THE SCO AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO WESTERN MILITARY BLOCS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH NATO

*Iskakov A.N.[1]
*[1] Kazakh Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article examines the potential of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) to function as an alternative to Western military-political blocs and provides a comparative analysis with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The study is conducted within the broader context of the transformation of the global order, the rise of multipolarity, and the diversification of regional security architectures. It compares NATO as a highly institutionalized military alliance based on legally binding collective defense commitments with the SCO as a coordination-based security platform grounded in the principles of sovereignty, consensus, and non-interference.

The analysis covers the degree of military institutionalization, strategic orientation, enlargement policies, and normative foundations of both organizations. It is argued that the absence of a binding collective defense clause within the SCO framework limits its transformation into a traditional military alliance; however, this structural flexibility allows member states to preserve strategic autonomy and avoid rigid bloc confrontation.

The findings suggest that the SCO should not be viewed as a direct structural analogue of NATO but rather as an alternative regional security model that reflects the dynamics of the emerging multipolar world order and the evolving geopolitical landscape of Eurasia.

Keywords: SCO, NATO, military alliance, multipolarity, security architecture, collective defense, Eurasia, geopolitics

Introduction

In the 21st century, the global security environment is characterized by profound geopolitical transformations and the reconfiguration of the international system. The emergence of new centers of power, the erosion of the unipolar order, and the intensification of regional conflicts have led to a reassessment of traditional models of collective security. Military-political alliances and regional organizations are increasingly compelled to adapt to the evolving balance of power and to redefine their strategic roles in the context of a shifting world order.

Within this changing geopolitical landscape, established Western military alliances, particularly the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), continue to play a central role in shaping the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. At the same time, alternative regional institutions have gained prominence, reflecting the growing influence of non-Western actors. One of the most significant among them is the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), which unites Belarus, China, India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. The SCO serves as an important platform for political, economic, and security cooperation across Eurasia.

Against the backdrop of intensifying strategic competition and the transformation of the global order toward multipolarity, the question arises whether the SCO can be regarded as an alternative model to Western military blocs. Unlike NATO, which is based on legally binding collective defense obligations and an integrated military command structure, the SCO operates on the principles of consensus, sovereignty, and non-interference. Nevertheless, its expanding membership, growing geopolitical influence, and increasing military cooperation activities raise important questions regarding its long-term strategic trajectory.

The relevance of this article is determined by the ongoing restructuring of the international security system and the search for new formats of interstate military cooperation. As global power dynamics shift, comparative analysis of different security models becomes essential for understanding the future of international stability.

This article examines the institutional foundations, strategic objectives, and mechanisms of military cooperation within the SCO and compares them with those of NATO. It analyzes whether the SCO represents a competing military bloc, a complementary security platform, or a fundamentally different model of regional security governance in the emerging multipolar world order.

Materials and Methods

A growing body of scholarly literature emphasizes the increasing role of regional security institutions in the context of a transforming global order. In particular, the shift toward multipolarity has led to the emergence of new regional organizations that complement or challenge traditional Western-led security structures.

This transformation reflects deeper changes in the distribution of power, where regional actors are gaining greater autonomy in addressing security challenges within their respective areas.

According to B.Buzan, international security is increasingly organized around regional security complexes, where threats are geographically clustered and interdependent, making regional institutions essential for managing security

dynamics [1, p.6]. In such contexts, regional organizations are not merely cooperative platforms but become key mechanisms for stabilizing security environments and responding to transnational threats such as terrorism and extremism.

Furthermore, A. Acharya argues that the contemporary international system is evolving toward a "multiplex world order," characterized by multiple centers of power and diverse institutional frameworks, including non-Western organizations such as the SCO. This perspective highlights the growing importance of pluralism in global governance, where different regions develop their own models of cooperation and security management [2, p.24].

From an institutionalist perspective, international organizations play a crucial role in facilitating cooperation, reducing uncertainty, and creating norms that structure state behavior, even in an anarchic system.

