

AMERICAN POLICY DIRECTIONS IN THE CENTRAL ASIAN REGION

Yernur Tulakbayev

PhD student, department of international relations, Wuhan University.

ABSTRACT: *The subject of the research is the areas of the USA policy in Central Asia. The object of the research is the policy of the USA. The author of the article underlines particular areas of the region's life the USA policy is directed at. These are the human rights and support of civil liberties organizations, the process of democratization in the region and assertion of democratic values, trades and investments. The states of the region have rich natural resources such as uranium, gas, oil, aluminum, cotton, and gold. At the same time, they have very different state structures, - democratic, authoritarian and neutral. The researcher provides trading volumes of the USA with Central Asia member states for 2013 as well as data about the financial support that has been given by America during the period from 1992 till 2015. The economic structure of the member states is oriented at the markets of the foreign states that are parts of the WTO and Eurasian Economic Union. The author of the article focuses on the contents of such USA programs as the 'ensuring safety and control over military equipment', 'drug control', and 'anti-terrorist campaign'. The main areas of America's policy in Kyrgyzstan were more of political, military, humanitarian and anti-terroristic nature while the economic factor was not so evident. Thus, during the post-Soviet period of their development, the region's countries selected different political, economic and humanitarian policy (democratic, authoritarian or neutral). That had a different effect on their relations with the USA.*

KEYWORDS: Policy, Central Asia, political pluralism, drug trafficking, counter-terrorism, ungoverned territories, energy influence, freedom of the press, USA, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan Turkmenistan

INTRODUCTION

In the late XX and early XXI centuries, there have been dramatic changes in the geopolitical strategy of the United States associated with the elimination of the bipolar system of international relations, caused by the collapse of the USSR and the US desire to become a world hegemon. The results directly affected the post-Soviet countries of Central Asia. The new world geopolitical concept of the United States, conducted in the countries of Central Asia, was based on the doctrine of the "New World Order," announced on September 11, 1991, by US President George W. Bush.

The United States conducted work with the post-Soviet Central Asian republics in areas such as human rights, democratization processes in the region, within the framework of both economic and political issues.

Human rights:

In the report of Country Reports on Human Rights Practices since 2013, all Central Asian states (except Kyrgyzstan) were called authoritarian and it was reported that there are treaties on human rights in many areas. In Kazakhstan, the president and the "Nur Otan" party control the political system. The most important human rights issues are respected in freedom of speech, the press, parliament, in the religious sphere and in communities. The most basic shortcomings are abuses of official positions in the work processes of law enforcement and judicial authorities. In addition to this, contract killings take place, inhuman attitudes towards convicts, unjustified arrests and extension of trials. In the process of registration of parties, illegal demands are made, the actions of non-governmental organizations are limited. There is traffic in prostitution and slavery, and the labor of minors is used. Despite tough measures to bring individuals to justice, corruption has taken root too deeply.

The constitution provides for the transfer of power in Kyrgyzstan to a parliamentary form, to limit the power of the president, and to increase the role of parliament and government. In some of the law enforcement agencies in the southern region of the country, there are facts of ignoring civilian control and infringement of human rights. The most important of them can be considered pressure on ethnic groups. The following issues can be considered concerns of non-governmental organizations, restriction of a free press, journalists, religious restrictions, flourishing corruption, discrimination, flirting with ethnic and religious groups, rape of minors, trafficking in persons and forced labor of minors. Representatives of the central government create a platform for law enforcement agencies to abuse their position, so that they infringe the rights of helpless citizens, indirectly cover the organized criminal group, without interfering with pressure on witnesses, plaintiffs, and judges.

In Tajikistan, the government blocked the path to political pluralism. The biggest human rights problem is the repression of political activists, the prohibition of the activities of certain social web addresses and the restriction of religious freedom. Arrogance and arrests, interference with fair interrogation, corruption, prostitution, and trafficking in persons are following. Security authorities, individual officials in the structures of power are not responsible before the law. The number of prosecuted among the authorities is too small.

