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Abstract

This research aims at finding how Russian print media perceive migrants. The study examines newspapers with different political belonging, which depict the migrant issue in Russia in a different way. In the centre of the research is the press coverage of the ethnic conflict in Biryulyovo (a district of Moscow) in October 2013.

To achieve the goal, Critical Discourse Analysis was carried out for a sample of 22 news articles published on the websites of two Russian newspapers: a liberal and oppositional “Novaya Gazeta” and a conservative state–owned “Rossiyskaya Gazeta” during October 13th – November 24th, 2013. Articles were analyzed by means of the two-level analysis method, including the so-called thematic and in-depth analysis. On the first, entry-level analysis, I focus on contents of texts and define key categories – ‘discourse topics’, aiming to map the contents and establish boundaries of the thus identified discourses. The second level follows analytical categories - strategies of self- and other-presentation.

The study revealed that, surprisingly, both the conservative and the liberal newspapers cover migrants similarly. While nationalistic moods are justified in Rossiyskaya Gazeta in several ways, Novaya Gazeta blames federal authorities in supporting nationalistic moods and presents the events in Biryulyovo as a logical result of the current political system.

The newspapers describe the events in Biryulyovo differently. The state newspaper tends to perceive migrants as a threat and the liberal one - as victims of the corrupted political regime. However, the core principals of depicting migrants are the same. Both newspapers show migrants as a voiceless group of people who do not have the same rights as the local residents.

The newspapers highlight the problem of separatism in Russian society, emphasizing that Russian local residents do not consider persons from the North Caucasus as fellow nationals. Also, newspapers underline the same trend in politics that both the state and the opposition are using nationalism as a tool in their political campaigns to attract more voters.

Key words: migration, ethnic conflict, CDA, DHA, Russian press, Rossiyskaya Gazeta, Novaya Gazeta, Biryulyovo.
1. INTRODUCTION

In 2013, xenophobic sentiments have intensified in Russian society. If earlier intolerance toward migrants spilled mainly in social networks, now it is manifested on the streets. Xenophobic street actions have become more frequent across the country. In January 2013, in the city of Nevinnomyssk (Stavropolsky Kray), hundreds of people tried to hold a street demonstration demanding the closure of the borders with the neighboring North Caucasus Republics, but were dispersed by police. In July 2013, in the city of Pugachyov (Saratov region), spontaneous actions demanding to evict all Caucasians continued for a week. Locals of Pugachyov blocked the federal highway and torched restaurants. It is noteworthy that in both cases the riots flared up on domestic violence cases - the locals were killed in fights with natives from the Caucasus. In July 2013, in Moscow, the incident involving police raised xenophobic attitudes even higher. Then the police officers were beaten on the Moscow market “Matveevsky” while trying to arrest a suspected of raping native of Dagestan. Thereafter the police began massive checks of migrants in Moscow.

The most vivid street action took place in October 2013. The people’s gathering in the capital’s district of Biryulyovo culminated in riots after the murder of a local Muscovite by the native of the Caucasus.

1.1 Purpose

This research is focused on the representation of migrants in Russian newspapers using Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) as a methodological paradigm.

The main analytical focus of the research is to investigate how the migrants are depicted in newspapers with different political orientation. I analyzed the press coverage of the ethnic riot in Biryulyovo (a district of Moscow) in October 2013.

For the research, I chose a state-owned newspaper Rossiyskaya Gazeta and an oppositional one - Novaya Gazeta. I analyzed articles dedicated to the mentioned conflict that were published on the websites of these newspapers: http://rg.ru and http://www.novayagazeta.ru. Novaya Gazeta is a well-known, liberal newspaper with a specific focus on investigative journalism. Rossiyskaya Gazeta is a Russian government daily newspaper. Both newspapers have open archives on their websites with a free access. This makes possible to search articles suitable for research online.
1.2 Research questions

The hypothesis of the research is that both state-owned and oppositional newspapers depict migrants in the same way, regardless their political belonging.

One of the research questions is to define who is a migrant according to Russian media. It is a common situation in the news media coverage when Russian citizens from Caucasus region are opposed to Russians from any other region and are put in the same row with migrants from Central Asia.

Another research question is to understand how Russian identity is constructed according to the media.

1.3 Motivation

The issue of migrants has always been challenging for the Russian society. The riot in Biryulyovo in October 2013 just enhanced it. This event got a great public attention worldwide.

On October 10th, 2013 in Moscow south district Biryulyovo a 25-year-old man Egor Shcherbakov was stabbed to death. Presumably, the killer was a migrant from Central Asia or a native of the North Caucasus. Residents of Biryulyovo demanded the authorities to find and punish the murderer immediately, as well as to evict migrant workers from the district. As a result, on October 13th the people’s gathering, aimed to raise a protest against the inactivity of the police, turned into nationalist riots.¹

During the past years, Moscow has seen many nationalistic riots. However, the riot in Biryulyovo became an outstanding one and is already used as a common name for characterizing ethnic conflicts. Different media called it a “revolutionary riot”, in a sense, that it may be a turning point in modern Russian history.

An overview of research in media and communication studies in English language showed that there is a relatively low amount of research concerning migrant question in modern Russia and especially CDA-research made by Russian researchers on this topic. In this case, the analysis of the media coverage of the conflict in Biryulyovo using CDA will support the timeliness of the research, its uniqueness and value.

¹ More detailed description of the events in Biryulyovo is given in the Context chapter.
1.4 Thesis outline

As noted earlier, this research is aimed at studying how Russian newspapers depict the migrants. To achieve this, the thesis is divided into seven chapters. Following the Introduction chapter, the Context gives essential background information about the country, Russian media system, the history of the analyzed events and brief descriptions of the regions relevant for the research.

The third is the Theoretical Framework and Previous Research chapter. It aims at identifying relevant theories and research work on migrant discourse in Russia and presents the CDA research on ethnic minorities and migrants.

The fourth is the Methodology chapter, which includes the description of Discourse Historical Approach, its key concepts and levels of the analysis.

The Empirical Material chapter presents the process of data collection and gives the description of the analyzed newspapers.

The Analysis chapter of the study examines and interprets the findings obtained by the methods described in the previous chapter.

The Conclusion chapter sums up the study by analyzing the findings and connecting them with literature and previous work and gives recommendations for the future research.

The Conclusion chapter is followed by the Bibliography and the Appendices.
2. CONTEXT

In this chapter, I present general background information that helps to understand better the analyzed issues. Some historical, geographical and cultural frames are presented, brief description of the modern Russian media model, brief descriptions of the regions important for the research and the history of the analyzed conflict.

2.1 General cultural and geographical background of Russia

Russia, Russian Empire, Soviet Union and Post-Soviet Russia has always been a very diverse country, multicultural, multiethnic and multilingual. According to the National Population Census (2010), more than 200 different nations and ethnic groups live in Russia. This number includes not only the indigenous small groups but also autochthonous peoples in the country. The importance of this fact is marked in the preamble to the Constitution. Russia is a country that stretches across two continents and nine time zones. Its inhabitants are practicing four traditional religions (Christian Orthodoxy, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism), and a variety of other faiths, from Christian denominations to shamanism (Pankin, et al., 2011, p. 49).

Russia is an asymmetrical federation. It means that some ethnic groups have their political subdivisions, and others do not. Hence, some of ethnic groups may have a qualitatively different political status. Administrative-territorial entity guarantees the dominant ethnic group of wider representation in regional government and police, as well as greater access to resources. Ethnic groups that do not have such status, require equality.

As a federation, the country consists of different parts: the republics, which are a form of quasi-statehood for numerous ethnic groups that have traditionally inhabited the territories where they are located. Such republics include Tatarstan in the Volga region, the Altai Republic in Western Siberia, Saha-Yakutia in Eastern Siberia, and the Chechen Republic in the Northern Caucasus, etc. Other types of the regional authority areas include the regions (oblasts) based on non-ethnic administrative principles and the one autonomous region (the Jewish autonomous oblast); and autonomous districts (okrug), that are a form of cultural autonomy for smaller ethnic groups (e.g. Chukotka is an autonomous district in the Far East) (Pankin, et al., 2011, p. 49).

The report of Open Society Foundation (2011) marks that the lifestyles practiced in Russia range from the nomadic deer herders Nenets of the Siberian Arctic who practice shamanism, to secular cosmopolitan lifestyles of the big cities, to polygamy as a social, but not legislated, norm in the Muslim North Caucasian Republics.

### 2.2 Modern Russian media system

As the analysis of the paper is focused on media coverage, it is important to understand the basic principles of Russian media model. I will present a short overview of modern Russian media system. I acknowledge it will help to understand better the complex relationship between citizens, the government and the media.

After the election of Vladimir Putin as the Russian president in 2000, the new vision of the state as a core of national identity emerged. This became a landmark in the development of the media market as well (Vartanova, 2012).

According to researchers of Russian media (Oates, 2006, p. 192), Russians perceive media as an essential part of the power structure and traditionally “see themselves as media subjects, without the rights of either media citizens or media consumers”. This is a consequence of the tradition of people’s subordination to the state and at the same time their alienation from it.

The dean of the Faculty of Journalism of Lomonosov Moscow State University Vartanova (2012) argues that since 2000s Russian media system is characterized by the emergence of Putin’s “monocentric” political regime. As a result, the state was using Russian media increasingly as tools to support the vertical power system, create a unified national identity, and downplay politically incorrect debates. According to Vartanova (2012), the key new element of the 2000s was the attempt of the Russian state to accelerate the process of nation-building and formation of common values that could cut across ethnic and regional divides.

Russian media model differs from the models established by Hallin and Mancini (2004). The reason for this difference, as Vartanova (2012, p. 140) notes, lies in the unique character of Russian society and culture, which is rooted in its geopolitical position, the complexity of its historical heritage, and the multiethnic, multicultural and multilingual nature of Russia.

The origins of the modern Russian media system were laid down by the birth of the first Russian newspaper, *Vedomosti* (1730). By that time, the Russian political elite realized
the potentials of print periodicals as an essentials means of social management. *Vedomosti* was set up by Tsar Peter the Great after his European trip. It was intended to become a tool for elite communication. For centuries thereafter, the Russian political system was managed in a top-down way by the ruling bureaucracy, and Russian power structures did not include political parties (Zassoursky & Esin, 2003).

Vartanova (2012) describes contemporary Russian media model as a synergy of different features that might be found in various national context. The synergy of Western and Asian elements found in the Russian media system is sometimes regarded as a distinct “Eurasian hybrid system” (Vartanova, 2012).

The key difference between Hallin and Mancini’s models and the Russian system is a strong relationship between the state, media and journalists, legitimized by a shared belief in the regulatory or decisive role of the state and state agencies. (Vartanova, 2012, p. 141). A contemporary Russian media model has emerged in the transitional postmodern fragmented society characterized by a struggle of conflicting multiethnic, multiconfessional, and multicultural interests in which values of modernization and knowledge confront the paternalistic mentality of Russian audiences and journalists. Russia’s media model certainly has many of the features of the Polarized Pluralist model and some of the Liberal model (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Vartanova (2012, p. 142) defines Russian media model as “Statist Commercialized”. She bases the definition on national history, pressures of the authoritarian traditions of Imperial and Soviet Russia, cultural practices, features inherited from Soviet journalism, the emergence of the market in the media industry, and trends in journalism.

### 2.3 Sensitive Issues

During the Soviet period the main ideological clichés, which indicated the direction of public policy, was the “friendship of peoples”. In the late 80s - early 90s emphasis has shifted markedly. The former thesis began to be seen through negation - as conflict resolution and prevention.

According to the report of Open Society Foundation (Alexei, et al., 2011), there are various discriminatory practices in modern Russia that arise from local politics or local prejudice. The researchers argue that the federal government is unwilling to look into those practices as long as the overall situation remains stable. So far, the situation is stable and volatile. However, inherent tensions sometimes come to the fore and produce tragic or dramatic consequences. The most noticeable event in modern history was the Chechen
conflict. There were two full-scale military conflicts between the federal government and the breakaway Chechen Republic (1994–1996 and 1999–2001). This conflict resulted in many civilian casualties. It also led to “the restoration of Constitutional order” in Chechnya, and to a wave of terrorist attacks and mutual acrimony (Pankin, et al., 2011).

Russian legislation bans discrimination on the basis of language, ethnicity, gender and religion. However, according to the report of the Open Society Foundation (Pankin, et al., 2011), the state has failed to ensure uniform implementation of these norms. Researches claim that the legal system and the law enforcement institutions in Russia lack the capacity and knowledge necessary to perform the task of enforcing anti-discriminatory legislation (Pankin, et al., 2011, p. 50).

In Russia, ethnicization of migration is linked indirectly to the institution of registration. Registration in Russia according to “the place you live permanently” or according to the “the place you reside temporary” is a euphemism for the Soviet registration system. Permit, unlike registration in the strict sense, is not a simple notification, but is permissive, so it is an open gate for corruption among the officials dealing with these issues.

It means a missing de jure, but de facto actively used ethnic criteria when deciding on a residence permit in a particular place. The primary victims of such practices are seasonal workers and migrants from Central Asia, the Caucasus, Moldova and Ukraine, as well as Russian citizens from the North Caucasus republics. Ethnic profiling is clearly seen in the way authorities treat migrants from the southern regions of Russia, seeking luck in the big cities of the Central and Northwest regions. While federal law guarantees Russian citizens freedom of movement and the right to choose their place of residence, in fact they do not apply to citizens of “non-Slavic” appearance.

In Moscow, the main source of national news, the most sensitive issues are ethnic. As the richest city in Russia, Moscow attracts many residents from the Northern Caucasian republics of the Russian Federation, and migrants from the Central Asian countries of the former USSR. It is a well-known fact that the newcomers often become the victims of police corruption and oppression by employers. A growing number of Muscovites perceive them as a threat to native culture. Researchers (Pankin, et al., 2011) prove that xenophobic attitudes are very much present in this society.
2.4 The history of the analyzed conflict

Egor Shcherbakov, a 25-year-old male Muscovite, was killed during the night next to his house in West Biryulyovo on October 10th, 2013. An unknown man killed Egor in front of his girlfriend. The incident caused a high public outcry. Locals suspected that Egor was killed by the resident of the North Caucasus Republics. The girl and a surveillance camera confirmed the “Caucasian appearance” of the killer.

After the police took no active steps, residents of the area went on the streets for a people’s gathering on October 13th, 2013. Initially, around 40 people attended the street gathering. They demanded that the police should not only find the killer, but also close the vegetable base where migrants and supposedly the killer work. But late in the afternoon nationalist forces began to tighten Biryulyovo. Peaceful people’s gathering escalated into riots. Several thousands of people crushed the vegetable base and a shopping center. The anger the crowd turned against migrants living in the district.

According to media reports, the police started massively to check the documents and registration of migrants in the surrounding areas. The police also began checks of apartments where illegals could reside.

Accused of murder was arrested on October 15th in Moscow region. It appeared to be 31-year-old citizen of Azerbaijan Orhan Zeynalov, who has been living in Russia for over 10 years.

2.4.1 The description of the Biryulyovo District

Biryulyovo Zapadnoye District (in Russian: район Бирюлёво Западное) is an administrative district of Southern Administrative area, and one of the 125 districts of Moscow, the capital of Russia.
The district has a vast industrial zone with the construction enterprises, light and food industries, consumer goods manufacturing, waste incineration plant etc. The largest fruit and vegetable base in Moscow situates in this industrial area.

According to the infographics, published by the state news agency “RIA Novosti” (Ria.ru, 2013), the district has 87,348 inhabitants. The area of the district is 8.51 km². Biryulyovo has relatively quiet crime situation compared with the average level in Moscow. The results of the elections of the city mayor confirmed that the majority of residents support the current government. “RIA Novosti” (Ria.ru, 2013) notes that there is no theater, cinema, concert hall or museum in the district.

2.5 A brief overview on the North Caucasus region

Analyzing the migrant issue it is important to understand who are those migrants, and where are they coming from, their cultural and traditional background. A brief overview of the regions where most of the migrants are coming from will help to analyse deeper the ethnic and national issues and to understand better the relationship between them and the local residents.

