



WORKING PAPER

MIGRANT INTEGRATION: THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE AND PROSPECTS FOR RUSSIA

№ XII

2014

Russian International Affairs Council

Moscow 2014

Russian International Affairs Council

Editor-in-Chief:

I.S. Ivanov, Corresponding Member, RAS, Dr. of History

Author:

V.S. Malakhov, Dr. of Political Science

Drafting and copy editing:

I.N. Timofeev, Ph.D. in Political Science; **T.A. Makhmutov**, Ph.D. in Political Science;
E.S. Alekseenkova, Ph.D. in Political Science

Migrant Integration: The European Experience and Prospects for Russia : Working Paper / [V.S. Malakhov; I.S. Ivanov, Editor-in-Chief] ; RIAC. – Moscow: Spetskniga, 2014. – 20 pages. ISBN 978-5-91891-364-2.

This working paper was prepared as part of the Russian International Affairs Council's project *International Migration Processes: Trends, Challenges and Prospects*. Whereas Europe has dealt with mass influxes of immigrants since the 1950s, Russia only encountered this phenomenon relatively recently. Europe's experience with migrant integration, which will be considered in this working paper, might be useful to Russia in resolving similar issues. The author identifies a range of specific programmes and measures to ease the process of including immigrants and their descendants into the host country's social institutions, and he offers several recommendations regarding the prospects for integrating migrants in Russia.

The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the RIAC.

Photo used on the cover is taken from DAPD / David Hecker.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Key Terms	4
Conceptual Aspects of Integration Issues.....	6
The Situation in Russia	11
Structural and Cultural Dimensions of Integration.....	13
Integration Policy: Practical Aspects	15
Conclusions	18

Introduction

For Russia, the phenomenon of mass immigration is relatively new. While Russia's partners in the G8 have been dealing with mass influxes of immigrants since the 1950s, migrant workers did not start moving to Russia en masse until 40 years later. While labour migration to Russia was mostly temporary in the 1990s, in the last 10 to 15 years an ever increasing number of migrant workers has been relocating to Russia with the aim of living there permanently. This fact has fundamentally changed the situation. Many people – colloquially referred to as 'Gastarbeiters' (guest workers) – are not actually in Russia as guests, but are rather de facto or de jure permanent residents. The children of migrant workers also fall into this category. To a significant degree, Russia's future development depends on how successfully these migrant workers and their children are integrated into Russian society.

Therefore, Russia has yet to address the challenges that the industrial Western European nations have been facing for half a century¹. Western Europe has garnered a wealth of experience, both positive and negative, in those 50 years. It is not only useful, but also necessary, for Russia to understand this experience.

Key Terms

Immigrants – foreign citizens that live in another country for more than one year.

A synonym for this term is 'external migrant', as opposed to 'internal migrants', which is used to denote citizens of a particular nation that move from one region to another within that same state. We will adhere to the usage adopted in everyday language by referring to the terms 'immigrant' and 'migrant' interchangeably, although we will always mean 'external migrants'².

Immigrant integration – the inclusion of immigrants and their descendants in the host country's social institutions. A synonym for integration is *social incorporation*, with *social exclusion* being the antonym.

¹ As for the North American countries (the United States and Canada), they are 'immigration countries' by definition, because the formation of their political and cultural integrity (nationhood) was inseparable from the process of immigration from the very beginning.

² In Russian public discourse, the friction and controversy associated with internal migration (particularly the relocation of people from the North Caucasus to Central Russia) often appear to be part of the problem with migrant integration. Participants in the discussion point to particular differences in household behaviour and cultural norms associated with ethnic origin. When members of the host society demand that newcomers must be 'integrated', they are essentially calling for assimilation – full conformity to the way of life that was in place before this category of migrants appeared. Such a notion, however, leads to a serious distortion of reality, with the host society underestimating the depth of the divide between this category of people and *immigrants* proper. A foreign citizen has a fundamentally different *legal status* than

Immigrant integration should not be confused with *assimilation*, in which newcomers are completely dissolved into the host country's population. In most cases, assimilation is unfeasible for objective and subjective reasons. It is unlikely that cultural differences can be fully eliminated, even if the host society and newcomers mutually desire it. However, this condition is typically not satisfied for social and psychological reasons. It would be morally traumatic for a newcomer to completely reject his or her cultural particularities, which are strongly intertwined with personal identity.

