



Diasporas in the modern world: the evolution of phenomena and concepts

Mansur BOYSARIEV ¹

National university of Uzbekistan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received September 2020

Received in revised form 15
September 2020

Accepted 25 September
2020

Available online
1 October 2020

Keywords:

Diasporology

Diaspora

Interdisciplinary subject

Classification of diasporas

National politics

Interethnic conflicts

Refugees

Migration.

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes scientific views, the concept of "diaspora", classification of diasporas, modern and classical diasporas, a description of existing scientific views as an object of a transnational community. The conclusion is made about the absence of a single generally accepted definition of the concept of "diaspora", which is necessary both theoretically and practically. In the conclusion, the author's views on improving research on the history of diasporas are presented.

2181-1415/© 2020 in Science LLC.

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Замонавий дунёда диаспоралар: ривожланиш ҳодисаси ва тушунчалар

АННОТАЦИЯ

Мақолада, диаспорология фанини таҳлил қилиш мақсадида, илмий тадқиқотлар, "Диаспора" тушунчаси, диаспоралар таснифи, замонавий ва классий диаспоралар, диаспоралар трансмиллий ҳамжамият объекти сифатида мавжуд илмий қарашлар баёни таҳлил этилган. "Диаспора" тушунчасининг ягона умумий қабул қилинган таърифи йўқлиги, бунда ҳам назарий, ҳам амалий жиҳатдан зарур эканлиги хулоса қилинган. Хулосада диаспоралар тарихига доир тадқиқотларни такомиллаштиришга оид муаллифнинг фикрлари ишлаб чиқилган.

Калит сўзлар:

Диаспорология

Диаспора

Фанлараро мавзу

Диаспоралар

Классификацияси

Миллий сиёсат

Миллаталаро низолар

Қочоқлар

Миграция

¹ Doctoral student, National university of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
email: m.boysariyev@gmail.com

Диаспоры в современном мире: эволюция явления и понятия

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

Диаспорология
Диаспора
Междисциплинарный
субъект
Классификация диаспор
Национальная политика
Межэтнические
конфликты
Беженцы
Миграция.

В статье анализируются научные взгляды, понятие «диаспора», классификация диаспор, современные и классические диаспоры, описание существующих научных взглядов как объекта транснационального сообщества. Делается вывод об отсутствии единого общепринятого определения понятия «диаспора», необходимого как теоретически, так и практически. В заключении изложены взгляды автора на совершенствование исследований по истории диаспор.

INTRODUCTION.

A characteristic feature of a globalizing world is the strengthening of migration processes. Globalization makes the "national partitions" more transparent, and therefore millions of people in search of a better share are leaving their homeland and rushing to other countries. Over the past 50 years, the number of international migrants has almost tripled. If in 1960 there were 75.5 million people living outside the country of their birth throughout the world, then in 2000 it was 176.6 million, and at the end of 2009 there were already 213.9 million. According to estimates UN experts, currently every 35th inhabitant of the globe is an international migrant, and in the developed countries - already every tenth [34; 33].

A sharp increase in migration goes in parallel with the consolidation of immigrant ethnic communities. Once in a new place, migrants tend to unite in order not only to survive, but also to preserve their customs, traditions, language in an alien to them, often very hostile, ethnocultural environment. To this end, they either join the existing diasporas or create new ones. As a result, the number of diasporas in the world is constantly increasing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Professor G. Schaeffer of the University of Jerusalem made an attempt to determine the number of the most famous diasporas in the world. According to his calculations, the largest of the so-called "historical" (that is, existing since ancient times) diasporas - Chinese - currently amounts to 35 million people, Indian - 9 million, Jewish and Gypsy - 8 million each, Armenian - 5.5 million, Greek - 4 million, German - 2.5 million, the Druze diaspora - 1 million people.

Among the "modern" diasporas, the largest, African-American, has 25 million people, Kurdish - 14 million, Irish - 10 million, Italian - 8 million, Hungarian and Polish - 4.5 million each, Turkish and Iranian - 3.5 million each, Japanese - 3 million, Lebanese (Christian) - 2.5 million people [Quoted from: 26, pp. 10–11].

"The process of formation of diasporas has already taken on such a significant scale that it is obviously impossible to find a country in the world where there would be no diaspora of another people, as well as a country from which people would not form at least a small diaspora in any other country or several countries "(3). The previously widespread

individual integration of immigrants into their host society is increasingly being replaced by collective integration, resulting in a different, diasporal form of settlement of peoples.

Diasporas have a major impact on host countries. They change their demographic structure, ethnic and religious structure. Diasporas not only preserve their traditions, customs, rituals, but often impose values alien to society on society. The influence of the diasporas not only on the domestic, but also on the foreign policy of the host countries is growing, since large transnational diasporas, with significant financial resources, are actively lobbying for the interests of those countries that were recently their homeland and with which they have close ties. According to the ethnologist, the corresponding member. RAS S.A. Arutyunova, “if we take into account the constant growth in the number of diasporas, their dynamism, active economic, political ties, lobbying right up to the very “upper floors” - both in the countries of “exodus” and in the host countries, their role in the modern world cannot be overestimated” (1). The growth of the number of immigrant communities and their institutionalization is so rapid that, according to some experts, this gives reason to talk about “diasporization of the world”, and some of them believe that the modern world is “not so much the sum of states ... but the sum of diasporas” (8).

“Diasporas rule the world, establish international norms, form governments and states, and even set the task of creating a world government,” says E. Grigoryan, professor, doctor of philosophy, leading researcher at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia. “... In a broad sense, we can say that for the past half century, global processes have been taking place with the economic and even ideological domination of the diasporas” [5].

