

Territorial and Border Issues in Central Asia: Analysis of the Reasons, Current State and Perspectives

Raikhana Tashtemkhanova, Zhanar Medeubayeva, Aizhan Serikbayeva and Madina Igimbayeva

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, 010000
E-mail: anthropology.kz@gmail.com

KEYWORDS Central Asia. Border Conflicts. Delimitation. Demarcation. Ethnic. Experts. Instrumentalism. Primordialism. Territory

ABSTRACT The purpose of this research is to examine the expert opinions on the territorial and border issues in the CAR. The border issues are of key importance in Central Asia Relationships (CAR). The border between the region states, carried out in the Soviet period, excluding local religious, cultural, ethnic and economic specificity, are increasingly turning to the conflict zones. In the context of the existing situation it requires careful attention, both from officials and the scientific community of the region. Priority basis of the paper were Central and Western experts survey, conducted by the authors and introduced into scientific use. In the course of research, the common ground and knots of contradictions were identified in the expert's approaches on the issue. This fact indicates the complexity of solving the underlined issues in the short term.

INTRODUCTION

Actually, the issue of borders is of key importance both in inter-regional aspects and in the relationships between Central Asian states with certain countries. It must be admitted that the modern borders of the Central Asian States were determined by the Central authorities of the former USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) without considering many historical, cultural and other features. Also, there were no clear residence boundaries of different ethnic groups. As a result, the Central Asian states' borders largely do not coincide with the territory inhabited by the region's people today. The situation is complicated by the fact that unlike external borders of the region, the demarcation of the borders between the Central Asian States is still not complete. Therefore, territorial uncertainty, reinforced by a critical shortage of water and land resources, contributes to the escalation of ethnic tensions, especially in the border regions of the Central Asian States. It is no secret that ethnic contradictions can lead to tensions in regional interstate relations in the future. Kyrgyz-Uzbek, Kyrgyz-Tajik, Uzbek-Tajik and partly Uzbek-Kazakh contradictions are vivid examples. Recently on May 12, 2015 at the Kyrgyz-Uzbek border area was an incident in which a Kyrgyz citizen was killed. The incident took place on mismatched/ undefined part of the border. From this, it is clear that in order to conduct and strengthen security, it is necessary to

accelerate the process of fixing the external borders of the Kyrgyzstan. The experts unanimously repeated that it is necessary to prevent territorial disputes, to which they promptly agree on the border line, otherwise there will be a constant threat to the security not only of the population but also the state as a whole (Kozhobayeva 2015). Therefore, solutions of the territorial-border issues in Central Asia, which are legacies of the former USSR and rooted back in centuries, are gaining huge importance today.

President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nazarbayev in the strategy document, "Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: new political course of the established state" (2012) pointed out the necessity of strengthening regional and national security. According to Kazakhstani President's opinion, the problem is to remove the preconditions of conflicts in the region.

Due to the above mentioned issues, Kazakhstan's authorities, based on the principles of legal succession in respect of the former Soviet Union, confirm its state border passing established by the current international treaties, including acts of administrative territorial delimitation of the Republic of Kazakhstan and other former Soviet Union states.

Thus, the complex of unresolved national and territorial issues in the Central Asian region and the absence of certain aspects in studying of the historical experience of territorial issues solving determines the relevance of the proposed paper.

Despite the topicality of the problem, scientific community of the region near and far abroad

have not devoted special and fundamental works to it. Scientific literature on the problem is basically presented by separate papers and analytical inquiries. In the course of research, we also found that it is very difficult to find texts of interstate documents on settlement of territorial and boundary issues.

The objective of the study is the analysis of reasons, actual status and opportunities of regulation of the territorial and near-border conflicts in Central Asia.

According to the objective to be achieved it is necessary to settle several tasks:

- Studying of the historical background on the basis of earlier sources of research;
- Analysis of a status of issue basing on expert estimates of Central Asian and American researchers.

During the research, the authors were faced with the absence of complex and fundamental works on the problem.

