Leonid V. SAVINO
Institute of Management, Branch of Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration Novosibirsk, Russia savinov@siu.ranepa.ru

Marina I. KOVALEVA, Institute of Management, Branch of Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration Novosibirsk, Russia kovaleva@siu.ranepa.ru

MIGRATION AS A FACTOR OF REGIONAL ETHNIC (NATIONALITIES) POLICY IN THE SIBERIAN FEDERAL REGION OF RUSSIA: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

In the paper ‘migration processes management’ within the frame of a regional ethnic policy in the Siberian Federal Region (SFR) analyzed. In-depth interviews with migrants and informal interviews with employers and experts have shown us that migration is moving into social and political spheres from an economic one under its own driving forces and as a consequence of political and cultural requirements. More and more migrants from countries outside the former Soviet Union are applying for citizenship of Russia and this tendency is getting stronger and stronger. Challenges revealed in the migration and regional ethnic policy in Siberia such as the disintegration of the National Cultural Autonomies, the problems of their organizations’ leaders and illegal migration etc. were highlighted in the research. The paper concludes that some steps to solving the migration problems in the frame of the regional ethnic policy in SFR are being taken and there is a vital necessity for scientist’s cooperation with migration policy institutions such as the state, the public organizations, the mass media etc. Recommendations as the result of the research are given here.
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Today in the era of globalization all countries, including Russia, are affected by migration flows and it requires not only a new national ethnic policy but a regional one as well.

Substantial analysis of modern discourse about migration and its influence on political, social, economic, cultural and other processes allow us to emphasize at least three semantic areas of the problem: migration as a social phenomenon, a social process and a social problem. The understanding of migration as a difficult structural phenomenon requires an interdisciplinary systematic approach. This is especially vital for the Siberian Federal Region (SFR) which represents one of the largest areas of the Russian Federation. The aim of the current paper is to provide discourse about migration within the frame of the regional ethnic policy in Siberia.

The structure of the paper reflects the notion that migration and ethnic policy need special attention from all institutions of Russian society especially at the regional level.

The main theorizing of migration and ethnic policy has been discussed by numerous authors in Russia as well as in other countries. To begin with, there have been quite a few studies on migration based on Soviet statistics. We can name Perevedentsev V.I., Lituyakov P.P., Staroverov O.V. and more. Their research data were accurate, because there were very tight administrative controls in the Soviet Union. Moreover, inappropriate categories of ethnos and nation are still in the modern scientific and political discourses as well as in the Russian Constitution, the State National Policy Concept of the Russian Federation, the Federal Law on National and Cultural Autonomy, etc [4, pp. 50-54].

It could be argued that, with the exception of anthropology, until the late 20-th century, migration studies haven’t paid much attention to ethnic problems or explicitly negated them and political aspects were more or less “ignored” in migration theories.
Today the attempts to assign a theoretical framework to migratory phenomenon have been made by the representatives of the various Russian disciplines of science, including political science, sociology, economics and human geography. We can mention the following scientists here: Andrienko, S. Golunov, I. Ivanov, V. Mukomel, V. Perevedentsov, O. Staroverov, O. Troitskaya, A. Vishnevsky, etc. But there isn't enough in-depth research on the current Siberian situation in the sphere of migration and its role in regional ethnic policy.

There is also some foreign research on migration that analyses its essence, the main features, types and other aspects: C.M. Becker, R.V. Budnik, P. Eberhardt, A. Favell, R. Finnigan, R. King, W. Kymlicka, J. Lee, R. Skeldon, S. Thieme, etc.

There is no doubt, migration should be one of the main factors in a regional ethnic policy. Ethnic policy today is defined as a system of ideologies and doctrines on synchronizing different interests in an ethnic sphere, including the interests of the state and ethnic groups, and the realization of these interests by institutions of the state and civil society. As such, ethnic policy is a twofold policy, namely the incorporation of ethnic minorities into the social-cultural space of an ethnic majority on the one hand, and the policy of the conservation of the cultural identity and ethnic cultural heritage of ethnic minorities on the other hand [5, p. 102].