In Turkmenistan, the most important issue is arbitrariness and arrest of people, torture, ignoring civil freedoms, there is pressure on freedom of speech, on parliament and on movements. To these problems can be added the inability of citizens to choose their own power, interference in religious life, the lack of fair testimony, arbitrariness and control over private property, the purchase of housing and secret correspondence, human trafficking. Until now, there has not been a single case of bringing the authorities to justice.

In Uzbekistan, authoritarian President I. Karimov dominated the political arena and held the Government under complete control. Cruel torture of security forces in prisons, restrictions on fair interrogation, religious activities, and arrest of members of religious groups can be considered the most serious violations of human rights. There was a ban for convicts to meet with representatives of the outside world, long detention at the SIZO, unauthorized arrests, pressure on freedom of speech, the press, NGOs, civil-social events and movements. Used by teenagers. According to observers, journalists and activists who criticize the authorities, and members of their families, were illegally

prolonged political prison terms. Representatives of the government, as a rule, were not responsible before the law for corruption acts [20].

The process of democratization in the region

One of the main priorities of the U.S. policy in Central Asia is the development of long-term democratic institutions and the call for respect for human rights. The leaders of all the states in the region have given their word to the path of democratization. During Nazarbayev's visit to the United States in 1994, he and Bill Clinton signed a declaration on making lawmaking, respect for human rights and economic reforms.

In 2002, Uzbekistan and the United States signed a Declaration of Strategic Partnership to strengthen the democratic transformation of Uzbekistan and the development of press freedom. In 2002, Tajik President Rahmon gave the floor to expand fundamental freedoms and improve respect for human rights. In Turkmenistan, after the death of Niyazov, one can observe an unwillingness to carry out democratic transformations of the remains of the post-Soviet elite of the country.

Trade and investment

All states in the region have enormous natural resources, and this could give an impetus to the creation of the foundations of trade for the "New Silk Road". If the Kazakh and Turkmen economy relies primarily on the export of energy, their production and transportation need foreign investment. Kazakhstan is the world's largest exporter of uranium. Since Soviet times, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan have focused on cotton production. Uzbekistan entered the front ranks of the production and export of cotton and gold. It needs modernization of the gas industry, needed investment to improve the infrastructure. Kyrgyzstan is mainly rich in gold reserves and strategic mineral resources; such profitable industries as tourism have not yet been developed. Tajikistan is one of the largest aluminum producers in the world. In this region, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan are the owners of water reserves.

In the framework of the US national interests for the development and distribution of goods and services, to achieve energy, mineral sources for opening new markets, Washington supports a free-market economy in Central Asia. Although there are bilateral trade treaties with all five states of the region, today only contracts with Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan remain in force. The United States conducts trade directly with Kyrgyzstan, which was the very first to enter the WTO (1998), actively supported Tajikistan (2013) and Kazakhstan (2015) when they joined the WTO, by providing technical assistance. The trade volume of the United States with the countries of Central Asia is 1% of the total trade with all countries of the world. The United States exports poultry meat, inorganic chemicals, industrial valves, oil and gas production equipment, ore processing machinery, technical engines, generators, automobiles, railway parts, and civil aircraft equipment to the region. Uranium ores, petroleum products, iron, steel, and other metals are exported from Kazakhstan to the USA.

Table 1
US trade turnover with Central Asia in 2013 (in millions of US dollars)

Country	US import	Import categories	US export	Export categories	Overall volume
Kazakhstan	1,390.4	Petroleum products, iron and steel, inorganic chemicals	1,095.7	Civil aircraft, railway equipment, technical equipment, poultry products	2,486.1
Kyrgyzstan	3,5	Paper, textiles, fish, coffee, vodka	106,1	Car, poultry products	109,6
Tajikistan	0,7	Measuring instruments, dried fruits	52,6	Poultry products, equipment, aircraft	53.3
Turkmenistan	31,1	Agricultural products, textile, semi-finished products, crude oil products	260,8	Poultry products, valves, oil and gas equipment, turbines, air and gas compressors, civil aircraft	291,9
Uzbekistan	26,6	Inorganic chemicals, pepper, dried fruits	320,9	Poultry products, oil products, furnaces, pharmaceuticals, pipelines, air and gas compressors, civil aircraft	347,5

Source: [23]

US energy policy in the region

The US policy in Central Asia, aimed at energy goals, supports their sovereignty and the development of ties with the West. Washington's policies include supporting US private investment, promoting the energy security of various NATO and EU transport and road alternatives, supporting friendly Turkey and opposing Iran to hinder its energy influence. Other interests include support for exports to South

Asia of hydropower, HS and gas, thereby ensuring the safety of pipes and resources in the Caspian region [21].

