

Национальный Союз Политологов

ВОПРОСЫ ВЫПУСК 3(31), 2018 ПОЛИТОЛОГИИ

Научный журнал

Журнал «Вопросы политологии» включен
в Перечень рецензируемых научных изданий
ВАК Министерства образования и науки РФ по политическим
наукам, в которых должны быть опубликованы основные
научные результаты на соискание ученой степени кандидата наук,
на соискание ученой степени доктора наук

Журнал включен в Перечень научных изданий
рекомендованных ВАК Республики Узбекистан
для публикации основных научных результатов диссертаций
по политическим и философским наукам

С 1 января 2018 года
журнал выходит один раз в месяц

МОСКВА, 2018

ВОПРОСЫ ПОЛИТОЛОГИИ

Научный журнал

Председатель Редакционного Совета – ПЛАТОНОВ В.М.,
к.ю.н., заведующий кафедрой политических наук РУДН,
Председатель Московской городской Думы (1994–2014 гг.)

Редакционный Совет

БЕХ Владимир Павлович	д.ф.н., первый проректор Национального педагогического университета им. М.П. Драгоманова (Украина, г. Киев)
БОЖАНОВ Владимир Александрович	д.и.н., профессор, зав. кафедрой мировой и отечественной культуры Белорусского Национального технического университета (Белоруссия, г. Минск)
ВЕДРИН Оливье	главный редактор русской версии французского журнала «Национальная оборона» (Revue Défense Nationale), спикер Европейской комиссии, редактор франко-германского журнала по вопросам внешней политики «European Union Foreign Affairs Journal» и ректор «Континентального университета в Киеве» (Франция, г. Париж)
ИРХИН Юрий Васильевич	д.ф.н., профессор кафедры политологии и политического управления РАНХ и ГС при Президенте РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
КАРАДЖЕ Татьяна Васильевна	д.ф.н., заведующая кафедрой политологии и социологии МПГУ (Россия, г. Москва)
КЕТЦЯН Григор Ваникович	к.п.н., заместитель Главного редактора журнала, Председатель Попечительского Совета научного журнала «Вопросы политологии» (Россия, г. Москва)
КОВАЛЕНКО Валерий Иванович	д.ф.н., зав. кафедрой российской политики МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова (Россия, г. Москва)
КОСИКОВ Игорь Георгиевич	д.и.н., главный научный сотрудник Института этнологии и антропологии РАН (Россия, г. Москва)
МЕДВЕДЕВ Николай Павлович	д.п.н., профессор, Президент Национального Союза Политологов, главный редактор журнала (Россия, г. Москва)
МИХАЙЛОВ Вячеслав Александрович	д.и.н., зав. кафедрой национальных и федеративных отношений РАНХ и ГС при Президенте РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
НАСИМОВА Гульнара Орленбаевна	д.п.н., профессор, зав. кафедрой политологии факультета философии и политологии Казахского Национального университета им. Аль-Фараби (Казахстан, г. Алматы)
НИСНЕВИЧ Юлий Анатольевич	д.п.н., профессор Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» (Россия, г. Москва)
ПАХРУТДИНОВ Шукритдин Ильясович	д.п.н., профессор, заведующий кафедрой «Национальные интересы и стабильность общества» Академии государственного и общественного строительства при Президенте Республики Узбекистан (Узбекистан, г. Ташкент)
ПЛЯЙС Яков Андреевич	д.и.н., д.п.н., профессор, заведующий кафедрой политологии Финансового университета при Правительстве РФ (Россия, г. Москва)
ПРЯХИН Владимир Федорович	д.п.н., профессор кафедры мировой политики и международных отношений РГГУ (Россия, г. Москва)
ПУСЬКО Виталий Станиславович	д.ф.н., профессор кафедры политологии МГТУ им. Н.Э. Баумана (Россия, г. Москва)
СМИРОВ Вильям Викторович	к.ю.н., заведующий сектором Института государства и права РАН (Россия, г. Москва)

