

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

Leonid Vyacheslavovich Savinov, Dean of the State and Municipal Management
Department of the Institute of Management – the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy
of National Economy and Public Administration, Doctor of Political Sciences
Marina Ivanovna Kovaleva, Chair of the Foreign Languages Department of the
Institute of Management – the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National
Economy and Public Administration, Candidate of Pedagogic Sciences

Today in the era of globalisation 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 theorising 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. (1969), Litvyakov P.P. (1969), Staroverov O.V. (1979) 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.

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. Perevedentsev, 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.

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 characterised 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.

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» . 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).

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 neighbouring 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 characterised by high intensity of capital, vertical integration of manufacture, technological innovations, national or international scale, diversification, high profits, the monopoloid powers in the commodity markets, etc. These characteristics are much less expressed by the organisation of the internal labour market on the periphery. 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.

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.

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. 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 organisations, 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.

References:

1. Big Illustrated Encyclopedia in 32 Volumes. 2010. Vol.17. Moscow: AST, Astrel.
2. Savinov L.V., Kovaleva M.I. Poly-ethnicity and a System of Education in Russia with Special Reference to the Siberian Federal District // Education and Ethnicity: Comparative Perspectives. - Platinum Press, Potchefstroom, South Africa. - 2010.
3. Andrienko Y., Guriev S. Understanding Migration in Russia // CEFIR Policy Paper. - 2005. - P. 23.
4. Andrienko Y., Guriev S. Analysis of Migration in Russia // Centre of Economic and Financial Research of the Russian Economic School. -2006.
5. Golunov S. Ethnic Migration: a Challenge to Russian Border Security? // PONARS Policy Memo. - No. 432. - March 2007. - Retrieved September 20, 2014 (http://csis.org/files/media/isis/pubs/pm_0432.pdf).
6. Troitskaya O. Russian Migration Policy: Restrict or Liberalize? // RIAC: Russian International Affairs Council. – 2013.