METHODOLOGY

Two directions in approach to analysis of this problem in the available literature are obvious: primordialism and instrumentalism (Roberts 2010). The primordialist approach is based on the principle of historicism: all the conflict knots due to the territorial division in the region are caused by sociopolitical and economic processes, especially during the Soviet period. Such approach is traced in the works of Schoeberlein-Engel (1994), McGlinchey (2011), and Kulchik (2004). Instrumentalism is inclined to negation of the fatal role of history in the modern territorial issues. Emergence of disputes and conflicts on the problems of territory and borders are connected with ambitions of certain groups, for which the obvious or hidden existing disagreements and claims are the issues of political conjuncture and, first of all, instruments for the achievement of their purposes. One of the interviewed experts, the American scientist Sadri, shares similar thoughts. Also a number of experts consider a combination of these two approaches to be expedient, for example, the expert Rakhimov. Key aspects of this approach are indicated by Swanson (1995), who believes that one of the major problems with regional conflict prevention is that it is dependent on relatively strong states that can act with coordination and strength. Similar items viewed also in the Allison's (2004) works.

When analyzing these two approaches from the standpoint of possibility of settlement of territorial oppositions and conflicts, the primordialism approach, that demands correction of "defects" of the history, shows initial limitedness. Instrumentalism has an advantage in respect of solving territorial issues, as it operates with the categories directly connected with the current situation of interstate, internal political, social and economic fields. It is also possible to distinguish one more approach that contemplates the problem in a context of political geography. Representatives of this approach, while concentrating the main attention on the types and configurations of borders between Central Asian states, see the problem's solution in the choice of the optimal kind of border which would allow removing the acuteness of this issue. Researchers Kolosov and Mironenko (2011) distinguish alienating, semi-permeable, connecting borders, integration borders. The connecting type of border, which has a general meaning for two or more states, and semi-permeable type of border is offered in Central Asia. Some researchers give great attention to geographic factors as a pivotal one (Megoran 2004). However, the political geography, as well as borders, rarely reminds themselves in static condition; even the delimited borders do not guarantee stability and peace (it is known from the experience of the Central Asian countries, where some countries of the region somehow manage to enter in boundary skirmishes even after the delimitation of borders). Also the primordialism, that is, historical vision of the problem, as it has been mentioned above, is limited: there is a lot of examples of territorial claims, unresolved boundary issues in world practice that remain only in historical records (at least until they lead to any considerable skirmishes and conflicts). In fact, there were periods in the Post-Soviet history of the region, when the territorial issue was not on the agenda despite the omnipresence of historic facts. Thereby, in our opinion, instrumentalism is more productive for both scientific analysis and development of practical recommendations. That is, the attention of experts should be concentrated on the factors which make territorial issues actual and bring them up on the surface of social being.

In order to carry out independent, verified analysis of the issue, the authors conducted a poll among experts from Central Asia and the United States.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Historical Roots and Current State of the Issue

As it is known, the geographical landscape and climatic conditionality of resettlement of native ethnic groups of Central Asia in contemporary time was not the initial element at formation of the region's geopolitical borders. Up to the contemporary time, political borders in existing state formations did not coincide with territories of ethnic resettlement. For example, the territory of Kokand khanate included modern Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Bukhara emirate included not only territories of the modern southern Uzbekistan, eastern Turkmenistan and Tajikistan, but also a part of northern Afghanistan. The large rivers of Central Asia - Syr-Darya, Amu Darya, Zeravshan, Ili, Tedzhen and Mugrab were not real internal geopolitical boundaries. During the 19th century, the compression of traditional geopolitical space has led to a new, as though to Semi-European structuration of territory under the pressure of the Russian and British empires from the north to the south (Olimov 1991).

Throughout the course of history, the area was under the influence of numerous regional and clan conflicts which, having social and cultural preconditions on their basis, very often found the form of ethnic opposition. The Soviet power has liberated energy of ethnic struggles to an even greater degree (at least by the fact that it destroyed many traditional stabilizing institutes). So, in Bukhara and Khorezm republics the Uzbek-Turkmen antagonism amplified a bloody war between Kazakhs of Mangyshlak and Turkmans of Krasnovodsk district arose in 1923 - 1924, in which Basmach groups of Dzhulaid khan participated (more than 100 people were killed). Skirmishes concerning water use between Uzbeks of the Samarkand area and Bukhara republic, Kazakhs and Uzbeks of Turkestan district (May 1924) were frequent (Gordienko 1959).