Редакционная коллегия

Главный редактор – МЕДВЕДЕВ Н.П., д.п.н., профессор

Кетцян Г.В. (к.п.н. – зам. гл. редактора)	Козлов Г.Я. (д.и.н.)
Чернышов С.И. (к.п.н. – зам. гл. редактора)	Медведева В.К. (к.п.н.)
Шкурина С.С. (к.п.н. – ответ. редактор)	Слизовский Д.Е. (д.и.н.)
Абрамова О.Д. (д.п.н.)	Давыдов В.Н. (к.п.н.)

ISSN 2225–8922

**ЖУРНАЛ ВКЛЮЧЕН
В ПЕРЕЧЕНЬ ВАК РФ**

УЧРЕЖДЕН
Национальным Союзом
Политологов

Журнал издается при
содействии ООО «Издательство
«Наука сегодня» с участием
Института современной
политики РУДН

Журнал зарегистрирован
Федеральной службой по
надзору в сфере массовых
коммуникаций, связи и охраны
культурного наследия

Пер. № ПИ № ФС77–46176
от 12 августа 2011 г.

Журнал издается ежемесячно

Журнал включен в базу РИНЦ
(Российский индекс научного
цитирования)

Включен в каталог
Ulrich's Periodicals Directory
Пятилетний импакт-фактор: 1,489.

Адрес редакции:
115598, г. Москва, ул. Загорьевская,
д. 10, корп. 4, цокольный этаж,
помещение I, комната 7-1, офис 4
Тел.: (910) 463–53–42
Интернет-ресурс:
www.souzpolitolog.ru
www.voprospolitolog.ru
E-mail: voprospolitolog@yandex.ru
souzpolitolog@yandex.ru

Мнение авторов может
не совпадать с мнением редакции.
При перепечатке ссылка
на журнал обязательна.

Научные статьи, публикуемые
в журнале подлежат обязательному
рецензированию.

Ответственный редактор
Шкурина С.С.

Перевод
Чернышова Е.В.

Компьютерная верстка
Анциферова А.С.

Подписано в печать 26.03.2018
Формат 60×84/8. Объем 24,3.
Печать офсетная.
Тираж – 1000 экз.
(1-й завод – 500 экз.)
Заказ № 000.

Отпечатано в типографии
ООО «Белый ветер»
115054, г. Москва, ул. Щипок, 28
Тел.: (495) 651-84-56

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ, ПРОЦЕССЫ И ТЕХНОЛОГИИ

- Медведев Н.П., Ивайна Мохаммед* Политические проблемы развития палестинской государственности 7
- Пыж В.В., Фролов А.Е.* Политическая безопасность государства и политическая стабильность общества как объект политологического анализа..... 16
- Попов С.И., Ершов Н.А.* Политические коммуникации в интернете 28
- Амиантов А.А., Масляный А.А.* Представительные и законодательные функции парламентов субъектов Российской Федерации на примере Московской областной Думы 39
- Парамохина А.С.* Ориентации малого бизнеса и проблема реализации социально-политических функций среднего класса в 1990-е гг..... 51
- Сабирьянов Р.Ф.* Протофедерализм как фактор территориального развития древнерусского государства: политологический аспект 61

ЭТНОПОЛИТИКА И МЕЖНАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ

- Гаджиев М.М.* Межнациональная семья как фактор консолидации социума 66
- Шовканов Д.А.* Коллективная ответственность как внешний и внутренний регулятор локализации этнополитических напряжений и конфликтности..... 75

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ И ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ

- Форот И.В.* The EU migration policy: Visegrad group policy review/ Миграционная политика Европейского Союза: позиция стран Вышеградской группы 85
- Ханалиев Н.У.* Россия как альтернативный США актор на Ближнем Востоке..... 92
- Черемин Г.Д.* Зарубежный опыт государственной политики в отношении железнодорожного транспорта 104
- Темирханова А.Е.* Взаимодействие стран Центральной Азии и России в борьбе с международным терроризмом..... 112
- Тодорова Р.В.* Возобновляемые источники энергии как движущая сила энергетической политики Республики Болгария 118
- Ширгазина Э.Р.* Геополитические детерминанты сотрудничества стран БРИКС 130
- Ли Дань* Китайская политика научно-исследовательских и образовательных институтов по изучению России 140
- Пусурманова А.А.* Перспективы евразийской интеграции 151

Вернер Н.В. Соотечественники как элемент политики «мягкой силы»	161
Шелест Д.А. Политика Нарасимха Рао «Смотри на Восток» как инструмент формирования будущего Индии.....	176

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

Медведев Н.П., Слизовский Д.Е. Рецензия на статью Пыжа В.В., Фролова А.Е. «Политическая безопасность государства и политическая стабильность общества как объект политологического анализа».....	185
---	-----

Пряхин В.Ф. Рецензия на статью Медведева Н.П., Ивайны Мохаммеда «Политические проблемы развития палестинской государственности».....	190
--	-----

НАШИ АВТОРЫ	193
-------------------	-----

ТРЕБОВАНИЯ К ОФОРМЛЕНИЮ РУКОПИСЕЙ	197
---	-----

УДК 32.327

И.В. ФОРЕТ

*кандидат исторических наук, доцент
кафедры регионоведения и экономики зарубежных стран
факультета международных отношений
Воронежского государственного университета,
Россия, г. Воронеж*

МИГРАЦИОННАЯ ПОЛИТИКА ЕВРОПЕЙСКОГО СОЮЗА: ПОЗИЦИЯ СТРАН ВЫШЕГРАДСКОЙ ГРУППЫ

В данной статье автор анализирует развитие миграционного кризиса Европейского Союза на современном этапе, систему Дублинского регулирования и проблему распределения квот на мигрантов в странах ЕС. Предметом исследования является миграционная политика Польши, Венгрии, Чехии, Словакии в масштабе Европейского Союза и влияние различных факторов на ее трансформацию. Цель исследования – изучить основные составляющие позиции стран Вышеградской группы по вопросам кризисных явлений в политике ЕС по миграции. В итоге автор делает вывод относительно причин жесткой позиции стран Центральной Европы по вопросу распределения квот на мигрантов и дальнейшего развития взаимоотношений Брюсселя, с одной стороны, и Польши, Венгрии, Чехии и Словакии – с другой.

Ключевые слова: *миграция, Европейский Союз, кризис, убежище, беженец, право Европейского Союза, Дублинская система, Вышеградская группа.*

I.V. FORET

*Ph.D., Associate Professor
Department of the regional studies
and foreign countries economy
Faculty of International Relations
Voronezh State University, Voronezh, Russia*

THE EU MIGRATION POLICY: VISEGRAD GROUP POLICY REVIEW

In this article the author analyzes the position of the Visegrad Group countries and the development of the European Union migration crisis at the present stage. The subject of the research is the migration policy of Poland, Hungary,

the Czech Republic, Slovakia on the European Union scale and the impact of various factors on its transformation. The aim of the research is to study the main components of the position of the Visegrad Group countries on crisis in the EU migration policy. The author concludes upon the further development of relations between Brussels, on the one hand, and Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, on the other.

Key words: *migration, European Union, crisis, asylum, refugee, European Union law, Dublin regulation, Visegrad group.*

Visegrad group is the community of Central-European states who signed the joint declaration on drive for integration into European structures in 1991 in Visegrad (Hungary)¹. Initially Visegrad group included three states – Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but after the disintegration of the last-mentioned Visegrad group has included 4 countries (Czech and Slovak Republics). The first goal of the group was the facilitation of the integration for above-mentioned countries on their way to the EU membership.