North Caucasus region (Dagestan, Chechnya, Ingushetia, North Ossetia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia and Stavropol Krai) has a small (9.86 million), but very multicultural population. According to the report of the International Crisis Group (October, 2012), the most numerous of the dozens of national and ethnic groups are Russian (3,178,128), Chechens (1,335,183) and the Avars (863,884). The main ethnic groups are indigenous Circassians, Avars, Balkars, Chechens, Circassians, Dargin, Ingush, Kabardinians Karachai, Kumyks, Laks, Lezghins, Nogais, Ossetians, Russian, Tats and Shapsugs. Most mono-ethnic population is in Chechnya and Ingushetia. Dagestan is the most diverse, with a population of more than 30 different ethnic groups.
Russian is the official language, but in the republics, people speak local languages. All of them use the Cyrillic alphabet. Russian language proficiency is declining, especially in mono-ethnic republics. In multi-ethnic republics, the proficiency of local languages also tends to decrease.

Islam is the religion of the majority population in the five republics (Dagestan, Chechnya, Ingushetia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia) of the North Caucasus - prevails in the east of the region compared to the western part of it, but in general its presence has become ubiquitous. Ossetians and Russian - the main ethnic groups, mostly professing Orthodox Christianity.

The peoples of the western part of the region (North Ossetia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia, Adygea), tend to be better integrated with the rest of Russia, and their traditional institutions and religious practices play a less prominent role in comparison with residents of the eastern republics (Ingushetia, Chechnya Dagestan).

It is noted in the report of the International Crisis Group (October, 2012) that despite a significant decline of the importance of traditional institutions, it is still widely believed that a clan system and traditionalism of the North Caucasian societies explain the increasing conflict in the region.
2.5.1 A brief overview on history of the conflict in the North Caucasus region

Integration of the North Caucasus has always been a problem for the Russian state (International Crisis Group, October, 2012). Russia began to build its influence in the region since the 16th century. The conquest of the North Caucasus by the Russian Empire was completed in 1864.

In the 1940s on charges of collaborating with the Nazis entire nations - Chechens, Ingush, Kalmyks, Karachay and Balkar - were deported to Central Asia (mainly in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan). Many of them died on their way, and on arrival died of starvation, unbearable living conditions and lack of medical care. Repressed people consider this as genocide. The consequences of deportation still have a big impact on the international relations, and territorial disputes relating to the legitimacy of the state.

Chechen separatism is described by the International Crisis Group (October, 2012) as the most vivid example of mobilization on the basis of the collective memory of repression which was transformed by the national leaders in the demand for complete independence. The conflict has had a profound impact on the entire North Caucasus, especially in Dagestan and Ingushetia. Now separatist conflict is largely substituted by Islamist underground, which operates not only in Chechnya, but has spread to neighboring republics.

The first Chechen war, officially named “operation to restore constitutional order and disarm of illegal armed groups” (International Crisis Group, October, 2012), started in 1994, when the Russian government sent troops to return the breakaway republic. Chechen national movement gradually radicalized as the militants took Islamist rhetoric and ideology, adopting jihadist tactics. After the invasion of Chechen militants in Dagestan and the ensuing wave of terrorist violence in August 1999, Moscow launched a so-called “anti-terrorist operation”. In fact that was the beginning of the next full-scale war, which officially ended only in 2009.

In March 2003, the referendum approved the Constitution of Chechen republic, according to which Chechnya became part of the Russian Federation.

2.6 An overview of the Central Asian Region

After the collapse of the USSR in the Central Asian region formed five independent states: the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Republic of Uzbekistan.
Many people from these republics started to migrate to Russia motivated primarily by economic interests, problems of survival and unemployment.

Fixed in the 2000s growth in the number of migrants in Russia, according to forecasts, will continue to grow (Rosstat, Federal State Statistics Service, 2011). On the one hand, there is a wage gap in the level of living conditions in Russia and sending countries, the high rate of unemployment in neighbouring countries are the factors shaping the flows of migrants traveling to Russia in search of places of employment. On the other hand, the massive reduction of the working population in Russia and the above-mentioned factors create a fundamentally new situation in the local labor markets of Russia.

Researchers speak openly about shamefully hidden fact: migration in Russia "is another form of “neocolonialism” <...> Therefore, such migration is extremely beneficial to recipient countries, and illegal migration is twice beneficial” (Ivakhniuk, 2003, p. 34).

2.7 Estimating the amount of migrants

There is a lack of transparency of the evaluation process and the inaccessibility of the decision-making information in FMS (Federal Migration Service of Russia). Officials usually rely on some ‘experts’ when presenting data (Mukomel, 2004). Information function prevails communication function in FMS’ work. Some researches (Mukomel, 2004) claim that the growth of illegal migrants in Russia is a direct consequence of the activities of FMS.
Statistics, which is not transparent, has become a tool of manipulation. This service discredited itself and stopped being a reliable source for the academic community.

Mukomel in his articles (2013) has also doubts about the quality of departmental statistics of FMS. He argues that FMS of Russia does not fully capture even those migrants who reside/live legally in Russia and who are legally employed (have a work permit or a so-called “patents” that enable migrants to work for individuals). Central data bank of foreign citizens and stateless persons (CDB UIG) allows partially to compensate the lack of statistics, but the analytical capabilities of CDB UIG have limited set of developed indicators.
3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Migration is a multidimensional phenomenon with social, economic, political, cultural, demographic, socio-psychological, humanitarian, criminological and even geopolitical components. Accordingly, this phenomenon can be analyzed from various positions using various categories (Malakhov, 2004).

The growth of the number of migrants in Russia during 2000s, according to forecasts, will continue to rise (Federal State Statistics Service, 2010). On the one hand, there is a wage gap in the level of living conditions and the rate of unemployment in Russia and sending countries (mostly Central Asian Republics of the former USSR), that shape the flows of migrants coming to Russia in search of employment. On the other hand, the massive reduction of the working population in Russia and the above-mentioned factors create a fundamentally new situation in the local labor markets of Russia.

Russia should be ready for the fact that the influx of migrants will increase. (According to Rosstat forecast, migration growth in 2012-2030 will be much higher than current levels and will reach 7.2 million people). It is inevitable that the newcomers will be foreign workers, due to reduced migration potential of Russian co-citizens. (Rosstat, Federal State Statistics Service, 2011).

Migration to Russia is not a matter of choice, but a matter of necessity (Mukomel, 2013). Migration is becoming a major element in maintaining the potential for economic development, preservation of stability in some regions, and national security. According to some researchers (Mukomel, 2013), a massive influx of foreign workers will become a global challenge, if the adaptation and integration of newcomers will be failed, and if they will not turn into loyal citizens, regardless of ethnic origin and the state of origin.

Russians perceive intolerance to migrants by the receiving population as a serious social problem (Mukomel, 2013). Many migrants do not know or ignore traditions of the host community. Indeed, young migrants, coming to work from rural areas, do not have proper skills and have poor knowledge of Russian language. Such migrants do not tend to adapt to Russian realities. However, they are only part of all migrants. Migrants differ significantly in their migration experience, motivation, and their original focus on the length of stay. Those characteristics affect the practice of their inclusion in the labor markets, migration strategies and long-term plans, relations with the host community.
Researchers (Newland, 2009, p. 10) distinguish three categories of migrants. The first category - “permanent” or “long-term” - includes migrants, who almost do not leave Russian territory except for rare visits to their home countries. The second category - “circular migrants” - are persons entering periodically (usually for the purpose of work) and leaving the territory of Russia. Seasonal migrants, who come to the seasonal work, are one part of “circular migrants” group. The third category stands somewhat apart, which includes first timers in Russia. Large-scale survey of migrant workers conducted at the end of 2011 (Mukomel, 2013) showed 40.8% of them are permanent migrants, not leaving Russia for more than a year, 38% - circular migrants (including 11.6% - seasonal migrants\(^3\)), and 21.2% - first timers in the country in 2011.

Most migrants-respondents of the survey (Mukomel, 2013) believe that Russians have a good attitude to migrant workers (72.2%). The narrower and more specific social network, the more it is personified, the rosier are migrants’ estimates of their relations with the local population. Partly, this is the evidence that tensions between migrants and host populations are an artificially created construction. The main channel for the dissemination of xenophobic sentiments is media from which migrants get their ideas about the relation to them of Russians.

According to Mukomel (2013), media, public politicians’ speeches, mass culture (especially youth subcultures) are the well-known distribution channels of hatred to “others”. At the same time, the primary goals of these channels are education of the newcomers about the Russian realities and vice versa, the host population needs basic knowledge about traditions, customs, culture, and the peculiarities of the behavior and social communications of migrants arriving from other societies.

Another problem is the ignoring of the Russian context by the integration policy. First, in the Russian discourse often present substitution of concepts. It happens when the discussion about the problems of integration of migrants is replaced by the discussion of their assimilation (Mukomel, 2011). Moreover, it is a widespread practice of interpreting events from the West, when these events are made up under the thesis about fundamental inability of migrants from Muslim societies to the integration and about the failure of multiculturalism.

According to Banerjee and Linstead (2001), multiculturalism aims at preserving different cultures without interfering with the ‘smooth functioning of society’. It emerged from attempts to manage the consequences of mass immigration and cultural diversity and is now ‘official’ in many countries (Banerjee & Linstead, 2001, p. 702). Ongoing in Europe

\(^3\) Migrants who repeatedly come to Russia and their last stay in the country was less than 6 months.
discussions on policies of multiculturalism are interpreted in Russian discourse as a failure of
the ideology of multiculturalism. The policy of multiculturalism, designed for traditional
ethnic minorities and migrant integration policy overlap but do not coincide (Vasilieva, 2010).
Proposals to provide and defend social rights to foreign nationals in accordance with
European standards, do not consider that these rights are not provided by the Russian state to
its own citizens.

3.1 Ethnicity and Ethnic conflict

Recently in Russia, the so-called “national” or “ethnic problems” have been discussed
in the most active manner, in different forms and at different levels. This “problem” is
dedicated to a number of official, academic, mass media and other texts. A community of
experts and managers arose, and it is already possible to assume a more or less coherent
discourse field. “Ethnic problems” are often described and interpreted primarily in terms or
the context of “ethnic” conflict. The term “ethnic” often means “inter-ethnic” or “internation” and is used in such concepts as “inter-ethnic relations”, “inter-ethnic tensions” etc.
The dominant direction in the domestic “ethnic” studies has been conflictological. Conflict
language is used by the variety of agents of social action in all areas of public sphere. Conflict
language plays a huge role in the justification and promotion of racist discourse and
discriminatory practices. In other words, as “ethnic conflicts” are described and interpreted
direct discrimination, different forms of indirect discrimination, extremist organizations, hate
crime and hate speech.

At first glance, ethnic conflict can be interpreted as so-called “denial issue”. The term
“the problem of denial” refers to various forms of rejection, denial or justification of racism
and discriminatory practices and has become firmly established in the lexicon of many human
rights organizations (Petrova, 2000). This conflict approach can be used as an instrument of
manipulations.

The so-called “ethnic problems” are mainly discussed in the context of migration and
in close connection with the “problems of migration”. The word “migrants” or similar terms
are used in the official language, the language of media and academic experts in several not
well-defined values. “Migrants” are often described as a culturally distinct from the majority
category, sometimes - as “migrant ethnic minorities”.

In academic texts such terms as “cultural distance” (Lebedeva, Drobizheva, 1997) or
“ethnic status” (Savva, 1997) are used. However, experts generously use clichés in their texts.
Migration of ethnic minorities is described as a “breach of the ethnic balance” and, together with the activity of minorities in various areas of public life is referred to as “expansion”, “non-indigenous nationalities” or “succession”. “Imbalance”, “expansion”, and other behavioral norms of “migrants” cause “natural” negative response of “indigenous people” (Popov, 1998).

A wide range of people, including those who are not involved in advocacy and policy-making, uses the concept of “conflict” within the migrant discourse. We are dealing with a stable and widely used approach. This approach to the description of any forms of domination, aggression, violence or xenophobia supersedes all other approaches and analytical perspectives. This approach includes a specific language, specific logic of perception and interpretation. Social, including ethnic, conflict, as part of social reality can and should be viewed as a process and a product of social construction. Manifestations, defined as “conflict”, are inseparable from the categories in which they are perceived and described (Malakhov, 2001, pp. 119-120). Different social concepts are involved in construction of the conflict. In this case, some researches (Osipov, 2002) acknowledge that in Russia the official institutes, academic experts and the media use the same language and follow roughly the same notions of “ethnic relations” and “ethnic conflict”.

3.1.1 Conceptualization of Ethnic Conflict

Ethnic conflict is a worldwide phenomenon (Horowitz, 1985). The definition of the conflict is a core element of it. There are many different approaches in defining “conflict”. For this paper, I chose several definitions, the one by Coser (1956), where conflict is a struggle in which the aim is to gain objectives and simultaneously to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals. Fairchild (1977, pp. 58-59) defines conflict as “a process-situation in which two or more individual or two or more groups are actively seeking to thwart the intentions of each other, to prevent the satisfaction of the interests of each other until the injury to the other party or destroy it”. Under the term “conflict”, Miall (1999) means the pursuit of different groups of incompatible objectives. If we understand these definitions broadly, any aggressive behavior, including verbal, can be interpreted as a conflict, since the interests of the one who commits an aggressive act, and another one to whom this act is aimed, obviously are not the same.

Ethnicity has often been studied in the context of modernization (Horowitz, 1985). Deutsch developed the idea that “social mobilization” was related to ethnic conflict. Social
mobilization was understood as “an overall process of change, which happens to substantial parts of the population in countries which are moving from traditional to modern ways of life” (Deutsch, 1961, p. 493). According to Deutsch, ethnic conflict is the product of something analogous to a race between rates of social mobilization and rates of assimilation. “The first crude indicator” of group conflict is the proportion of mobilized but unassimilated persons. Social mobilization fosters ethnic competition.

According to Wimmer (2002), ethnic conflicts and xenophobia/racism are integral parts of modern order of nation-state. He argues that democracy, citizenship and national self-identification are the main elements of the world order of nation-states.

For Yamskov (1997, pp. 206-207), ethnic conflicts include situations of rejection of the status quo from certain groups and relevant, including unilateral, action. Conflict becomes “ethnic” when “in the perception of at least one side of the defining characteristic of the opposing party serves ethnicity” (Yamskov, 1997, p. 208).

In some academic publications on the situation in the North Caucasus and especially on “migration problems”, by default is implied or explicitly states that the subjects of “expansion” or vice versa “counter expansion” are ethnic groups or quasi-ethnic groups (“Caucasians”, “Cossacks”) as such.

In public discourse, phenomenon defined as “ethnic”, is different from just a social conflict. One side of the conflict is subjected to ethnic categorization or, conversely, the group of people with a different ethnicity is seen as a consolidated social actor forming one side of the ethnic conflict. On the other hand, factors and elements of the situation, defined as conflict, are given the “ethnic” sense, which can be carried out by political officials, the media and the scientific community.

According to Osipov (2002), the idea of conflict justifies inaction of authorities as provided by the law actions (restoration of violated rights of citizens, prevention of the activities of extremist organizations) can be interpreted as a factor of possible destabilization. As an option - power portrays itself as a hostage of “people’s will”. Since peace and stability are described as priority values, it allows to justify discriminatory acts or omissions as necessity. Thereby, the researcher concludes that “conflict prevention” also actively encourages discriminatory practices. Conflict context as a whole, regardless of any specific incidents allows evade positive action aimed at preventing discrimination and protection of minorities under the pretext of “preserving the balance”. Russian politicians often use the slogan “protect the stability” to excuse at least propaganda pressure on the opposition and
organizations representing national minorities. Osipov (2002) claims that the concept of conflict is used in political discourse as a way of denial of racism and discrimination.

“Conflict” approach has become universal and stereotypical and found where the government, in general, has nothing to defend. Practically any program or regional concept of “national policy” is referred to as the plan of “harmonization” or “stabilization” of “international relations”. Since the “conflict” approach does not just mean support of racism and discrimination but itself is often a form of racism, it cannot be interesting for practitioners involved in anti-discrimination activities. Osipov (2002) argues that such metaphors as “prevention” and “early warning” of “conflicts” are an effective technique to justify a wide range of actions. Simplicity, clarity and matching concepts of common sense make conflict approach attractive to the media and public.