These institutions help states overcome collective action problems and build trust through repeated interactions, which is particularly important in regions facing persistent security threats.

At the same time, recent studies indicate that rising powers increasingly rely on regional institutions as instruments of influence, using them to promote their strategic interests and shape regional security agendas. This trend reflects a broader reconfiguration of global governance, where authority is no longer concentrated in a single center but distributed across multiple actors and institutional frameworks [3, p.16].

Overall, the regional security organizations such as the SCO and NATO should be understood not only as mechanisms of cooperation, but also as instruments through which states - particularly emerging powers - contribute to the construction of a multipolar security order. Their roles extend beyond traditional security functions, encompassing political coordination, norm development, and the management of complex regional security challenges.

The analysis of the role of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) as a potential alternative or complementary framework to Western military alliances was conducted through a comprehensive methodological framework combining qualitative analytical approaches widely applied in contemporary studies of international relations and security governance.

At the conceptual level, the research is grounded in institutional and systemic approaches to international security analysis, which allow international organizations to be examined as dynamic political structures operating within a changing global order. The study focuses on understanding how institutional design, strategic culture, and geopolitical context influence the functioning and effectiveness of collective security mechanisms.

First, systems analysis was employed to examine both the SCO and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as complex institutional entities

characterized by interconnected political, military, and strategic components. This approach enabled the assessment of organizational hierarchies, decision-making procedures, coordination mechanisms, and operational capabilities within each organization. Particular attention was paid to the degree of institutionalization, distribution of authority among member states, and adaptability of institutional structures to emerging security challenges.

Second, a comparative analytical method was applied in order to identify similarities and differences between the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian models of security cooperation. The comparison covered legal foundations, strategic objectives, organizational architecture, military coordination mechanisms, enlargement policies, and approaches to collective defense and regional stability. Such comparison made it possible to evaluate whether the SCO can be interpreted as an institutional alternative to NATO or rather as a fundamentally different model of multilateral security interaction.

To identify core principles, dominant narratives, and strategic priorities guiding both organizations, qualitative content analysis of official documents was conducted. The analyzed materials included founding charters, summit declarations, strategic concepts, joint communiqués, policy statements, and security cooperation agreements adopted within the SCO and NATO frameworks. Content analysis allowed for the identification of recurring concepts such as collective defense, sovereignty, non-interference, multipolarity, and cooperative security.

Inductive and deductive reasoning methods were applied throughout the research process. Inductive reasoning enabled the formulation of broader theoretical conclusions based on empirical observations derived from institutional practices and policy documents, while deductive analysis was used to test the hypothesis that the SCO represents not a classical military alliance but an alternative form of security cooperation emerging within the context of an evolving multipolar international system.

In this regard, NATO was used as a comparative reference model representing a traditional military alliance structure, which allowed for a clearer conceptual distinction between alliance-based security and alternative forms of regional cooperation.

This analytical approach is further complemented by engagement with key theoretical perspectives in international relations. From a realist standpoint, the SCO can be understood as a mechanism through which states respond to shared security threats while preserving sovereignty and balancing regional power dynamics. At the same time, an institutionalist perspective highlights the role of the organization in facilitating cooperation, reducing uncertainty, and creating stable patterns of interaction among member states.

Additionally, the regional dimension of security is reflected in the recognition that threats such as terrorism and extremism are inherently transnational and geographically interconnected. This makes regional cooperation frameworks particularly relevant, as security challenges in one part of the region tend to affect neighboring states, thereby necessitating coordinated responses.

The combination of these approaches allows for a more comprehensive interpretation of the SCO as both a pragmatic security arrangement and a reflection of broader structural transformations in the international system.

The empirical base of the study includes both primary and secondary sources. At the initial stage, primary materials consisting of official SCO regulatory and strategic documents were examined, including summit declarations, regional security agreements, and counterterrorism cooperation frameworks. Subsequently, NATO strategic concepts, official communiqués, and institutional policy documents were analyzed in order to assess the alliance's collective defense commitments, integrated command structure, and operational doctrine.