Migrant integration is made possible by *acculturation* and/or cultural *adaptation*. It is very important to emphasise that the meaning of these terms has evolved in recent decades. Whereas prior to the mid-20th century researchers and politicians used these terms to refer the new population adapting its culture to that of the host population, in the 1960s–1970s the understanding shifted to the *mutual adaptation* of cultures³. Changes in the interpretation of 'acculturation' and 'adaptation' were facilitated by the process of democratisation, the decisive stage of which occurred abroad in the 1960s–1970s, but which has now acquired a global character. Because the democratic system is based on civil equality and participation, modern states cannot allow discrimination and/or the exclusion of particular categories of people⁴.

Second-generation immigrant – a child who grew up in a family of migrants (or in a family in which one of the parents is a migrant). Strictly speaking, this expression is not entirely accurate. If a child who was born into a family of migrants *in the host country* acquires citizenship in that country, he or she is not an immigrant. However, as long as the process of incorporation into the host society is associated with certain difficulties, this definition is appropriate. Moreover, analysts sometimes use the term '**third-generation immigrant**' to highlight the possibility of conflicts associated with an individual's migrant origins, qualifying the grandchildren of migrants

a Russian citizen from the southern regions. In contrast with foreign nationals, Russian citizens cannot be deported. At the same time, unlike foreigners, Russian citizens have nowhere to appeal if their rights are grossly violated; for example, a Chinese citizen can contact the Chinese embassy, whereas a person from Dagestan can only contact Russian law enforcement. Furthermore, regardless of their ethnicity, 'internal migrants' have a fundamentally different *historical status*. As Russian citizens, they are morally, psychologically, socially and culturally a part of Russia. They feel that they are full members of the Russian national community. In contrast with foreign citizens (be it from Central Asia, the South Caucasus or North-East Asia), they *do not have an alternative cultural affiliation*. Despite the widespread myth of the cultural chasm that allegedly separates the people from the North Caucasus from the rest of Russia, they are culturally not very different from the majority of the country's population. Young people from the North Caucasus affirm their membership in Russian society by, among other things, studying in universities of Moscow, marrying outside of their ethnicity, and participating in national sports (for example, the proportion of North Caucasians on Russian national martial arts teams is impressive).

³ See: Dyatlov V.I. (ed.) *Cross-Border Migration and the Host Society: Mechanisms and Practices in Mutual Adaptation: A Study* / Yekaterinburg: Ural University Publishers, 2009 (in Russian).

⁴ According to Article 4 and 5 of the European Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities, "forced assimilation is prohibited." URL: <http://www.conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/157.htm>

as migrants, as well. Finally, with respect to children born in a family of migrants *in the country of their former residence*, the term '**half-generation immigrant**' is used (this notion is important, for example, for the sociology of education)⁵.

In order to avoid the undesirable associations generated by the terms listed above, many authors prefer to use alternatives such as **migrant origin**, **migrant background** and **people from a migrant background**. These concepts are more accurate in many cases. For example, individuals who blend into the host society soon after relocation are formally 'first-generation immigrants', but they are actually full members of this society⁶. Likewise, it would be counter-productive to refer to people who have made an indisputable contribution to the political development of their motherland as 'second-generation immigrants'⁷.

Conceptual Aspects of Integration Issues

During their study of the problems associated with migrant integration, European analysts arrived at a consensus on several conceptual issues⁸. The key elements of this consensus are shown below.

1. Problems associated with the social inclusion of migrants should not be considered in isolation from those associated with **national integration** (that is, cohesion and the collective solidarity of the host community). Before posing the question of 'migrant integration', it should be asked to what extent the society into which the migrant must integrate is 'integrated'.

French sociologist Emile Durkheim believed that there is a direct link between the degree of a society's integration and the level of suicide. The more atomised and divided (that is, the less 'cohesive' and 'integrated') a society is, the higher is the likelihood of *social anomie*.

Social anomie is moral disorientation and the erosion of norms that govern an individual's behaviour. Durkheim thought that it is the driving force behind increases in the suicide rate. Although this clas-

⁵ See, for example: Baranova V. Language Socialization of the Children of Migrants // Antropologicheskyy Forum. 2012. No. 17 (in Russian).