3.2 Russian Discourses on Migration

Mukomel (2004) in his research examines different Russian discourses on migration. He looks at different genres and goals from different approaches to the same problems. Stylistics, argumentation and the ideology form the characteristic of mass media, bureaucratic, political and academic discourses on migration.

His research (Mukomel, 2004) showed that Russian mass media hardly have any neutral articles about migrants. Russian journalists aim to describe problems of migration emotionally and to form public opinion, based on such perception. The main components of this construction become metaphors. The image of migrants is formed by characteristics, causing extremely negative emotions: fear, alienation, rejection or disgust that regardless of the author’s intention creates an image of “dangerous stranger”.

According to the analysis of Titov (2003), all the social contexts, where ethnic migrants are mentioned, can be grouped into two interrelated thematic blocks: a) ethnic migrants and the informal economy, and b) ethnic migrants and criminal economy. Because of selective typification, migrants become firmly associated with illegal economic spheres. The media use other destructive discursive strategies aimed at constructing increased risk from migrants. One of them is the exaggeration of the problem.

The media impose to the reader the correlation between migration and terrorism, migration and crime. Also, the media suggest ways to solve the problem: the suppression of terrorism is equal to limiting migration. As the result, marginal pseudoscientific speculation and fantastic data and estimates are retransmitted. It was noted in the research (Titov, 2003),
that “the primary function of the so-called statistics, driven by the publication of the press in connection with ethnic migrants is <...> to lead a formal argument in favor of the idea that migrants are an increasing problem”. The method of “dramatization” is frequently used by the media. Mukomel (2004) concludes in his research that media discourse is polemical and provocative and anxiety and irritability predominate.

Researchers have noted a shift to the language of hatred by journalists: “Increasingly, journalists identify with incorrect statements, deliberately emphasizing it <...>. Sharply reduced the share of statements condemning those we conventionally call “state representatives” <...>. Some details <...> suggest that journalists consciously prefer not to criticize the state for the hate speech” (Kozhevnikova, 2004). Researchers discuss openly almost a hidden fact: migration in Russia “is another form of “neocolonialism”... Therefore, such migration is extremely beneficial to recipient countries, and illegal migration is twice beneficial (Ivakhniuk, 2003, p. 34).

One of the dominant features of Russian discourse is the link of migration policy issues with socio-economic and political context. There is a noticeable vacuum in research of economic consequences of migration; socio-cultural aspects of mass migration are poorly accounted. Karachurina (2013) notes that it is difficult to seek an objective economic background in Biryulyovo-events in October 2013. Specifically, it can take place, but this is not due to migration and the redistribution of property. All around this discourse lies in the political arena, again giving a powerful impulse to the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of migration for the economic system. In the absence of proper research in the field of economics of migration - attention is drawn primarily to the negative aspects of migration (Karachurina, 2013). She concludes that one of the most important consequences of the Biryulyovo-riots is a powerful wave of nationalist discourse in which migration plays the role of perhaps the main problem of the country (and certainly Moscow). “Migration problems now have a leading position, ahead of almost everything else, no matter how deep they may be”, states Karachurina (2013).

3.3 Ethnicization of Migration

Ethnic affiliation of migrant problems is a key problem according to Mukomel (2013, p. 7). In Russian discourses on migrants, their nationality is replaced by their ethnic origin, nationality in everyday consciousness prevails over citizenship. In the society, the rights of the group dominate over the individual rights.
Exaggerated importance of ethnicity, permeating all aspects of social contacts, primarily affects migrants: “migrant phobia” has a clear ethnic etiology. Russians perceive influx of migrants as a violation of the established social order. The host population considers the countering to migrants as the restoration of the status quo (Mukomel, 2013).

Malakhov (2004) goes deeper in researching the problem of the ethnicization of the migration. Understanding of migration within ethnic categories is in focus of his research. The author examines the features of public discourse, conditional ethnicization of migration and the institutional factors that contribute to its perception in ethnic terms. According to his paper, ethnicization of migration is a direct consequence of an ethnocentric discourse. Under ethnocentric thinking, or ‘ethnocentrism’, the author means a way of theoretical classification of the social reality in which the base category is ‘ethnicity’. It is clear that within this discourse not only migration is ethnicized, but also society as a whole. As Malakhov notes (2004), ethnocentric discourse systematically entails the reduction of social disparities to ethnic and social interaction - the interaction between ethnic groups, the identification of cultural and ethnic identity of individuals. Born as “Russian”, the individual is automatically assigned to the “Russian culture”, born “Jew” - a “Jewish culture”. As a result, conflicts arising out of competition for access to power and resources, are understood as a manifestation of mutual incompatibility of ethnic groups, such as “Orthodox Slavs” with “Muslim Caucasians” etc. In this conceptual framework, the influx of migrants, ethnically which is distinct from the general population of the host community, can only be regarded in terms of threat.

According to Malakhov (2004), the main sources of the reproduction of ethnocentric discourse are federal and regional elites, ethnic activists and experts. Representatives of elites resort to ethnic classifications partly by inertia, partly of the instrumental political reasons. While everyone knows that the relationship between Moscow and Kazan - is the relationship between the federal center and the region of the federation, they can be interpreted as the relationship between “Russian” and “Tatar” people. Here are some more examples of manifestations of ethnocentrism in the perception of migration by representatives of the Russian ruling class. “Russian way of life” is used in public speeches by some politicians as a legal concept (Malakhov, 2004, p. 57).

Another subject of the ethnocentric discourse are activists of “ethnic revival” organizations. These are the leaders of numerous cultural and ethnic and ethno-religious organizations and informal structures that under a sincere conviction, and sometimes under a quite cynical calculation represent social interaction as the interaction between “ethnic
groups”. It is a fact that in a particular region, a certain number of migrants who are ethnically different from the general population are seen as undesirable. Arguments thus are usually rational: the lack of jobs, the negative crime situation, the pressure on the social infrastructure, etc. However, the crucial thing here is the fear to lose the cultural and ethnic purity, argues Malakhov (2004).

Finally, in the production and reproduction of the ethnocentric discourse, as already noted, take part representatives of the academic and expert communities. They use such categories as “ethnic balance” and “ethno-cultural security” (Malakhov, 2004, p. 59). “Ethnic balance” is an expression that is found in the lexicon of journalists, politicians and experts. It is unknown what specific criteria are used to calculate “ethnic balance”.

A belief in the need to maintain “ethnic balance” leads some researchers to look for examples of compliance with such a balance in the regions poorly suited for this purpose. The value of the expression “ethnic balance” is replaced: it is now used in the sense of not limiting the influx of immigration, but in terms of proportional representation in the power structures.

Central assumption for the Russian literature on migration is the idea of the difference as a source of conflict. Some authors (Sikevich, 1999, p. 99) argue that the formation of the image of “ethnic enemy” is paradoxically caused by the ethnicity itself. Researchers thus initially assumed that the difference as such lays in the basis of social conflict, but not the terms of social interaction in which any differences can acquire significance. German philosopher K. Hubner was also convinced that the peaceful coexistence of different ethnic and cultural communities is not normal. What was normal was their separate existence (Hubner, 2001, p. 390).

Malakhov (2004) draws attention to another controversial theoretical assumption, which is an equation of “other ethnicity” to “other culture”. In Russia’s case, this identification is doubtful especially since the vast majority of migrants in Russia come from the former Soviet republics. Those people went through the socialization in the same institutions. Thus, ethnicity, i.e. assignment of a particular ethnic group, begins to look like the affiliation to some special culture. Behind these innocent substitutions are hidden not innocent manipulations of expressions-myths: “Muslim diaspora”, “Azerbaijani crime”, etc. The newspaper reader learns from experts, that in Moscow and the Moscow region, “there are already about half a million Muslims”. The reader may well imagine a ring of migrants, while in fact, those people are Russian citizens of Tatar origin or of the North Caucasus or Transcaucasi ans, and most of them have probably a distance attitude to Islam (Malakhov, 2004, p. 62).
Among the institutions that promote ethnicization of migration in public discourse, Malakhov (2004, p. 62) highlights:

- state and state-supported organizations whose purpose is to solve the problems of migration;
- institution of registration;
- legislation blocking the possibility of the integration of migrants into society;
- non-governmental organizations, which are based on the ethnocentric principles.

Ethnic nongovernmental organizations have too modest financial, organizational and symbolic resources to consider their impact on the public debate significant. Some of these organizations promote the spread of ethnocentrism. Some of them are quite active in publishing activities. They produce a considerable amount of quasi-scientific monographs and collections of articles that replicate openly racist ideas. Also, they publish chauvinistic essays of Tatar, Turkish and other ethnocentric activists. Moreover, leaders of these organizations from time to time appear on television.

Classification by “cultural” grounds does not reflect the real social and cultural differentiation of migrants. State finances organizations that should solve the problems of migrants. In fact, they just create this problem as they fix migrants in a strictly defined status and make it virtually impossible to change. Migrants can count on support only as long as they are considered members of a “cultural group”.

In Russia, ethnicization of migration is linked indirectly to the institution of registration. Registration in Russia, according to “the place you live permanently” or according to the “the place you reside temporary”, is an euphemism for the Soviet registration system. Permit, unlike registration in the strict sense, is not a simple notification, but is permissive, so it is an open gate for corruption among the officials dealing with these issues. One of the manifestations of such tyranny is a practice referred to in the international literature “ethnic profiling”. It means a missing de jure, but de facto actively used ethnic criteria when deciding on a residence permit in a particular place. The primary victims of such practices are seasonal workers and migrants from Central Asia, the Caucasus, Moldova and Ukraine, as well as Russian citizens from the North Caucasus republics. Ethnic profiling is clearly seen in the way authorities treat migrants from the southern regions of Russia, seeking luck in the big cities of the Central and Northwest regions. While the federal laws guarantee Russian citizens freedom of movement and the right to choose their place of residence, in fact they do not work. In addition to the registration system, there is another less obvious
mechanism for limiting the right to choose the place of residence associated with ethnic discrimination in hiring.

The desire of bureaucratic structures to regulate the movement of people objectively leads to the situation when people start to look for solution of these problems outside of the legal field. Social consequences of such a situation lead to “ghettoization” (Malakhov, 2004, p. 65) of migrants. In the case of their ethnic differences from the general population of the host community, workers become members of social groups formed by origin - the so-called ethnic networks. Paradoxically, the institution of registration just generates the phenomena that it is supposed to struggle with.

It is essential to mention the legislation against migrants. Even under the previous legislation, it has been very problematic for migrants to gain legal and social equality with respect to permanent residents. New laws also close the already minimal opportunities for the integration of migrants into society. Malakhov (2004, p. 65) captures well the mentality of an average Russian official. He argues that it is unacceptable for the official that “migrants” may have the same rights as the “indigenous” people. Moreover, quite beyond officials’ understanding is the prospect of naturalization of migrants.

In Russia, ethnic model of the nation dominates. Nation in the context of this model is considered as a common origin, suggesting a common cultural identity, not as a civil-political community that can have multiple cultural identities of its members. Russian political elite is stubbornly unwilling to associate the country with “migrants”.

Multinational rhetoric, which sometimes is used by domestic officials, does not fundamentally change anything. Russia, according to popular belief, is a big country with a Russian people and several dozens of ethnic (national) minorities. This setting, despite its contradiction of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, finds adherents among legislators.

Ethno-nationalistic model largely determines the Russian politicians’ attitude to migration. In Russia, the emphasis in migration policy is to encourage the entry of members of similar nation. Symptomatic ethnicization of the term “Russians”, is commonly used to refer to supra-ethnic, civil community.

However, most often behind the “foreign compatriots” Russian officials have in mind not ethnic Russian, but Russian migrants, living in neighboring states and remained loyal to the Russian language and culture. The changes in Russian legislation are aimed in the direction of tightening. Thereby the ethnocentric ideal of nation is secured as a community of individuals of the same origin, which does not consider it necessary to grow due to migration.
3.4 CDA research on ethnic minorities and migrants

In this paper, I analyse the representation of migrants in Russian press. According to (Spencer, 2014), representation is the social process of making sense of the many signifying systems within a culture. It refers both to the products of the process of representing and to the active process. This process of interpreting signs is central to how we see other people and ourselves. Spencer (2014, p. 11) argues that by critically exploring those commonplace representations it is possible to demonstrate that the accepted ‘natural’ order of things is really the product of culture.

The social world we live in is full of signs, images and stories projected through different forms of media, permeating our consumer culture and all levels of social relationships. It is argued that the media are powerful sources, presenting persuasive and authoritative messages from celebrities and ‘experts’. I support the idea presented by Spencer (2014) that some of the complex negotiated views that form our self-identity are shaped by the media.

‘Othering’ is an essential part of the process of forming our self-identity. Spencer (2014, p. 10) defines the other as an “alien subjectivity, a being who exhibits characteristics notably different from our own, whether gender, race, class, custom or behaviour”. He argues that to some extent, each person is born into a social system, which has a pre-existing influence on our behaviour and outlook and on our understanding of difference. According to Spencer (2014), the ‘other’ exists as a metaphysical concept rather than as a genuine entity. This concept represents an area of consensus, a way of delineating self and the shared values of our culture or subculture.

Edward Said (1995) retraces the origin of negative stereotypes towards minorities considering the Western historical background of colonization. The era of colonization and imperialization contributed to forming an unfair and unbalanced view of non-European people and cultures. In his book, Said underlines the term “Orientalism” as a collection of false preconceptions characterizing Western attitudes toward non-western societies. I assume that his theory is applicable in case of the negative attitude of Russian people towards Asian and Caucasian migrants.

Critical discourse studies of the representations of various ethnic minorities in modern societies got ample attention in CDA.

Wodak (1996) analysed the socio-political and historical context of the development of racist discourse in Austria in terms of argumentative strategies. The study concludes that the semantic macro-structure of the anti-foreigner discourse incorporates the elements of
difference, deviance and perceived threat. The ‘foreigners’ damage the host country’s socio-economic interests while at the same time they are stereotyped as ‘different’ in terms of culture and mentality.

Teo (2000) presents a comprehensive study of the construction of immigrants in the structure of newspapers in Australia, highlighting similar discursive strategies of negativization and criminalization of Asian immigrants in Australia.

Van Dijk (1991), Wodak (1996) and Teo (2000) mark the new role for ‘culture’ as a point of categorization, distancing and blaming of foreigners, migrants and ethnic minorities.

KhosraviNik, Majid (2009) in his paper, which is a part of RASIM project⁴, points at the striking similarities among discriminatory and xenophobic discourses in various contexts and times, both in terms of micro-linguistic features and macro-argumentative structures. For example, the author refers to Hartmann and Husband (1974)⁵, who were studying the representation of immigrants in the media in the early 1970s. They found major similarities between anti-Semitic discourses regarding Jewish immigrants in the 1920s and arguments and discursive strategies used in 1970s discourse on immigration. They argued that in both historical instances news discourses drew on certain fallacious xenophobic arguments. According to KhosraviNik (2009), this theme of victim–perpetrator reversal is a widespread argumentative strategy in contemporary xenophobic discourses (Wodak, 1996; Teo, 2000).

Also, KhosraviNik (2009) notes that van Dijk (1987)⁶ confirms the findings of Hartmann and Husband (1974) and argues that immigration and social problems are redefined as a ‘race’ problem concomitant with a clear ‘us/them’ divide in which these groups are not represented as being part of society, but as outsiders who preferably should be ‘kept out’.

Van Dijk (1991), in a study on the British press, highlights the genre-specific features of newspaper coverage, and shows how manipulation of the features of a typical news report such as quotations and sources can play a significant role in micro-linguistic practices based on a prejudicial ideology.