In addition, analytical reports and assessments produced by international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe were reviewed to situate both institutions within the broader framework of international law, regional stability mechanisms, and global security governance processes.

Finally, peer-reviewed academic articles, analytical reports, and scholarly monographs in the fields of geopolitics, military integration, regionalism, and international security studies were examined to ensure theoretical grounding and analytical balance. The combination of multiple methodological approaches and diverse source categories ensured the reliability, consistency, and analytical validity of the research findings.

At the same time, the study primarily relies on qualitative institutional analysis and therefore does not aim to provide quantitative measurement of military capabilities or operational effectiveness, which constitutes a potential limitation but remains consistent with the research objective focused on comparative institutional and strategic evaluation.

Results

The conducted analysis demonstrates that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) represent fundamentally different institutional models of security governance, shaped by distinct historical trajectories, geopolitical contexts, and normative foundations.

While both organizations operate within the broader framework of collective security and military cooperation, their structural design, legal commitments, operational mechanisms, and strategic orientations diverge significantly [4, p.14].

Institutionalization of Military Cooperation. NATO functions as a highly institutionalized military alliance with a centralized and permanent command structure. Its institutional framework includes the North Atlantic Council, the Military Committee, Allied Command Operations (ACO), and Allied Command Transformation (ACT). The Alliance maintains standing forces, joint operational planning mechanisms, unified military standards, and well-developed interoperability among member states. These features enable rapid collective response and coordinated military action under unified leadership.

For comparison, NATO conducts regular large-scale military exercises aimed at improving interoperability, readiness, and collective defense capabilities. One of the most recent examples is the "Steadfast Defender 2025" exercise, which involved approximately 90,000 troops and became the largest NATO exercise since the Cold War.

These exercises are designed to test rapid deployment, coordination among allied forces, and responses to complex security threats, including terrorism and hybrid warfare. In addition, NATO regularly conducts multinational exercises such as "Joint Warrior," involving thousands of personnel and focusing on joint maritime, air, and land operations

NATO's counterterrorism efforts are also supported by operational experience, including missions such as Operation Active Endeavour in the Mediterranean, which aimed to deter terrorist activity and enhance maritime security.

Overall, NATO emphasizes expeditionary capabilities, large-scale force projection, and collective defense, which contrasts with the SCO's focus on regional stability, sovereignty, and internal counterterrorism coordination [5].

In contrast, the SCO does not establish supranational military authority or integrated command structures. Military cooperation within the SCO is organized primarily through periodic joint exercises, coordination meetings of defense ministers, and cooperation under the Regional Anti-Terrorist Structure (RATS). Decision-making is based on consensus, and no binding collective defense clause comparable to Article 5 exists within the SCO framework.

For instance, SCO joint counterterrorism exercises "Sahand-2025," conducted under the framework of the SCO Regional Anti-Terrorist Structure (RATS), took place in December 2025 in Iran and involved military and security forces from multiple SCO member states.

The drills focused on coordinated counterterrorism operations, including the neutralization of simulated terrorist groups, joint command coordination, and the use of modern military and special equipment. The exercise lasted several days and included both planning and live operational phases [6].

Moreover, "Sahand-2025" was part of a broader pattern of SCO counterterrorism cooperation, following earlier joint drills such as

"Interaction-2024," and reflects the organization's continued emphasis on combating the so-called "three evils" - terrorism, extremism, and separatism.

Finally, these exercises serve as an important platform for strengthening practical cooperation, exchanging operational experience, and improving interoperability among member states in the fight against terrorism and extremism [7, p.18].