USAID Assistance to the Region: Total US Assistance to Central Asia in the First Policy Phase between 1992–2010, i.e. before September 11, 2011, amounted to 5.7 billion US dollars. This represents 14% of the total amount allocated for Eurasian countries, which indicates a low priority for the region. The B. Obama administration planned to divide \$495.5 for Central Asia in 2009 (through general agencies and programs) but since 2010 this was to \$436.3 million. According to the administration, for 2010-2011. In the field of foreign aid, benefits were foreseen for Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Assistance to Tajikistan was planned to stabilize the regional situation around Afghanistan. They wanted to see assistance for Kyrgyzstan in the costs of security, the fight against drug trafficking, economic reforms, and improved food security [22]. In addition, \$77.6 million was allocated for economic recovery after the April and June events of 2010, for holding elections, for solving food and housing issues, and for training the police. Compared to 2014, in 2015, the administration requested relatively less money to help Central Asia, and the amount was \$113.7 million. In the tables you can see the amounts of assistance provided to the countries of Central Asia by countries and years:

table 2

US support (in millions of US dollars)1992-2001

Countries	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Kazakhstan	20.3	51.47	202.7	138.85	79.32	53.2	75.85	72.6	77.95	80.01
Kyrgyzstan	13.03	108.2	90.36	44.43	63.63	23.85	50.29	61.12	49.73	43.07
Tajikistan	11.61	33.72	45.25	33.71	45.36	14.75	36.57	38..16	38.69	76.48
Turkmenistan	14.71	57.28	22.38	21.82	25.33	6.25	8.94	15.94	10.91	12.57
Uzbekistan	5.62	15	34.07	14.44	23.34	30.88	26.84	46.88	39.06	48.33
Total	65,27	265,67	394,76	253,25	236,98	128,93	198,49	196,54	216,34	260,46

Source: [23]

Table 3

US support (in millions of US dollars) 2010-2015

Countries	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Kazakhstan	2,050.40	17,57	19,29	12,526	9,761	8.347
Kyrgyzstan	1,221.71	41,36	47,4	47,11	45,287	40.05
Tajikistan	988,57	44,8	45,09	37,47	34,479	26,89
Turkmenistan	351,36	11,01	9,2	5,468	5,473	4,85
Uzbekistan	971,36	11,34	16,73	11,378	11,278	9,79
Regional	130,44	23,15	8,22	17,105	25,928	23,8
Total	5,714.03	148,91	145,92	131,057	132,206	113,727
Eurasia	14%	26%	34%	37%	40%	54%

Source: [24]

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) has developed a new additional US program to assist reliable countries, while only Kyrgyzstan among the countries in this region met the requirements, so an additional \$16 million was allocated to it in March 2008. In June 2010, Kyrgyzstan re-applied for this support but was not covered by the program for shortcomings in respecting political and civil rights and preventing corruption.

The Peace Corps Program was suspended in many parts of the Central Asian states. Tajikistan was defined as a "dangerous country" for volunteers. In the region, the only country -Kyrgyzstan welcomes volunteers hospitably. In 2012, there were problems between the Turkmen authorities and the Peace Corps, and the activities that were to take place there were suspended [25].