In his later research, van Dijk (2000) analyses some of the ideological properties of political discourse on immigration and minorities in contemporary Europe. He focuses on the theory of ideology and on the discursive reproduction of racism. The framework of this

---

⁴ RASIM project - a research project at Lancaster University’s Linguistics and English Language department. The study was a double-angled investigation in the discursive representations of immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees in the British newspapers between 1996 and 2006, with one strand looking into the texts through the traditionally qualitative approach of CDA and the other adopting the generally quantitative methodology of corpus linguistics.


discussion examines and compares the way leading politicians in seven EU countries speak and write about immigration and ethnic issues. The theoretical framework for the analysis combines such elements as an elite theory of racism as a form of ethnic dominance and inequality; a socio-cognitive approach to ideologies; and a complex multi-level analysis of text and talk in context. Van Dijk analyses the relations between ideology, racism and discourse and argues that both racism and ideology are prominently reproduced by social practices and especially by discourse. He described the racist ideologies and how they may be expressed in discourses of social and political interaction. In the paper, the author also showed how racist ideologies may thus be propagated and reproduced in society.

The responsibility of media and public opinion in Western states when considering issues of discrimination of ethnic minorities and human rights is in focus in research carried out by Cristina Pace (2011). Her paper is based on the analysis of the media attitudes towards ethnic minorities, the media description of these minorities and its effect on the general social and political context.

The author follows van Dijk’s (2000) theory, that the media play an important role in the reproduction of racial and ethnic inequality in the society. Pace adapts van Dijk’s statement that the media discourse is the main source of peoples knowledge, attitudes and ideologies (van Dijk, 2000, pp. 33-36). She considers the role of media as an essential tool for shaping the national identity of a nation and in social cohesion or conflict as well as in the propagation of a more or less homogeneous picture of a country.

Pace claims that, in a time of multiculturalism and globalization where largely homogeneous societies are becoming ethnically diverse; a new, inclusive definition of national identity is required, which recognize this change in Western States and the diversity of multiethnic societies, going beyond the dominant framework of the nation-state and liberal individualism.

Pace argues that since the rise of the modern nation-state, the role of media in shaping public opinion has been essential in disseminating official policies and creating a picture of the new nation-state based on characteristics such as a common language, cultural heritage and history. In her view, the mass media outlets spread a false, imagined picture of the nation.

In her essay, she states that the media have an important role in social cohesion being able to change the way in which people from different communities view and relate to each other. The author concludes that a fair and balanced reporting respectful of the identity of the migrants helps bridging the gap between the different ethnic enclaves, while an unfair and limited reporting leads to prejudices and discrimination.
4. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I give a brief summary of the origins of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Then I focus on Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), which provides a set of methods of analyzing discriminatory public discourses. I present key DHA concepts, levels of analysis and categories that I use for the research.

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Discourse analysis is a quite recent transdisciplinary field of study. It emerged in late 1960s and early 1970s in such disciplines as anthropology, ethnography, microsociology, cognitive and social psychology, poetics, rhetoric, stylistics, linguistics, semiotics, and other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences interested in the systematic study of the structures, functions, and processing of text and talk (van Dijk, 1991).

Roots of CDA lie in classical rhetoric, text linguistics and sociolinguistics, as well as in applied linguistics and pragmatics. As Wodak and Meyer (2009, p. 3) mention, the notions of power, ideology, hierarchy and gender, and static sociological variables are all relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text. The aim of CDA is to investigate critically social inequality which is expressed, constituted, legitimized by language use (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 2). CDA is not one homogenous theory or single methodology, it should rather be understood as an approach, which constitutes itself at different levels (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 14). It offers a “different ‘mode’ or ‘perspective’ of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). A defining feature of CDA is its concern with power as a central condition in social life, and its efforts to develop a theory of language, which incorporates this as a major premise (Fairclough, 2001; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). CDA shows how particular language users establish exclusionary attitudes and practices by recurrently and selectively asserting certain attributes (i.e. social roles, behavioral characteristics, physical appearance, etc.) of social and ethnic groups (Wodak & Chilton, 2005, p. 24).

Discourse analysis is applicable for this research because it provides a general framework for the problem-oriented social research (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p. 2). It allows the integration of different dimensions of interdisciplinarity and multiple perspectives on the object investigated. One of the characteristics of discourse analysis is that it describes
text and talk in terms of theories developed for the several levels or dimensions of discourse (van Dijk, 1991). I chose CDA as a methodology because it draws attention to the existence of stereotyped categorisations in texts. CDA also shows how language users categorize behaviour, actions and attributes – all of which may be observable facts – in ways that express attitudes towards such facts (Wodak & Chilton, 2005, p. 24).

There is a difference between the various approaches to discourse. Norman Fairclough (2003) defines the relationship in accordance with Halliday’s multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orders of discourse according to Foucault, while Ruth Wodak, like Teun van Dijk, introduces a sociocognitive level (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 15).

Ruth Wodak bases her model on sociolinguistics in the Bernsteinian tradition, and on ideas of the Frankfurt school, especially those of Jürgen Habermas (Wodak, 2011, p. 61). Reisigl and Wodak (2001) describe a theory of discourse-historical analysis. They understand discourse as “a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral or written tokens, very often as ‘texts’, that belong to specific semiotic types, i.e. genres” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 36). In the discourse-historical approach, the connection between fields of action, genres, discourses and texts is described and modelled (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 22). Although the discourse-historical approach is indebted to critical theory, general social theory plays a negligible part: context is understood mainly historically. The discourse-historical approach finds its focal point in the field of politics, where it tries to develop conceptual frameworks for political discourse (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 22). Wodak also makes extensive use of argumentation theory (list of topoi).

**4.2 Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)**

DHA derives from linguistics, having its roots in linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics or linguistic discourse analysis (Reisigl, 2007, p. 6 as cited in Krzyżanowski, 2010, p. 72). DHA integrates historical background in the interpretation of all layers of a text (Krzyżanowski, 2010). The focus of DHA is on discursive and linguistic elements, social practices and their in-depth examination (Krzyżanowski, 2010). DHA is designed to carry on the analysis of indirect prejudiced utterances and to identify and expose the codes and allusions contained in prejudiced discourse (Wodak, 2011, p. 62).

The study for which the discourse-historical approach was actually developed, sought initially to trace in detail the constitution of anti-Semitic stereotyped image, or ‘Feindbild’, as
it emerged in public discourse in the 1986 Austrian presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 70). The discourse-historical approach has been further elaborated in a number of more recent studies, for example, in a study on racist discrimination against immigrants from Romania, and in a study on the discourse about nation and national identity in Austria (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 71).

According to Wodak and Meyer (2009, p. 65), one of the most salient distinguishing features of the discourse-historical approach is its endeavour to work with various methods and on the basis of a variety of empirical data as well as background information. Depending on the object of investigation, DHA attempts to transcend the purely linguistic dimension and to include more or less systematically the historical, political, sociological and/or psychological dimensions in the analysis and interpretation of a specific discourse event.

Wodak (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, pp. 69-70) distinguishes following most important characteristics of DHA. First, the approach is interdisciplinary. The notion of interdisciplinarity is located on several levels: in theory, in the work itself, in teams, and in practice. DHA is problem oriented, not focused on specific linguistic items. The theory and the methodology are integrated which is helpful in understanding and explaining the object under investigation. Wodak marks that a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary. Intertextual and interdiscursive relationships are investigated in multiple genres and multiple public spaces. Recontextualization is the most important process in connecting genres, topics and arguments. One more characteristic of DHA is that the historical context is always analyzed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts. Finally, the results should be made available to experts in different fields and be applied with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices.

Wodak (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, pp. 71-72) suggests that discourses about nations and national identities rely on at least four types of discursive macro-strategies: constructive strategies (aiming at the construction of national identities), preservative or justificatory strategies (aiming at the conservation and reproduction of national identities or narratives of identity), transformative strategies (aiming at the change of national identities), and destructive strategies (aiming at the dismantling of national identities).

### 4.3 Key Concepts of DHA

One important assumption of CDA is that all discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 15).
In accordance with this, CDA refers to such extralinguistic factors as culture, society, and ideology. Researchers emphasize that the notion of context is crucial for CDA, since this explicitly includes social-psychological, political and ideological components and thereby postulates an interdisciplinary procedure. Other concepts in CDA are intertextuality and interdiscursivity. These allow to investigate relationships with other texts.

DHA approach, according to Wodak (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 67), is based on a concept of ‘context’, which takes into account four levels. The first one is descriptive, while the other three levels are part of theories on context (see Figure 1). The first level includes the immediate, language or text internal co-text. On the second level, there are the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses. The third levels takes into account the extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific ‘context of situation’ (middle range theories). Finally, on the fourth level, there is the broader sociopolitical and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to (‘grand’ theories).

![Diagram of Levels of Theories and Linguistic Analysis](Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 69)

Researchers distinguish between discourse and text. Discourse is defined in a different, more abstract, level as text. Discourse implies patterns and commonalities of knowledge and structures whereas a text is a specific and unique realization of a discourse. (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p. 6). Jay Lemke (1995, p. 7) defines discourse as following:

“Discourses, as social actions more or less governed by social habits, produce texts that will in some ways be alike in their meanings...When we want to focus on the specifics of an event or occasion, we speak of the text; when we want to look at patterns, commonality, relationships that embrace different texts and occasions, we can speak of discourses”.
Discourses are open and hybrid and not closed systems at all. New sub-topics can be created, and intertextuality and interdiscursivity allow for new fields of action (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 66). Discourses and discourse topics ‘spread’ to different fields and discourses. They cross between fields, overlap, refer to each other or are in some other way socio-functionally linked with each other (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 67). These discursive characteristics are described under labels that include ‘textual chains’, ‘intertextuality’, ‘interdiscursivity’, ‘orders of discourse’ and ‘hybridity’ (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 36).

‘Hybridity’ refers to the heterogeneous mixture of different genres or genre features in a concrete linguistic token (written or oral) or a new genre. ‘Interdiscursivity’ means both the mutual relationships of discourses and the connection, intersecting or overlapping (see Figure 2), of different discourses ‘within’ a particular heterogeneous linguistic product. ‘Textual chains’ refer to the sequence or succession of thematically or/and functionally related texts, which is preshaped by the frame of particular configurations of conventionalised linguistic practices that reflect the social order in its discursive facet, that is to say, the ‘orders of discourse’ (Fairclough 1995a: 10 as cited in Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p.36). Intertextuality refers to the fact that all the texts are linked to other texts, both in the past and in the present. Such links can be established in different ways: through continued reference to a topic or main actors; through reference to the same events or by the transfer of main arguments from one text into the next (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p. 3). The latter process is also called recontextualisation, which can be described as a two-step process in which elements of particular discourses are taken out of their original context and strategically placed into a different context (Krzyżanowski, 2010, p. 78).

FIGURE 2. Interdiscursive and intertextual relationships between discourses, discourse topics, genres and texts (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 69).
4.4 Levels of analysis in DHA

I follow the two-level analysis method presented by Krzyżanowski (2010), and including the so-called thematic and in-depth analysis. On the first, entry-level analysis, I focus on contents of texts and define key categories – ‘discourse topics’ (van Dijk, 2000), aiming to map the contents and establish boundaries of the thus identified discourses. The second level follows analytical categories described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) - strategies of self- and other-presentation.

The aim of the entry-level analysis is to determine the contents of the analyzed material and to attribute it to particular genres. The analytical category of ‘discourse topic’ was described by van Dijk (van Dijk, 1991):

“Topics conceptually, summarize the text, and specify its most important information. In theoretical terms such topics can be described as semantic macro-propositions, that is, as propositions that are derived from sequences of propositions in the text: for instance, by macro-rules such as selection, abstraction, and other operations which reduce complex information. The hierarchical set of topics or macro-propositions forms the thematic or topical structure of the text. Language users employ such macro-structures in order to understand globally and to summarize a text” (van Dijk, 1991, p. 113, original emphasis).

Discourse topics summarise the most important information in the text. In the analysis, discourse topics are defined in an inductive way. The macro-topic is found after several readings then, sub-topics of parts of a text are decoded. Finally, these topics are ordered into the list of key themes and sub-themes (Krzyżanowski, 2010, p. 81).

The second level of analysis is the in-depth analysis, which examines ‘deeper’ located discourse structures. I use discursive strategies of Reisigl and Wodak (2001) with special focus on topoi and other supporting elements, such as rhetorical tropes (e.g. metaphors, metonymies etc), and other means of linguistic realization. The aim of the in-depth analysis is to establish the actual characteristics and features of the analyzed discourses. According to Krzyżanowski (2010, p. 83), the in-depth analysis “is primarily argumentation-oriented and aims to reveal how different elements of discourse are endowed with pragmatic meaning and thus placed with different arguments according to the more-or-less strategic aims set up by the speakers/authors of texts”.
4.4.1 Strategies of Self- and Other-Presentation

Reisigl and Wodak (2001) created five questions that help to define the Strategies of Self- and Other-Presentation in the analysis of discourses about racial, national and ethnic issues:

How are persons named and referred to linguistically? What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them? By means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others? From what perspective or point of view are these labels, attributions and arguments expressed? Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, are they intensified or are they mitigated? (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 44).

These questions lead to the five discursive strategies, which are all involved in the positive self- and negative other presentation. According to Wodak (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 73), the discursive constructions of ‘us’ and ‘them’ are the basic fundaments of discourses of identity and difference. She emphasizes that such discourses are salient for discourses of discrimination. By ‘strategy’ the researches mean a plan of practices (including discursive practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 44).

There are five different strategies (see Table 4.1) distinguished by Reisigl and Wodak (2001, pp. 44-46): referential strategies or nomination strategies (by which one constructs and represents social actors: for example, in-groups and out-groups); predicational strategies (aim either at labeling social actors more or less positively or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively); argumentation strategies (a fund of topoi through which positive and negative attributions are justified); perspectivation, framing or discourse representation (by means of which speakers express their involvement in discourse); intensing/mitigation strategies (help to qualify and modify the epistemic status of a proposition by intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of racist, nationalist or ethnicist utterances).
In their method Reisigl and Wodak (2001, pp. 46-47), adopt some concepts of Theo van Leeuwen’s system network of representation of social actors in discourse (van Leeuwen, 1996), such as the categories of ‘exclusion’, ‘inclusion’, ‘suppression’, ‘backgrounding’, ‘passivation’, ‘categorisation’, ‘specification’, ‘genericisation’, ‘assimilation’, ‘collectivisation’. According to Reisigl and Wodak (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 46), the common feature of the presented labellings is that they are based on a referential identification procedure which is tropologically described as synecdochisation: a specific feature, trait or characteristic is selectively pushed to the fore as a ‘part for the whole’, as a representative depictor.

The social actors’ exclusion or inclusion in the linguistic representations can serve many different psychological, social or political interests on the side of the speakers or writers. Linguistic exclusion has clearly discriminating effects. Linguistic inclusion is very often an indicator of fair and just representation and treatment, but can also have a disguising, relativising or averting function (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 47).

In the analysis, I use the list of potential referential strategies presented by Reisigl and Wodak (2001, pp. 48-52). Analytically, Reisigl and Wodak (2001, p. 52) assume a strategy

---

### Discursive strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential/ nomination</td>
<td>Construction of in-groups and out-groups</td>
<td>• membership categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• metaphors and metonymies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predication</td>
<td>Labelling social actors more or less positively or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively</td>
<td>• stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>Justification of positive or negative attributions</td>
<td>• <em>topoi</em> used to justify political inclusion or exclusion, discrimination or preferential treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectivation, framing or discourse representation</td>
<td>Expressing involvement</td>
<td>• reporting, description, narration or quotation of (discriminatory) events and utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positioning speaker’s point of view</td>
<td>• intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of (discriminatory) utterances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Discursive strategies (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 73).
that represents social actors in terms of social activities. Researchers name this strategy `actionalisation', considering `professionalisation' as a specific form of actionalisation, which can also overlap with other categories.

A key category in the analysis of the argumentative strategies is the notion of topos. It is used in as an argumentation scheme. Topoi defines what is the aim of the argument. Topoi can be identified as:

“Certain headings of arguments which, in a way, summarise the argument while also providing it with a necessary ‘skeleton’ which is fleshed over by respective discourse contents. Therefore, the analysis aims to discover the links which are established in the course of analysis between the levels of mapping of those contents (i.e. topics) and establish the argumentation schemes (i.e. topoi) deployed, and related linguistic aspects” (Krzyżanowski, 2010, p. 85).

