the growth of Russian-speaking population, which became an essential element in supporting interethnic balance in some peripheral areas facing longstanding disagreements among various ethnical and religious groups. Simultaneously, the administration policy had some negative aspects initially aimed to stabilize the periphery but, in fact, the authorities only preserved and exacerbated the challenges instead of meeting them. For example, the Soviet authorities took some measures to resettle a part of residents from border areas intending to alter the ethnic population composition.

The periphery of Eurasia is oriented in two ways. The first one is directed into Eurasian space while another one is guided out of it. These orientations have both economic and ethnical background and can be related to the total area in whole and to its parts in particular. For instance, the contact area of the Baltic States is generally and culturally oriented to European region while its southwestern periphery bordering mainly with the territory of Moldova is oriented both into and out of Eurasia. On the other hand, the post-Soviet Ukraine, in spite of its pro-western orientation, is in search of its identity trying to meet the challenges of the national integration.

Cross-bordering ethnical connections create potential danger to the state sovereignty. Peripheral conflicts unavoidably turn to be cross-border ones. Frequently such conflicts can be hardly addressed without intermediaries and only within bilateral frameworks. Conflicts comprise different processes stipulated by various social links as material and spiritual ones, namely, economic, political, legal and moral. In this case, traditional ethnical groups mainly concentrated on their background, historical offences, unimplemented opportunities, conflicts and so on.

At the proper time, the Union Center failed to realistically and fully assess the situation at peripherals and develop the relative policy. Based on stereotypes, it implemented the old force methods as in Chechnya thereby aggravating the existing problems. It resulted in reduction of Russian-speaking population automatically leading to the shifts in the balance in contact areas. Within the circumstances and historical experience, a number of ethnical groups took some preventive steps to strengthen their security ranging from spontaneous migration to political and military measures.

In whole, the collapse of the USSR as other similar multistructural entities has not automatically led to the emergency of sustainable communities. In spite of the antitotalitarian declarations, there was a struggle between the Center and authorized elite groups for the power redistribution. As a result, after seizing the power the majority of those who promoted “freedom and independence”, “national Renaissance” turned to be the spoilers of the rights and freedoms for the representatives of untitled nations. Therefore, the communities of the contact areas are facing the process of coordination of their interests and obtaining their balance within new conditions. Considering interregional interaction and interests of the surrounding countries, it is worth mentioning that this process is significantly complicated by the external factor including some definite states and ethnical groups connected with the part of the population of contact areas with their cultural affinity.

Asynchronous processes of increase of national consciousness, an unmatched and contradictory social, political and value orientation of some ethnical groups settled in peripheral contact areas promoter a number of open armed conflicts as in Abkhazia, Karabagh, Ossetia, Ingushetia, Transdnestria and Tajikistan. In view of the certain geopolitical specifics, the conflict in the Republic of Chechnya can be considered as the development of the processes caused by the collapse of the USSR. Russia was the direct participant of the conflicts both on its own initiative and upon one or some conflict participants' request. As it was mentioned above, the start of the series of conflicts was connected with the weakness of the Center and the collapse of the USSR. Afterwards the conflicts became aggravated and obtained new characteristics. In particular, during the post-Soviet period Eurasian space had become the arena of various international entities competing with one another. The external factor had strengthened its impact on political processes and international relationship in Europe. It is worth noting that during the post-Soviet period Eurasian peripherals had strictly limited connections with global community. After the collapse of the UUSR and the emergence of new Eurasian states, they started expanding their contacts with neighboring and other states. Therefore, Eurasia has become more available for various international actors. It is quite natural at the current phase of the global development characterized by growing interaction of regions and countries. Nevertheless, during this period the activities of the external factor had accelerated sharply and threatened national security of Russia. In whole, we focus on some important advances in the balance of interests and forces at regional and global levels particularly considering some adverse effects for the Russian Federation.