As for the Siberian Federal Region (SFR), it represents one of the largest areas of the Russian Federation. It covers about 30% of the country's territory, with a population of more than 20.5 million people or 14.3% of the total population of Russia. The uniqueness of the region is defined not only by its geographical territory, its peculiarities of natural-climatic conditions and remoteness from the centre of government, but also by the historical uniqueness of its expansion and development, its geopolitical status, its natural resources as well as its economic, scientific and human resources. What makes SFR a problematic area is its multi-cultural community, which is characterized by ethnic, religious and socio-cultural differences. These features define the uniqueness of the area as part of Russia and its value as an integral part of a multi-ethnic, diverse religious and multicultural state [6, p. 175].

In addition, SFR differs from other regions of Russia due to its diverse ethnic population and complex territorial-administrative structure. SFR is the second most populous area after the Central Federal Region in Russia and eight out of the sixteen regions have ethnic origins here.

The authors of the research project "Migration and diasporas in socio-cultural, economic and political space of Siberia, XIX – the beginning of the XXI century" point out that there was a joining of Siberia to Russia as a development of "empty" space in the Russian history. Now trans-boundary migrations are the mechanism of a gradual "exception" of Siberia from the Russian space. Thus authors of the project view Siberia not only as a territory but also as a specific type of society, and a special type of culture and tradition, historically formed and developed «beyond the Urals» [2]. In these conditions Siberia can be considered on the basis of system analysis as a black box with a high level of uncertainty, where at the entrance the Siberian society has a massive migratory stream, and at the output – numerous problems of socio-cultural, economic and political character appear.

Siberia as a regional community acts as an example of a super region which was historically formed with migration as a strong influential factor.

In 2014, 762 compatriots' visa applications were received by the Office of the Federal Migration Service of Russia in the Novosibirsk region. Applications from potential participants of a State program arrived from 12 states including Kazakhstan (577), Kyrgyzstan (65), Uzbekistan (63), Ukraine (19), and Tajikistan (13) (Department of the Federal Migration Service for Novosibirsk Region).

The analysis of the population's ethnic structures identifies the appearance of "new" ethnic groups that can be divided into three subgroups, namely:

- ethnic groups that emigrated from other Russian regions,
- ethnic groups that emigrated from neighboring or nearby foreign countries (former Soviet Republics),
- ethnic groups that emigrated from distant foreign countries.

We've carried out in-depth interviews with migrants and informal interviews with employers and experts. The results of our research show that in the 1990's, migrants' motivation and aspirations for integration were basically concentrated on the spheres of economy and culture. They remembered their common language and cultural space and tried to keep it. So migrants of that period practically didn't migrate with the purpose of starting a family (including mixed marriage) or taking a family to Russia to live. In the year 2000 priorities changed, and we could see a displacement of the integration desires. The economic motivation still prevailed, however the desire to export a family and get citizenship became more important for the migrants.

The beginning of 2010 was remarkable for Russia because of a sharp increase in the migrants' interest in political inclusiveness. Elections for the State Duma of 2011 showed that the ethnic factor
became a priority in pre-election campaigns. The results of sociological polls and expert reviews also indicated that in SFR motivations and the claims of immigrants have considerably changed. The labour (economic) motivation has been gradually replaced by a social motivation in a broad sense as the consequence of political and cultural requirements. Thus, in the 90’s of the XX century migration was mostly labour and temporary but in the beginning of XXI century, migrants tended to apply for citizenship of the Russian Federation. And today this tendency is becoming stronger and stronger.

From the position of the economic sciences and classical political economy, the phenomenon, in our opinion, is better explained in the frame of the theory of "dual" economy as well as "dual" and "segmented" labour markets.

In the policy sciences of a dual economy the core is characterized by high intensity of capital, vertical integration of manufacture, technological innovations, national or international scale, diversification, high profits, the monopole powers in the commodity markets, etc. These characteristics are much less expressed by the organization of the internal labour market on the periphery [3, p. 89]. The core basically includes "good" workplaces, and the periphery - all the others. Thus, a concept of "dualism" concerns three interconnected, but unidentical positions:

1) dual economy, i.e. division of economy into a core and peripheral branches on the basis of the market forces;
2) dual labour market, i.e. classification of labour markets (for hiring and advancement) as providing or not providing workers with security of work and ladders of internal advancement;
3) dual labour, i.e. labour division into more or less exclusive categories of workers not competing among themselves (for example, ethnic). The people belonging to "primary" (exclusive) categories of labour usually get a job in the economy core. Labour markets in the economic core tend to be internal ("primary"). So, for example, we find white male workers in the economic core in the domestic market, where there is a high salary, comfortable conditions and good security of work [7, p. 567].

