



Л. Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ
ЕВРАЗИЙСКИЙ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМ. Л. Н.
ГУМИЛЕВА
L.N. GUMILYOV EURASIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

**«АДАМИ КАПИТАЛ ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ ДАМУДЫҢ
НЕГІЗГІ ФАКТОРЫ РЕТІНДЕ»**

Халықаралық ғылыми-тәжірибелік конференциясының
ЕҢБЕКТЕР ЖИНАҒЫ

СБОРНИК ТРУДОВ

Международной научно-практической конференции

**«ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКИЙ КАПИТАЛ КАК ОСНОВНОЙ ФАКТОР
ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО РАЗВИТИЯ»**

WORKS

of the International scientific and practical conference

**«HUMAN CAPITAL AS THE MAIN FACTOR OF ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT»**

Астана

20 қазан 2022

УДК 331.5 (075.8)

ББК 65.240я73

А 24

Рецензенты: профессор «Esil University», д.э.н. Галиева А.Х.
профессор Евразийского национального университета им.Л.Н.Гумилева, д.э.н.
Шалболова У.Ж.

Редакционная коллегия

Макыш С.Б. – д.э.н., профессор, декан экономического факультета, Евразийский национальный университет им.Л.Н.Гумилева, г.Астана

Байжолова Р.А. – д.э.н., профессор, Евразийский национальный университет им.Л.Н.Гумилева, г.Астана

Ауелбекова А.К. – к.э.н., доцент Евразийский национальный университет им.Л.Н.Гумилева, г.Астана

Исаева Б.К. – PhD., доцент, Евразийский национальный университет им.Л.Н.Гумилева, г.Астана

ISBN 978-601-337-744-5

«Адами капитал экономикалық дамудың негізгі факторы ретінде» халықаралық ғылыми-тәжірибелік конференциясының еңбектер жинағы. –Астана: Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, 2022. -330б.

Сборник трудов международной научно-практической конференции «Человеческий капитал как основной фактор экономического развития». – Астана: Евразийский национальный университет им.Л.Н.Гумилева, 2022. -330с.

Works of the International scientific and practical conference «Human capital as the main factor of economic development». - Astana: L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 2022. -330p.

УДК 331.5 (075.8)

ББК 65.240я73

ISBN 978 – 601 – 337 – 744 – 5

© Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, 2022

© Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, 2022

© L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 2022

management;strengthening the cooperation (participation, supervision and coordination) of non-governmental organization in ecological and environmental protection; To explore the establishment of a green technology bank (large ecological and environmental protection database and information sharing platform); To coordinate energy conservation and green standards and norms; And to plan for a soft connectivity that integrates policies, rules and standards, create three major platforms for policy dialogue and communication, environmental knowledge and information, and exchange and transfer of green technologies.

References

1. «The person in charge of the Department of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Environmental Protection answered questions from reporters on <Guiding Opinions on Promoting the Green Belt and Road Construction > and <the Belt and Road Ecological Environmental Protection Cooperation Plan>», [http: // www.quwo.gov.cn/contents/22/27.html](http://www.quwo.gov.cn/contents/22/27.html).

2. Положение республиканского государственного учреждения "Комитет экологического регулирования и контроля Министерства энергетики Республики Казахстан".[http: //cerc.energo.gov.kk/index.php?id=3471](http://cerc.energo.gov.kk/index.php?id=3471)

3. «ILO: A green economy will create jobs around the world», [http: // www.xinhuanet.com/photo/2018-05/15/c_1122834462.htm](http://www.xinhuanet.com/photo/2018-05/15/c_1122834462.htm).

4. Wang Xiaoquan. The background of "de-dollarization" of china-russia settlement and payment system and the prospect of RMB settlement [J] . A study of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Russia, 2021, (02): -p.150.