US Security Support and Arms Control Programs:

On March 5, 2004, the former head of the US Armed Forces, General Lloyd Austin, made the following statement: "The geographical position of Central Asia, bordering the Russian Federation, Iran, and Afghanistan, shows that this factor is of high importance in the long term. Through the improvement of military relations, we will create conditions in the counter-defense, the protection of communication lines and preventing the passage of the separatists through uncontrolled territories. Our further investments should be directed towards a constructive continuation of the existing relationship. Funds should be directed to conduct exercises and provide equipment to the countries of Central Asia in order to organize efficient operations. "

His report mentions that such terrorist organizations as al-Qaida can create economic and military problems by moving from Afghanistan and Pakistan to Central and East Asia, and from there to Russia, China and Iran. The importance of the fight against drug trafficking in Central Asia is also mentioned, when terrorist organizations, having grown rich from profits through the sale of drugs grown in Afghanistan, will begin to look for ways to market them.

Thus, the main findings of the report are as follows:

- The US Headquarters trusts an important partner in Kazakhstan, in maintaining stability in the region, since this republic earlier in 2014 provided assistance in operations in Afghanistan. For 2013-2017 bilateral military treaties are planned.
- The headquarters was confident that the situation around the transit center "Manas" in Kyrgyzstan would go for the better.
- Recent headquarters investments have covered military upgrades such as counter-terrorism in Tajikistan, countering drug trafficking and border security.
- Turkmenistan can be called a stable country in the region. Its neutrality does not allow drawing up bilateral military treaties, but nevertheless, support can be observed to strengthen the borders and the Caspian fleet.
- Relations with Uzbekistan and the US General Staff are developing in the field of training special forces for a period of five years in order to counter-terrorism and fight against drugs [26].

In Central Asia, the United States intends to participate in intelligence, information and military cooperation and enhance the role of the Pentagon. The task was to work out a program for military education, prepare new military personnel and carry out activities to develop military cooperation.

According to the historian M. Muradyan, when it came to problems of regional security, in many regions, the Pentagon relied on the military elites [27].

Anti-drug programs in the region:

For the days of independence of Central Asian countries to the present day, the US Department of State has been contributing to the fight against drug trafficking in the region. In 2013, the State Department, in a report on the Drug Control Strategy, cited the following facts: 1/4 of the opium and heroin produced in the world are cultivated in Afghanistan and delivered through Central Asian transit to customers of Russia and Central Europe. A certain part of these drugs, crossing the Tajik-Afghan border, pass through the Uzbek highways. The State Department believes that local authorities are involved in this [28]. In June 2011, during his stay in Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan, the Deputy International Service for Drug Control and Law Offenses of the State Secretariat (INC), William Brownfield, announced that \$4.2 million had been allocated to fight drugs in Central Asia. In official reports, the State Department of Defense planned to control how the \$100 million allocated to the fight against drugs in the countries of the region is spent [29]. According to unspecified data, Russia was against the implementation of this plan [30].

Antiterrorist struggle

After the terrorist attacks in New York on September 11, 2001, starting from October 7, 2001, in the south-east of Uzbekistan, in the Karshi-Khanabad or by the well-known K2 air Mайдan, the US military began to deploy. On July 5, 2005, the presidents of Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan in the framework of the SCO said: "We must put an end to the issues of long-term operations against terrorism in Afghanistan. It is necessary to determine the date of release of the bases of the anti-terrorist coalition forces in the territories of the SCO members. " None of the Central Asian leaders were demanded to close the coalition bases as a matter of urgency, but after the Andijan events of 2005, when it became clear that refugees hiding in Kyrgyzstan could fly to Romania, Uzbekistan set a condition to withdraw the military base in Karshi-Khanabad within 6 months.

Warning local authorities about the evacuation of US forces from Uzbekistan was filed in an unusual form. The warning through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Uzbekistan was transmitted by courier to the US embassy in Tashkent. This was announced by a representative of the US government on policy issues in Central Asia. Uzbekistan gave the United States a period of 180 days for the withdrawal of aircraft, personnel, and equipment [31]. And the base was relocated on November 21 to neighboring Kyrgyzstan - to Manas Airport.

In 2008, the first step was taken towards improving relations between the United States and Uzbekistan, which allowed the US military personnel to use, at their discretion, the air base near Termez and NATO units under German control [32]. During the NATO Summit in Bucharest in April 2008, the leaders of Tashkent who took part in this summit announced their readiness to discuss the issue of transporting NATO goods and equipment to Afghanistan through Uzbekistan.