The presence of a set of ethnic-territorial and boundary problems inherent in the Central Asia, their real political influence up to the middle of 1990, as the overwhelming majority of researchers note, had mainly background and secondary nature in comparison with economic and other geopolitical issues. Preservation of the status quo, aspiration to avoid interstate conflicts con-

cerning borders was paramount in political rhetoric. The situation changed with Batken events in 1990. The armed intrusion of armed gangs clearly designated the danger of transparent borders to national safety of Central Asian states. After the events of 1999, the "sleeping" boundary issues got great value for mutual relations of the countries' region. Batken conflicts of 1999 and 2000 became activation catalyzers of the boundary issue.

The main participants of frontier incidents more often are Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, whose citizens most of all suffer as a result of constant boundary dismantlings. And it is not by chance. In the conditions of Soviet period, the Fergana valley was divided between three states, and freakish lines of borders designated territories which, because of landscape features or structures by means of communication, have actually appeared in enclaved or semi-enclaved position. In this connection, ethnic groups appeared to be divided by territorial borders. Thus, eight enclaves with the total population of 100,000 people are situated in the Central Asia. Frontier conflicts in this region occur often enough, especially inside and in vicinities of the largest enclaves of Sarvak and Voruh (Tajikistan), and also Soh and Shahmardan (Uzbekistan). Access to water, pastures and strict boundary control are the main principles of periodic collisions which can negatively affect the lives of 80000 people.

The researchers will use the Table 1, in which the population and ethnic structure of enclaves in the Central Asia are reflected, as a bright example.

As seen unsolved boundary settlement not only raises the issues of delimitation and demarcation of borders, definition and introduction of their mode, but also demands solution of some large ethnic problems, the complexity of which consists in the fact that large diasporas of other nations in a kind of enclave impregnations live by different sides of the border of Kyrgyzstan - Tajikistan, Uzbekistan - Kyrgyzstan (and on the contrary) in each of the states. The "Relative density" of Uzbek diasporas in Tajikistan's ethno social structure makes 24.4 percent, that of Kyrgyzstan - 13.8 percent. And the Uzbekistan's population is by 0.97 percent - Tajiks, by 0.9 percent - Kyrgyzs. At that, the overwhelming majority of 73.5 percent of Uzbekistan's Kyrgyzs live

Table 1: Enclaves in Central Asia: the population and ethnic composition according Humanitarian Bulletin for the South Caucasus and Central Asia (2013)

<i>Enclave</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Ethnic composition</i>
Barak	Kyrgyzstan	Uzbekistan	600	100% Kyrgyz
Chonkara	Uzbekistan	Kyrgyzstan	0	Land used for pastures
Dzhangail	Uzbekistan	Kyrgyzstan	0	Land used for pastures
Sarvak	Tajikistan	Uzbekistan	400-2,500	99% Uzbek, 1% Tajik
Shakhimardan	Uzbekistan	Kyrgyzstan	5,000	91% Uzbek, 9% Kyrgyz
Sokh	Uzbekistan	Kyrgyzstan	25,000-70,000	99% Tajik, 1% Kyrgyz
Vorukh	Tajikistan	Kyrgyzstan	10,000-30,000	95% Tajik, 5% Kyrgyz
Kayragach	Tajikistan	Kyrgyzstan	150	100% Tajik

in three areas of Fergana valley: Andizhan, Fergana and Namagan. In the total number of Uzbekistan's population (25 million people), the number of Kyrgyzs is insignificant enough, in relation to the number of inhabitants of Kyrgyzstan (5.4 million people) 13.8 Uzbeks are a large diaspora. The presence of such parity of ethnoses at delimitation of borders leads to strengthening of conflict situations (Musaev 2004).

In spite of the fact that the population of Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan has changed since 2000 to 2014 towards an increase, the parity of ethnoses remains the key problem. Thereupon, it is necessary to give particular attention to relations between the Central Asian countries within the limits of existing ethnic-territorial and boundary problems.

Of five Central Asian republics, only Turkmenistan has completely delimited overland borders, having signed corresponding contracts with Uzbekistan (September 2000) and Kazakhstan (July 2001). Kazakhstan solved the basic problems of delimitation of borders, having settled the most part of issues with Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Russia. At the same time, problems of delimitation of borders between Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan remain. Therefore, we will consider mutual relations of these states connected with the territorial issue.

Intense relations between the three Central Asian republics do not exclude occurrence of new ethnic-territorial conflicts, the social soil for which is created by the proceeding increase in population and difficult economic and social situation. Besides, conflicts here are provoked by the process of formation of "new national states" with their state ideology, a part of indispensable arsenal which became promotion of territorial claims to neighbors (Shustov 2008).