In fact, in modern Russia we have an economic core and periphery in both cases: internal and external. There is a centre (capital) and periphery (suburbs) within Russia, the suburbs being mainly Siberia and the Far East. In external representations the Russian Federation acts as a core in relation to the majority of the former Soviet republics, which nowadays are sovereign states.

It is possible to find a special separation of enclave market segments (including ethnic) besides the core and periphery in the literature. Today such labour markets are widely discussed in the sociology of inter-ethnic relations. These markets are described as an addition to monopole firms (a primary labour market) and to small firms (a secondary labour market). But, unlike a secondary market where investments in human capital don't pay off, in the enclave economy the investments in workers/migrants to the human capital pays off just the same as in the primary market. In an economy core, monopolistic firms are vertically and horizontally integrated. A lot of small, «atomized» businesses operate on the periphery. The enclave economy consists of clusters of small businesses which are horizontally and vertically integrated with each other.

Now the largest ethnic communities have some ethno-national organizations that indicate stratification in these communities and diversity in interests. More than that, there is a disintegration of the National Cultural Autonomies (NCA). Another important aspect of NCA is the real participation of rank-and-file members of the autonomy – ethnophors – in their activities. We should also mention the problems of the organizations’ leaders: not all of them realize the priorities and goals of the state ethnic policy and aren’t ready for a constructive dialogue with the authorities and society, public leadership, etc. It’s not a secret that some leaders of ethno-national communities actively use the power of their position because of a natural leadership aspiration, prestige, social recognition and opportunities for close contact with the authorities of parent states or regions. The ruling elite of the new independent states, especially Transcaucasia and Central Asia, try to oversee corresponding Diasporas and use their resources for state-building and power struggles. It’s estimated that there is a quarter of the Azerbaijani electorate in Russia [8]. However, national-cultural autonomies are an important part but not the most important part of inter-ethnic relations and communications. In truth, all these relationships are built on an informal basis and it’s very difficult to study them.

Recently the attention of NCA has been specifically aimed at migration problems. In the NCA Association “Commonwealth” (Novosibirsk region) a special directive in labour migration is included in its structure. This fact proves that today NCA is trying to move their status from the social and cultural area into civil and political.

Here the problem is of the interaction of the NCA with public authorities and local government changes. Such interaction can be carried out at least in two directions: firstly, the direct dialogue of separate autonomies with power structures; secondly, indirect interaction through associated or repre-
sentative structures. The Advisory Board of the National Cultural Autonomy and organizations have successfully working together in the City administration in Novosibirsk since 2001.

There are considerable labour migrations in the big cities of Siberia. We can highlight branches of economy in which the share of the migrants becomes the dominant factor: building, trade, housing and communal services, transport, and services. Another important problem of the migrants’ incorporation is their integration into the new political realities (state, citizenship, political participation, etc.) and into the political culture of society. One of the main tools of immigrants’ integration into society is the practice of granting political rights to migrants such as the right to vote in elections, as a rule, at the local level. At the same time the political rights of immigrants aren't limited to the electoral rights.

One important tool of migrants’ integration is their involvement in public life. And usually it takes place in two forms. The first is the foundation of a special advisory structure in the executive and legislative authority (at local or regional levels). They include representatives of migrants’ institutionalized communities or representatives of certain ethnic groups constantly living in the territory of the corresponding areas. As a rule, such communities unite both immigrants (aliens) and immigrants who have already become citizens of the state. Such advisory structures have consultative functions and take an active part in the discussions of authorities’ decisions which are directly connected with immigrant communities.

The second form of migrants’ involvement in public life is active encouragement for them to be involved with (in frames of the laws) various public and political organisations (political parties, trade unions, mass media, charitable, remedial, and religious and other organisations). Being the backbone of a civil society, such organisations, on the one hand, promote complex integration of migrants into the social and political structure of the host country, and, on the other hand, they allow migrants to protect and lobby for their interests in the processes of migrants’ institutionalization through effective dialogues with local authorities.

The above mentioned argument implies that public organizations can be used for carrying out various integration projects.