In May 2009, the United States and NATO announced the permission of the Uzbek authorities to use Navoi Airport in the east of the country. During the Obama administration, an agreement was reached to hold the traditional bilateral consultations with Uzbekistan (Annual Bilateral Consultation ABC) in December 2009, February 2011, August 2012, December 2013.

Deletion of weapons of mass destruction

The most important security interest of the United States was to clean up the remaining nuclear weapons in Kazakhstan after the collapse of the Soviet state and prevent their proliferation in Central Asia. The United States announced a tender to support the physical control of the export of nuclear technology and materials. Iran, neighboring with Central Asia, caused great concern [33]. After the collapse of the USSR, Kazakhstan was considered the master of the main nuclear weapons in the world, but in reality, these weapons were under the control of Russia. In December 1993, an agreement was signed on the safe destruction of 104 SS-18s nuclear weapons and the destruction of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) silos. In February 1994, cruise missiles were redeployed, and 97 of them were destroyed with the help of the United States. In late 1994, SS-18s were destroyed. On April 21, 1995, the last 1040 missiles were transported to Russia, and Kazakhstan announced full deliverance from nuclear weapons. In addition to nuclear weapons in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, dozens of radioactive waste, storage tanks, active reactor studies, and uranium ores pose a great danger. In 2012, a summit was held in Seoul on the purification of nuclear weapons, which pose global dangers in other regions of the world. At the summit, the United States, Kazakhstan, and Russia made a joint statement. Americans loudly praised Kazakhstan in connection with the cleansing of nuclear weapons and other materials [34].

The main directions of US relations with the countries of Central Asia differed depending on the situation, development paths, and their possibilities. For example, for individual states, economic interest is considered to be the main one. For example, Kazakhstan is considered the main trading partner of the United States in Central Asia, which accounted for 44% of trade in 90 years. Uzbekistan accounted for 32.5%, the rest of the region 23.5%. Of the US economic investments attracted to Central Asia, 86% goes to Kazakhstan, 12% to Uzbekistan and 2% to other countries in the region. Due to the fact that Tajikistan is more loyal to Russia, this country has remained on the periphery of US political activity in Central Asia. This was influenced by the fact that in the 90s, for reasons of Islamization, a civil war broke out in the country.

CONCLUSION

The main policies of the United States in Kyrgyzstan were of a political, military-political, humanitarian, and anti-terrorism nature, and the economic factor was not so tangible. Thus, since the acquisition of independence, each of the five states of Central Asia has begun to integrate into international relations along different vectors and at different speeds. At the same time, the policy of the United States to the countries of Central Asia was formed in two directions and was conducted in several forms, where different approaches took place. Different policies applied to each country individually. It is obvious that the countries of the region in the post-Soviet period of development in the political-economic and humanitarian areas have chosen different paths (democratic, authoritarian, neutral). This has had a different impact on relations with the United States. It should be noted that relations between the states of Central Asia were not similar, this moment had an impact in determining the US policy towards them. The foreign policy of the countries of Central Asia, positions and orientations in international relations differed significantly from each other.

The structure of the economy and the level of development of Central Asian states were different and were focused on the markets of different countries (EurAsEC, EAEU, WTO).