Such a statement can hardly be called indisputable. Diasporas undoubtedly play an increasing role both in the domestic politics of those countries in which they have settled and which have become their “second homeland”, and in world politics, where they are increasingly expressing themselves as an independent player. But it’s probably too early to talk about the “diasporization of the world”, although it cannot be ruled out that the development of mankind could follow such a scenario.

Close attention of diaspora researchers began to attract only from the late 1970s. It was then that a number of works (mainly American scientists) appeared that served as a starting point for further research on a wide range of problems posed by diasporization. But the diaspora theme has really gained wide scope only since the 1990s, when diasporas began to acquire the features of transnational communities. As noted by a well-known specialist in ethnic problems, a professor at the University of California R. Brubaker, if in the 1970s the word “diaspora” or similar words appeared in the dissertations as keywords only once or twice a year, in the 1980s - 13 times, then in 2001 - already 130 times. Interest in this subject is not limited to the academic field, but also extends to paper and electronic media (the Google search engine, for example, currently contains more than a million references to the word “diaspora”) [26, p. 1].

A great contribution to the theoretical understanding of the diaspora phenomenon was made by such Western researchers as J. Armstrong, R. Brubaker, M. Dabag, J. Clifford, J. Conner (W. Conner), R. Cohen (W. Cohen), W. Safran (W. Safran), G. Sheffer (G. Sheffer), M. Esman (M. Esman) and others.

In Uzbekistan, research interest in the problem of diasporas manifested itself only at the end 1990s. The phenomenon itself has hardly attracted the attention of scientists. Perhaps this is due to the fact that Uzbekistan has long been a multiethnic state. And despite

the fact that its ethnic mosaicism increased significantly, it remained natural territorial dispersal of peoples and did not contribute to the formation of diasporas, although, in more than 130 representatives of various nationalities live in the republic. Unlike other states, where diaspora themes have become the subject of close attention of scientists because of the problems of refugees and their migration, interethnic conflicts, in Uzbekistan, interest in the life of diasporas began in connection with the increased interest of peoples in knowledge of their ethnic roots. During the years of independence, Uzbekistan moved to a new stage in interethnic relations, which can be safely called the "Uzbekistan model of interethnic harmony". One of the first works devoted to ethnic diasporas in Uzbekistan, was the "Ethnic Atlas of Uzbekistan", in which presented author's articles on almost all nationalities and ethnic groups, inhabiting modern Uzbekistan, their ethnogenesis, history of settlement and residence on the territory of the republic. Since 2006 at the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek was created and there is a scientific center "Interethnic harmony and tolerance in Uzbekistan" which brings together specialists from all universities and research institutes in republic working on ethnic themes. Its specialists lead a fruitful scientific work: conduct "round tables", organize debates, international and republican scientific conferences, publish collections of scientific articles, masters and doctoral students conduct research on ethnic diasporas in Uzbekistan. At the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, researchers of the department of ethnology in close contact with foreign scholars study the history of ethnic minorities in Central Asian region. Over the past decade, a number of candidate and doctoral dissertations on the problems of ethnic diasporas. Korean is widely researched, Russian, Tatar, Kazakh, Jewish and other diasporas of Uzbekistan, including Uzbek diasporas abroad.

Any science begins with the definition of terms. From this point of view, the situation with the study of diasporal problems looks paradoxical. Numerous studies have been devoted to the phenomenon of the diaspora, but the concept of "diaspora" still does not have a clear definition and is interpreted by scientists in different ways. The explanation, obviously, is that the diaspora is the subject of study of various sciences and disciplines - history, sociology, ethnology, political science, cultural studies, etc., and this alone implies the inevitability of a variety of approaches to understanding this complex and diverse phenomenon. Almost every researcher interprets it in his own way and gives him his own definition. - Serious discussions about its semantic load for decades have been conducted even within the framework of the same scientific disciplines.

DISCUSSION

Classic and modern diaspora

Many dictionaries define the term "diaspora" as "the resettlement of Jews since the Babylonian captivity in the VI century. BC e. outside Palestine." It is noted that gradually the term began to be applied to other religious and ethnic groups living in new areas of their settlement [see, for example, 6]. In the British Encyclopedia, this concept is interpreted exclusively through the prism of Jewish history and refers to the life of only this people (29). The Jewish diaspora becomes, with this approach, if not the only criterion, then at least the starting point, according to which it is customary to check all other scattering nations for their compliance with the term "diaspora" [15, p. 9-10]. "At first glance it seems quite clear that the term "diaspora" can only be applied to universally

recognized peoples of dispersion, for example, such as Jews, Armenians or Gypsies. Then everything falls into place, making it possible to judge the diaspora, consistent with the facts of Jewish history," writes a famous Russian researcher, Doctor of Social Sciences V.D. Popkov [15, p. 7-8].

This is also indicated by the author of numerous works on the problems of diasporas G. Schaeffer. He notes that in the 1980s, at the very beginning of the discussion on diaspora topics, the Jewish diaspora served as the starting point for almost all researchers [32]. With this approach, other ethnic entities outside their country of origin are "only" ethnic groups or minorities. However, many find this position obsolete. According to V.D. Popkova, it unnecessarily simplifies the problem, since it does not take into account the presence of many different types of transnational communities that have formed so far.

In recent years, any movement of people associated with crossing state borders, on the contrary, has been increasingly viewed from the point of view of diasporization processes. Diasporas began to be called any ethnic group, for some reason living outside the country of origin. This led to a partial rejection of the classical interpretation and a wider interpretation of the term, which in the literature began to be called the "new" or "modern" diaspora [17].

However, some questions remain open. From what moment can we assume that an ethnic group has already become a diaspora? Is reverse transformation possible? Under what conditions and how does this process occur? All this boils down to the search for criteria defining the diaspora and giving clear theoretical and methodological guidelines [17]. None of the "newly made" diasporas can be put on a par with the Armenian, Greek or Jewish, although in their practice there are some signs of the classical diaspora. However, the concept of "modern diaspora" already exists, attempts are being made to theoretical understanding of it, and this would be pointless.