UTDC 331.556.4

LABOR MIGRATION AND ITS ECONOMIC IMPACT TO THE EU POLICY

Ospan Kamila

Kamila_ospanova98@mail.ru

Master's degree in International Business and Strategic Trade Control,
L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – Khoich Aizhan

This is the European Union's migration policy, from arrival to housing and processing and in return. It has broken the old system. It has been labeled as not strict enough, not humane enough and fair enough.

So why is it broken and can it be fixed?

To understand how the policy works, we have to go back to 1995. The EU was just two years old. Austria, Finland and Sweden just joined. In addition, Yugoslavia was falling apart in a violent conflict. In that year, the Schengen area opened. It got rid of border checks between some EU countries and created free movement across the continent. However, there was a catch. While it facilitated the movement of Europeans, it also made it easier for people coming from outside of the area to move around to

explain the problem that this created. We first have talk about the different types of migration under Schengen [1].

There are three types. The first is migration from people coming from member states of Schengen, which can move around freely. The second is for people coming from outside the EU, but having documents to stay like a visa or work or residency permits. Those two categories fall under what is called irregular migration. In addition, the third is irregular migration for people who enter the EU without the documents to do so. It is sometimes called illegal migration. That last category is the one that poses a challenge how to manage irregular migrants when they enter the EU under international law. These irregular migrants have certain rights. The Geneva Convention grants migrants who have a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality or membership of a particular social group the status of refugees. They are eligible to ask for protection or asylum in a country. However, another category economic migrant come looking for jobs or opportunities, they are not eligible for asylum [2].

Therefore, if we go back to 1995, one of the main features of Schengen was that borders between countries lost their parents. This caused a problem. First, we had like to share a word about this video sponsor. As Yugoslavia collapsed, it led to Europe's largest refugee crisis since World War 2 and because of the EU's open internal borders and led to a phenomenon called migration shopping. Instead of going to a single country and asking for protection, their migrants would visit several, sometimes applying for asylum and several of them at the same time and choose the best one to live in. To fix this problem that you set up rules for, who would handle migration under the common European asylum system. The key element of this package was the Dublin Convention, which has been revamped twice and is now known as Dublin three for short. The key article of this piece of legislation is called Article 13. What it says is that irregular migrants, including both refugees and economic migrants, would be the responsibility of the country they first arrives in.

Migrant arrives in the EU through the Netherlands, wanting asylum under the Dublin system, you would have to be housed and have his asylum application there, even if you want to go to another country that would be sent back to the Netherlands. Nevertheless, in 2015, during the migration crisis, the system's flaws came to light. Cousins of refugees and migrants continued to cross into Slovenia. German police check Lorries for smuggled migrants [3].

Migrant camps in the south of Europe filled up caravans cross the EU to reach wealthier western and northern Europe. In the case of Germany, this welcomed nearly 1,000,000 migrants, they did so at Angela Merkel's invitation, while at the same time Central European countries declared that they would not take any refugees in that situation. Dublin 3 displays that it had three main flaws. The first is about solidarity. The system ignores geography and the fact that nearly all migration comes from across the Mediterranean or from the East. That means that the countries of the South received nearly all the migrants and under Article 13 are responsible for handling them. This is financial costs and political implications, which those countries bear responsibility for. The second is that of returning migrants. Only about four out of every ten people that

applies for asylum in the EU gets their request granted. Nevertheless, out of those six that are not on you, only one of them is returned to their country of origin. That is because returning migrants often means cooperating with their country of origin, something that is easier said than done.

It means that even when migrants know they cannot claim refugee status, they can still chance that they will not be deported in 2020. While most migrants came from Syria, the next three countries were Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia, which most EU countries consider us safe. These two aspects lead to a third problem since migrants are the responsibility of the first country they enter. In addition, even when their application for asylum is rejected, they are likely to stay. It means countries have incentives to bend the rules to get rid of migrants and the 2015 migrant crisis. This meant letting migrants through to the next country without registering them. In addition, today it still means sending back migrants without processing in what are called migrant pushbacks to take some of the pressure off its migration system. That you struck a series of deals with countries along the main migration routes like Libya, Turkey and Morocco to stop migration. In addition, while those deals have been successful at calling back migration, they have come with their own set of problems. In Libya, it is been the cause of human rights abuses, and they have been used by Morocco and Turkey to blackmail the EU. While all EU leaders recognize that the situation is unsustainable, they have been too divided to come up with a solution [4].