References

1. Adams B. The New Empire. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902. 255 pp.
2. Teilor P. Dzh. Vtoraya mirovaya voina: Dva vzglyada. M.: Mysl', 1995.
3. Taylor P. J. Political Geography: World-Economy, Nation-State and Locality. London: Harlow, 2000.
4. Arbatov G. Sovremennaya vneshnyaya politika SShA. Otv.red. Trofimenko G. M.: Nauka, 1984. S.33-36.
5. Braterskii M.V. SShA i problemnye strany Azii: obosnovanie, vyrabotka i realizatsiya politiki v 1990-2005 gg. M.: 2005. S.178-191.
6. Utkin A.I. Mirovoi poryadok v KhKhI veke. – M: Eksmo, 2002.
7. Utkin A. Doktrina Busha: kontseptsiya, razdelivshaya Ameriku // Rossiya v global'noi politike. – 2005.-№4.
8. Pleshakov K.V. Komponenty geopoliticheskogo myshleniya // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'. 1994. №10.
9. Kopylov A. O ponyatii «natsional'naya bezopasnost'» v amerikanskoj politologii // Bezopasnost'. 1996. №3-4.
10. Kopylov A. Politika natsional'noi bezopasnosti SShA v 90-e gody: sodержanie i protsess realizatsii. Monografiya. M.: VAGSh, 1999.
11. Kopylov A. Sovremennaya voennaya strategiya SShA: sodержanie i tendentsii razvitiya. M.: VAGSh, 2006.
12. Kopylov A. Sovremennaya strategiya natsional'noi bezopasnosti SShA: kontseptsii i politicheskaya praktika. M.: VAGSh, 2009.
13. Akaev A. Pamyatnoe desyatiletie. Bishkek: Uchkun, 2001. 518 c.
14. Akaev A. Kyrgyzskaya gosudarstvennost' i epos «Manas». Bishkek: Uchkun, 2003. 287 c.
15. Akaev A. Dumaya o budushchem s optimizmom. Razmyshleniya o vneshnei politike i miroustroistve. M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 2004. C. 935-948.
16. Dzhekshenkulov A. D. Novye nezavisimye gosudarstva Tsentral'noi Azii v mirovom soobshchestve. M.: Nauchnaya kniga, 2000. 306 c.
17. Dzhekshenkulov A. O bez'yadernoi zone v Tsentral'noi Azii // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'. 1999. № 6. S. 92-96.
18. Omarov N.M. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya v epokhu global'nogo razvitiya. Bishkek: Nauka i obrazovanie, 2003. 280 s.
19. Omarov N.M. Tsentral'naya Aziya v Zerkale «Chuzhoi Bol'shoi Igry»: put' k samoidentifikatsii ili kapitulyatsii? //Interesy Rossii, Kitaya, SShA i ES v Tsentral'noi Azii. Bishkek: 2004. S. 150-156.
20. U.S. Department of State. // Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013. 2014.
21. Nichol J. Central Asia: Regional Developments and Implications for U.S. Interests, //Congressional Research Service 7-5700, RL33458, CRS Report. 2014. 55p.

22. State Department. // Office of the Coordinator for Europe and Eurasia and Related Programs for FY2015. 2014.
23. U.S. Department of State.//Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations for FY2010. May 2009. p.44.
24. Cleek A. Peace Corps Pulling Out of Turkmenistan / Eurasianet. 2012. [Elektronnyi resurs] URL: <https://eurasianet.org/s/peace-corps-pulling-out-of-turkmenistan> (data obrashcheniya: 21.07.2017)
25. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. Central Command, and U.S. Africa Command, Statement of General Lloyd J. Austin III, Commander U.S. Central Command, on the Posture of U.S. Central Command, March 5, 2014.
26. Muradyan M. Protivorechiya politiki atlantizma i problemy regional'noi Bezopasnosti. Erevan: Anteres, 2002.149 s.
27. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs // International Narcotics Control Strategy Report. 2013.
28. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs // Fact Sheet: The Central Asia Counternarcotics Initiative (CACI). 2012.
29. U.S. Evicted from Air Base in Uzbekistan. By Robin Wright and Ann Scott Tyson // Washington Post. Saturday, July 30, 2005.
30. U.S. Military Returns to Ex-Soviet Uzbekistan. Agence France Presse. March 6, 2008.
31. United Press International. Only Germany Can Use Uzbek Bases Now. December 13, 2005.
32. A Treaty on the Central Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone entered into force in January 2009. All five Central Asian states are signatories. The Treaty prohibits the development, manufacture, stockpiling, acquisition, or possession of nuclear explosive devices within the zone.
33. Beth M., Nikitin D. CRS Report RL31559 // Proliferation Control Regimes: Background and States. 2009.
34. The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, Remarks by President Obama and President Nursultan Nazarbayev of the Republic of Kazakhstan Before Bilateral Meeting, March 26, 2012; Joint Statement of the Presidents of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America Regarding the Trilateral Cooperation at the Former Semipalatinsk Test Site, March 26, 2012.