The problem, according to V.D. Popkova, is where to look for a field for the modern diaspora, how to determine its place in society and correlate with the classical understanding of the term. According to this author, "the phenomenon of modern diasporas still contains a poorly researched phenomenon of overlapping social, ethnic and political spaces, as a result of which the emergence and existence of global ethnic enclaves crossing the borders of cultures and states has become possible" [15, p. 7-8].

As noted by S.A. Arutyunov and S.Ya. Kozlov, "Jews - if not unique, then certainly a textbook example of a" diaspora "people. Israel (along with Armenia and Ireland) is included in the group of states, the predominant part of the titular ethnic groups of which still live in the diaspora "[17]. They recall that the outstanding English scholar Arnold J. Toynbee, in a summary of his monumental 12-volume work, *The Study of History*, which was published in 1972, pointed to the Jewish diaspora as a model for the future world order and emphasized that with an increasingly active economic and political globalization, social structures associated with ethnic groups that are dispersed over large areas but united by language, culture, history, i.e., diasporal communities, are crucial war, the most characteristic example of which, by virtue of their history, are the Jews.

And yet, talking about the Jewish diasporas as a kind of unified model, according to S.A. Arutyunova and S.Ya. Kozlova, it is rather difficult, since the Jewish diasporal communities at different times and in different countries were very different and continue to differ from each other both in their own characteristics and in the situation in the surrounding society.

To various ethnic groups, as close as possible to model or stereotypical diasporas (Jewish and Armenian), various scholars also include Greek, Gypsy, Cuban, Chinese, Irish and several others.

However, the experience of studying classical diasporas with the identification of their fundamental features and group characteristics is difficult to extend to the study of new processes. More and more national groups find themselves outside the established coordinate systems adopted when considering ideal models, although they essentially solve the same information, communication, and ideological tasks of survival and adaptation in the new environment. "Therefore, the provisions on what the diaspora is, formulated with reference to the classical or historical diasporas (which traditionally include the Jewish, Armenian, etc.), require a new understanding in the context of globalization and the creation of a single economic and economic space" [18].

Classification of diasporas

Researchers have identified various types of diasporas and are attempting to classify them. So, S.A. Arutyunov and S.Ya. Kozlov distinguish diasporas by the time of their formation. In the old group, they include those that have existed since antiquity or the Middle Ages: these are Jewish, Greek, Armenian diasporas in Europe and West Asia, Chinese and Indian in Southeast Asia. Relatively young authors consider Turkish, Polish, Algerian, Moroccan, Korean, Japanese diasporas; completely new - diasporas formed by migrant workers (immigrants from Palestine, India, Pakistan, Korea) in the oil states of the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula since the early 1970s [3].

R. Brubaker introduced a new concept into scientific circulation - the "cataclysm diaspora". He connects the emergence of such diasporas with the disintegration and disintegration of large state formations, leading to a change in political borders. The main idea put by R. Brubaker in the basis of identifying the "diasporas of the cataclysm" is not the movement of people across borders, but the movement of the borders themselves. "Diasporas of cataclysm", in contrast to the already familiar historical or labor diasporas, arise instantly, as a result of a sharp change in the political system, contrary to the wishes of people. They are more compact than labor diasporas, which tend to be scattered in space and weakly rooted in host countries [25].

British sociologist, University professor Warwick R. Cohen identifies four types of diasporas: victim diasporas (Jewish, African, Armenian, Palestinian), labor diasporas (Indian), trade (Chinese) and imperial (British, French, Spanish, Portuguese) [27].

Professor of Wisconsin University (USA) J. Armstrong, when classifying diasporas, proceeds from the nature of their interaction with the multi-ethnic state in which they settled. He distinguishes two types of diasporas: "mobilized" and "proletarian". The "mobilized" diasporas have a long and complex history, they have evolved over centuries. These diasporas are capable of social adaptation and are therefore deeply rooted in the host society. As J. Armstrong emphasizes, "although from the point of view of their position in society, these diasporas do not surpass other ethnic groups of multi-ethnic states, nevertheless they have a number of material and cultural advantages in comparison with them." To the category of "mobilized" diasporas, J. Armstrong refers primarily to the Jewish diaspora (he calls it archetypal, that is, the true, original diaspora) and the Armenian. The "proletarian" diasporas are young, recent ethnic communities. J. Armstrong considers them "an unsuccessful product of modern politics" [24, p. 393].

G. Schaeffer distinguishes the following types of diasporas:

- Diasporas with deep historical roots (this includes Armenian, Jewish and Chinese);
- “dormant” diasporas (Americans in Europe and Asia and Scandinavians in the USA);
- “young” diasporas (they are formed by Greeks, Poles and Turks);
- “nascent”, that is, only at the initial stage of their formation (Koreans, Filipinos, and also Russians in the former Soviet republics are just beginning to form them);
- “homeless”, that is, without a “home” state (diasporas of Kurds, Palestinians and Gypsies fall into this category);
- “Ethno-national” is the most common type of diaspora. Their characteristic feature is that they feel behind the back the invisible presence of “their” state;
- diasporas “scattered” and diasporas living compactly [23, p. 165].

Very interesting is the detailed typology proposed by V.D. Popkov. He classifies diasporas based on eight criteria.

I. Community of historical fate. According to this criterion, two types are distinguished: 1) diaspora communities whose members live in the territory of their former state, but outside the separated country of origin (for example, Armenian or Azerbaijani diasporas in Russia, Russian (and “Russian-speaking” communities in Central Asian states) ; 2) diaspora entities, whose members were not previously associated with the territory of their new residence with a single legal, language field and have never been part of a single state (this includes most of the existing diasporas - for example, Armenians in the United States or France, Turks in Germany, etc.)