Expert survey, conducted as a part of the study perspective, allowed to identify the foreground directions in the formulation and solu-

tion of territorial and border disputes in Central Asia.

Thus, the expert Nazarov believes that every side of the region experiences fundamental differences in the understanding of the border crossing. Administrative borders "existing on paper" that were inherited from the Soviet Union automatically became a way of taking responsibility for it.

According to the expert, the total share of the existing disputed areas is insignificant to make a tragedy out of this. He believes that the problem is not in the areas, but in the members of the Commission on the delimitation of borders and their direct management. The expert points out that some of the committee members occasionally demonstrate outright incompetence, others - passivity or lack of a "mandate for decision making" from top officials. As a result, for 23 years of independence of the countries of the CIS, the inhabitants of several villages and houses still cannot legally identify their affiliation to any country.

In any case, what is the main obstacle to the formulation of the final point in the delimitation and demarcation of the borders? In response to this question, Nazarov explained it by the lack of a political decision at the highest level by means of peace negotiations among the heads of the concerned states. He opposes those who believe that obstacle is announced lack of appropriate maps of the 19th – 20th centuries, references to the various territorial and administrative decisions in the USSR and other fiction. As an illustrative example, the expert presented the memories of one of the vice-premiers of Kyrgyz Republic Mambetov: "In 2001, the Government delegation from Uzbekistan visited Kyrgyzstan on the issue of signing of the Memorandum to accelerate work on the delimitation of boundaries. Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan Bakiyev signed the

document, and the Uzbek delegation flew home that very evening. The next morning, perhaps after a sleepless night of thinking and doubts, Prime Minister of the Kyrgyz Republic through the diplomatic channels withdrew his signature. The presence of such situations, according to the expert's opinion, does not lead to problem solving.

In addition, the question of the existence of enclaves is indeed a serious problem. Enclaves are sufficiently large settlements both in terms of territory and population. And more importantly, they are often of great importance when considering strategic objects (roads, irrigation systems, the laying of pipelines). Consequently, the enclaves are hostages of the situation, if necessary, to put pressure on neighboring states.

Satpayev, a Kazakh political analyst, expressed his concern over the fact that residents of border areas are involved in the majority of encounters with border guards in the enclaves. The aphorism of Lec "Love for the country knows no foreign boundaries" is extremely appropriate to the Central Asian region, where almost every year border conflicts take place, often with casualties. Unfortunately, oftentimes the main actors in cross-border incidents are Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Border incidents did not have mercy on Kazakhstani side either; there is evidence of unreasonable use of firearms by Uzbek border guards. A rare event took place in the Turkmen-Uzbek border, where in 2010 a citizen of Uzbekistan was shot. In response to the question "Why exactly these three states?" Satpayev says that there is nothing surprising. These three states in the Ferghana Valley are trapped in their enclaves, which are located on the territory of neighboring states.

The expert Sadri points out the difficult situation in the Ferghana Valley. He believes that territorial disputes in Central Asia are divided into two main types of obstacles: domestic and international factors. Internal obstacles are most often the result of ethnic conflicts. International obstacles are mostly the result of historical claims of one republic against another. Territorial disputes in the Ferghana Valley are excellent examples of both types of obstacles.

According to Satpayev, conflicts break out either because of access to the water, or because of the pasturelands, or in the protest against overly rigid border crossing. In fact, in a constantly tense atmosphere, mixed with the domes-

tic nationalism and etched disputed territories, the reason for an incident can be any. In addition, the presence of disputed areas often leads to the fact that the soldiers of the two states are often confronted head-on. This naturally leads to the use of weapons, after which traditionally both sides accuse each other in aggressive intentions.

Nazarov does not consider enclaves as the relic of the past. He refers to the global practice of peaceful coexistence. However, a banal exchange of territories in the mid-2000s between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan has been unsuccessful, and from that moment the contractual process is almost stopped.

Expert opinion of Nazarov can be accompanied by an example that there is a number of sovereign states, having certain territorial issues and not going into the conflict. The most prominent example is Gibraltar, since 1813 being in the possession of the United Kingdom. The previous owner, Spain, wishes to restore its sovereignty. However, this issue is not a reason for conflict.