According to M. Kienpointner, topoi are the content-related warrants or ‘conclusion rules’ which connect the argument or arguments with the conclusion, the claim (Kienpointner, 1992, p. 194, as cited in Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 74).

The analysis of typical content-related argument schemes can be carried out against the background of the list of topoi. For my research I adapt the list of topoi presented in Wodak & Meyer (2009, p. 74), given in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of topoi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Usefulness, advantage</td>
<td>9 Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Uselessness, disadvantage</td>
<td>10 Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Definition, name-interpretation</td>
<td>11 Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Danger and threat</td>
<td>12 Law and right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Humanitarianism</td>
<td>13 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Justice</td>
<td>14 Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Responsibility</td>
<td>15 Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Burdening, weighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. The list of topoi (adapted from Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 74).

The different forms of social exclusion and discrimination can be discussed inter alia by means of topoi, both arguing for and against racism, ethnicism and nationalism (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 73).

Here are the topoi that are most relevant for this research described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001). The topos of danger or topos of threat can lead to a victim-victimizer reversal when victims are made responsible for the prejudices directed against them. The topos of humanitarianism is closely connected with the topos of justice that is based on the claim of
‘equal rights for all’. The *topos of history* focuses on a change situated in the past: on supposedly having learned from history. *Topos of history* is used to warn of a repetition of the past, the historical analogies being more or less adequate. The *topos of burdening or weighing down* is a specific causal *topos* and can be reduced to the following metaphorical phrase ‘the boat is full/overcrowded’. The *topos of responsibility* can be summarised by the formula: because a state or a group of persons is responsible for the emergence of specific problems, it or they should act in order to find solutions of these problems. *Topos of finances* focuses on allegedly negative socioeconomic consequences. The *topos of culture* is based on the following argumentation scheme: because the culture of a specific group of people is as it is, specific problems arise in specific situations. The *topos of numbers* may be defined under the condition: if the numbers prove a specific *topos*, a specific action should be performed.
5. EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

In this chapter, I present the methods of data collection and give a brief description of the chosen media outlets.

5.1 Data collection

Data collection in CDA is not considered a specific phase that must be completed before analysis begins: after the first collection exercise, it is a matter of carrying out the first analyses, finding indicators for particular concepts, expanding concepts into categories and, based on these results, collecting further data (theoretical sampling). In this mode of procedure, data collection is never completely excluded, and new questions always arise which can only be dealt with if new data are collected or earlier data are re-examined (Strauss, 1987 p. 56 as cited in Wodak & Meyer, 2009, pp. 23-24).

Concerning sampling in CDA, Gerlinde Mautner (2008, p. 35) recommends to use a cyclical process instead of random sampling. Following this way of sampling, I began with a small but relevant amount of articles, analyzed them and on the basis of my findings selected again.

I analyzed articles of all journalistic genres that were written by the journalists of chosen newspapers or other experts for those newspapers. Analytical and opinion-oriented articles were preferred. One condition was that articles should be original. The reproduction of the news from news agencies was not analyzed. The analyzed event was not covered by particular author/group of authors, so the author-filter was not considered.

I gathered articles that were published during six weeks after the analyzed riot happened (October 13th, 2013). To search for relevant articles online I used the combination of words ‘migrant’, ‘Biryulyovo’, ‘ethnic conflict’ etc.

I used the search field on the website http://www.novayagazeta.ru/ with a time filter: October 13th, 2013 – November 24th, 2013. The entry-level search with a key word: “Бирюлево” (Biryulyovo) gave 124 articles. Articles were sorted based on the principle that Biryulyovo-riot was the main topic and the word ‘Biryulyovo’ was mentioned in the article more than once. One more filter was used – the amount of the views by independent Internet-users. I chose articles with the biggest amount of views.
The search field on the web-site http://rg.ru/ was used as well. The newspaper has a collection of materials named “the murder case of Yegor Shcherbakov” which consists of 133 articles about the Biryulyovo-riot. The search with the key-word ‘Biryulyovo’ during October 13th – November 24th, 2013 showed around 320 results.

After reviewing articles and implication all the filters of the search, 22 articles were selected, 11 texts from each newspaper. All articles are published in Russian language.

5.2 Novaya Gazeta

Editorially independent Novaya Gazeta is a Russian liberal opposition newspaper, which is famous for its high standard pieces of investigative journalism. It was first published on April 1st, 1993. Editorial team owns a controlling stake, the rest shares are divided between a businessman Alexander Lebedev, who also controls the London Evening Standard and The Independent newspapers in the UK, and ex-Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The newspaper is defined (Slon.ru, 2010) as the one with the “reputation of the most oppositional media in the country” during two terms of Vladimir Putin’s rule.

The newspaper is printed three times a week in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, Ryazan, Samara, Nizhny Novgorod, Krasnodar, Novosibirsk, Vladivostok. It has foreign issues in Germany, Israel and Kazakhstan. Some of its articles are translated into English on the English version of the newspapers’ website. The recent print issue (№53, May 19th, 2014) had a circulation of 245.65 thousand copies. The number of viewers of the website (http://www.novayagazeta.ru) reached 15.3 mln in April 2014.

The world-famous journalist Anna Politkovskaya, Anastasia Baburova, Yury Shchekochikhin and Igor Domnikov are the killed journalists who worked for the newspaper.

5.3 Rossiyskaya Gazeta

Rossiyskaya Gazeta is a Russian government daily newspaper and one of the leading quality daily newspapers in Russia. It was founded by the Government of the Russian Federation, and its first issue appeared on November 11th, 1990. Its circulation is 180.000 copies daily. The newspaper (RG.ru) defines its readers as “even-tempered adults inclined to conservative views”.

It is a unique exception among other Russian newspapers because it constantly increases its circulation due to direct government subsidies and a monopoly on printing
legislation and government acts. All distribution costs of the newspaper are covered by the government, which tries to expand the territorial scope of distribution. The government subsidies also enable the newspaper to have a low subscription price. In 2008, the paper launched a new Friday edition with a circulation of 3.5 million copies. It is distributed free, mainly to low-income households in the regions.

The Rossiyskaya Gazeta has 38 offices in Russia and abroad. It is printed in 41 Russian cities (daily edition) and in 46 cities (weekly edition).\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Website of Rossiyskaya Gazeta, [http://www.rg.ru/about.html](http://www.rg.ru/about.html), accessed on May, 20\(^{\text{th}}\) 2014.
6. ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I present the findings of the thematic and in-depth analysis of the articles. The most common topics of the articles from both newspapers are given, as well as the examples of the strategies of self- and other-presentation.

6.1 Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis, as an introduction to the in-depth analysis, revealed several tendencies among the articles. The empirical material of both newspapers focuses on four themes: migration policy; authorities; migration and national issue. These general themes are revealed by several topics in two newspapers, framing the migration issue in a different way. Topics of the articles in RG are mostly focused on authorities of different level, their actions during the riot and the discussion around the migration regulations and laws. Articles in NG are focused on corruption among authorities, on inaction of police, and on the usage of xenophobia in political campaigns. Full lists of topics are presented in tables below:

Table 6.1. Topics of articles from Rossiyskaya Gazeta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Russian society is against migrants</td>
<td>RG6, RG5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migration in general</td>
<td>RG7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situation with migrants in other countries</td>
<td>RG10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Policy</td>
<td>FMS controls the flows of migrants</td>
<td>RG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migration policy should not be toughened up</td>
<td>RG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations should be toughened up</td>
<td>RG9, RG3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migration policy in general</td>
<td>RG5, RG7, RG8, RG10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National issues</td>
<td>Separatism between people in Russia</td>
<td>RG5, RG6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National issues in general</td>
<td>RG7, RG8, RG11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>Local authorities are responsible for ethnic conflicts</td>
<td>RG5, RG8, RG9, RG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active actions of authorities during and after the riot</td>
<td>RG1, RG2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2 Topics of articles from Novaya Gazeta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Migrants are useless for Russian society</td>
<td>NG11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The idea of Migrants-slaves is cultivated in the society</td>
<td>NG11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal situation in West Biryulyovo</td>
<td>NG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situation with migrants in other countries</td>
<td>NG5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Migration policy in general</td>
<td>NG5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Integration as the only solution for migrants</td>
<td>NG3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National issue</td>
<td>Separatism between people in Russia</td>
<td>NG3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Idea/Ideology</td>
<td>NG10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>Crisis in a state management</td>
<td>NG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaction of authorities</td>
<td>NG1, NG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The State/local authorities encourage xenophobia</td>
<td>NG3, NG6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationalism/ xenophobia as a tool in politics (for both State and opposition)</td>
<td>NG2, NG6, NG9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption of local authorities/police</td>
<td>NG7, NG8, NG9, NG11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 In-Depth Analysis

First, I present how the topics from the entry-level analysis are discussed in each newspaper. Then I sum up most common topoi and the strategies of self- and other-presentation used.

6.2.1 Analysis of the articles of Rossiyskaya Gazeta (RG)

6.2.1.1 General description of the events in Biryulyovo

The event in Biryulyovo is not seen as a nationalistic riot in Rossiyskaya Gazeta (RG) and the event itself neither is criticized, nor is called “a pogrom”. Instead, what happened in Biryulyovo is called as “mass riots”, “events in Biryulyovo”, “mass protests and riots”, “unpredictable actions of the crowd”, “actions of citizens”, “the action of the local residents”, “a symbol of civil unrest”, “extreme manifestations of civil discontent”, “a spontaneous demonstration”, “Biryulyovo-story”. The article “Thunder” (RG7, 22 October 2013), explains that the riot in Biryulyovo cannot be called “a pogrom”, because it had “no blood” and
nobody died. The article stresses that among Russian citizens there is even a need in such a “pogrom-like self-defense”. According to the author, a Russian citizen is very often more defenseless than a migrant, because state institutes and authorities are equally indifferent to both Russian citizens and migrants, but the latter ones have support from the diaspora. In several articles, Russian nationalism is justified by means of the *topos of danger* through presenting Russian citizens as victims. In the article “Citizens and non-citizens” (RG11, 13 October 2013), the author argues: “Russian nationalism is the answer for the tragedy of the Soviet era and for the violation of rights of Russians outside Russia”. On his opinion, after the collapse of the USSR, Russia, as a state, lost more than other former USSR republics, moreover Russia did not experienced the same national rise as other republics did. Finally, Russians inside the country did not have the same national rise compared to other nations living in Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Although it is mentioned that radical nationalistic groups provoked the riots, the local authorities are the only ones to blame in the article.

The same argument we find in the article “A knife in the heart” (RG1, 14 October 2013). Radical groups and nationalistic sentiments among local people are not a subject to criticism. According to the article, such mass riots and clashes between local citizens and strangers are the answer for the inaction of local authorities. The attention is focused on the murder and not on the street riots. It is said that some participants of riots in Biryulyovo were chanting nationalistic slogans. At the end of the article, it is also mentioned that according to human right activists, who were in Biryulyovo during the riots, there were calls containing signs of extremism through social media. It is noted that radical groups were involved in the riots but it is not stressed that the riots had nationalistic or xenophobic basis.

The article “From markets to the borders” (RG8, 23 October 2013) notes that local citizens were forced to attempt to resolve the conflict by illegal methods because of the inaction of local authorities. It is mentioned that extremists and radical groups usually heat up ethnic tensions, but it is mass media and web community that make the situation even worse by pointing at the national side of the conflict.

In the article “Deputy gathering” (RG9, 24 October 2013), there is an interesting twist in argumentation of justifying the riots with an employment of the *topos of responsibility*. It argues that, it is not “a normal situation” when one part of local citizens are protesting against a big amount of migrants in the district and another part of locals rent their flats out to those migrants illegally. In other words, those who give migrants a place to stay are guilty and those involved into nationalistic riots are not.
6.2.1.2 Representation of migrants in RG

Migration is a “sore point” for the society, says the cross heading in one of the articles and this statement sums up the general attitude towards migrants and migration issue in Rossiyskaya Gazeta.

In one of first detailed articles published after the murderer “A knife in the heart” (RG1, 14 October 2013), the author is choosing words very carefully. The murderer is called “an unknown man”, “an alleged murderer”, and “a suspect for murder” but there is no evidence that he might be a migrant, although there was a report of witness and an identikit was made. At the same time, it is underlined that “a muscovite” was killed. This repeatedly mentioned detail lets us understand that the murderer was at least not from Moscow. The phrase “ethnic conflict” is mentioned at the very end of the article and it is not yet understandable from the text, why the locals called to close the vegetable base in the district, why they destroyed the shopping mall and why in local administration a special office to counteract illegal migration was created. The topos of threat is employed when presenting the locals’ “strong opinion” that many guest workers are illegal migrants. Locals believe that there are a lot of criminals and lawbreakers among guest workers. That is why they called to toughen migration regulations up. According to the locals, the majority of the conflicts occur with foreign workers.

The article “A Gun and a cabbage” (RG2, 15 October 2013), starts with the news that the police found a car full of money and guns on the vegetable base in Biryulyovo. Only in the second paragraph, readers also get information that 1200 migrant workers from that base were arrested. The journalist concludes, “there is no doubt that in this crowd at least illegals will be definitely revealed”. Although it is mentioned, that investigation has the video of the alleged offender and that he even might be a kebab-seller, he is still not called as a migrant or a foreigner. It is interesting that a comment of the Spiritual Directorate of the Muslims of European Russia, Moscow Muslim Spiritual Authority is presented in the article and this is the only comment from confessions’ representatives. They call for the punishment to overtake the killer regardless his faith and nationality. “The one committed such a crime placed himself outside of his family and the nation”, said in the comment. However, it is not mentioned anywhere that the alleged offender was Muslim. In this sense, this comment looks like an excuse. Here it is possible to build a logic chain that the supposed criminal, who did not look Slavic, and who might be a kebab-seller was probably a migrant, which is followed by the assumption that he was an illegal migrant, who is most probably a Muslim. Although none of
this is clearly stated in the article, readers can build this logical chain from the facts and description presented in the text.

Some articles in Rossiyskaya Gazeta are very careful in naming migrants. For example, in the article “Strictly according to the list” (RG3, 16 October 2013), this group of people is named as “migrants”, “newcomers”, “the flow of those willing to come”, “foreigners”, “foreign citizens”, “illegals”, “migration law violators”. Interesting to notice is that in the same article, every time some negative aspects are mentioned the word “migrant” is used, for example when the journalist quotes authorities talking about visa issues or police raids. The ones who cause irritation of the local citizens are “migrants” and not “foreign citizens” or “foreign workers”.

In the article “The anger of volcano” (RG5, 16 October 2013), the *topos of definition* is used to interpret nationalistic riots as “a symbol of civil unrest” and “extreme manifestations of civil discontent”. The author discusses the tension between “indigenous” and “non-indigenous”, “insiders” and “outsiders” and clashes between “locals” and “non-locals”. The *topos of responsibility* is employed when the author blames migrants for the nationalistic riots. The journalist argues that the clashes will continue because the first mentioned groups “are infected with xenophobia” but the latter ones more often give rise to it. Here the locals or insiders are victimized because they are presented as passive victims of a disease (xenophobia) where it is not their fault that they became infected. On the other hand, the “outsiders” or “non-locals” are perceived as active participants who cause the clashes. According to the author, mass attempts of setting the order by illegal methods in districts with “non-Russian” residents are the results of inaction of local authorities who cannot “take control over the touring ethnic criminals”. In the article, two groups of people are mentioned: “persons of Caucasian nationality” (which is an offensive expression in Russian language - AR) and “brother-Slavs”. Another example of the *topos of definition* is employed when the author explains that people’s gathering do not make any difference between foreigners from Transcaucasia and Central Asia and Russian citizens from North Caucasus, both two groups are considered to be “migrants”. The reason for that, according to the author, is very deep – local residents do not consider persons from North Caucasus as fellow nationals. They treat comers from that region, as “suspicious, strange and dangerous people” – “migrants”. Here, there is another chain of features that a word “migrant” contains and none of them is positive. Such newcomers in the text are called as “envoys from the North Caucasus, who sell watermelons or are cab drivers”.