II. Legal status. This criterion also allows you to divide all diasporas into two types: 1) communities whose members have the official legal status necessary for legal stay in the host region (this includes the status of a citizen of the country of settlement, residence permit, refugee status, etc.) ; 2) communities whose members are mostly illegally located in the host country and do not have official documents governing their stay (V.D. Popkov emphasizes that this division is rather arbitrary, since almost every diaspora community includes people with recognized legal status and illegal immigrants).

III. Circumstances of the emergence of diasporas. Two cases are possible here. The first is related to migration. Groups of people cross state borders and move from one region to another; as a result, new diaspora communities arise or existing ones replenish. The second case involves the displacement of the borders themselves: one or another group remains in place and, finding itself “suddenly” in the position of an ethnic minority, is compelled to form a diaspora community (the most striking example is the Russians in the former republics of the Soviet Union).

IV. The nature of the motivation for relocation. In accordance with this criterion, diaspora communities are divided into: 1) arising as a result of voluntary movement of people driven, for example, by economic motives (these are the majority of “new” diaspora communities in the EU countries, for example, Turks or Poles in Germany); 2) formed as a result of “squeezing” the members of this ethnic group from the original territory as a result of various social, political changes or natural disasters (most of the classical diasporas that arose as a result of forced resettlement, as well as Russian emigration of the first and second waves fall into this category) .

V. The nature of the stay in the region of the settlement. According to this criterion, the diasporas are divided into three types: 1) communities, whose members are oriented to permanently stay in a new territory, that is, to settle and obtain citizenship of the

country of settlement; 2) communities whose members are inclined to consider the region of the new settlement as a transit area, from where the continuation of migration or return to the country of origin should follow; 3) communities whose members are committed to continuous migration between the country of origin and the region of the new settlement (this should include, for example, a significant part of Azerbaijanis in Russia focused on shuttle migration).

VI. The presence of a "base" in the region of the new settlement. Two types are distinguished here: 1) diaspora entities, whose members have lived (or lived) for a long time in the region of the settlement region, are historically associated with the place of new residence and already have experience in interacting with its culture and society. Such diasporas are distinguished by the presence of established communication networks, have a high level of organization and economic capital (typical examples are the Jewish or Armenian diasporas in Russia); 2) diaspora communities that have emerged in relatively recent times and have no experience in interacting with the culture and society of the host region (this includes "new" or "modern" diasporas, such as, for example, Turks in Germany or Afghans in Russia).

VII. "Cultural similarity" with the host population. This criterion assumes a division into three types: 1) communities with close cultural distances (for example, Ukrainian communities in Russia, Azerbaijani communities in Turkey, Afghan communities in Iran); 2) communities with an average cultural distance (for example, Russian communities in Germany or Armenian communities in Russia); 3) communities with a long cultural distance in relation to the population of the host region (for example, Afghan communities in Russia or Turkish communities in Germany).

VIII. The presence of state entities in the country of origin. This criterion involves the division of diaspora communities into three types: 1) diaspora communities whose members have their own state, their historical homeland, where they can return voluntarily or be deported by the authorities of the region of the new settlement; 2) "stateless" diasporas, whose members do not have an officially recognized state, whose support they could count on (for example, Gypsies, Palestinians, Jews until 1947) [16].

The above typologization shows how complex and ambiguous the diaspora phenomenon is. It is not surprising, therefore, that no researcher has so far been able to give a definition that more or less suits everyone. As the vice president of the Institute of National Strategy A.Yu. Militarev, "in modern literature this term is quite arbitrarily applied to a variety of processes and phenomena with the meaning that it considers it necessary to give it to one or another author or scientific school" [13, p. 24].

Obviously, the only thing that can be done under these conditions is to try to identify the similarities and differences in the positions of leading scientists that emerged during the discussion.

The variety of approaches to the definition of the term "diaspora"

Some scholars define the diaspora as part of an ethnic group (or religious group), living outside their country of origin, in new places for themselves [see, for example, 28; 7]. Others specify that diasporas are non-ethnic or non-confessional groups, not only living outside the country of origin, but also in a new place of residence in the position of an ethnic minority [see, for example, 12].

The third group of scientists - in particular, J. Armstrong, who is considered a pioneer in the field of diasporal research, belongs to them, emphasizes that the hallmark

of the diaspora is such dispersed settlement in which the community does not have its own territorial base. The absence of such means that in all areas of the state where the diaspora is deployed, it represents only a small minority [24, p. 393].

The fourth group defines the modern diaspora as an ethnic minority resulting from migration, maintaining a connection with their country of origin. Such an interpretation of the diaspora is provided, for example, by professor of Cornell University (USA) Milton J. Esman. For him, the key point in determining whether one or another ethnic group can be considered a “diaspora” is its relationship with the titular state.

A close relationship with the country of origin, in his opinion, is emotional or based on material factors. Esman emphasizes that there is a constant interaction between the diaspora, its so-called historical homeland and the country of its current residence, which can take a variety of forms. A characteristic feature of the diaspora is the ability to directly influence events both in the country of residence and in the country of “exodus”. In some cases, a “native” country may turn to the diaspora for help; in others, on the contrary, it may come forward (which is done very often) in defense of its diaspora, the rights and interests of which, in its opinion, are violated [30; 31].

The fifth group believes that diasporas should have the following features: they are “scattered” in more than two external regions; they are united by a “single ethnic consciousness”, preserve the collective memory of their homeland and strive to return there sooner or later, and also have an “increased creativity”. A supporter of just such an interpretation of the concept of “diaspora” is R. Cohen [27].