On the question of migration that you can be roughly divided into three factions, the first is the pro migration side. Despite the label, they are not for migration, but rather do not oppose it. They believe the EU has a moral obligation to help refugees fleeing war persecution, and they mentioned that migration could be an economic opportunity for Europe. There is also the anti-immigration side. They mainly questioned the ability to integrate migrants who speak different languages and have different cultures. The debate between those two sides is complicated by their disagreement on who has right to ask for protection in Europe. That is because the difference between economic migrants and refugees has been blurred. The anti-immigration position states that most migrants come from countries that do not border the EU and that they could have applied. They argue that refugees, when they come to Europe, are also economic migrants. In addition, there is the third faction, the border countries [5].

They want support for dealing with the costs involved with migration, both financially but also in the housing and processing of migrants. So with those three sides, what does a working migration policy for Europe look like? One area of consensus has been the reinforcing of contexts that use Border Guard Agency, which has been its budget quadruple since 2015. Despite reports of abuses, the agency has been its mandate to police Europe's borders reinforced. Another option for the European Union's migration policy can be found in the aborted 2020-migration pact, which pushed for mandatory solidarity as it brings together which pushed for mandatory solidarity as it brings together all aspects of migration, border management and screening, asylum and integration, return and relations with external partners. It

would have allowed countries to choose the way in which they contribute to Europe's migration efforts.

Countries would have had the choice between either organizing returns or housing migrants, but since organizing returns is so difficult. Opponents to the plan called for outside hotspots. Breakthrough would mean outside hotspots so nobody can step on the ground of the European Union without having a permission to do so because their request for asylum is accepted. This would create migrant processing centers outside of the EU. Advocates of the idea say that migrants should first apply for asylum before being let into the EU. While the move is legal under the Geneva Convention, and Joseph voiced concerns about potential abuses in migrant centers that are far away from Europe. However, one EU country is pushing ahead with the idea. Denmark, which has opt out from the EU's migration policy, is looking to open such centers in Rwanda. In another development, Greece has unveiled closed off migration centers to be able to process migrants more efficiently. And despite hints at successful integration of migrants in Germany since the 2015 migrants crisis, sentiments on migration in Europe is changing and a stances on migration to harden potential solutions like the ones being explores in Greece and Denmark are becoming more accepted. However, what is clear is that as long as there is not a working system for receiving, processing, admitting and returning migrants for the whole of the European Union, migrants including those who have a right to asylum, will continue to suffer. The issue will continue to divide EU politics and migration will continue to be used to threaten the European Union [6].

Future trends in migration could have more substantial demographic consequences than what has been observed in the past. As fertility is now below replacement in Europe, policies to encourage immigration may become an important means for the EU to moderate rates of population decline [7].

References

1. Cameron, D. 2011 'David Cameron immigration speech', April 14, available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-13083781>
2. Mulley, S. 2010 United Kingdom. In: Migration, Employment and the Outcomes of Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union (A. Platonova and G. Urso, eds.), IOM, Brussels.
3. Office for National Statistics 2011a Migration Statistics Quarterly Report: February 2011, Newport: ONS, www.statistics.gov.uk/pdffdir/mig0211.pdf 2011b Labour market statistics: May 2011, Newport: ONS, www.statistics.gov.uk/pdffdir/lmsuk0511.pdf
4. DG Home Affairs – European Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/index_en.html
5. European Migration Network: www.emn.europa.eu
6. European Website on Integration: <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/>
7. EU Immigration Portal: <http://ec.europa.eu/immigration>