Historical memory continues to haunt the nations of Central Asia. A number of local experts, with the exception of Kazakhstan, focus on the so-called disproportionate distribution of territory and population in Central Asian countries, which requires adapting to the "common denominator". They refer to the following. Thus, according to some statistics, as of 1990, Kazakhstan had a territory of 2,171,000 sq. km and a population of 16.7 million people, Uzbekistan, respectively, 447,400 sq. km and 20.7 million people, Tajikistan – 143,100 sq. km and 5,358,000 people, Turkmenistan – 488,100 sq. km and 3.7 million people, Kyrgyzstan – 198,500 sq. km and 4.4 million people. Thus, the density of population in these republics are as follows: in Kazakhstan - 6.2 people per 1 sq. km, Uzbekistan - 46.3, Tajikistan - 37.4, Turkmenistan - 7.6, Kyrgyzstan - 22.3. Comparing these data, the experts came to the conclusion that some nations with lesser population have larger territories of state entities than others – vice versa.

Obviously, the talks revolve around Kazakhstan: a total area of 2,171,000 sq. km is inhabited by only 16.7 million people. Back in 1992, Kazakhstan's President Nazarbayev in the "Strategy of Establishment and Development of Kazakhstan as a Sovereign State"; referring to the history, explained that the existing borders of Kazakhstan has historically been the territory of re-

settlement of ethnic tribes who later formed the Kazakh nation and controlled the entire territory of modern Kazakhstan. Further, he noted that an independent state in its present form was not someone's gift to the Kazakhs, but the historic homeland, the indigenous Kazakh land, and the authorities would employ all constitutional means to ensure the integrity of the unitary state, accord and inviolability of its territory. This was an important statement for such an unstable period.

The authors of the given paper share the position of the American expert Sadri, regarding the question that territorial issues between the former Soviet republics have become more complex during the post-Soviet era. According to Sadri, each republic is an independent state, recognized by the international community. In the light of emerging challenges related to the events in Ukraine and Georgia, the struggle of Central Asian republics for their independence and territorial integrity is of current interest.

The expert Rakhimov also points to the negative effect of destabilizing processes that occur, for instance, in Afghanistan, Ukraine and the Middle East.

With regards to the role of external factors in addressing the existing problems, the opinions of Central Asian and American experts diverge. Thus, expert Nazarov believes that the impact of external or third countries have not only a positive effect in solving the problems, but to a certain extent may also be a detonator of these problems. Most global players are not interested in justice, and even less they are interested in a speedy settlement of territorial issues, as this topic along with the watershed issues in Central Asia is and will dominate in the coming years and decades. On the basis of the set of public and private premises, most of external powers are not interested in stabilizing the situation in Central Asia and are supporters of permanent internal conflicts, as disintegrating elements of the whole region, and accordingly, the economic backwardness of the Central Asian states. According to Nazarov, in this regard, poor countries are always easier to agree and easier to succumb. In his opinion, the decision of interstate regional issues should be the responsibility solely of the region, in the form of bilateral agreements (territorial, water, energy issues) or in the format "4 + 1" (the integration issues of Central Asia + the Republic of Kazakhstan).

Expert Rakhimov considers the role of external factors in the resolution of territorial and border issues as diverse, but at the same time frequently not constructive.

Expert Sadri shares completely different point of view. According to his views, an external factor, holding neutral position, can play a decisive and effective role in accelerating the process of negotiations, and can contribute to the resolution of the conflict by peaceful means. It eliminates the effectiveness of great powers in this sense. States with good reputation, holding neutrality, should act in this role.

However, the expert opinion of both Central Asian and American experts have commonalities. What they are unanimous in is the question of how to address border conflicts related to territorial factors. All of them believe that the best way to solve problems is a process of negotiations on the peaceful settlement of disputes.

One of the reasons why peaceful settlement of territorial and border issues is not possible is the presence of black market smuggling and corruption of the security forces and officials. This eventually leads to the fact that bringing order of the state borders does not find much support from them. This is to say, for some leaky border is a constant risk factor, but for others it is an important source of illegal income.