As a result, this distinction indicates that NATO represents a model of deep military integration, whereas the SCO demonstrates a lower degree of institutionalization in strictly military terms, but retains flexibility and respect for national sovereignty

Strategic Orientation and Security Doctrine. NATO's strategic doctrine historically evolved from Cold War deterrence to crisis management, cooperative security, and more recently, renewed emphasis on collective defense and strategic competition. The Alliance has engaged in operations beyond its traditional geographical scope, including in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Libya. This demonstrates NATO's capacity for power projection and expeditionary operations.

The SCO, by contrast, was initially formed to address regional security challenges, particularly terrorism, separatism, and extremism within the Eurasian space. Its security agenda emphasizes internal stability, border security, counterterrorism cooperation, and prevention of destabilization [8, pp.1249-1267].

The organization's official documents stress non-interference in domestic affairs and rejection of unilateral military interventions.

Therefore, NATO operates within a deterrence-based and, at times, intervention-capable framework, while the SCO adheres to a sovereignty-centered and regionally focused security paradigm.

Expansion Policy and Geopolitical Implications. NATO enlargement has historically entailed deep institutional integration. New member states are required to align defense policies, modernize armed forces according to NATO standards, and integrate into the Alliance's command structure. Enlargement thus reinforces NATO's military cohesion and extends its collective defense perimeter.

The SCO's expansion, in contrast, primarily enhances geopolitical representation rather than military integration. The inclusion of major regional powers such as India and Iran increases the organization's demographic, economic, and strategic weight. However, enlargement does not automatically result in harmonization of defense doctrines or integration of armed forces. Given the diverse geopolitical interests of its members, the SCO prioritizes political dialogue and coordination rather than structural military unification [9, pp.7-28].

This difference highlights NATO's identity as a consolidated military bloc, whereas the SCO functions as a broad security platform with heterogeneous actors.

Normative and Ideological Foundations. NATO's normative framework is explicitly linked to Euro-Atlantic values, including liberal democracy, rule of

law, and political solidarity among member states. Political compatibility and shared strategic outlook are considered prerequisites for membership.

The SCO promotes principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference, equality among states, and respect for different political systems. Its normative orientation reflects a pluralistic and multipolar vision of international relations, where diversity of governance models is acknowledged rather than standardized.

Thus, while NATO's cohesion is reinforced by shared ideological foundations, the SCO's cohesion derives from pragmatic cooperation and mutual strategic interests rather than value-based alignment [10, p. 45].

Degree of Collective Commitment. A central distinction lies in the nature of collective obligations. NATO's Article 5 establishes a legally binding commitment to collective defense, forming the core of its deterrence credibility. The presence of such a clause significantly enhances strategic predictability and alliance solidarity.

The SCO does not contain an equivalent collective defense provision. Security cooperation remains primarily consultative and coordinated, without automatic military assistance obligations. This limits the SCO's transformation into a formal military bloc but simultaneously reduces the risk of entrapment in interstate conflicts [11, p.312].

General Findings. Overall, the findings of the study indicate that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) represents not a structural analogue of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), but rather an alternative model of regional security governance shaped by distinct geopolitical, institutional, and strategic conditions. While NATO functions as a highly integrated military alliance based on legally binding collective defense obligations, centralized command structures, and operational interoperability, the SCO operates as a flexible, sovereignty-oriented, and regionally focused framework of multilateral security cooperation.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that the fundamental differences between the two organizations stem from divergent historical experiences, security perceptions, and strategic cultures of their member states. NATO emerged within the context of bipolar confrontation and institutionalized deterrence, whereas the SCO developed in response to post-Cold War regional challenges, including terrorism, separatism, extremism, and the need for stability across Eurasia. Consequently, the SCO prioritizes political coordination, confidence-building, and cooperative security mechanisms rather than formalized military integration.

The results further reveal that the effectiveness of the SCO should not be evaluated through the criteria traditionally applied to Western military alliances. Its institutional strength lies in adaptability, consensus-based decision-making, and the ability to accommodate states with diverse political systems and strategic

interests. This flexibility enables member states to maintain strategic autonomy while engaging in coordinated responses to shared regional threats.