Therefore, during the post-Soviet period Eurasia found itself in a complex geopolitical situation, which implies various evolution scenarios of international context in the region. It promoted a number of discussions concerning the contents and prospects of the modern Eurasian space. For instance, the Russian scientist Erasov B.S. is forecasting three possible models of Eurasia evolution [2]. At first, he considers the model of hegemony when the states primarily as the USA, China, some European and Islamic countries and Russia as well, attempt to spread their power on various parts of the region. He suggests that none of these political powers is a monopolist in the region. Moreover, he puts forward that in spite of the fact that Russia is the most developed and mature state with its spiritual and imperial potential, its advantages are doubtful within the context.

Secondly, he proposes the model of intermediate ethno-cultural entities obtaining the ability to reorient with simultaneous maneuvering through core civilizations preserving their peripheral status. The prospects of the development of this model are uncertain but run much deeper than studying interethnic conflict and analyzing current political regimes. Evidently, all the regional processes could lead to separation of some peripheral spaces of Eurasia and their integration into other historically close regions (Zadohin, 1998). It is worth mentioning that the similar processes could be observed in the period of the Russian's Empire disintegration.

Thirdly, the model of general civilized community based on the recognition of equal rights for different civilizations and peripheral entities is suggested. It provides full preservation and protection of national identity and supplies people with possibility to adjust structurally to various global processes. This model of international relationship in the intermediate geocultural space implies the identification of constructive principles of interaction among various ethnic, national, confessional, social and cultural groups leading to understanding and empathy of a certain degree.

It is widely known that a well-known US political analyst Zbigniew Brzezinski who did not consider the post-Soviet space as a historical and cultural identity indicated the possibility of the UUSR's disintegration. He predicts the further possibility of disintegration and fragmentation both for Eurasia and for the Russian Federation defined as temporary territories. We support his opinion that this geopolitical space includes the area where "ethnic and religious violence have been protracted for a long". On the other hand, it is very difficult for us to accept his suggestion "to strengthen and to preserve the current pluralism" (Brzezinski, 1998).

Brzezinski completely denies the organizing role of the Russian Empire, the USSR or the Russian Federation in Eurasia. He suggests the alternative project that involves "the creation of trans-Eurasian security system and the establishment of the world center under the leadership of the United States of America" (Erasov, 2001). Therefore, he disregards the historical and cultural factors and ascribes the leading geopolitical role in developing a new world order to the USA. The views of Brzezinski can be regarded as setbacks of the Cold War period when they really mattered if not for all but for the majority of Euro-Atlantic political elites. From geopolitical perspective, this extremely narrow approach is based entirely on the traditional views of the first decades of the XX century. The traditional geopolitics implies military domination over some territories so that it can be considered as the return to the past.

Modern geopolitical approaches include the study of imperatives of each state, which are influenced by growing global interdependence, communication gaps and isolation, combination of cultural diversity with information openness. In terms of these approaches, the collapse of the USSR can be regarded as the phase of global integration of the previously isolated areas and transformation of control system over these territories. Moreover, it can be considered as the transition towards the horizontal model of Eurasia's territory organization based on federalism principles, when the interests of individuals, population of separate areas (social groups) and the nation in whole are declared equal (Strategiya nacionalnoj bezopasnosti Rossijskoj Federacii, 2015).

It is important to point out that the concept of the Soviet Union involved the federation of states and communities consisting of self-authorized geosocial entities (republics, territorial councils of various levels, cooperatives) as an alternative form to the imperial vertical of Eurasia. Nevertheless, the federal model of the state was not fully implemented in practice and had a declarative nature. The CIS is the reattempt to create a unified state of independent republics at another level of self-authority. Although, the establishment of such a union possibly needs more time to overcome the heritage of the Soviet totalitarian regime as well as to create new communities and a new culture of international relationship based at least on pluralistic and maximally open models of relations. Moving in that direction creates not only conditions of survival but new challenges for Eurasian states. It should be noted that the global process is increasingly intensifying under the dominance of the USA and massive eastward expansion of western values. Therefore, the conditions for global conflicts, which are likely to burst out at the former territories of the USSR, are gradually created.