The sixth group as the most important sign of the diaspora highlights the ability to resist assimilation and not dissolve in a new society for it. For example, the Russian ethnographer Z.I. Levin as a diaspora means “an ethnos or part of an ethnos living outside its historical homeland or territory of the ethnic massif, preserving the idea of unity of origin and not wanting to lose stable group characteristics, noticeably distinguishing them from the rest of the population of the host country, compelled (consciously or unconsciously) to submit the order adopted in it” [11, p. 5].

And, finally, the seventh group of researchers, among the most important conditions that make it possible to consider an immigrant community as a diaspora, calls its ability to maintain its ethnic or ethno-religious identity and community solidarity and at the same time maintain constant contacts between the country of origin and the new homeland through a system of transnational networks. Such a position is held, for example, by G. Schaeffer [32, p. 9].

Despite a wide range of opinions, with a certain degree of conventionality, three main approaches to the study of the diaspora phenomenon can be distinguished: sociological, political and ethnic.

Supporters of the “sociological” approach, which has recently become more widespread, call the presence of social institutions in them the most important condition for entitling ethnic and religious groups living outside their homeland to be called the diaspora. The methodology of this approach is well traced in the article by J.T. Toshchenko and T.I. Chaptukova “Diaspora as an object of sociological research” [22]. Although this article appeared back in 1996, almost all authors who touch upon the diaspora issue in their works still refer to it, and by virtue of this, it deserves a detailed consideration.

J.T. Toshchenko and T.I. Chaptukova gives the following definition: “the diaspora is a stable community of people of the same ethnic origin, living in a foreign ethnic

environment outside its historical homeland (or outside the area of resettlement of its people) and having social institutions for the development and functioning of this community” [22, p. 37].

They consider the presence of an ethnic community of people outside the country (territory) of their origin in a foreign ethnic environment a very important sign of the diaspora.

This separation from their historical Homeland, in their opinion, forms the initial distinctive feature, without which it is simply useless to talk about the essence of this phenomenon.

But the diaspora - “this is not just a “ piece ” of one people living among another people, - the authors of the article emphasize, - it is such an ethnic community that has the basic or important characteristics of the national identity of its people, preserves them, supports and promotes their development: language , culture, consciousness. It is impossible to call a diaspora a group of people, although they represent a certain people, but have embarked on the path of assimilation, on the path of their disappearance as a branch of a given people ”[22, p. 35].

As one of the most important signs that allow one or another ethnic community to be considered a diaspora, J.T. Toshchenko and T.I. Chapytkova is put forward “the presence of a certain ethnic organization of its organizational forms of its existence, starting from such a form as fraternity, and ending with the presence of social, national-cultural and political movements” [22, p. 36].

In their opinion, it is impossible to consider the diaspora “any group of people of a certain nationality, if they do not have an internal impulse, the need for self-preservation,” and the presence of these traits necessarily implies certain organizational functions, including social protection of people. The internal ability to organize itself allows the diaspora to function for a long time and at the same time remain a relatively self-sufficient organism.

The authors indicate that not every ethnic group has the ability to create a diaspora, but is only resistant to assimilation. If objectively, stability is achieved due to the organization of the diaspora (self-government, educational, cultural, political and other organizations), then subjectively - by the existence of a core, be it a national idea, historical memory, religious beliefs or something else that unites, preserves ethnic community and does not allow her to dissolve in a foreign ethnic environment.

“The fate of each diaspora is unique and peculiar to the same extent as the life of each person is unusual and individual,” Zh.T. Toshchenko and T.I. Chapytkova. - At the same time, in their activity there are many common functions. They are inherent in both “old” and “new” diasporas, both point and dispersed, both small and numerous national communities” [22, p. 38]. However, the volume, saturation and completeness of these functions can seriously distinguish one diaspora from another.

An important function of the diaspora, according to the authors, is to actively participate in maintaining, developing and strengthening the spiritual culture of their people, in cultivating national traditions and customs, in maintaining cultural ties with their historical homeland. In this regard, such a factor as the preservation of the native language acquires special significance, since it is he who is the relay of the national culture, and its loss affects the spiritual sphere of the ethnic community, that is, its customs, traditions, and self-consciousness. In the event that there is no serious cultural distance

between the diaspora and titular ethnic groups, and if there are no other signs that unite the ethnic community, the collapse of the diaspora as a result of assimilation is inevitable.

But the main function of the diaspora is to preserve ethnic identity or a sense of belonging to a particular ethnic group, externally manifesting itself in the form of a self-name or ethnonym. Its internal content is made up of the opposition “we are them”, the idea of a common origin and historical destinies, and a connection with the “native land” and “native language”.

Of great importance for the diaspora is its social function - the activity “on the social protection of members of the diaspora, protecting their rights, obtaining guarantees and providing for people in accordance with the UN Declaration of Human Rights”.

Recently, the political function of the diasporas has become increasingly important, which manifests itself in the form of lobbying for the interests of the diaspora, as well as in the various measures taken by the diaspora in order to obtain additional rights and guarantees.

Diasporas, or rather, their numerous organizations, very often also act as a force opposing the ruling regime of their historical homeland, and for this purpose they use a variety of means - from publishing newspapers to forming public opinion in order to combat unacceptable political forces. Putting forward these or those requirements, diasporas also affect the “international position of the country of residence” [22, p. 40].

J.T. Toshchenko and T.I. Chaptikova noted that their “positivity” and “destructiveness”. According to them, in general, diasporas are a positive phenomenon, but sometimes they are “focused on nationalist, extremist ideas and values” [22, p. 37].

A negative aspect is also the criminal activity of members of the diaspora, which takes the form of ethnic crime.

Proponents of the “political” approach see the diaspora as a political phenomenon. They make the main emphasis on such concepts as “homeland” and “political border”, since in their interpretation, diasporas are considered only those ethnic dispersions that are outside the state of origin.