Moreover, the research indicates that the SCO contributes to the gradual transformation of the international security environment by promoting principles associated with multipolarity and non-bloc cooperation. Instead of reinforcing rigid alliance divisions, the organization facilitates dialogue, regional stabilization efforts, and pragmatic security interaction among major and middle powers. In this sense, the SCO reflects broader shifts in global governance toward pluralistic and decentralized security arrangements.

At the same time, the findings highlight existing structural limitations within the organization, including uneven levels of military capability among member states, differing geopolitical priorities, and the absence of binding collective defense mechanisms. These factors constrain the SCO's capacity to function as a unified military actor but simultaneously preserve its role as an inclusive platform for political and strategic coordination.

Thus, the study confirms that the SCO's significance lies not in competing directly with NATO, but in representing a distinct institutional pathway for managing regional security challenges. The organization illustrates how cooperative security frameworks can evolve outside traditional alliance models, contributing to stability within Eurasia while reflecting the broader transition toward a more complex and multipolar international order.

Discussion

The analysis revealed that in the context of a transforming global order, there is a clear and measurable shift toward multipolarity and diversification of global and regional security architectures. The relative decline of unipolar dominance and the simultaneous rise of emerging powers have stimulated the formation of alternative institutional platforms capable of reflecting new distributions of power and influence. In this environment, security governance is no longer monopolized by Western-led institutions but increasingly shaped by regional arrangements with distinct normative and strategic orientations.

A number of scholars argue that the strengthening of non-Western institutions such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization reflects structural changes in the international system. From a realist perspective, the SCO can be interpreted as a balancing mechanism within Eurasia, facilitating coordination among major regional actors in response to perceived Western dominance. According to balance-of-power theory, the emergence of parallel institutional structures often accompanies systemic transitions, particularly when rising powers seek to secure their interests without integrating into existing Western frameworks [12, p.84].

From a constructivist viewpoint, the SCO represents not merely a geopolitical counterweight but an expression of alternative normative principles.

Its emphasis on sovereignty, non-interference, and pluralism of political systems challenges the value-based conditionality embedded in Western alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In this sense, the SCO may be viewed as contributing to the institutionalization of a multipolar normative order.

Some researchers suggest that the SCO could gradually evolve into a core element of a Eurasian security architecture, particularly given the growing strategic coordination between China and Russia and the organization's expanding membership. The inclusion of major regional actors such as India and Iran significantly increases the organization's geopolitical weight, economic potential, and strategic reach. In theory, this accumulation of capabilities could form the foundation for deeper institutionalization [13, p.56].

However, the SCO's potential transformation into a formal military alliance remains constrained by several structural limitations. Most notably, the absence of binding collective defense commitments distinguishes it fundamentally from NATO. Without a legally codified mutual defense clause comparable to Article 5, the credibility of collective deterrence within the SCO framework remains limited. This institutional design reflects deliberate political choices by member states, which seek to preserve strategic autonomy and avoid automatic entanglement in interstate conflicts.

Other scholars emphasize that this flexible and non-bloc character may constitute a strategic advantage rather than a structural weakness. Unlike NATO's rigid alliance commitments, the SCO's consensus-based model allows for pragmatic cooperation without imposing uniform strategic obligations. This reduces the risk of internal fragmentation and provides space for maneuvering among states with diverse geopolitical alignments. In a multipolar system characterized by fluid partnerships, such flexibility may enhance resilience [14, pp.22-34].

From a military cooperation perspective, regular joint exercises among SCO member states often conducted under counterterrorism scenarios demonstrate increasing operational coordination and confidence-building. These exercises enhance interoperability at a tactical level and foster mutual trust among armed forces. Nevertheless, the absence of unified command structures, standardized military doctrines, permanent joint forces, and harmonized procurement systems limits the depth of military integration. As a result, the SCO remains a coordination platform rather than a fully institutionalized military alliance.