Geopolitics is an important tool to consider Eurasia as a civilization. Revising the studies of a famous researcher of civilizations B.S. Erasov, we should point out that "any civilization possesses its own civilization core where its basic values are created and the majority of culture holders live" (Erasov, 2001). In this connection it would be reasonable to regard civilization policy according to its civilization characteristics. Moreover, the significance of the culture factor in geopolitics of big spaces has increased

enormously. Religious Renaissance and ethnical consolidation processes have a severe impact on internal and external policy of the states and relationship among them. Trans-boundary civilization systems are resulted if not in destruction of borders but at least in their blurring.

It is to be noted that although being different, the civilization and geopolitical approaches are mutually supportive in the scientific analysis context. The civilization approach suggests that each state as a territorial and political entity is the part of the supersystem but unfortunately, we cannot agree with the fact when both methods are used to stipulate the necessity of building the New Berlin Wall in Europe or the Trump's Wall in the North America. Social, political and cultural processes occurring at the south and western peripherals of Eurasia during the post-Soviet period determine significantly its future development including the possibility of its alternative directions at the West and the East. The new independent states of Central Asia and the Caucasus tend to isolation and promotion of connections with South Asia and the Middle East. At the western periphery some states as the Baltics, Ukraine and Moldova demonstrated their strong resolution to integrate into Europe.

Nevertheless, Russia is far from abandoning its status of a great power and carries out a noble mission of preserving Eurasian integrity. Being a regional geosocial system, Eurasia possesses a number of territories whose population not only rejected the fact of the USSR's collapse but insisted on their individual and territorial Soviet identity resulted from their development. Each region consists of subregions and has its own cultural and geopolitical specifics. Considering the study within the international context, it is necessary to single out those territories of Eurasia and Eurasian states where interaction with other regions has taken or is still taking place.

After the collapse of the USSR there was a cluster at the western periphery of Eurasia on the territories of post-Soviet Moldavia that created a number of challenges and dangers for Russia. Similar to other post-Soviet states, Moldova faced the crisis of self-identification and was searching for its own communal identity. Primarily, it was necessary to solve the problem of integration of this multistructural community. Within the orientation towards democracy, the state based its integration policy on the ethno-cultural Romanian-Moldavian nationalism. Moreover, the disagreements with Russia became aggravated. The Parliament of the Republic of Moldova accepted the Declaration of Sovereignty in 1990 and the Declaration of Independence in 1991. What is more, they decreed their return to the Latin script and declared Moldovan the sole State language (Usmanov & Nogmova, 2018). At the same time, Moldova saw a number of anti-Soviet and anti-Russian riots.

Moscow did not expect such scenarios and was mostly disturbed by the possibility of unifying Moldova and Romania, which took place in the other state. Besides severe geopolitical consequences of the possible evolution of the situation at the contact area of south-west Eurasia, the Russian population of Moldova especially at Transdnistria region faced an urgent challenge. Underestimation of Moldova authenticity and psychology of a small Eurasian ethnos contributed considerably to Moscow's strategy and tactics development toward Moldova. However, the clearly defined separatism of the Baltics was seen as natural while Moldova's sovereignty caused bewilderment being quite unexpected. Kishinev perceived the rejection to accept Moldova's independent way of development extremely morbidly that promoted further expand of separatism.

The problem of resolution of the armed conflict in Transdnistria instigated by pro-Romanian nationalists was the core predicament in the relations between Russia and

Moldova (Moshnyaga et al., 1992). Firstly, the Soviet troops, which were put under the jurisdiction of Russia, were deployed in the region. Moreover, the majority of the population as labor collectives of industrial enterprises in Tiraspol and retired military officers of the Soviet Army who settled in Transdniestria demonstrated their positive attitude toward Russia.

The process of resolution development to Transdniestrian conflict could not be simple and rapid. The uncertain position of Russia and possibly its wait-and-see policy at the earlier phases of the conflict in Transdniestria contributed indirectly to its transition into the armed conflict. Probably, some Russian military officers insisted on the military presence in the region by all means with the aim to preserve the previous function at the south and Balkans directions and save Moscow's status at the western periphery of Eurasia.