At the turn of the XX century as result of the EU policy realization (that was focused on the EU enlargement due to the new members admission) all members of the Visegrad group became the EU members on the 1st of May 2004.

The Visegrad group members have their own consolidated opinion on the whole set of the EU challenges and pursued policy that is often different from others EU members position.

The burning issue of migration crisis fell on the EU in 2015 when migration flows from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan flooded European countries. The Dublin system² wasn't able to resist such huge influx of refugees and migrants. The main influx of illegal migration has been accrued to Greece and Italy. The principle of responsibility for the refugee means that the one state is responsible for the refugee which borders have been crossed or where the motion was entered. This principle has applied the tremendous economic and social pressure on two states – Greece and Italy. It was obvious that in order to overcome the migration crisis it was necessary to undertake emergency measures in the EU migration policy.

In September 2015 the Commission contributed suggestions on introduction the mechanism of refugees relocation based on quota systeme.

The emergency meeting of ministers of internal affairs of the EU member states took place in Brussels on the 22nd of September, 2015. It was decided to re-

¹ Official web-site of Visegrad group. – URL: <http://www.visegradgroup.eu/>

² Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person. – URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=celex%3A32013R0604>

locate 120 000 migrants (coming to Italy and Greece) among all member states¹. The principle of the European solidarity was laid to the idea of the quota system which meant that all migrants must be relocated equitably among the all European countries². The main goal was to reduce the economic and demographic burden for frontline member states.

As a result of the adopted quota plan based on the population and income of the host country, Slovakia had to receive 902 migrants, Hungary – 1 294, Czech Republic – 2 691, Poland – 6 182.

It is worth noting that a vote was required because of a consensus lack among all member states. As a result of the voting 4 countries (Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Czech Republic) voted against and one country was abstained³. Initially Poland was for the quota system but after the party “Law and Justice” came to power, it refused to receive migrants.

Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia joined the EU quite late, and could not participate in the development of the first fundamental constituent agreements. They entered the European Union on conditions not all of which considered acceptable for themselves, hoping that in the future their opinions would be taken into account. The Visegrad group, after the accession of its member states to the EU, formulates the interests of the “new” members of the EU countries, often in opposition to the interests of the Benelux countries.

Former socialist countries are building national states, as stated in the constitutions of these states. Independence and full autonomy for them is the main value acquired not so long ago. The ideas of multiculturalism have not yet been widely disseminated.

Each of the countries of the Visegrad Group has its own argumentation of the position of disagreement with the quota allocation.

From all the countries of the Visegrad group Hungary was the most affected by the migration influx. Since early 2015, more than 140,000 migrants have illegally crossed the Serb-Hungarian border. The Hungarian government was forced to take radical measures to build a 4-meter-high wall on certain sections of the border with Serbia. The Hungarian authorities point out that their country is not attractive to refugees economically. Most migrants regard Hungary only as a transit country on their way to countries of western or northern Europe, which means that even in the long term, Hungary will not receive any possible benefits from the influx of migrants (for example, in the sense of demographic growth).

¹ Council Decision establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece (22 September 2015). – URL: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-12098-2015-INIT/en/pdf>

² The temporary emergency relocation scheme was established in two Council Decisions in September 2015 (Council Decision (EU) 2015/1523 and Council Decision (EU) 2015/1601), in which Member States committed to relocate persons in need of international protection from Italy and Greece.

³ Justice and Home Affairs Council, 22/09/2015. – URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/jha/2015/09/22/>

Hungarian Prime Minister, V. Orban, said that Hungary is under siege, and an aggressive Muslim culture is a threat to the Christian values and to the identity of the country. For more than a century, Hungarians lived under the rule of the Ottoman Empire and have complicated relations with the Muslim world¹.