Among Russian scientists, the director of the Institute of Ethnology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician V.A. Tishkov. In his opinion, “the most commonly used, textbook term “diaspora”, used to mean “the population of a certain ethnic or religious affiliation, who lives in a country or area of a new settlement”, as well as more complex definitions found in Russian literature, are unsatisfactory because they have a number of serious flaws” [21, p. 435].

The scientist sees the first and most important drawback in too broad an understanding of the category of “diaspora”, including all cases of major human displacements at the transnational and even at the national level in a historically foreseeable future. “This designation of the diaspora covers all forms of immigrant communities and actually does not distinguish between immigrants, expatriates, refugees, migrant workers and even includes old-time and integrated ethnic communities (for example, Chinese in Malaysia, Indians in Fiji, Russians Lipovans in Romania, Germans and Greeks in Russia)” [21, p. 441]. V.A. Tishkov notes that, based on this definition, the category of “diaspora” includes huge masses of the population, and in the case of Russia, for example, the size of its diaspora may be equal to the size of its current population.

The second drawback of the above interpretation of the concept of “diaspora” is that it is based on the movement (migration) of people and excludes another common case of

the formation of the diaspora - the movement of state borders, as a result of which the culturally related population living in one country ends up in two or several countries without moving anywhere in space. "This creates a sense of reality that has a political metaphor of a "divided people" as a kind of historical anomaly. And although history hardly knows "undivided peoples" (administrative, state borders never coincide with ethno-cultural areas), this metaphor is one of the most important components of the ideology of ethno-nationalism, which comes from the utopian postulate that ethnic and state borders should coincide in space" [20, p. 11-12].

V.A. Tishkov emphasizes that "this important reservation does not cancel the fact of the formation of the diaspora as a result of changes in state borders. The only problem is on which side of the border the diaspora appears, and on which - the main territory of residence. It would seem that everything is clear with Russia and Russians after the collapse of the USSR: here the "diaspora" is uniquely located outside the Russian Federation" [20, p. 11-12].

This item is in the position of V.A. Tishkova deserves special attention because he is the main one in the disagreements between the supporters of two different approaches to the phenomenon of the diaspora: political and ethnic.

Two concepts are key in the concept of V.A. Tishkova: "historical homeland" and "homeland". He defines his "historical homeland" as a region or country, "where the historical and cultural image of the diaspora group was formed and where the main culturally similar array continues to live." He understands the Diaspora as people who themselves (or their ancestors) "were scattered from a special" original center "to another or other peripheral or foreign regions" [20, p. 17-18].

A distinctive feature of the diaspora, according to V. Tishkov, is primarily "the presence and maintenance of a collective memory, idea or myth of the "primary homeland" ("fatherland", etc.), which include a geographical location, historical version, cultural achievements and cultural heroes" (20, p. 18).". Another distinguishing feature is "romantic (nostalgic) faith in the homeland of the ancestors as an authentic, real (ideal) house and a place where diaspora representatives or their descendants must return sooner or later" [20, p. 20-21].

But "the ideal homeland and political attitude towards it can vary greatly," V.A. Tishkov, and therefore "return" is understood as restoring some lost norm or bringing this norm-image into line with the ideal (narrated) way. This gives rise to another characteristic feature of the diaspora - "the conviction that its members must collectively serve to preserve and restore their original homeland, its prosperity and security ... In fact, relations in the diaspora are built around "serving the homeland", without which there is no diaspora itself" [20, p. 21].

Based on these postulates, V.A. Tishkov formulates the following definition of the term "diaspora": "The diaspora is a culturally distinctive community based on the idea of a common homeland and collective ties built on this basis, group solidarity and demonstrated attitude to the homeland. If there are no such characteristics, then there is no diaspora. In other words, the diaspora is a style of life behavior, and not a harsh demographic and even more ethnic reality. This diaspora phenomenon differs from the rest of the routine migration" [20, p.22].

V.A. Tishkov emphasizes that it is not an ethnic community, but the so-called national state that is the key moment of diaspora formation. "The diaspora unites and

preserves something more than cultural distinctiveness. Culture may disappear, but the diaspora may survive, because the latter, as a political project and life situation, performs a special mission compared to ethnicity. This is the political mission of service, resistance, struggle and revenge [21, p. 451].

The views of V.A. Tishkov are not shared by many researchers, and, above all, supporters of the so-called "ethnic" approach to understanding the diaspora phenomenon. S.A. Arutyunov believes that V.A. Tishkov overestimates the importance of states and state borders. He notes that the formation of diasporas today becomes the prerogative of ethnosocial organisms, nations or nationalities that may or may not have their own national states, may seek to create them, or may not set such a goal [2].

An active critic of the concept of V.A. Tishkov is Dr. Ist. n Yu. I. Semenov. V.A. Tishkov, according to Yu.I. Semenova, in determining the essence of the "diaspora," overestimates the significance of the concept of "homeland," which is interpreted by different scientists far differently. "Having concentrated his attention on the political side of the diaspora, V.A. Tishkov ultimately came to the conclusion that the diaspora is only a political phenomenon," notes Yu. I. Semenov. - This does not mean that he did not notice the diaspora at all as an ethnic phenomenon. However, he refused the right to be called a diaspora by a purely ethnic, unorganized diaspora. He called it simply "migration" [19].

Yu. I. Semenov does not agree with this approach. He believes that the diaspora is basically an ethnic phenomenon. He defines ethnicity, or ethnic community, as "the totality of people who have a common culture, speak, as a rule, the same language and are aware of both their commonality and their difference from members of other similar human groups" [19]. Yu.I. Semenov is convinced that "it is impossible to really understand the problem of the diaspora unless the relations of the diaspora and ethnos, ethnos and society, and finally, the ethnos, nation, and society are revealed" [19].