⁶ A characteristic example is Arnold Schwarzenegger. Who remembers that the 38th governor of California moved from Austria to the United States when he was 20 and was granted citizenship at 35? For Russia, the story of Eduard Bagirov is similar. This famous writer and aspiring politician moved from Turkmenistan to Russia in 1994 and became a Russian citizen in 1996.

⁷ Nicolas Sarkozy, who was president of France from 2007 to 2012, was born into a family of Hungarian immigrants.

⁸ See: Common Framework for the Integration of Non-EU Nationals // European Union (official website). URL: http://www.europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/114502_en.htm; Hansen R. Citizenship and Integration in Europe // Joppke C. and Morawska E (eds.). Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. P. 87–109.

sic sociological thesis has been revised in the modern social sciences, its key idea remains relevant. National integration (that is, the consolidation of the society being joined by the migrant and his or her descendant) is directly related to the topic of this study. Unfortunately, modern Russia has one of the highest levels of social polarisation – the gap between the rich and the poor – in the world. Social polarisation engenders a deep sense of mutual distrust between the various social layers and groups, and it causes resentment⁹, which entails a high degree of social tension in general and xenophobia in particular. Because xenophobia (the rejection of people from other countries) is primarily directed towards immigrants, it creates an unfavourable atmosphere for integration.

2. It is worth distinguishing between two different phenomena denoted by the term ‘migrant integration’: **process** and **policy**. Integration as a process is what *happens spontaneously* at the social level, while integration as a policy is *the aggregate of administrative efforts* on the part of the government.

The integration of newcomers is a phenomenon that is difficult to control. Integration is often *unintended* in the sense that it results from a chain of choices and decisions an individual makes without the specific goal of ‘integrating’. Meanwhile, the integration policy adopted by state institutions does not always yield the desired results. Paradoxically, in many ways the situation with migrant integration looks more favourable in the United States (where this process has been farmed out to the market and NGOs) than it does in several Western European countries (where the government acts as the guardian of the migrant population)¹⁰.

3. A **differentiated approach** is necessary for individuals that fall within the ‘immigrant’ category. Even though they are members of one set of statistics, these people are profoundly different from one another in a variety of ways, including:

(a) Legal status: refugees and asylum seekers, migrant workers that are on contracts, holders of temporary or permanent residence, those who have been granted citizenship, etc. (undocumented immigrants are not considered in this case);

(b) Social indicators: education, professional qualification, economic status (self-employed, employee, employer), proficiency in the language, family status, etc.

What this means is that integration programmes should be **targeted**; their contents should be based on the particular group of people they are addressing. At least five groups should be emphasised:

⁹ From the French word *ressentiment* – malice, bitterness, indignation.

¹⁰ See: Hansen R. Citizenship and Integration in Europe // C. Joppke & E. Morawska (eds.), *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2003.

- Spouses of citizens of the host country;
- Small entrepreneurs (self-employed¹¹);
- Migrant workers;
- Members of migrant families;
- Refugees and asylum seekers (strictly speaking, individuals in this category are not covered by integration programmes; however, in some cases such programmes grant them limited opportunities if they have a temporary residence permit).

Each of these groups contains a number of subgroups depending on the aforementioned social indicators. For example, the spouses and children of migrant workers who enter a foreign country to reunite with their family quite often lack even a basic knowledge of the host country's language. Children are provided with extra lessons in specialised classes at school, while adults are given language courses of various levels. Several European states also help countries of origin organise language courses within their own borders. In this case, the individual entering a foreign country to reunite with his or her spouse is required to take a language test. If they fail the test, they are not granted permanent residency¹². There is extreme variability within this migrant category, ranging from qualified specialists who merely need to find work within their field of expertise, to people with little education or lacking professional qualifications. Understandably, different categories of people have different initial opportunities for integration. As a rule, migrant entrepreneurs have extremely high integration potential. By engaging in business, they become involved in a wide network of social exchanges. Of no little importance is the fact that they often act as employers and create jobs.