The Slovak authorities are forced to take into account the opinion of their country's citizens who have repeatedly opposed the reception of migrants, in particular Muslims. The representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ivan Metik, said that Slovakia is not prepared to accept Muslim refugees, because the process of integration into Slovak society would be challenging for them, moreover, there is no mosques in Slovakia². A local referendum took place in the village of Gabčíkovo (on the border with Hungary) on August 2, 2015, and more than 96% of those who took part in it, spoke out against the hosting of migrants in the temporary camp³.

The position of Poland is justified by the presence of a military conflict in the territory of neighboring Ukraine. The Polish authorities have voiced the potential threat of a significant increase of refugees from Ukraine in the case of Ukrainian conflict escalation. The reluctance of Polish citizens to host migrants from the Middle East countries is confirmed by numerous social surveys and demonstrations.

The Czech government expresses and supports the idea of helping refugees outside the European Union by creating specialized camps and security zones in third countries. Realizing this concept Czech Republic finances the work of the Zadari camp in Jordan. It is worth noting that, according to "Eurobarometer" surveys, Czechs treat refugees extremely negatively – 81% of Czechs expressed a negative attitude towards refugees. This indicator is the highest in the EU. Similarly, the Czech government expresses its readiness to accept migrants, but not all, selectively, in accordance with the needs of the economy.

Common position of the countries of the Visegrad Group is that the system of migrants distribution based on quotas without taking into account the economic, political, demographic and social characteristics of the host countries is not fair, and the influx of migrants can threaten the security of countries.

"All decisions in the field of migration can be made only by member states. It depends on the labor market, demography. No international institution can impose this type of decision upon states" – Polish Foreign Minister, V. Waszczykowski, stated⁴.

¹ "They are not refugees, but a Muslim invasion force" said Viktor Orbán visiting Bavaria. – URL: <https://visegradpost.com/en/2018/01/09/7373/>

² Migrants crisis: Slovakia "will only accept Christians". – URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-33986738>

³ TASR, "Referendum v Gabčíkove sa skončilo. Ažylantov nechcú, mali s nimi problémy," HNonline, August 2, 2015, accessed November 27, 2015, <http://hn.hnonline.sk/referendum-v-gabcikove-sa-skoncilo-azylantov-nechcu-mali-s-nimi-problemy-864225>.

⁴ Minister Waszczykowski: those who opened up borders to migration wave acted irresponsibly. 26.10.2017. – URL: http://www.mfa.gov.pl/en/news/minister_waszczykowski_those_who_opened_up_borders_to_migration_wave_acted_irresponsibly_;jsessionid=C06207E0BFDABECAB452CF4484290B93.cmsap1p

Trying to challenge the decision on the distribution of migrants, Hungary and Slovakia sued the EU Court. According to the decision of the EU Court of Justice of 6 September 2017, the treaty on the functioning of the European Union allows Brussels “to take all the preliminary measures in order to respond effectively and quickly to the emergency situation caused by the sudden influx of internally displaced persons”¹. The EU Court considered that the adoption of this decision “did not require participation of national parliaments and open discussion and voting in the EU Council”. The claim was completely denied.

However, the decision of the Court of Justice of the European Union did not influence the actual fulfillment by the EU member states of their obligations.

On September 26, 2017, the two-year mechanism for the compulsory relocation of migrants seeking asylum in the EU was finished. According to the European Commission, by the end of 2017 only about 320000 migrants were distributed according to quota systems. 20 EU member states have fulfilled their obligations by no more than 50%. At the same time, Poland and Hungary completely refused to fulfill their obligations to receive refugees, not sheltering a single migrant, and the Czech Republic accepted only 12 people.

At the end of the two-year mechanism for the movement of migrants seeking asylum in the EU, the member of the European Commission on Migration, Internal Affairs and Citizenship, D. Avramopoulos, said that at a new stage the Commission calls on the EU states to continue to participate in the distribution of asylum seekers, but on a voluntary basis. At the same time, D. Avramopoulos stressed that all the commitments undertaken should be fully implemented by the EU member states, and not obeying the legally adopted decisions will entail bringing the responsible countries to justice.