Diaspora as a transnational community

In recent years, scientists involved in the study of problems associated with diasporal processes are increasingly talking about the "erosion of habitual ideas about the diaspora" and the emergence in modern diasporas of a qualitatively new feature - transnationality. As the doctor of political sciences A.S. Kim, modern diasporas are "special social groups whose identity is not determined by any particular territorial entity; the extent of their distribution suggests that the phenomenon of diasporality has already acquired a transnational character" [10]. When considering the problem of diasporal transnationality, according to A.S. Kim, two important factors to consider:

1. Socio-economic and political disasters lead to the emergence of quite numerous groups interested in relocating to other non-cultural, foreign ethnic territories: these are refugees, internally displaced persons, persons seeking temporary or political asylum, and flows of post-colonial migrants. In fact, in the context of globalization, a new model of social community has emerged - a transnational migrant. Despite specific ethnocultural identities, transnational communities have common interests and needs generated by migration motivation. For example, they are all interested in the freedom to cross the limits of nation states.

2. The basis for the emergence of diasporal communities is ethnic migration. Ethnic migrants are interested not just in moving, but in a long-term settlement in the host country. But immigrants are constantly faced with a varying degree of dilemma: successful

adaptation (integration) or separation (ethnocultural isolation, and perhaps even a return to their historical homeland).

Since in the context of globalization, ethnic migration is characterized by the scattering of ethnic groups not in one, but in at least several countries, the formation of diasporas leads to ethnocultural diversity in host societies, and creates problems of preserving the identity of both former immigrants and the elderly population. Thus, without a study of transnationality, it is impossible to understand and solve the problems that arise in the process of functioning of diasporas in modern societies.

V.A. Tishkov also speaks about the transnational character of modern diasporas. "We are witnessing fundamentally new phenomena that cannot be comprehended in the old categories," he emphasizes, "and one of such phenomena is the formation of transnational communities behind the usual facade of the diaspora" [21, p. 462]. The transformation of diasporas, according to V.A. Tishkova, was the result of a change in the nature of spatial movements, the emergence of new vehicles and communication capabilities, as well as activities.

Absolutely different emigrants appeared. "Not only in the West, but also in the Asia-Pacific region, there are large groups of people who, they claim, can live everywhere, but only closer to the airport [21, p. 463]. These are businessmen, and all sorts of professionals, and providers of special services. Home, family and work, and even more so the homeland for them, are not only divided by borders, but also have a multiple character.

Such people are "not between two countries and two cultures (which determined diaspora behavior in the past), but in two countries (sometimes even formally with two passports) and in two cultures at the same time" [21, p. 463].

They participate in microgroup decision making and influence other important aspects of the life of two or more communities at once.

Thus, due to the constant circulation of people, money, goods and information, a single community begins to form. "This nascent category of human coalitions and forms of historical ties can be called transnational communities," V.A. Tishkov [21, p. 463 - 464].

He draws attention to another important circumstance, which, from his point of view, is ignored by many scholars: "modern diasporas lose the obligatory reference to a certain locality - the country of origin - and acquire a reference connection with certain world-historical levels at the level of self-awareness and behavior. cultural systems and political forces. The obligation of the "historical homeland" leaves the diaspora discourse. Communication is built with such global metaphors as "Africa", "China", and "Islam" [21, p. 466].

This reflects the desire of members of the diaspora to perceive themselves as citizens of a new society for them, while maintaining their distinctiveness, and at the same time testifies to their desire to feel their global identity.

G. Schaeffer also draws attention to the relevance of the problems associated with the transnational nature of modern diasporas. He notes that diasporas are increasingly influencing the situation in their places of residence, as well as reaching the regional and international level of decision-making in all parts of the planet. At the same time, in this sphere of scientific research, according to G. Schaeffer, there are still many white spots, and one of them is the political aspects of the functioning of the diasporas, the trans-state networks and communication systems created by them that cross the borders of sending

and receiving societies, as well as political weight and political loyalty of diasporal collectives [23, p. 166-167].

Transstate networks [1] include a variety of contacts and connections established by social groups, political structures and economic institutions across state borders. G. Schaeffer believes that the ability to create cross-border networks stems from the essence of ethnonational diasporas, and the structure of these relations is very complex and confusing. It is impossible to fully control the flows of resources and information flowing through trans-state networks created by diasporas. But in the event that the authorities in the receiving and exiting countries show an inability to subjugate these flows to themselves, suspicions may arise of the lack of loyalty on the part of the diaspora, and this, in turn, may provoke a political and diplomatic confrontation between diasporas and their homelands, with one parties, and host states, on the other [23, p. 170]. Diasporas are not threatened with extinction, emphasizes G. Schaeffer. On the contrary, in the context of globalization in different states, new immigrant communities are likely to begin to emerge, and the number of old ones will increase. Accordingly, we should expect the strengthening of diaspora organizations and cross-border support networks, and the increasing politicization of leaders and ordinary members of diasporas will contribute to their more active participation in the cultural, economic and political life of the societies that hosted them "[23, p. 170].

CONCLUSION

So, the discussion in the scientific community on the definition of the term "diaspora" clarified the positions of researchers and clearly demonstrated how great the differences between them are in understanding such a complex and ambiguous socio-cultural phenomenon. Evidence of this is the absence of a single universally accepted definition of the term "diaspora". Meanwhile, the need for such a definition is felt quite acutely, and not only theoretical, but also practical. As the process of diasporization is deepening and taking on more and more new forms, and the role of diasporas and their influence is increasing, the host countries of the country are faced with the need to develop and implement special policies in relation to these new ethnic and cultural entities. But such a policy can hardly be effective if there is no clear definition of the "subject" itself, on which it is aimed.