One should also note the specific complications that female migrants can face during integration, particularly domestic violence and the burden of children, which can result in a situation whereby a woman from a migrant environment has practically no knowledge of the host country's language, despite having lived there for ten years or more. In many cases, the inability to speak the language is not due to a subjective lack of desire, but rather due to obstacles put up by a husband striving to retain full authority over the family. In other cases, the husband may not have a patriarchal attitude and affordable language courses may be available, but the woman does not attend them because she cannot find a babysitter. With these circumstances in mind, the municipal authorities in several European

¹¹ For example, approximately 8 per cent of Tajiks who relocate to Moscow are small entrepreneurs. See: Ivanova T.D. *Tajiks in Moscow Society // Immigrants in Moscow / Zayonchkovskaya Z.A.(ed.)* Moscow: Tri Quadrata 2009. P. 182 (in Russian).

¹² See: Joppke C. *Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe // West European Politics*. 2007. Vol. 30, No. 1. P. 1–22.

cities are trying to account for the gender aspect in their integration programmes.

4. **The host society's attitude towards migrants** is a crucial factor in the integration process (or rather, a factor preventing integration). There are two elements involved:

- (a) Discrimination;
- (b) Manifestations of xenophobia and racism.

When newcomers encounter inequality on the labour and housing market (i.e. discrimination) or hostility on ethnic, racial, or religious grounds, they tend to isolate themselves from the native population. In a process experts refer to as 'ghettoisation', they enclose themselves in a tight-knit circle of their peers.

The authorities in several Western European countries are monitoring the situation in an attempt to prevent such processes. Until 2007, Vienna was home to a special *EU* agency – the *European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia*, which registered cases of discrimination against migrants¹³. Nowadays, this function is assigned to the *Agency for Fundamental Rights*. However, it should be stated that these efforts have not produced the intended result. Migrant 'ghettos' with a high concentration of poverty and other manifestations of social disadvantage can be seen even in prosperous countries.

5. Although it is true that migrants are often separated from members of the host country by a certain cultural distance, **the role that cultural factors play in integration should not be exaggerated. The success** (or, in the opposite case, the failure) **of integration primarily depends on structural (objective) circumstances.**

Working and living conditions are the most important issues directly impacting the integration process. If these problems are not addressed (for example, if an individual works 12 hours a day without breaks and lives in degrading conditions), migrants cannot be expected to integrate into the host society.

Unfortunately, the Russian elite has not fully grasped this. When talking about migrant integration, Russian politicians and bureaucrats usually place cultural issues at the forefront (identity, readiness and ability to adapt to the social environment, respect for the host country's national traditions, etc.). It is no accident that when the topic of migrant integration resurfaced in the public discourse of large Russian cities at the beginning of the 2010s, it was discussed in the cultural context. The authorities of Moscow, St. Petersburg and other Russian megalopolises undertook to develop a code of migrant behaviour (the 'Moscovite's Code', the 'St. Petersburg's

¹³ It should be noted, however, that a larger number of registered cases in a particular country might not necessarily indicate a higher level of discrimination, but a more strictly organised registration system.

Code', etc.). However, people should be made aware that **without establishing order on the labour market, efforts in the cultural sphere will not produce the desired result.**

6. There are four key dimensions of integration – two structural and two cultural.

Accordingly, there are four main clusters of indicators by which one can assess how the integration process is moving along¹⁴.

Table 1. Integration Indicators

Socio-economic	Political and legal	Socio-cultural	Socio-psychological
Employment	Number of people naturalised per year	Language competence	Attitude of the host population
Income level		Choice of spouse	Cases of discrimination (receiving media attention or under NGO monitoring)
Social security	Participation in political life	Attitude towards host country's underlying norms	Ethnic and cultural diversity in the work place (state or private sector)
Education level	Participation in civil society institutions	Frequency of contact with host society and country of origin	Representation in the media: (a) methods of coverage of migration issues (b) presence of individuals of migrant origin in jobs at central television and radio channels, press
Living conditions	Number of migrants with dual citizenship (in cases envisaged by law)	Number of violations of law	
Presence/absence of housing segregation			

7. The integration process is a **two-way street**. Not only does it involve the migrant adapting to a new socio-cultural environment, but also certain changes on the part of the host population. Of course, acculturation is not symmetrical – more is required of the migrants than the hosts. Nevertheless, the host community cannot remain completely unaltered. It must revise its self-image and its level of tolerance, which means it must be ready to adopt a *positive perception of cultural diversity*.