The political will of Moscow was crucial in the termination of the war in Transdniestria and its transition to the peaceful confrontation between Kishinev and Transdniestria. In particular, the current conflict of President Dodon I. and the Parliament and the low consolidation level of Moldova political elites in whole prevented from searching the consensus. On the other hand, Tiraspol insisted on separating from post-Soviet Moldova and declaring the independent republic. In searching for the general standpoint between Kishinev and Tiraspol, V. Putin and I. Dodon agreed to recognize an autonomous, federative and independent status of Transdniestria.

After the collapse of the USSR, the relations between Russia and Ukraine became particularly significant both at geopolitical and cultural levels. These relations are characterized by a complicated procedure of demarcation, accompanied by the process of national identification and addressing differences. The mismatching of perceptions of Russians and Ukrainians about each other was evident (Torbakov, 1996). The Russians considered Ukraine as an integral part of the Russian history and Russia in whole. Therefore, the separation of Ukraine leads to the shrinkage of the historical and cultural space, the downgrading of the Russian statehood and, finally, the revision of the traditional concept of the unity of the Russian and Ukrainian people.

Separation of Ukraine from the USSR and the establishment of a new independent state caused the crisis of the Russian national self-identification. The myth of "Slavonic unity and friendship of Slavonic people" has been revised as well. Consequently, the Russians fail to fully accept or realize the fact of the unexpected separation of Ukraine, which has always been considered as a part of Russia. They considered the joining of the Ukrainian territories to Russia as the restoration of the historical justice and the reunion of Russian lands and reinstatement of Moscow's direct succession.

The independence of Ukraine made the Russian society face the challenge of defining its status without Ukraine, its history and its geographical and cultural regions. It was necessary to restate the fact that a number of Russian national symbols as Novorossiia territories, cities of military glory as Sevastopol, Odessa and Ochakov and Russian-speaking industrial regions as Donbass and Lugansk were joined to another state. The Crimea presented a particular challenge, namely, its joining to Ukraine in the 50s of the 20th century. The rejoining of the Crimea to the Russian Federation is entirely justifiable in spite of being contested and unrecognized by some western states.

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the policy of Ukrainization of Russian-speaking regions is possible and currently is taking place. A joint long-term living, the closeness of languages and cultures, their mutual integration and a great number of mixed families have contributed to the process greatly. On the other hand, the gap between

Russia and Ukraine is increasing deeply. Therefore, Ukraine can follow the way of former Russian territories as Poland and Finland that lost their cultural ties with Russia.

At the same time, the Caucasus presents a range of interregional contradictions and challenges aggravated by external forces. After the collapse of the USSR, a number of previous conflicts reignited followed by the new ones. The establishment of the statehood in the South Caucasus is the central social and political process in the Caucasus peripheral-contact area. The peculiarity of the South Caucasus states reveals the fact that the process of their self-assertion mainly takes place within the system of international relations consisting in their essence of Armenian-Azerbaijani, Armenian-Russian, Azerbaijani-Russian and Georgian-Russian ties. Besides, there was a problem with the former autonomies as Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which declared their independence. They suffered from armed inter-ethnic conflicts. The same situation was observed in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Russia.

Currently, the Caucasus has turned to be the arena of different external forces struggling with each other. Their economic and political interests have made a great contribution to the growing role of the international factor in political processes in the Caucasus. The development of restoration of relations with Turkey and Iran trying to reestablish their presence in the region is of the main significance. Russia is also concerned by the engagement of external forces in the Caucasus and its developing cooperation with South Caucasus states as it is perceived as the danger to Russian national interests and its historical status of the Caucasian state.

The territories of post-Soviet Central Asia constitute the subregion separated from Greater Central Asia during the Soviet period. The region of Greater Central Asia was a huge territory of contacts for various civilizations and the location of joining of different ethno-linguistic groups, cultures and the three global religions. All the above-mentioned determined its nature. Moreover, it was the place where some geopolitical interests of such world powers as China, Russia, Great Britain and Iran had once met.