It should also be noted that the process of transforming diasporas into transnational networks, which is gaining momentum, is making significant adjustments to the understanding of the essential characteristics of the diaspora by researchers and, as a consequence, to its definition. Therefore, it seems that the discussion currently underway in the scientific community on all these issues will undoubtedly continue, and the diasporal topic in the near future will not only not lose its significance, but, on the contrary, will become even more relevant.

References:

1. Арутюнов С.А.: «В мире все больше людей, живущих на два дома и две страны» // <http://nove-kovcheg.1gb.ru/article.asp?n=96&a=38>
2. Арутюнов С.А. Диаспора – это процесс // Этнографическое обозрение. – М., 2000. – № 2. – С. 74–78.

3. Арутюнов С.А., Козлов С.Я. Диаспоры: скрытая угроза или дополнительный ресурс // Независ. газ. – М., 2005. - 23 нояб.
4. Вишневский А.Г. Распад СССР: этнические миграции и проблема диаспор // <http://ons.gfns.net/2000/3/10.htm>
5. Григорьян Э. Контуры новой диаспоральной философии // http://www.perspectivy.info/oikumena/vector/kontury_novoiy_diasporalnoiy_filosofii_2009-3-9-29-18.htm
6. Диаспора // Исторический словарь // http://mirslovarei.com/content_his/DIASPORA-1402.html
7. Добренев В.И., Кравченко А.И. Социология: В 3 т. Т.2: Социальная структура и стратификация. – М., 2000. - 536 с.
8. Докучаева А. Проблемы диаспоры // <http://www.zatulin.ru/institute/sbornik/046/13.shtml>
9. Дятлов В. Миграции, мигранты, "новые диаспоры": фактор стабильности и конфликта в регионе // <http://www.archipelag.ru/authors/dyatlov/?library=2634>
10. Ким А.С. Этнополитическое исследование современных диаспор (конфликтологический аспект): Автореф. дис. на соискание ученой степени д.полит.н. – Спб., 2009 // <http://vak.ed.gov.ru/common/img/uploaded/files/vak/announcements/politich/2009/06-04/KimAS.rtf>
11. Левин З.И. Менталитет диаспоры (системный и социокультурный анализ). – М., 2001. – 170 с.
12. Лысенко Ю. Этнические мосты. Диаспоры как фактор международных отношений // Exlibris НГ (Прилож. к "Независимой газете"). – М., 1998. – 15 окт.
13. Милитарев А.Ю. О содержании термина "диаспора" (к разработке дефиниции) // Диаспоры. – М., 1999. – № 1. – С. 24–33.
14. Национальные диаспоры в России и за рубежом в XIX –XX вв./ Сб. ст. под ред. академика РАН Ю.А. Полякова и доктора ист. наук Г.Я. Тарле. - М., 2001. – 329 с.
15. Попков В.Д. «Классические» диаспоры: к вопросу о дефиниции термина // Диаспоры. – М., 2002. – №1. – С. 6–22.
16. Попков В.Д. Некоторые основания для типологии диаспор // <http://lib.socio.msu.ru/l/library?e=d-000-00---0kongress>
17. Попков В.Д. Феномен этнических диаспор. – М., 2003. – 340 с. – Режим доступа: <http://www.tovievich.ru/book/12/168/1.htm>
18. Ручкин А.Б. Русская диаспора в США в первой половине XX века: историография и вопросы теории // http://www.mosgu.ru/nauchnaya/publications/SCIENTIFICARTICLES/2007/Ruchkin_AB
19. Семёнов Ю. Этнос, нация, диаспора // Этнографическое обозрение. – М., 2000. – № 2. – С. 64–74 // http://scepsis.ru/library/id_160.html
20. Тишков В.А. Исторический феномен диаспоры / Национальные диаспоры в России и за рубежом в XIX–XX вв. Сб. ст. под ред. Ю.А. Полякова и Г.Я. Тарле. – М., 2001. - С. 9–44.
21. Тишков В.А. Реквием по этносу: Исследования по социально-культурной антропологии. – М., 2003. – 544 с.

22. Тощенко Ж.Т., Чаптыкова Т.И. Диаспора как объект социологического исследования // Социс. – М., 1996. – №12. – С. 33–42.
23. Шеффер Г. Диаспоры в мировой политике // Диаспоры. – М., 2003. – №1. – С. 162–184.
24. Armstrong J. A. Mobilized and proletarian diasporas // American political science review. – Wash., 1976. – Vol. 70, №2. – P. 393 – 408.
25. Brubaker R. Accidental diasporas and external "homelands" in Central and Eastern Europe: Past a. present. – Wien., 2000. – 19 p.
26. Brubaker R. The "diaspora" diaspora // Ethnic and racial studies.- N.Y., 2005.- Vol. 28, №1.- P.1-19.
27. Cohen R. Global diasporas: An introduction // Global diasporas /Ed. by R. Cohen.-Second edition. - N. Y., 2008. - 219p.
28. Connor W. The impact of homeland upon diasporas //Modern diasporas in intern. politics. / Ed. by Sheffer G. – L., 1986.- P.16 -38.
29. Diaspora // Encyclopedia Britannica, 2006
//<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/161756/Diaspora>
30. Esman M. J. Diasporas a. international relations //Modern diasporas in intern. politics politics. / Ed. by Sheffer G. – N.Y.,1986. – P. 333.
31. Esman M. J. Ethnic pluralism a. international relations //Canadian rev. of studies in nationalism. – Toronto. - 1990.-Vol. XVII, № 1-2.- P. 83-93.
32. Sheffer G. Diaspora politics: At home abroad.- Cambridge, 2003.- 208p.
33. Trends in international migrant stock: The 2008 Revision. CD-ROM Documentation. POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev/2008 – July 2009
//http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/migration/UN_MigStock_2008.pdf
34. Trends in total migrant stock: The 2005 revision //<http://esa.un.org/migration>