In this regard, the opinion of some Kyrgyz experts is of particular interest that, for example, the process of delimitation of the disputed areas of the Kyrgyz-Tajik border is delayed by Tajik officials who are associated with smugglers and drug traffickers. Events of the past three years have confirmed the association of certain high-ranking Tajik civil servants with drug trafficking. In 2012, in Tajikistan quite influential persons were convicted to long prison sentences. We are talking about Mirzoyev, a representative of the section of the *Interior Ministry's Drug Control Department*. His group included the head of Dushanbe police department for combating illegal drug trafficking Sherov and the brother of the deputy head of the State Committee for National Security Umarov. But it is unlikely that the sentence is final victory, since, according to Nazarov, director of the Agency for Drug Control under the President of Tajikistan, almost all drug circles include representatives of law enforcement agencies.

As for the Kyrgyz Republic, in 2008 the division for drug control of Ministry of Internal Af-

fairs was liquidated, and in 2009 the anti-drug trafficking Agency has also disappeared. According to the analyst from the neighboring republic Zelichenko, there are two major players in the drug trade in Kyrgyzstan: criminal organizations and law enforcement agencies. Wherein, the latter oppresses the former. As a result, the volume of shadow economy in the country, according to various estimates, constitutes from 50 to 70 percent of GDP.

Expert Alimov also claims that after the collapse of the Soviet Union in some Central Asian countries organized crime was actively involved in the development of post-Soviet institutions. Analyst Satpayev believes that in this case, these countries are Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. As for Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, where from the beginning a tight presidential vertical was forged, the presence of any alternative informal power centers, including organized crime networks, can be eliminated.

Lately, all the debates about the region and its prospects, unfortunately, have pessimistic shades. According to Satpayev, the movement of Central Asian countries towards each other was going to initially promising path - "one step forward and two steps back."

None of the modern regional projects have been launched, whether the creation of a single economic space, or environmental concerns. If countries in the region cannot attain border agreements for nearly a quarter-century, one should expect from them in other areas, cooperation, which requires political will, mutual trust and a spirit of partnership.

Thus, for the Central Asian countries the solution of two interrelated key issues that affect the security of the entire region is extremely vital. This increase confidence on the borders, as well as cooperation in the water and energy sectors. In fact, it is a foundation of the new regional policy.

Along with traditional understanding of anthropology the authors tried to rely on the main principles and thesis of "political anthropology" from the point of view of modern perception by the world scientific community. In line with traditional studying of political anthropology as the sphere of research, only personal and group parameters of public processes, authors are unanimous with opinion of the leading majority of world scientists (Vincent 1990; Pugachev 1999; Tishkov 2001) that the horizons of political an-

thropology constantly extend in the process of evolution and complication of the public process itself as well as according to development of the discipline and its methods' improvement.

Political anthropology has had interesting insights to offer us on such issues as national identity, ethnic conflict, the meaning of monarchy, and why people sometimes take the law into their own hands (Coleman et al. 2015).

On the basis of such approach during the research of the territorial conflicts in Central Asia, the authors concentrated their attention on political factors as one of the key aspects of disagreement solution.

CONCLUSION

For Central Asian and American experts, proper delimitation and demarcation is the unique and constructive decision for elimination of infinite frontier conflicts. At the same time, separate Russian experts specify that the boundary issue is not reduced only to procedures of delimitation and demarcation. In their opinion, the reasons of conflict potential in Central Asia are not only in the Soviet background, but in the events and factors surrounding boundary problems of the region in the last 10-12 years.

Foreign policy factors can be the catalyzer of tension. Boundary issues (especially those of such enclaves as Tajik Voruh and Uzbek Soh in the territory of Kyrgyzstan) are often related to the issues of water delivery, energy and gas supply, migration of labor force (including seasonal migration). With gaining state independence, the boundary issue also becomes aggravated by the problem of protection of own market.

Deficiency of fertile irrigated land, the problem of redistribution of power-water resources, demographic problems, including overpopulation of some oases (For example, the average density in Fergana valley reaches 500-600 people on 1 sq. km in some places, that is comparable to the density in the south of China and Bangladesh) are conflictogenity factors.

The general opinion of experts consists in the manner of solving disputable territorial issues in a diplomatic way and political decision-making at the highest level between the heads of the interested Central Asian states.

The shadow market of illegal traffic and corruption of national security agents and officials play a negative role in settlement of territorial

and border conflicts in the Fergana valley. If for once the leaky border is a constant factor of risk, for others, it is an important source of illegal incomes.

The type of semi-permeable border, when the local population would have the right of its simplified crossing, could be much more suitable in Fergana valley, taking into account its geography, ethnic resettlement, the specificity of management, land tenure and water use.