The periphery of Central Asia being the part of the unified territory of the Soviet Union served to political and economic interest of the whole country. The needs of the territories and population of Central Asia were satisfied through opportunities and resources of the Soviet state and other regions. The policy was intended to balance the development levels of the national peripheries of the USSR. It took into account a specific character and division of labor at the state level in ways adjusted to local economy, natural and labor resources and national traditions.

CONCLUSION

It is worth mentioning that each post-Soviet state possesses its own political philosophy and development strategy. After the collapse of the USSR, Moldova and Ukraine being located at the west of Eurasia streamed to the USA while the European Union is simultaneously distancing from Russia. Belorussia is determined to preserve its independence and sometimes giving no support to Russia in a number of international issues. The new independent states of post-Soviet Central Asia follow the policy of the eastern conformism. They perceive the USA as the desired investor or one of the world *power centers* but at the same time, they are not averse to cooperating with Russia, China and the European Union. The conflicts burst out within the absence of stable, clearly defined and recognized borderlines, particularly between a number of administrative and territorial entities joined to the new states. Some analysts believe that other approaches

to the current structure of the Caucasian region cannot be excluded (Zverev, 1996; Nogmova, 2018).

Outputs

The transformation of interaction among different entities leads to the need to recognize a de facto possibility of interstate boundary review under the condition of guiding this complicated process through the peaceful path of diplomatic negotiations. All the above-mentioned challenges could be anticipated and related as natural ones within the context of Eurasian restructuring processes emerged after the collapse of the USSR considered to be the only powerful organizing force in the region.

REFERENCES

1. Belokrenickij, V. Y. (2001). *Musulmanskie strany u granic SNG (Afganistan, Pakistan, Iran i Turciya - sovremennoe sostoyanie, istoriya i perspektivy)*, M.: Institut vostokovedeniya RAN, izdatelstvo «Kraf++», 336 s. (In Russian).
2. Erasov, B. S. (2001). *Sociokulturnye i geopoliticheskie principy Evrazijstva*. POLIS, 5, 65-74. (In Russian).
3. Zadohin, A. G. (1998). *Politicheskie processy na periferii Evrazii*. M.: Infra-M, 143 s. (In Russian).
4. Bzhezinskij, Z. B. (1998). *Velikaya shahmatnaya doska. Gospodstvo Ameriki i ego geostrategicheskie imperativy*. M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 69 s. (In Russian).
5. Moshnyaga, V., Ilashchuk, D., Srinej, F., & Zavtur, A. (1992). *Konflikt v Moldove: opyt etnopoliticheskogo analiza*. Kishinev, M.: Infra-M, 18 s. (In Russian).
6. Zverev, A. (1996). *Etnicheskie granicy na Kavkaze. Spornye granicy na Kavkaze*, M. Politika, 196 s. (In Russian).
7. Torbakov, I. (1996). *Istoricheskaya nauka kak instrument formirovaniya novyh gosudarstv*. *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 19(02), 4-5. (In Russian).
8. *Strategiya nacionalnoj bezopasnosti Rossijskoj Federacii /Elektronnyj resurs: Ukaz Prezidenta RF ot 31 dekabrya 2015 g. № 683. Spravochnaya pravovaya sistema «Konsultant Plyus». Razd. «Dokumenty». Inform. Bank «Versiya Prof»* (In Russian).
9. Usmanov, R. H., & Nogmova, A. Sh. (2018). *Osnovnye napravleniya i tendencii sovremennoj politiki Rossii v Kaspijskom regione: teorii i podhody*. *Diplomaticeskaya sluzhba*, 1, 11-18. (In Russian).
10. Nogmova, A. Sh. (2018). *Formy i strategii mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva prigranichnyh regionov Rossijskoj Federacii*. *Vestnik Diplomaticeskoy akademii MID Rossii*. *Rossiya i mir*, 2(16), 16-21. (In Russian).