It should be pointed out here that some of these steps have been taken to overcome some incredibly difficult challenges in the situation of migration and ethnic policy in SFR. But we can’t help but say here that the solution of many of the problems of migration are down to the public authorities and local government which can only be solved by the realization of the state and municipal ethnic policy. These problems produce significant risks and threats to the mutual relations between various ethnic cultural groups, most of all to the Siberian aborigines and new migrants. Moreover they strengthen pressure on imperial vertical and horizontal powers, creating “centre – regions” problems which in fact are the problems of real federalism.

Thus management of migratory processes should be concentrated in solving two mutual problems:

a) integration of migrants into a modern Russian society – inclusion in socio-cultural, economic and ordinary space;

b) acceptance of migrants as cultural "others", but not "strangers" by the Russian society, social groups and Russians.

On the whole, the problems of migration as a main factor of the ethnic policy in SFR are vital in this day and age. There is an opinion that neither technical improvements nor modernization of the economy will help the situation without sufficient labour resources. That is why the state and civil institutions have become more aware of not only migration challenges and risks to society, but also the opportunities that migration provides.

In fact, the territory of Siberia has become a comfortable «temporary house» for law-abiding foreigners. The Siberian multinational population’s good neighborly relationships with representatives of other states and the effective work of the migratory service’s branches provide the absence of international conflicts and other factors destabilizing the social situation in Siberian regions.

The following conclusions of the results of our research can be given here.

1. Migration to the Siberian Federal District is becoming a social problem and a security threat in the eyes of the various strata of society. It isn’t connected with an objective increase in the number of migrants, but with personal perceptions about their numbers in public spheres: trade, food, transport, housing and communal services, services, etc.

2. Migration is moving to social and political spheres from an economic one under its own internal forces. Labour migration is often replaced or initiated by social factors: higher standard of living, higher-quality health services and education.
3. A major factor affecting the immigrants' decision to live in Siberia is the guarantee of personal safety, because the hostility level is lower here compared with Central and Southern Russia.

4. Immigrants from former Soviet republics are forming Diasporas which have increasingly become consolidated and significant in the big cities of SFR. They aspire to ethnic cultural autonomy by using political demands and threats. These Diasporas are structured by a network principle and governed by informal social leaders, who are mostly religious and/or criminal bosses.

5. Official national and cultural autonomies and ethno-national organizations of immigrants from former Soviet republics are characterized by the weak participation of "new" migrants. To a greater extent they have a presentation character. Many leaders of these structures use their status as a means for personal achievement in small groups (clan, family, etc.) for political, economic and other purposes.

6. There is a threat of a considerable anthrop stream from countries outside the former Soviet Union, first of all from China – «a subjective reality» for the population of Siberia (according to Thomas theorem) and a myth as «a reality objective». The number of migrants from China decreases with the increase of the Chinese economy. Siberia isn't a priority immigration region and territory for the Chinese. Today, potential migrants have better opportunities and benefits in more comfortable social and cultural conditions in their own homeland.

7. Immigrants from countries outside the former Soviet Union are extremely passive in the formation of national-cultural autonomies and ethno-national organizations. Thus they are poorly integrated into Russian societies, civil and political space.

The resolution of the government of the Novosibirsk region No. 347-p approved a long-term target program "Aid to Compatriots Living Abroad Voluntary Resettlement in Novosibirsk Region for 2013-2020" on August, 6, 2013. The government of the Novosibirsk region continues to introduce migrants according to the requirements of demographic, social and economic development [1]. Some programs to solve migrants' problems are created. One of them is the regional Compatriots Program.

Yet, much more work is needed in order to understand the following questions connected with migration and ethnic policy: what is the impact of immigration on ethnic policy in Siberia? What policy mechanisms are effective in regulating migration in terms of ethnicity?

Summing up, the existing research implies that some steps of solving the problems of migration in the frame of the regional ethnic policy in Siberian Federal Region have been taken. There is a vital necessity for scientists' cooperation with different migration policy institutions, whose activities are directly aimed at solving the problems of migration, including ethno-political issues: state, public organizations, mass media, etc. Migration shouldn’t be a shadowy segment of the economy: it has to be rigidly controllable and transparent. Nowadays a methodological system of migration on the basis of monitoring international relations, assessment of risks, measures for possible conflict prevention should be created in SFR.
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