Central Asian experts believe that the role of external actors is non-constructive in the vast majority. The opposite position has foreign experts: external actor, which occupies a neutral position and can play a decisive and effective role.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The solution of territorial disputes to be made in a diplomatic way and to take political decisions at the highest level between leaders of the interested states of the Central Asian region. The most recommendable type of boundary for Fergana valley is the semi-permeable boundary: local population might have right on more simplified border crossing due to the peculiarities of this area (special strife area): geography, ethnic distribution, characteristics of house-holding, land use and water use.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The team of authors expresses special gratitude to the editorial office of the magazine for providing possibility to publish the results of their investigation. The authors express sincere gratitude for expert opinion of leading experts of Central Asia and USA (N. Nazarov, M Rakhimov, D. Satpayev and American expert H. Sadri).

REFERENCES

- Academy of Public Administration under the President of Kazakhstan. Nazarbayev N 2012. Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: New Political Course of the Established State. From <<http://pa-academy.kz/index.php/en/strategy-kazakhstan-2050-new-political-course-of-the-established-state>> (Retrieved on 19 March 2015).
- Allison R 2004. Regionalism, regional structures and security management in Central Asia. *Asia International Affairs*, 80(3): 463-483.
- Bhasin Veena 1981. *Ecological Influence on the Socio-cultural System of the Gaddis of Bharmour Sub-Tehsil, Chamba District, Himachal Pradesh*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Delhi: University of Delhi.
- Border Incidents in Central Asian Enclaves 2013. Humanitarian Bulletin South Caucasus and Central Asia, 2. From <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/HB_ROCCA_20130709%20EN.pdf> (Retrieved on 19 March 2015).
- Coleman S, Abrahams R 2015. Political Anthropology. From <<http://www.discoveranthropology.org.uk/about-anthropology/specialist-areas/political-anthropology.html>> (Retrieved on 19 March 2015).
- Gordienko AA 1959. *Sozdanie Sovetskoy Natsionalnoy Gosudarstvennosti v Sredney Azii*. Moskva: Gosyurizdat.
- Kolosov A, Mironenko N 2011. *Geopolitika i Politicheskaya Geografiya*. Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Kozhobayeva Z 2015. Pered Litsom Kakih Ugroz Stoit Kyrgyzstan? From <<http://rus.ozodi.org/content/paper/27017691.html>> (Retrieved on 19 June 2015).
- Kulchik YuG 1995. *Respublika Uzbekistan v seredine 90-h gg*. Moskva: Institut Jetnologii i Antropologii Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk.
- McGlinchey E 2011. *Chaos, Violence, Dynasty. Politics and Islam in Central Asia*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Megoran N 2004. The critical geopolitics of the Uzbekistan - Kyrgyzstan Ferghana Valley boundary dispute, 1999–2000. *Political Geography*, 23: 731–764.
- Musaev B 2004. Uzbekistan: Regional'naja bezopasnost' i social'no opasnye tendencii razvitiya obshchestva. *Central'naja Azija i Kavkaz*, 3: 159.
- Olimov MM 1991. V.V. Bartol'd o nacional'nom razmezhevanii v Srednej Azii. *Vostok*, 5: 97–110.
- Pugachev VP 1999. *Politologiya*. M.: Ast/Slovo.
- Roberts RS 2010. What's Ethnicity Got to Do With It? Healing the Wounds of Uzbek-Kyrgyz Violence in the Ferghana Valley. *PONARS Policy Memo*, 106.
- Schoeberlein-Engel J 1994. *Identity in Central Asia: Construction and Contention in the Conceptions of "Ozbek", "Tajik", "Muslim", "Samarqandi" and Other Groups*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Shustov A 2008. Etnoterritorialnyie Konflikty v Srednei Azii. From <<http://www.dialog.kz/papers/zagranica/2008-03-18/ashustov-etnoterritorialnye-konflikty-v-sredney-azii>> (Retrieved on 19 March 2015).
- Swanstrom N 2004. The prospects for multilateral conflict prevention and regional cooperation in Central Asia. *Central Asian Survey*, 23(1): 41-53.
- Tishkov VA 2001. Novaya Politicheskaya Antropologiya. From <http://www.jourssa.ru/sites/all/files/volumes/2001_4/Tishkov_2001_4.pdf> (Retrieved on 19 March 2015).
- Vincent J 1990. *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions and Trends*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.