It is worth noting that the process of investigating violations of obligations for the reception of migrants was started on June 15, 2017 after receiving unsatisfactory responses from Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic. Preliminary hearings on this case took place on July 26, 2017. But since even the decision of the Court of Justice of 06.09.2017 on the suit of Hungary and Slovakia did not force the Visegrad team to comply. On 07.12.2017 the European Commission sued Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic for failure to fulfill the obligations to receive migrants on agreed quotas².

Slovakia, thanks to the promises to increase the number of migrants, has so far avoided a judicial conflict with the European Commission, while the search for a way to relieve itself of the obligation to accept refugees has not stopped.

¹ Court of Justice of the European Union. PRESS RELEASE No 91/17 Luxembourg, 6 September 2017 / Judgment in Joined Cases C-643/15 and C-647/15 Slovakia and Hungary v Council. – URL: <https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-09/cp170091en.pdf>

² European Commission – Press release / Relocation: Commission refers the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the Court of Justice. – Brussels, 7 December 2017. – URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-5002_en.htm

«We completely reject the idea of quotas for the reception of migrants. They are extremely inefficient, which has already been confirmed by the head of the European Council, Donald Tusk. In return, we offered money. 35 million euros is a huge amount that should be used to protect borders», – said Slovak Prime Minister Robert Fico¹.

Thus, the countries of the Visegrad Group are still trying to protect the chosen course of migration policy, despite the enormous pressure of official Brussels. Their position finds understanding and support in many member states of the EU, at least among the inhabitants of these countries. The increasing threat of terrorist danger in the EU member states is directly related to migration policy. “Right” political forces are gaining an increasing number of votes in the national governance structures of the EU member states, and hence the likelihood of increasing pressure on the current migration policy of Brussels and strengthening the position of the Visegrad Group on migration issues.

REFERENCES:

1. Council Decision establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece (22 September 2015). – URL: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-12098-2015-INIT/en/pdf>
2. Court of Justice of the European Union. PRESS RELEASE No 91/17 Luxembourg, 6 September 2017 / Judgment in Joined Cases C-643/15 and C-647/15 Slovakia and Hungary v Council. – URL: <https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2017-09/cp170091en.pdf>
3. EU Nations Bicker Over Migration Policy as Summit Opens. – December, 14, 2017. – URL <https://www.usnews.com/news/business/articles/2017-12-14/eu-leaders-gather-set-to-move-brexit-talks-into-new-phase>
4. European Commission - Press release / Relocation: Commission refers the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the Court of Justice. – Brussels, 7 December 2017.
5. Justice and Home Affairs Council, 22/09/2015. – URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/jha/2015/09/22/>
6. Migrants crisis: Slovakia “will only accept Christians”. – URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-33986738>
7. Minister Waszczykowski: those who opened up borders to migration wave acted irresponsibly. 26.10.2017. – URL: http://www.mfa.gov.pl/en/news/minister_waszczykowski_those_who_opened_up_borders_to_migration_wave_acted_irresponsibly_;jsessionid=C06207E0BFDABECAB452CF4484290B93.cmsap1p

¹ EU Nations Bicker Over Migration Policy as Summit Opens. – December, 14, 2017. – URL <https://www.usnews.com/news/business/articles/2017-12-14/eu-leaders-gather-set-to-move-brexit-talks-into-new-phase>

8. Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person. – URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=cellex%3A32013R0604>

9. TASR, “Referendum v Gabčíkove sa skončilo. Ažylantov nechcú, mali s nimi problémy“, HNonline, August 2, 2015, accessed November 27, 2015, <http://hn.hnonline.sk/referendum-v-gabcikove-sa-skoncilo-azylantov-nehcu-mali-s-nimi-problemy-864225>.

10. “They are not refugees, but a Muslim invasion force” said Viktor Orbán visiting Bavaria. – URL:<https://visegradpost.com/en/2018/01/09/7373/>