¹⁴ This table is a compilation of the following theoretical work: Entzinger H., Biezeveld R. Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration. Report for the European Commission. European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER). Rotterdam, August 2003. With regards to practical 'measurements' of the results of particular migrant integration efforts, the following resources offer a wealth of material: <http://www.integrationindex.eu>; European Website on Integration. URL: <http://www.ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/practice/more.cfm>

The Situation in Russia

Russia's case is quite unique in comparison with European countries, the most important peculiarity being that Russia only recently became a destination for immigrants. Hence a certain lack of readiness on the part of the political class and wider society to acknowledge the fact of this transformation. Meanwhile, **the recognition that Russia is a country that attracts immigrants** to the same degree as all of the industrialised states of the North (which hire labour resources from the South) **is long overdue. Without that awareness, and without public articulation, the issue of migrant integration cannot be resolved.**

Most immigrants to Russia are from the former Soviet Union. If they were born in the 1960s–1970s, these migrants were socialised in the same institutions as Russians. This circumstance **minimises the cultural distance between migrants and the host population.** The older generation of immigrants to Russia is made up of former Soviet citizens who share a cultural and historical experience with Russians and, most importantly, speak Russian. Therefore, there are fewer socio-psychological and socio-cultural complications involved in integrating these migrants than migrants from outside the former Soviet Union.

That said, a growing contingent of migrants from the former Soviet republics are young people born after the collapse of the USSR. They do not know Russian as well as their parents do – and often do not speak the language at all. In this case, special language integration programmes are needed.

The second generation of migrants has not yet entered into active life in Russia. As the experience of Western Europe shows, the potential for conflict is connected specifically with young people born and raised in the country to which their parents migrated. Whereas the first generation of migrants usually strives to adapt to the host country's conditions (and therefore tries to conform as much as possible), their children are not inclined to such a degree of conformity. They might have inflated expectations of the host government and society (which is their native society). The discrepancies between expectation and reality are fraught with conflict.

Society's unwillingness to admit that Russia is now a country that attracts immigrants manifests itself in **a highly unfavourable atmosphere surrounding public discussion of the immigration problem.** In contrast with the majority of Western Europe, where this topic generally receives balanced media coverage¹⁵,

¹⁵ In Western Europe, public and political debates centre primarily on the desired volumes of immigration. As a result, whether or not there should be immigration at all is not debated.

an aggressive and destructive tone dominates the debate in Russia.

Most Russian citizens believe that immigration is undesirable in principle because it puts pressure on wages and squeezes out local workers¹⁶. Accordingly, the only adequate immigration policy would be to either sharply reduce or completely cut off the inflow of foreign workers. Only **a radical improvement in labour relations**, particularly removing a substantial portion of the labour market from the grey zone, will reverse that conviction.

Western European states – even those that joined the immigration club later (Spain, Portugal, Iceland) – have migrant integration programmes financed at the national, regional and European level¹⁷. These programmes offer a wide range of measures covering all the key spheres of social life, from economics to education and culture. Among the programmes on offer are *civil integration courses*, which entail language study, familiarisation with the host society's history and culture, and, if necessary, training in social competence, such as how to get around in a big city (using public transport, credit and debit cards, etc.). Russia has yet to undertake systematic measures such as these, although such projects do exist among NGOs and churches.

In general, Russian citizenship laws are similar to those in the European Union. However, recent legislative initiatives point to a gap of sorts in strategies. Whereas citizenship laws started to undergo a certain degree of liberalisation in many European countries in the 1980s¹⁸, **the Russian trend with respect to the possibility of migrant naturalisation is rather restrictive**. The 2002 law 'On Russian Federation Citizenship' abolishes the institution of dual citizenship for individuals applying for Russian citizenship¹⁹. The law's lack of a *jus soli* (right of soil) clause for children born into migrant families on Russian soil is particularly telling. In recent decades,

¹⁶ According to the *Levada Center*, in 2012 over 60 per cent of Russians expressed the opinion that immigrants take jobs from locals. Twelve per cent of Russians disagreed with that position (compared to 16 per cent in 2003). Furthermore, nearly half of those polled in 2012 (46 per cent) believed that migrants destroy Russian culture. See: National Policy and Attitudes towards Migrants // Levada Center. November 28, 2012. URL: <http://www.levada.ru/28-11-2012/natsionalnaya-politika-i-otnoshenie-k-migrantam> (in Russian). See also: Volkov D. Growth in Anti-Migrant Sentiment and the Probability of Nationalistic Protests in Russia: Report as Part of a Seminar at the Center for Citizenship and Identity Studies // Center for Citizenship and Identity Studies // November 5, 2013. URL: http://www.ccisru.org/books/2013-11-TCIPGI_Volkov_doklad.pdf (in Russian).