45
The *topoi of threat* and *weighing down* are used when the author of the article “Thunder” (RG7, 22 October 2013) compares the division “us-them” with immunity, which is essential for the survival. According to the article, ethnos also has its own immunity, but the question is in balance of “us” and “them”. The author talks about a certain “reasonable measure” which leads to xenophobia in case it is exceeded. When talking about different cultural clashes, the author presents such pairs of antagonists: “white”–“black”, Christians-Muslims, “indigenous”–“newcomers”. The author sees the reason of ethnic conflicts in two-way xenophobia. It is even stressed that “black (not people with black skin, but Asians or Caucasians who are considered “black” in Russian society - AR) who are new comers” are much more nationalists, than “white locals”. The author presents three classes of migrants: newcomers from Central Asia, from Transcaucasia and North Caucasus. However, the journalist makes a remark that the last group are Russian citizens.

In the article “When working, we love them. Otherwise – no” (RG6, 18 October 2013), migrants are divided in other three groups according to the attitude of Russians to them based on surveys. Locals have positive or indifferent attitude to newcomers from neighbouring regions of Russia, neutral attitude – to “brothers-Slavs” from Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine, and finally show a disinclination for comers from North Caucasus, Transcaucasia, Central Asia, Vietnam and China. The *topos of authority* is employed while presenting the results of surveys in several articles. All of the surveys have the same results, namely the general attitude to foreign workers is negative and people think that there are too many of them in Russia.

Separatism between different nations living in Russia is shown in several articles. While describing the situation with migrants in Poland (RG10, 30 October 2013) Russians and Chechens are referred to as two different groups of migrants. The *topos of culture* is employed in the argument that Poland is considered to be “lucky” among other EU countries in that sense that the majority of migrants are coming from Belarus, Ukraine and Russia, the countries with similar language and culture. It is said that those migrants assimilate quickly compared to Chechens to whom it is more difficult to integrate.

Newcomers are shown as aggressors compared to locals (*topos of danger*). Non-residents both foreign and Russian from another region are seen as the first ones to be suspected in illegal actions. The article “Deputy gathering” (RG9, 24 October 2013) tells about the specialized department on struggle against ethnic crime within the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The *topos of numbers* is used to support the *topos of danger*. The article gives statistics about the so-called ethnic criminal groups and the crimes they committed.
Such ethnic criminals are accused in acts of violence, the usage of guns, and illegal drug trade.

In fact, “migrants” and “illegal migrants” are mentioned often together in the articles and it seems like there is not any difference between them because under the word “migrants” illegals can be implied. For example, in the article “Citizens and non-citizens” (RG11, 13 October 2013), the author tells that none of the “mechanisms for the protection from outlanders and aliens” can prevent “the flow of legal and illegal migrants”, as if both of them are equally bad. On the one hand, the author presents the idea that multiculturalism is something inevitable nowadays. According to the author, “the general context of global social existence does not imply today another scenario of the development of the mankind”. On the other hand, the author employs the topos of threat presenting “the problems of migration” as a supernatural phenomenon: “Today in the world here is no other force, which is able to cancel or prevent that Brownian motion of nations”. The author goes further and even uses high-flown phrases: “Obviously, we are not able to prevent this process: apparently, no one knows the right words of prayer, so we need to find a solution that will transform the problem into a blessing.” The author has doubts if the migration issue is solvable at all, asking the readers rhetorical questions: “are we able to do that?” (emphasis – AR).

The phrase “a struggle with migrants” or “a struggle with illegal migrants” is mentioned repeatedly in the articles in different context, which gives an idea that this struggle is essential and is the only possible attitude and action towards migrants.

There is no discussion in the articles about the rights of the migrants themselves, no cases of their rights violation are presented. The author of the article “Thunder” (RG7, 22 October 2013) notes that “ordinary migrant”, for example Uzbek driver, suffers from the police actions and domestic xenophobia of locals much less, that democratic journalists write on behalf of them. The author explains it with the fact that the respect for human rights in the countries, that migrants are coming from, is even lower than in Russia. At the same time, the author mentions that Russia respects much less “human-migrant rights” than the EU countries.

The attention in the articles is focused on discontent and complaints of locals and not on migrants. In the article “From markets to the borders” (RG8, 23 October 2013), the journalist quotes the president’s speech concerning the situation in Biryulyovo. First, Vladimir Putin said that in Biryulyovo, “people’s discontent was accumulated over the years” and later he continued, “the connivance of illegal actions of newcomers is unacceptable”. It sounds as if migrants cannot complain and it is acceptable for locals to commit illegal actions.
However, the president underlined that the recent tendency is a rising tension between locals and migrants.

The *topos of usefulness* is employed in the article “Thunder” (RG7, 22 October 2013). The author gives several reasons why migrants are useful for Russia. There is an economic reason - migrants carry out low-paid unqualified jobs and there are no other people to replace them because of the lack of workers. Another side of the economic reason is that migrants are one of the links in the corruption chains and some authorities are interested in them. There is also a geopolitical reason - Russian is interested to keep on having “special relations” with the members of Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Finally, the journalist presents an ideological reason. On the one hand, migrants rise up the tensions inside the country but on the other hand, they can be used as “can-carriers” and “lightning rod of hatred”.

In the article “West-Birulevo” (RG10, 30 October 2013), the rhetoric is pessimistic and negative towards migrants. The *strategies of ‘collectivisation’* and *‘primitivisation’* are employed when migrants are called as “the aliens”, “tribespeople”. The areas they live in are described as “problem zones”, “explosive and poor neighborhoods”, “unfortunate districts”, “areas with serious social problems”. The article also tells us about the schools, “where poor academic performance beats all possible records”. The situation looks even worse while reading that teachers in such schools should take a course of special psychological training to cope with “kids who have offbeat notions of discipline”.

When describing Turkish migrants in Germany, the author names them as “black-haired Turks who speak their own language” compared to just “Germans” describing the locals. Later in the article (RG10, 30 October 2013), the author tells how Turks “occupied” (*topos of threat*) some areas in Berlin. Illegal and criminal activities are emphasized in the article.

### 6.2.1.3 Migration Policy

The discussion about the migration policy goes around the same issue - how to regulate the amount of migrants coming inside the country and which state authority should be responsible for that. However, what is not discussed is how to solve other problems that migrants face once they arrived. The issue of building special centers for accused illegal migrants is raised up in several articles. Nevertheless, the question about accommodation and registration for those who work legally and pay taxes is not brought up. Although it is
mentioned that there are not any positive changes in integration and adaptation process of migrants – this issue is not raised up.

According to the author of the article “The anger of volcano” (RG5, 16 October 2013), Russia does not have any clear migration policy and hence it cannot be called neither tough, nor liberal. However, on his opinion, no policies are effective and there is no way to struggle with illegal migrants. The journalist uses the topos of law arguing that when it comes to illegal migration, everything becomes illegal around: illegal business, illegal labor market. The topos of justice is used when the author writes that, illegal migrants do not deserve amnesty and “the event in Biryulyovo only discourages from treating them humanely”. Migrants are turned out to be guilty regardless political system and regulations. This is the only case when the problem of possible legalization is somehow mentioned, although no chance is given to migrants.

Visa issue is widely discussed in several articles and this is the main tool to regulate the flow of newcomers according to politicians. The problem of corruption is mentioned together with the question of visa introduction. It is argued that visas will move corruption from the cities to the borders and this is regarded as the main disadvantage of the whole idea. It is possible to build some logical assumptions here. Federal Migration Service (FMS) controls migrants that come to Russia and if a migrant is not registered within FMS he/she becomes illegal. Police is responsible for catching illegals and checking the documents of the migrants. In the articles, corruption is seen as one of reasons of such a big amount of illegal migrants. Hence, it is possible to assume, which state institute can be suspected in corruption. At the same time, in case of visa implementation the flow of migrants will become under the control of the Border Service of Federal Security Service of Russia. This shows the hidden struggle of different services to be responsible of the highly corrupted field. However, there is no discussion about how to reduce or prevent the corruption when it comes to migration issue, but only – who will regulate this field.

The article “West-Birulevo” (RG10, 30 October 2013) describes how “governments around the world are struggling with the influx of illegal migrants”. The naturalizing reference “the influx of illegal migrants” represents both referential strategies and argumentation strategies (the topos of danger). The cross headings of the article show the general mood in which it is written: “French became foreigners in their own country”, “migrants often appear in police reports” etc. The author gives an example of how the demonstrations of locals against illegal migrants lead to the one of the strictest migration regulations in the USA.
In addition, it is said that the majority of the European Union countries toughen migration laws up, which can be considered as a weighty opinion (*topos of authority*) and a motive for the same actions. Overall situation in presented European countries and the USA seem to be difficult and it looks like none of these countries found an effective way to struggle with illegal migrants. According to the article, although a lot of money was spent on those “problem zones” there were no big changes.

### 6.2.1.4 Comparison with other countries

The migrant issue in Europe (the European Union) is raised up in several articles. In all cases, it is described as worse and more stressful than in Russia. It is mentioned that some European countries have already admitted the failure of national policy and Russia cannot do the same (RG8, 23 October 2013). It is noted that migration issue in Russia is not special and what is more, the amount of migrants and intensity of the problems is much lower than in the EU (RG7, 22 October 2013). It is shown as a disadvantage for locals that migrants in the EU struggle for their rights. The *topos of justice* is employed to describe that ‘migrants are attacking locals, defending their “inalienable rights”’. As an example of such “inalienable rights”, the author chose a very speculative one – the right for Muslims in mosques of London to call for *jihad*. Thus, the situation in Russia when locals attack migrants does not look ridiculous in this context. The author also claims that the situation with migration in Russia is not tensed as much politically and religiously as in the EU. Another comment concerning events in Biryulyovo gave the head of FMS of Russia: “In the West, such cases have generally more cruel and extreme nature” (RG4, 15 October 2013).

### 6.2.1.5 Authority and the question of Responsibility

The discussion about authorities and state officials falls into several lines. The first one is about the question of responsibility. It is underlined in many articles that the local authorities are the ones responsible for the conflict in Biryulyovo. A lot of criticism is directed to the local authorities who are the only ones to blame in Biryulyovo events. It could be possible to avoid the conflicts if local authorities would listen to the public opinion (RG8, 23 October 2013). The second line is the repeated description of how active local officials and police were during and after the riots. The overall impression from reading these articles is that situation is under the control of the authorities and the police. There are several comments in different texts with words of gratitude to the police. Shortly after the events in
Biryulyovo, the president of Russia signed a new law defining the power and responsibilities of local authorities in ethnic conflicts. However, it is not discussed how exactly municipal officials should solve ethnic problems. The question of responsibility concerns not only local administration. Local residents are accused in renting their flats out illegally to migrants. According to the newspaper, businesspersons who hire migrants should be responsible for the accommodation and registration documents. At the same time, the state will invest money in building special centers for accused migrants waiting for the deportation. On the one hand it is noted in the article that officials control the situation, but on the other hand it is stated that issues with migrants and national problems are inevitable and there is no final solution for them (RG7, 22 October 2013). However, the explanation for this kind of statement is quite blurry, that “life consists of conflicts and compromises”. “There are ordinary waves around the point of balance – but there are no signs of a chain reaction of an explosion”, concludes the author meaning the events in Biryulyovo. Nevertheless, such a chain exists and is even mentioned in one of the articles (RG3, 16 October 2013). Events in cities Kondopoga (August-September 2006) and Pugachyov (July 2013) and a pogrom on Manezh Square in Moscow (December 2010) became common nouns and symbols of ethnic conflicts in modern Russia.

6.2.1.6 National Issue

The national issue is raised in several articles. Moscow is described as a multinational city where “people of all nations will feel like home” or where “every citizen can celebrate his/her religious holiday”. Discussing the problem of national identity, the author of the article “Citizens and non-citizens” (RG11, 13 October 2013), writes that Russia is a multinational country, although he makes a remark that “Russians” is probably not the best definition for citizens’ self-identification. At the same time, he noted that Russian language and Russian culture are the core of the country’s unity. In parallel with the discussions on migration policy, the issue of a certain state programme that regulates the national policy inside the country is brought up. In the article “Deputy gathering” (RG9, 24 October 2013), the head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is quoted saying that nationalism “leads to a dead end and a civil enmity”. However, later on he is quoted telling about ethnic criminal groups and giving the statistic about their crimes. While other authors only discuss the need of such a national programme, the president of Russia named it as “a State Strategy of national policy” (RG8, 23 October 2013). This document is mentioned in the only one article and is not
referred to in any others neither by journalists, nor by politicians. According to the president, this document contains modern systematic methods for solving ethnic conflicts. However, any details about those methods and the content of the strategy are not presented.

It is seen how the issue of migrants and illegal migrants is closely associated with national problems inside the country between its citizens and how the notion of “ethnic conflict” goes beyond the citizenship. The discussion is very often transformed from the question of “how to prevent the flow of illegal migrants” into the national problem of multiculturalism in Russia.

6.2.2 Analysis of the articles of Novaya Gazeta (NG)

6.2.2.1 General description of the event in Biryulyovo

The nationalistic riots in Biryulyovo in general got more attention in Novaya Gazeta (NG) than the murderer itself, which is seen only as a cause for the riots. The actions of radical groups are strongly criticized in the newspaper. For example, in the article “Biryulyovolyutsiya against Bolotnaya” (NG1, 15 October 2013), the riot is called “Biryulyovolution” (a combination of words ‘Biryulyovo’ and ‘revolution’), “rebellious suburbs” and in another article, as “pogroms when locals beat newcomers”, “a spontaneous riot”.

Journalists of Novaya Gazeta try to find political, economic and social reasons and prerequisites of the conflict in Biryulyovo. It is mentioned several times that the government supports the nationalists indirectly and that radical groups support the federal authorities: “Biryulyovo – is a violation of the civil rights, the consciousness of rioters, people who actually support the federal government” (NG1, 15 October 2013). Moreover, the author tries to explore deeper the reasons of the riot - “a very serious, not a one-act event and a lasting social phenomenon” (NG1, 15 October 2013). The riot is presented as a logical result of the current political system: “it is an inevitable stage of decay of the management system in Putin’s style” (NG1, 15 October 2013). According to the author, the conflict in Biryulyovo is the result of the crisis in a state administration itself when “nothing is being done at all, because nobody wants to take responsibility”. Among other reasons that caused the riot mentioned the absence of migration policy, the crisis of the state ideology, which supports “controlled” nationalism. Another reason is the crisis of educational policy, which resulted in raising “characters who blame outlanders in everything”. The crisis of city policy is among of
the causes, because “the city officials did not see the problematic area with an impending nationalist conflict”.

Nationalists are referred to as “vegetable Russia” or derogatory - “vegetables”, meaning “people who are irritated by illegal and sometimes legal migration and television propaganda of nationalism and wild ideas about reality and history of Russia” (NG1, 15 October 2013). The participants of the riot are called as “pogrom-makers”, who are filled with “foreign-phobia”, homophobia and other phobias; “specific social groups, which all tend to carry their woes on foreigners, aliens, ‘conditional Caucasians’”. According to the article, nationalistic marginals with a xenophobic mind were raised by the political system and support the federal government.

Novaya Gazeta gives several descriptions of West Biryulyovo district trying to analyse the social prerequisites of the riots, it also presents criminal statistics of the district, topics described on the Internet forums, gives a short history of the local government. The topos of finances is employed in the description of the district that emphasizes negative socioeconomic consequences. Biryulyovo is described as “a migrant ghetto of the capital” (NG2, 3 November 2013). Moscow suburbs in general are called “national ghettos”. In the article “Did the sleeping areas wake up?” (NG4, 15 October 2013), Biryulyovo is described as “a difficult district even for Moscow”. The article gives some recent statistics on crimes committed in that area. As it turned out, during last five years 60% of the criminals were Russian citizens with Russian surnames and 30% - Transcaucasiens. In the article “Hatred on wholesale and retail” (NG6, 16 October 2013), West Biryulyovo is “one of the most dull and depressed areas of the capital”, it is “a big social and urban planning mistake”. The author of the article compares Biryulyovo with an industrial town in the Urals, which is described as “a spot of gray panel buildings around the industrial zone”, “typical province, only within Moscow borders”. However, the negative description of the district is not associated with migrants who are not mentioned in representation of Biryulyovo. The article “Biryulyovo-live” (NG7, 21 October 2013) tells about the dark sides of Biryulyovo district, protection racket, custom arrests and illegal migrants as well as about the criminal parts of government, business and security forces, schemes how local businesspersons are using illegal migrants. The journalist concludes, “the visible part of reality in Biryulyovo with its rabbles, hordes of migrants, substandard living conditions, street crime has got out in media”.