Another significant factor shaping the SCO's trajectory is the diversity of political systems, security priorities, and strategic cultures among its member states. While NATO members share relatively homogeneous political models and institutional standards, the SCO encompasses states with differing governance systems and foreign policy orientations. India's strategic autonomy, China's global ambitions, Russia's security posture, and Central Asian states' regional

concerns do not always fully converge [15, p.70]. This heterogeneity complicates the development of a unified defense doctrine and long-term military integration.

Moreover, internal geopolitical dynamics such as Sino-Indian rivalry or varying threat perceptions among members further constrain deeper institutional consolidation. These divergences highlight the structural challenge of transforming a broad geopolitical coalition into a cohesive military bloc.

Thus, the central debate concerns whether the SCO should pursue deeper institutionalization similar to NATO or whether its strategic value lies precisely in its alternative, sovereignty-centered model of cooperation. The former path would require significant political will, doctrinal harmonization, and partial delegation of sovereign authority steps that may contradict the organization's foundational principles. The latter path preserves flexibility and strategic autonomy but limits the organization's deterrence credibility and global military influence [16, p.18].

Ultimately, the discussion reflects a broader theoretical dilemma in international relations: whether emerging powers seek to replicate existing Western institutional models or to construct alternative frameworks better aligned with their strategic preferences. The SCO appears, at least for now, to embody the second approach favoring coordination over integration and multipolar coexistence over bloc confrontation.

Conclusion

In conclusion of the article, I would like to note that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization does not represent a direct structural analogue of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and does not seek to replicate the Western model of a highly institutionalized military alliance founded upon legally binding collective defense obligations. Rather than functioning as a traditional military bloc, the SCO has developed a distinctive security paradigm grounded in the principles of multipolarity, consensus-based decision-making, sovereign equality of states, and strict non-interference in domestic affairs.

This institutional configuration reflects the geopolitical realities of Eurasia, where historical sensitivities, strategic diversity, and differing threat perceptions encourage flexible cooperation mechanisms instead of rigid alliance commitments. The SCO's approach allows its member states to pursue collective stability while simultaneously preserving national autonomy and strategic maneuverability – factors that remain particularly important for middle powers pursuing multivector foreign policies.

In the contemporary international environment characterized by redistribution of global power, intensifying strategic competition, and the gradual fragmentation of the liberal international order, the SCO is increasingly positioned as an important platform for coordinating regional security responses across Eurasia. Its growing agenda, which includes counterterrorism cooperation,

regional stability initiatives, economic connectivity, and dialogue on emerging security challenges, demonstrates the organization's evolution beyond a narrowly defined security forum toward a broader mechanism of regional governance.

Nevertheless, the long-term effectiveness and international credibility of the SCO will depend on its ability to move from predominantly declarative cooperation toward deeper practical coordination. This includes strengthening mechanisms of military and strategic planning, enhancing intelligence and information exchange, improving interoperability through regular and technologically advanced joint exercises, and fostering higher levels of political trust among its heterogeneous membership. Addressing internal asymmetries of power and differing strategic priorities among member states will also remain a critical challenge for institutional consolidation.

At the same time, expanding constructive engagement with external actors and regional organizations – including dialogue mechanisms with Euro-Atlantic and Asia-Pacific institutions – could contribute to greater transparency, confidence-building, and systemic stability within the broader international security architecture. Such interaction does not imply institutional convergence with Western alliances but rather reflects the increasing necessity of cooperative security management in an interdependent world.

Ultimately, the SCO's future relevance will depend on its capacity for gradual institutional adaptation, strategic coherence, and balanced cooperation among major and middle powers. By maintaining its consensus-driven character while incrementally enhancing operational effectiveness, the organization may reinforce its role as a stable and meaningful actor within the emerging multipolar world order, offering an alternative model of regional security cooperation that complements rather than directly competes with existing alliance systems.