¹⁷ In 2007, the European Union founded the *European Integration Fund*, with a five-year budget of 825 million euros (\$1 billion). See: Collett E. Immigrant Integration in Europe in a Time of Austerity. Transatlantic Council on Migration – Migration Policy Institute, March 2011. P. 7. URL: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/tcm-integration.pdf>

¹⁸ For more detail on modern trends in this sphere, see: Malakhov V. Citizenship Policy in the 'Axial' EU Countries: Empirical Aspects // Malakhov V. Cultural Differences and Political Borders in the Epoch of Global Migration. Moscow: NLO, 2014. P. 132–149 (in Russian).

¹⁹ For many migrants, the prohibition on retaining their original citizenship is an obstacle to adopting citizenship in their country of residence. See: Dual Citizenship in Global Perspective: From Unitary To Multiple Citizenship / Faist T. and Kivisto P. (eds.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

most European states have introduced *jus soli*, albeit with several reservations²⁰. In the 2000s, the prevailing opinion among the elites in these nations was that citizenship is not the ‘crown’ of integration (a ‘reward’ for integration, in a sense), but rather a *condition* for integration. Even a number of conservative political leaders who opposed granting citizenship to migrants in the 1980s–1990s changed their position in the 2000s²¹. This position contrasts with that of the Russian elite, which is to be very wary of citizenship for migrants.

In parallel with the liberalisation of citizenship laws in Western Europe, the last decade has seen a tendency towards tightened requirements for citizenship applicants. In 2004–2005, multiple EU states introduced mandatory tests on ‘civil integration’ for aspiring citizens, and several countries linked success on these tests to a positive solution to the naturalisation issue. However, regardless of how tough a particular country’s stance is, the practice of naturalisation requires a *high degree of transparency*. This is precisely what Russia clearly lacks.

Structural and Cultural Dimensions of Integration

So-called ‘youth riots’ have become routine in the public life of many large European cities and suburbs. Such unrest regularly happens every seven to ten years in the United Kingdom, the suburbs of Paris, and other large French cities. In Russia, it is widely believed that the root cause of these disturbances is unwillingness on the part of the descendants of migrants to integrate and adopt the host country’s culture. However, most experts who have studied this phenomenon posit that **ethnic and cultural differences themselves are not the reason for conflict**²². The children of migrants do not create disorder because they are culturally different from the host society’s natives; on the contrary, they create disorder because they have *internalised* the host country’s cultural norms (that is, *consumer culture norms*). The source of their rebellion is dissatisfaction caused by unfulfilled expectations. By virtue of the fact that they live in marginalised areas and receive a poor education, they are de-

²⁰ The exceptions are Denmark and Austria, whose legal systems do not provide citizenship rights to the children of migrants once they have reached adulthood (and, as a consequence, automatic citizenship for grandchildren).

²¹ In particular, German conservatives from the CDU/CSU, who supported the idea of a highly restrictive citizenship law two decades ago, have expressed the conviction in the last decade that citizenship is a necessary prerequisite for successful integration. See: Joppke C. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press, 2010.

²² See: Balibar E. *Unrest in Banlieues // Prognosis*. 2008. No. 2. P. 269–298 (in Russian); Wihtol de Wenden C. *Urban Riots in France // SAIS Review of International Affairs*. 2006. Vol. 26, No. 2. P. 47–53; Amin A. *Unruly Strangers? The 2001 Urban Riots in Britain // International Journal of Migration Research*. 2003. Vol. 27, No. 2. P. 460–463; Entzinger H. *Different Systems, Similar Problems: The French Urban Riots from A Dutch Perspective // Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 35, No.5 (May 2009). P. 815–834.

prived of the social mobility that would allow them to overcome the inferior status of their parents.

Therefore, **the essence of the matter lies not in the ethnic and cultural differences between newcomers and locals, but in the manifestation of these differences in social inequality.** In other words, it is the confluence of class division and ethnic division.