Local and federal authorities are considered to be responsible for the riots, according to the articles. Moscow mayor is accused for not getting the control over the situation in the
city (NG3, 14 October 2013). Among the reasons of the riot are mentioned “frostbitten Nazi groups” and complete inaction of police, which is accused for being slow, late and ineffective.

Compared to articles in RG, NG shows details about the riots and the behaviour of nationalistic groups. For example, describing the riot in a shopping mall, “aggressive young people in sportswear started kicking a man transporting boxes of clothing” (NG4, 15 October 2013). “Drunk young people chanted nationalist slogans” such as “Russia for the Russians”, “Moscow for Muscovites!” (NG4, 15 October 2013).

### 6.2.2.2 Representation of migrants in NG

“Migration – is a lifestyle of a mankind whether we like it or not. Labor migration - is the normal state of the modern world, as well as the movement of capital and production”, said in the article “Tolerance and violence” (NG5, 16 October 2013). The topos of reality is used here by stating that migration is something “normal”.

Migrants are always referred to in plural. The strategy of referential/nomination is realized in various ways, such as “hordes of migrants”, “migrants-slaves”, *Gastarbeiter*, “objectionable aliens”, “illegals”, “the black”, “rightless migrants”. In the article “Biryulyovo-live” (NG7, 21 October 2013) migrants are mentioned in one raw with a rabble and street criminals.

The events after the riots in Biryulyovo and the media coverage of the riots are described as “xenophobic hysteria” (NG4, 15 October 2013). NG gives the description of the personality of Yegor Shcherbakov, the organizational scheme of pogroms, stressing inaction of police and authorities, while RG focuses mostly on the police’s and authorities’ actions during the riots. The article (NG4, 15 October 2013) also presents the criminal situation in the district, which shows that local residents committed more crimes than newcomers did.

It is interesting to note that there is no discussion about legal or illegal migrants, which leads to an assumption that there is not any difference between them in terms of locals’ attitude to migrants in general.

The very notion of “illegal migrant” in Russia is discussed in NG by means of the topos of name-interpretation. According to the law, there is no visa-regime between Russia and Central Asian countries. It means that the workers from those countries can legally cross the border and come to Russia without a visa. However, the main “absurd” is that they can enter Russia, but they cannot stay in the country without other special documents like registration and work permit, otherwise they become “illegal migrants”. Thus, the notion of
“illegality” is perceived in a wrong way and is very often neglected when it comes to the migration topic. In general, “illegal” does not necessarily mean “criminal”. “This is not a visa-free regime, but a free entrance to the corruption hell”, sums up the journalist (NG9, 21 October 2013).

When does the issue of “illegality” appear? In a cited politician’s speech, the problems with illegal migrants and ethnic criminality go along (NG6, 16 October 2013). Illegal migrants also appear in the articles when it comes to local criminal authorities and an issue of corruption in police and local government. Articles do not pay attention so much to the migrants/illegal migrants themselves but to the corruption structures, which use and treat migrants as slaves. In the articles, such actions as “cleansing” and “police raids” are used when talking about illegal migrants. The events are never presented from the point of view of migrants and their voices are never heard in the articles. When a rare comment is given it is not a person with a name and a surname, it’s a voice of a whole group - “from the words of the migrants themselves…” . The author is more interested in the owners of facilities where illegal activities were carried out. The journalist concludes that the struggle with corruption among businesspersons, local authorities and police “is the real fight against illegal migration, and not just indulging to xenophobic instincts of the masses” (NG8, 21 October 2013).

In the article “Biryulyovo - switching of points from the corruption to the national question” (NG9, 21 October 2013), the conflict is presented as a scheme of a typical ethnic conflict that happened already several times on Manezh Square in Moscow (December 2010) and in the city of Pugachyov (July 2013). According to this scheme, the domestic “local Caucasians” initiate the conflict, by often killing the participant from another side. The disturbance of local residents is associated with the suspicions that local authorities and police are corrupted by “Caucasians” and cover the killer. That is why the crowd in Biryulyovo decides to smash the shopping center - a symbol of the economic power of the Caucasian diaspora in the district. The author assumes that originally the calls of the locals’ gathering in Biryulyovo were not nationalistic. They were based on the requirement of fairness – impartiality and non-corruptness of police. However, small and very well organized radical groups turn it into a nationalistic riot. The next usual step in such conflicts is the actions of the authorities who support the idea of the “ethnic conflict”. Being under the suspicion of corruption by Caucasian groups, police makes numerous raids in around the city markets and arrests those whom they call “illegal migrants”. At the end, the initial conflict is completely changed. The crowd is persuaded that they were irritated not by the corrupted police, but by a large number of newcomers and by “wrong” ones, who are actually not guilty in the initial
crime. This is an example how the state is encouraging xenophobia among the citizens. In the article, the migrants are presented as rightless group of people who can fall a victim to the state, police and locals. According to the author, the switch from the issue of corruption to the national issue separates the society. The author is writing about the established “mechanism” of the problem replacement, which is used in case of migrants.

The *topos of threat* is employed in the discussion about democratic values and promotion of tolerance. The author (NG9, 21 October 2013) claims that in fact, in a democratic society people have the right to discuss the amount of migrants it is ready to allow enter the country. And, ultimately, migration policy (and other policies) should be the result of a public agreement. According to the author, only in an open discussion people begin to educate and promote tolerance.

In the articles of Novaya Gazeta, the economic factor is a fundamental issue in migration policy. The *topos of finances* and the *topos of advantage/usefulness* are employed through mentioning repeatedly that Russian economy needs migrants and that Russia should allow “as many migrants as the economy need” (NG9, 21 October 2013). On the other hand, in the article “Twenty years till Moskvabad” (NG11, 23 October 2013), the author claims that thousands of migrants carry out work that nobody needs (*topos of uselessness*), only because authorities can steal on that. “Why do we need them here in Moscow?” (emphasis – AR) – says the author. The headline of this article combines the *topos of threat* and the *topos of definition* naming Moscow as “Moskvabad” which is associated with the names of cities in Central Asia (e.g. Ashkhabad, the capital of Turkmenistan). The article dispels common beliefs about why Russia needs migrants, such as “Russians don’t want to work”; “shortages in the labor market”; “staffing shortfall in Russia”; “migrants occupy a niche of unskilled labor”. Migrants coming to Moscow are compared to the poor from Charles Dickens’ novels, who came to London and formed the criminal ground there.

The author discusses the effects and influences of migration for society using the *topos of finances* and the *topos of uselessness*. According to the article (NG11, 23 October 2013), the costs for the local society are too high, because the district is turning into the “bottom”, people are not going out in the evenings and at schools, there are classes where children of migrants are the majority. In this piece of text, several dangers are simultaneously and stereotypically mentioned in the form of imaginary, pseudo-argumentative examples. The author evokes the prejudiced dangers of insecurity, of criminality, of aggressivity. The journalist claims that the migrant workers are covered by the state budget. While the profit goes to a private company who hires migrants, the expenses are covered by “you and me”, says the
author appealing to the readers. “Slave labor” will never be profitable for the whole society, but to the specific groups inside the society, argues the author.

The idea of migrants Slaves is cultivated in the society, claims the journalist (NG11, 23 October 2013). The schematic reconstruction of Russian society is presented in the article. According to it, “Putin’s regime” is establishing a slave-owning system in Russia. This society consists of the upper class, which gets all the profit, and the slaves. There are rightless migrants Slaves and “lumpen class”, who is living for panem et circenses! From time to time “lumpen class” rebels and smashes the slaves. This shows that “lumpens” also belong to a slavery class, they are not free, and otherwise they would rebel against their masters and not slaves. According to the author, such “lumpens”’ riots do not bother the upper class, it is a part of the system instead, which makes the migrants Slaves rightless, terrified and obedient.

The author continues, if the amount of migrants is “low”, then they become the most active and successful part of the society. The author implies the topos of threat and the topos of weighing down when writing about “the subculture of slaves”. It may lead to the serious problems or a disaster, if the amount of migrants is “high” and the society is using them as slaves or prevent their integration.

The migrant issue is seen as a part of a general political agenda. It is a part of a struggle for the right to interpret social discontent, which is “the most important and severe struggle” in modern politics (NG9, 21 October 2013). According to the article, the nationalistic interpretation leads to a separatism in the society.

Integration as the only possible way for migrants to become part of the local society is mentioned in the article “Biryulyovo for Biryulyovo-inhabitants” (NG3, 14 October 2013). However, according to the article migrants should be forced to become a part of the local population, as if they are not able or not willing to do so. The conditions of the migrants’ life and the process of integration is not in focus. It is corruption of local authorities and police that the newspaper cares about: “there is no other way but to make those illegal migrants a part of local population, adapt them, not to let the outskirts of Moscow became in national ghetto which feed the local authorities and the police” (NG3, 14 October 2013). Here, the topos of finances is employed which focuses on allegedly negative socioeconomic consequences.

There is an assumption in the article that if a suspect for murder is not a Russian citizen, then he/she is an illegal migrant. This logic is presented as a common sense. The author writes about three groups of people living in Moscow. The first group is illegal migrant
workers - Tadjiks and Uzbeks, the second group - legal Chechens and Dagestani people and the third one - Russians. This division gives an idea of how Russian society is separated.

6.2.2.3 National issue: Separatism between people in Russia

The problem of separatism is discussed within the topic of a national issue. This leads to the situation when there are smaller separate states inside one country. According to the article “Biryulyovo for Biryulyovo-inhabitants” (NG3, October 2013), the national issue in Russia is not solvable because politicians “don’t know the country they live in”. The author assumes that federal authorities do not understand what it means “local residents” in Russia. Instead, they persistently introduce distorted concept to the masses. In fact, the nationalistic riots against migrants in Biryulyovo occurred after the girlfriend of the victim described the murderer as “a newcomer from Caucasus”. The author claims that citizens in Russia themselves still do not understand that not only ethnic Russians live and will be living in Moscow and whole Russia.

In several articles of NG, “persons of Caucasian nationality” are opposed to the ones with a “Slavic appearance”. The topos of culture is employed in the article “Twenty years till Moskvabads” (NG11, 23 October 2013), where migrants from Ukraine and Moldova are called “close to us in culture” (emphasis – AR). Migrants from Central Asia are considered “worse” than the Slavic ones because in their countries there is “a traditional culture of despotism, oppression, and Islam”.

The problem raised in NG is that Russians and Caucasians became strangers to each other in their own country (NG3, 14 October 2013). The topos of justice arises in this discussion. It is based on the principle of ‘equal rights for all’. One of the reasons for this separatism the author sees in the “parasitism of Caucasian elites”, who get money from the federal authorities. Another reason, according to the article, is that federal government encourages xenophobia. The author of the article claims that Russian authorities connived repression of Russians in Chechnya and Dagestan and therefore caused “Caucasian-phobia” in the Central Russia. Residents of Biryulyovo were calling to close the biggest in the district vegetable base, which is considered to be a “nest of migrants” and a “hotbed of vice” (NG6, 16 October 2013). According to the author, participants destroyed the shopping mall, because it had a reputation of being “non-Russian”.

In this article “Biryulyovo - switching of points from the corruption to the national question” (NG9, 21 October 2013), the author writes about “non-aggressive form of
xenophobia” that is typical for Muscovites, because they are not competing with migrants on labor market and because migrant workers are also described as being “non-aggressive”. In the article, migrant workers from Central Asia are opposed to Caucasians, who are considered to be rivals for local citizens on labor market and who are “quite powerful and keep the profitable business in the city”. On the other hand, in the article “Did the sleeping areas wake up?” (NG4, 15 October 2013), migrants and residents of the North Caucasus are mentioned together as if they have the same status. As well as in the article “Biryulyovo for Biryulyovo-inhabitants” (NG3, 14 October 2013), the journalist is using “migrants and Caucasians” together, regardless if the migrants are illegal or not, and that Caucasians are Russian citizens.

The author of the article “A jam for Navalny” (NG2, 3 November 2013), accuses the very principal of nationalism, arguing that “respectable conservative values”, “mild xenophobia” or “respectable nationalism” do not exist.

6.2.2.4 National Idea/Ideology

National idea is discussed in the article “What did Bortko cry about” (NG10, 22 October 2013). The author claims that national idea is a current issue among elites. “A weeping for a lost ideology” is used as a justification for any social problems, the author argues. According to the journalist, politicians of different political parties have the same rhetoric about the lack of ideology in Russia. National ideology is perceived by some federal supporters as something necessary, and even as a basis for the national security. The riot in Biryulyovo happened because of the lack of a national idea, ironically notes the author. The journalist sarcastically imagines that with the strong ideology, people would have built “a bright future without migrants” and the vegetable bases would stay “fragrant and prosperous” like during the Soviet times. The journalist names authorities as “professional lovers of homeland”, who are struggling for the national idea. However, the author notes that this contradicts the Constitution of the Russian Federation, where it is said that no ideology can be set as state or obligatory. The author warns that in Russian history there was already once a complete triumph of ideology which turned into repressions for those who denied it. The discussion about the national idea is one more way to restrict the society and make people think in a special way.
6.2.2.5 Comparison with other countries

The situation with migrants in Russia is compared with other countries in several articles of NG. Most of the comparisons are with European countries (the EU members) and the USA, so-called “civilized world” or very often “West”. In majority cases, the situation in Russia is considered worse or less developed, more corrupted. The article “Tolerance and violence” (NG5, 16 October 2013), is written by the journalist of NG who is residing in Brussels. He makes the comparison with an “Old Europe”. The author describes the problems with migrants in Europe concluding, “there are no easy solutions”. At the same time, the author stresses that people in Europe learn how to live with migrants regardless how alien they look like. According to the author, the modern political trend is the same among conservatives, liberals, socialists – they all offer to toughen up the migration regulations. People more and more often vote for right-wing radical parties. Migration in Europe is described as “an inevitable process”, which will continue. “Yes, Europe will be white-black-yellow with an Arabic shade”, says the author hinting that Russia has the same fate.

6.2.2.6 Authority and the question of Responsibility

Generally, authorities on different levels are accused in inaction, incompetence and corruption. The topos of responsibility and a topos of consequence are employed to argue about the prerequisites of the riot and general xenophobic moods among people. There is not a single positive word about the authorities, especially on the federal ones. Authorities are called “irresponsible politicians”, “valiant guards of corruption order” etc. While RG is mostly blaming local government, NG criticizes state government and police. According to the articles, police was lenient to the riots and illegal migrants and federal government caused the socio-economic prerequisites for nationalistic sentiments among citizens. Migrants are seen as a source of money for police and politicians. Hence, the negative attitude to the migrants in NG articles is actually the reaction against the corrupted authorities. The actions that authorities take to struggle with illegal migrants are compared to “circus” and “a game”. Moreover, the migrant issue has a clear political background. This topic is considered to be “popular” among the politicians, especially during the election campaigns. Interesting to note that the theme of struggling with migrants is used in election programmes of different political parties, both federal and oppositional. Nationalistic rhetoric is used by politicians to gain “political credits” and not to solve the real problems, claims the newspaper. In the article “A jam for Navalny” (NG2, 3 November 2013), the global political trend is defined as a
“migrant phobia”, when all political forces are interested in nationalism as a tool of attracting voters. The phrase “political xenophobia” is even used in the article (NG6, 16 October 2013). “Instead of to ensure the equality of all social and ethnic groups before the law, the state simply incites them against each other”, argues the author (NG3, 14 October 2013) using the topos of right. In the article “Hatred on wholesale and retail” (NG6, 14 October 2013), the author claims that, “political forces, from the ruling party to the underground “youth movements”, not just exploit xenophobia of Muscovites, they actively and deliberately provoke and awake it”. The politicians, who encouraged xenophobia among locals, heated up the situation in Biryulyovo. For example, one of the speeches quoted in the newspaper: “The problem of illegal migration and ethnic crime reached boiling point” (NG6, 16 October 2013). The idea of corrupted authorities is not even called in question by the authors of NG. The real situation is described as “a current corruption order of migration regulations” (NG9, 21 October 2013).