In this regard, the findings of the study have direct implications for the future configuration of the Eurasian security architecture. Rather than evolving toward a single, unified security system, Eurasia is likely to develop as a pluralistic and multilayered security space characterized by the coexistence of multiple institutional frameworks with overlapping functions and flexible interaction mechanisms.

Within this emerging architecture, the SCO may serve as one of the central regional platforms for coordinating security policies, particularly in addressing transnational threats such as terrorism, extremism, and instability in neighboring regions. Its emphasis on sovereignty, non-alignment, and consensus-based cooperation suggests that future Eurasian security arrangements will prioritize adaptability and political inclusiveness over rigid alliance structures.

At the same time, the evolution of Eurasian security will depend on the ability of regional actors to balance competition and cooperation, prevent

fragmentation into isolated security blocs, and maintain channels of dialogue across different institutional systems. In this context, the SCO's role may extend beyond internal coordination toward acting as a bridge between regional and global security processes.

REFERENCES

[1] Buzan B. Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 564 p. [in Eng.].

[2] Acharya A., Buzan B. The Making of Global International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 400 p. [in Eng.].

[3] Shah S. A. Re-examining Multipolarity as a Concept. 2024. Available at: https://zenodo.org/records/15016024/files/10%2BRe-examining%2BMulti-Polarity%2B-%2BSyed%2BAizaz%2BAli%2BShah.pdf [in Eng.].

[4] NATO. NATO 2022 Strategic Concept. Madrid: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2022. 14 p. [in Eng.].

[5] NATO. NATO operations and missions. Brussels: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2025. Available at: https://www.nato.int/en/what-we-do/operations-and-missions/nato-operations-and-missions [in Eng.].

[6] Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Joint anti-terrorism exercises "Sahand-2025". SCO Secretariat, 2025. Available at: https://eng.sectsco. org/20251205/2093981.html [in Eng.].

[7] Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Samarkand Declaration of the Council of Heads of State of the SCO. Samarkand: SCO Secretariat, 2022. 18 p. [in Eng.].

[8] Allison R. China, Russia and the Post-Western World Order // International Affairs. – 2018. – Vol. 94, No. 6. – P. 1249–1267. [in Eng.].

[9] Charap S., Shapiro J. The New Eurasian Security Architecture: Prospects and Limits // Survival. – 2021. – Vol. 63, No. 2. – P. 7–28. [in Eng.].

[10] Rumer E., Sokolsky R. NATO in a Multipolar World. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2020. 45 p. [in Eng.].

[11] Cooley A. Great Games, Local Rules: The New Great Power Contest in Central Asia. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. 312 p. [in Eng.].

[12] Laumulin M. Kazakhstan between NATO and the SCO: Strategic Balancing in Eurasia. Astana: Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies (KISI), 2019. 84 p. [in Eng.].

[13] Kassenova T. Kazakhstan and the Changing Euro-Atlantic Security Environment. Astana: Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Public Policy, 2021. 56 p. [in Eng.].

[14] Nurgaliyev B. The SCO and NATO: Competing or Complementary Security Models? Central Asia's Perspective // Central Asia and the Caucasus. – 2022. – Vol. 23, No. 4. – P. 22–34. [in Eng.].

[15] Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies (KISI). NATO–Russia Confrontation and Its Implications for Central Asia: Analytical Review. Astana, 2023. 70 p. [in Eng.].

[16] Umbetaliyeva T. Kazakhstan's Multivector Policy between the SCO and NATO Partnerships // International Security Conference. Astana, 2022. 18 p. [in Eng.].

ШЫҰ БАТЫС ӘСКЕРИ БЛОКТАРЫНА БАЛАМА РЕТІНДЕ: НАТО-МЕН САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ

*Искаков А.Н.[1]

*[1] Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Мақалада жаһандық тәртіптің трансформациясы жағдайында Шанхай ынтымақтастық ұйымының (ШЫҰ) Батыс әскери-саяси блоктарына балама ретінде қалыптасу мүмкіндігі және оның Солтүстік Атлантикалық Шарт Ұйымымен (НАТО) салыстырмалы талдауы қарастырылады. Зерттеу көпполярлы әлемдік жүйенің қалыптасуы, күштердің қайта бөлінуі және аймақтық қауіпсіздік архитектурасының әртараптандырылуы жағдайында жүргізіледі. НАТО-ның ұжымдық қорғанысқа негізделген жоғары институционалданған әскери альянс ретіндегі моделі мен ШЫҰ-ның егемендік, консенсус және ішкі істерге араласпау қағидаттарына сүйенетін үйлестіруші қауіпсіздік платформасы ретіндегі ерекшеліктері салыстырылады.

Талдау әскери ынтымақтастықтың институционалдану деңгейін, стратегиялық бағдарларын, кеңею саясатын және нормативтік негіздерін қамтиды. ШЫҰ-ның ұжымдық қорғаныс туралы міндетті ережелерінің болмауы оның әскери блокқа айналу мүмкіндігін шектейтіні, алайда бұл икемділік мүше мемлекеттердің стратегиялық дербестігін сақтауға мүмкіндік беретіні анықталды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері ШЫҰ-ның НАТО құрылымдық баламасы емес, қауіпсіздіктің баламалы үлгісі екенін көрсетеді. Бұл модель Еуразиядағы тұрақтылықты қамтамасыз етуге бағытталған және қалыптасып келе жатқан көпполярлы әлем тәртібінде маңызды рөл атқарады.

Тірек сөздер: ШЫҰ, НАТО, әскери альянс, көпполярлық, қауіпсіздік архитектурасы, ұжымдық қорғаныс, Еуразия, геосаясат

ШОС КАК АЛЬТЕРНАТИВА ЗАПАДНЫМ ВОЕННЫМ БЛОКАМ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ С НАТО

*Искаков А.Н.[1]

*[1] Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается возможность формирования Шанхайской организации сотрудничества (ШОС) в качестве альтернативы западным военно-политическим блокам и проводится сравнительный анализ с Организацией Североатлантического договора (НАТО). Исследование осуществляется в контексте трансформации мирового порядка, усиления многополярности и диверсификации региональных архитектур безопасности. Сопоставляются институциональные особенности НАТО как высоко интегрированного военного союза, основанного на обязательствах коллективной обороны, и ШОС как координационной платформы, функционирующей на принципах консенсуса, суверенитета и невмешательства во внутренние дела государств.

Анализ охватывает уровень институционализации военного сотрудничества, стратегические ориентиры, политику расширения и нормативные основания обеих организаций. Установлено, что отсутствие у ШОС юридически закреплённого механизма коллективной обороны ограничивает её трансформацию в классический военный блок, однако одновременно обеспечивает гибкость и сохранение стратегической автономии государств-участников.

Сделан вывод о том, что ШОС не является прямым аналогом НАТО, а формирует альтернативную модель региональной безопасности, ориентированную на принципы многополярности и баланс интересов в Евразии.

Ключевые слова: ШОС, НАТО, военный альянс, многополярность, архитектура безопасности, коллективная оборона, Евразия, геополитика

Информация об авторе:

Искаков Аян Нурланович – докторант 2-курса ОП 8D03121 «Международные отношения», Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан, ORCID 0009-0008-5173-1942, e-mail: a.n.iskakov@gmail.com

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Искаков Аян Нурланович – Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті 8D03121 «Халықаралық қатынастар» мамандығының 2-курс докторанты, Алматы, Қазақстан, ORCID 0009-0008-5173-1942, e-mail: a.n.iskakov@gmail.com

Information about the author:

Iskakov Ayan N. – 2-nd year PhD student of the EP 8D03121 "International Relations", Kazakh Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan, ORCID 0009-0008-5173-1942, e-mail: a.n.iskakov@gmail.com