### 6.2.3 Historical References

The topos of history is widely used by both newspapers and the same historical events are referred to. Reisigl and Wodak (2001, p. 81) distinguish a specific subtype of this argumentation scheme – ‘history teaching lessons’, which is also presented in the analyzed newspapers. It focuses on a change situated in the past: on supposedly having learned from history.

Generally, there are several historical periods/events that are referred to: the Roman Empire, anti-Jews pogroms in the Russian Empire, Nazi Germany, Soviet Union era, Stalin’s rule and Putin’s rule (as a specific historical event). NG uses the topos of history wider than RG.

The articles “A jam for Navalny” (NG2, 3 November 2013) and “Twenty years till Moskvabad” (NG11, 23 October 2013) define the current political situation in Russia as “Putin’s regime”. In the latter one, it is compared with the slave-holding society in the Roman Empire. Further in the same article, the author makes a comparison that there were several examples in the history when slave-holding societies collapsed. The author continues the argumentation telling, as it is an accomplished fact, that a mass import of workers from the regions with a huge difference in development, living standards and culture will in any way lead to a catastrophe regardless if those workers were slaves or free. In this case, the topos of culture and the topos of danger are employed together with the topos of history, when the
author indirectly argues that migrants with different cultural background are a threat to the host state regardless their official status and rights.

The reference to the Roman Empire is used in RG as well. The author of the article “Citizens and non-citizens” (RG11, 13 October 2013), tells the ancient legend about the Pope Leo I and Attila. Russia is compared with the Roman Empire, “the imperial center of the world civilization”. And the migrants are compared with “hordes” of “barbarian warriors”, who “besieged Rome”.

The notion of “empire” is used not only in comparison with the Roman Empire. The author of the article “Biryulyovo for Biryulyovo-inhabitants” (NG3, 14 October 2013) ironically defines the political situation in Russia as “the renaissance of quasi-Orthodox quasi-Empire”.

The comparison to the Soviet period of Russian history and the modern Russia is used in several articles. The author of the article (RG11, 13 October 2013) recalls to “many examples in modern history” when a diverse, collaborative and neighboring residence of different nations is fraught with explosions and ethnic conflicts. The author goes back to the Soviet Union epoch, referring to Stalin. According to the author, even Stalin’s repressions in 1930s and 1940s could not drown out the need for national identity among the soviet citizens.

Stalin’s personality is mentioned in another article “Biryulyovo for Biryulyovo-inhabitants” (NG3, 14 October 2013). The author referrers to Stalin arguing, that he deported whole nations inside the country but not outside of the country. The author concludes that hence it is impossible to deport all the migrants back to their home countries because even Stalin did not succeed in that. In another article (NG10, 22 October 2013), the Soviet Union epoch is ironically defined as “the triumph of ideology” meaning a negative experience.

The newspapers refer to the topic of Nazi Germany and the Jewish issue. Both newspapers use the phrase “the final decision” in the same context and agree that the national issue in Russia is unsolvable and the “final decision” is not possible to make. In NG, the German original “Endlosung” complements this phrase in Russian language. The author marks that it has a strong associations with Hitler and a “Jewish issue” in a Nazi Germany. Anti-Semitism as a part of the modern Russian reality is mentioned in another article (NG2, 3 November 2013). The neo-nationalistic movements in Russia are described as “a torchlight procession” complemented by the German original “Fackelzuge”, which has a strong allusion to Nazi Germany.
7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study has achieved its goal in answering the research questions by means of the chosen methodology. This chapter attempts to connect the dots and link the answers derived from the findings to the theoretical framework as well as parts of relevant previous studies. It also incorporates some recommendations for potential research in the future.

7.1 Summary of the findings

Rossiyskaya Gazeta in its articles tries to reduce the intensity of emotions around the events in Biryulyovo. Massive street riots are presented as a minor event on the background of the murder, which were quickly suppressed by the police and are not considered extraordinary. On contrary, NG pays much more attention to the street riots, calling them “pogroms” and comparing them with a revolution. In general, NG gives more details about the riots and mentions concrete actions of the police and nationalistic groups during the riots. NG explores the socioeconomic prerequisites that lead to the conflict in Biryulyovo and other migrant issues. It gives the detailed description of the Biryulyovo district giving the background information, numbers and statistic.

The focus of RG is on authorities’ actions and the reaction of the police. RG actively accuses local authorities, approves police sanctions and partly shifts the responsibility to local residents’ shoulders and migrants themselves. NG blames federal authorities in supporting nationalistic moods and presents the events in Biryulyovo as a logical result of the current political system. According to NG, the conflict in Biryulyovo is the consequence of the crisis in a state administration, state ideology and educational policy, and the absence of migration policy. NG strongly accuses any kind of nationalistic, radical or xenophobic sentiments. The liberal newspaper stresses inaction of the police and authorities during the riots. According to NG, the government manipulates the public opinion and attitudes making the society believe that migrants are guilty and that they are the source of vice in the district. Moreover, NG assumes that authorities and the state propaganda in media encourage and support xenophobia.

Nationalistic moods are justified in RG in several ways. The state newspaper presents it as a natural reaction of locals who are considered more defenseless than migrants are.
Russian nationalism is justified by means of the *topos of danger* through victimizing Russian citizens. RG does not pay much attention to the radical nationalistic movements, it also does not blame them as heavily as local governments. The newspaper tries not to highlight the ethnic side of the conflict, accusing media and internet-communities in heating up the situation. The illegal and aggressive actions of locals, their riots and nationalistic sentiments are justified as their right to protect their district and are even presented as actions of the civil society. In RG, such kind of collaboration of locals with migrants as renting out the flats to them is accused more than the street riots against them.

In both newspapers only the discontent of local residents is taken into account, the rights of migrants are never in focus and are not even discussed. Only NG mentions about the democratic values and promotion of tolerance. However, it is not a main focus of the discussion.

Talking about the issues of identity, different divisions of society are presented in the newspapers. However, all of them divide ethnic Russians and North Caucasians in separate groups and never consider them as one united society of Russian citizens. “Persons of Caucasian nationality” are opposed to “brother-Slavs”. RG notes that there is no difference between foreigners from Transcaucasia and Central Asia and Russian citizens from North Caucasus, all of them are considered to be “migrants”. Both RG and NG highlight the problem of separatism in Russian society, emphasizing that Russian local residents do not consider persons from North Caucasus as fellow nationals. Both newspapers note that migrants with less cultural differences from the host country are considered better. It is interesting to note that NG shows more sympathy to defenseless and rightless migrants from Central Asian countries than to Caucasians or Transcauscians.

In both newspapers, the discussion goes mainly about the procedure of how to not let the migrants inside the country. The newspapers write about how to trace, reveal and punish those who break the migration regulation laws. “Struggling” is the most common action mentioned towards the migrants in the articles. Other issues concerning their integration process, living conditions, their economic and social situation, rights violations are not discussed and are not in focus.

Both newspapers agree that the situation with migrants in Russia is problematic and call it “a problem”. RG more actively uses public opinion surveys and academic research to support their views, that generally, migrants are not welcomed in Russia, local residents are not tolerant enough to them and there are too many migrants in Russia.
Both newspapers do not have a clear division between legal and illegal migrants, mixing these two opposite terms in the same texts and generally presenting the same attitude to them. The word “migrant” itself has a clear negative shade in both newspapers compared to more neutral “foreign worker”.

Migrant issue and the national issues are shown as unsolvable problems without any successful examples from other more developed countries. Authors do not offer or discuss any specific methods except implementing visa-regime with Central Asian countries, agreeing that this is unlikely to help. Both newspapers compare the situation in Russia with more developed European Union countries and the USA but estimate it differently. According to RG, the situation in Russia is better but NG claims that it is worse. However, the experience of the EU countries and the USA is considered weak and sluggish (NG) or unsuccessful, ineffective and money-losing (RG).

According to RG, the national issues should be regulated on the state level by the special law or strategy. NG argues that the discussion about the national idea is another way of restricting public opinion.

In both newspapers, the discussion about migrants is very often mixed with or transformed into the discussion about the national identity or the issue of multiculturalism in Russia. According to NG, the government uses the established “mechanism” of the problem replacement, which is used in case of migrants. For example, the discussion about corruption is often replaced by the discussion about national issues.

Concerning the question of migration laws and regulations, both newspapers agreed on the fact that more restrictions are needed and the laws should be toughened.

Economic factor is the main one when discussing the migrants issue in both newspapers. In RG, it is agreed that migrants are useful for Russian economic development. NG is more focused on another economic aspect namely corruption among authorities when migrants are one of the links in their chains. NG does not pay attention to the migrants themselves but to the corruption mechanisms, which use and treat migrants as slaves. According to NG, the idea of migrants-slaves is cultivated in the society.

There are several peculiar cases of using metonymies in RG. One of them is when xenophobia is compared with a disease that locals are infected with. Another example is when a suspicious attitude towards strangers is seen as immunity, which is considered natural and essential for the survival.

Migrants in RG are presented in a more aggressive way as active provocateurs of xenophobia to themselves. In both newspapers, migrants are always referred to in plural. In
both newspapers, migrants are perceived as ruck, or a mass of people who have less rights than local residents. The strategy of referential/nomination is realized in many ways. Both newspapers do not present events from the migrants’ point of view and their voices in the articles are not heard.

RG and NG write about some reasonable measures to define the amount of migrants. They discuss the balance that should be kept in quantity of locals and foreigners.

Most commonly used argumentation strategies in the newspapers are the topoi of responsibility, threat/danger, weighting, usefulness/uselessness, justice and history.

The topos of history is widely used by both newspapers. There are several historical periods/events that are referred to: the Roman Empire, anti-Jews pogroms in the Russian Empire, Nazi Germany, Soviet Union era, Stalin’s rule and Putin’s rule (as a specific historical event). NG uses the topos of history wider than RG. Russia is compared with the Roman Empire, Soviet Union and Nazi Germany in sense of solving ethnic conflicts. None of the previous historical experiences is shown as a successful one.

The hypothesis of the research is proved. Based on the analysis of the articles, it is possible to conclude that both newspapers perceive migrant issues in the same negative way regardless their political belonging. The newspapers justify their attitude to migrants with the global trend of “migrant phobia”. The migrant issue is presented in NG as a part of a general political agenda and a struggle for the right to interpret social discontent. According to NG, the theme of struggling with migrants is used in election programmes of both ruling and oppositional political parties. Politicians use nationalistic rhetoric to gain “political credits” and nationalism as a tool of attracting voters.

One of the research questions was to define who is a migrant according to Russian media. Obviously, Russian society is not depicted as one united nation or a united society of fellow citizens. Both newspapers show how deeply Russian society is divided and separatism is one of the main features of it. Residents of North Caucasus are perceived as migrants regardless the fact that they are Russian citizens.

Another research question in my thesis was to understand how Russian identity is formulated according to the media. As it was discussed above, Russian language, “Slavic appearance” and cultural similarity are still the most common features of Russian identity. This is the reason why migrants from Ukraine are more welcomed in Russian society then the Russian citizens from the North Caucasus Republics.
7.2 Discussion

Although, both newspapers represent migrants in differences ways, the core principals are the same. Migrants are depicted as a dehumanized mass of people who have fewer rights than the locals.

One of the interesting trends described in the newspapers is the established mechanism of public mobilization. Nationalistic street manifestations mobilize people and such mobilization, which is based on hostility, is replaced by the concept of civil engagement. In other words, for example, Rossiyskaya Gazeta writes about the participants of nationalist riots as about civil activists struggling for their rights.

Newspapers write about the failure of the ideas of multiculturalism without even trying to explain its core principals. It is obvious that the ideas of multiculturalism are not developed in Russian society.

There is a circulation of opinion on migration. Media reproduce results of surveys on public opinion about migrants, which are most often negative. The audience reads these articles and then gets this idea of the negative attitudes to migrants in the society.

Both newspapers agreed that nationalism and migrants are very popular topics among politicians who use them as a tool in their campaigns to attract more voters. This scheme works for both the state and the opposition. Migration and nationalism, two topics that go together, is a comfortable way for speculation for the state and the opposition. The state can use them to switch public’s attention from other serious problems. For the opposition this is another way to blame the government by accusing it in corruption schemes related to migration.

Findings of the analysis showed that, there is a clear separatism in Russian society. Both newspapers admit that the natives from the North Caucasus Republics are often mixed with foreign migrants. It is interesting that this specific problem of separatism is not in given much attention compared to other issues related to migrants. This problem raises the question of complex relations between citizenship and ethnicity and self-identification in Russian society.

Such thing as tolerance is not discussed as a primary value of a developing democracy. On contrary, it is seen as “democratic” that the locals can discuss and set the limits of the incoming migrants. Obviously, there should be more discussion in media on democratic values in modern Russian society in terms of ongoing migration processes.
Newspapers, which take up polar political positions, converge in the ways of representation of migration. It means that, generally, different attitudes towards migrants are not the determining factors in defining political belonging.

As discussed in the theoretical chapter, the analysis of the newspapers proved that the migrant issue in Russia is mostly discussed in the context of their economic attractiveness for the Russian Society. Economic factor still defines public opinion about migrants and not, for example, cultural diversity. Obviously, there is a lack of alternative views and approaches on migration issue in Russian media.

The analysis of the newspapers proved the statements mentioned in the theoretical chapter, regarding the issues of a certain “balance”, when journalists try to measure an appropriate amount of migrants or when they write about the “natural” negative reaction of locals.

RG showed the conflict approach, described by Osipov (2002), when the power of the authorities towards migrants is shown as a result of “peoples’ will”. The newspapers proved that the process of the ethnicization of migration (Malakhov, 2004) is ongoing, and ethnic affiliation and cultural distance go along with the migrant issues.

The victim–perpetrator reversal (KhosraviNik, 2009), which is a widespread argumentative strategy in contemporary xenophobic discourses, was found in both newspapers. The links between anti-Jewish discourse and the migrant discourse were particularly noticeable in the NG that corresponds to the results of Hartmann and Husband (1974), presented in KhosraviNik’s paper.

Although we live in a time of multiculturalism and globalization where largely homogeneous societies are becoming ethnically diverse and the diversity of Russian citizens is marked in the preamble to the Constitution, newspapers present Russia as a “homogeneous” nation-state and support the idea of a homogenous culture and language as the main prerequisite of the nation-state. Following Pace (2011), I agree that a new, inclusive definition of national identity is required in case of Russia. And the media can play a great role in disseminating the new views on identity among the public.

7.3 Suggestions for further research

Migrant issues are ongoing in Russia. More and more often different ethnic conflicts arise, which shows the urgency of this issue.
CONCLUSION

Riots based on ethnic hatred, with hooligan and criminal underlying reasons, are taking place in the metropolitan area with frightening regularity. The most recent one happened on May 19th, 2014 in a town of Pushkin, Moscow region. The citizen of Uzbekistan killed a 23-year old football fan, the local resident. This case provoked street riots in the town and raised a new wave of nationalist rhetoric in media. For the future research, the generalization of all recent cases of ethnic conflicts in Moscow region can be carried out. It is also interesting to compare the way media depict migrants in different countries, especially with the countries where the level of tolerance is higher and ideas of multiculturalism are widely spread.

Another possible theme for future research is a broad issue of national identity. This theme is especially complex in Russia.

One more direction for the further research is the analysis of nationalist rhetoric in media during the conflict, for example during the recent Russian-Ukrainian conflict. This conflict as a key-event of the research can give interesting results in all mentioned aspects, such as defining national identities, the usage of nationalistic rhetoric in media and by politicians.

I would love to continue my research on a Doctoral level and I am open for any PhD-offers in Media and Communication Studies.
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**Appendix (A):**

*List of analyzed articles from Rossiyskaya Gazeta (RG)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RG</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Name of the article</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Published on the web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix (B):
List of analyzed articles from Novaya Gazeta (NG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NG</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Name of the article</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Published on the web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>