A state's cultural policy plays a crucial role in migrant integration. The majority of countries that accept migrants have already drafted a system of measures oriented towards the *political accommodation of cultural differences*. This is true even for states that are known for their negative attitude towards cultural differences in the public sphere (the textbook example is France, where attempts to raise the question of 'multiculturalism' are always met with vigorous opposition, at both the societal and ruling levels).

Regardless of whether the term 'multiculturalism' is used in official and public rhetoric (this term has become somewhat of a bug-bear lately), European nations continue to take *action to organise community life in culturally diverse conditions*. These measures cover language, education, religion, the media and symbols (primarily religious).

It is worthwhile to enumerate the entire set of measures. They include:

- the opportunity to receive interpreter assistance at hospital, in court, etc.;
- support for ethno-cultural organisations created by migrants;
- the reflection of society's ethno-cultural heterogeneity in school textbooks;
- the reflection of racial and ethnic heterogeneity in the media;
- separate sectors in cemeteries for religious minorities;
- the opportunity to observe a diet prescribed by a certain religion in schools and army canteens;
- exceptions in the dress code (turbans or hijabs at schools and universities, shalwar kameez for nurses, a kippah or turban for soldiers, etc.²³);
- the admission of clerics of different faiths into barracks, prisons and hospitals;
- the allocation of land plots to construct places of worship for religious minorities;
- the arrangement of church-state relations based on religious diversity; in many countries, the government creates 'umbrella' Is-

²³ For example, in the UK Sikhs have the right to not remove their turban even when riding a motorcycle, Hindu nurses wear a white coat with a grey shalwar kameez, and female Muslim police officers wear a hijab. Schoolchildren are allowed to wear the hijab in all European countries except France, which banned the practice at public schools in 2004.

lamic organisations modelled on similar Christian (primarily Catholic and protestant²⁴) and Jewish organisations;

- Sunday schools, as well as private faith schools, from Judaic and Hindu to Islamic.

The picture described above might seem fantastical, but it does not apply to Russian reality. However, it seems quite reasonable to be proactive, not waiting until tension has built up and conflicts among various groups have been brought to a head. With that in mind, it would be appropriate to consider applying several of the abovementioned measures in the Russian regions, while taking national peculiarities into account.

Integration Policy: Practical Aspects

The expert community and administrators in Western Europe have arrived at the common view that the process of migrant *integration will only be successful if state and non-state actors undertake simultaneous and harmonised action*²⁵. These actors include:

(a) state institutions at the national and regional (as well as local) level;

(b) social partners of the government (private business);

(c) civil society organisations;

(d) migrant organisations.

The following are problems that, if solved, could facilitate successful integration:

Diploma recognition. If an educational certificate (secondary, specialised or higher education) received in the country of origin is not recognised in the host country, a person who could have worked as a doctor or engineer, for example, is forced to work as a loader or caretaker²⁶;

Language barrier (which makes it impossible for certain individuals to visit the doctor, for example; and obviously, weak language skills are the key obstacle to applying professional skills);

Lack of information (regarding openings on the job market, available housing, legal support, etc.);

²⁴ In Belgium – Orthodox, as well.

²⁵ In Russia, the issue of migrant integration is in the early stages of development at the expert level, while it is practically not discussed at the administrative level. See: Florinskaya Y.F. The Migration of Families with Children to Russia: Problems in Integration (Based on Sociological Polls by the Centre for Migration Research) // Problems in Forecasting. 2012. No. 4. P. 118–126. URL: <http://www.publications.hse.ru/articles/68808508> (in Russian); Mukomel V.I. Migrant Integration: Challenges, Policy, Social Practices // Mir Rossii, 2011. No. 1. P. 34–50 (in Russian). See also: Tyuryukanova E.V., Florinskaya Y.F., Azhgikhina N.I. The Strategy of Social Integration of Migrant Workers // Union of Russian Journalists. URL: http://www.ruj.ru/_projects/the-strategy-of-social-integration-of-migrant-workers-.php (in Russian). This project developed in 2012 did not receive support among Moscow officials.

²⁶ See: Abramova I., Schulle L. Arab Migration to Germany: Economic Growth Stimulus or Social and Cultural Threat? // Azia i Afrika Segodnya. 2003, No. 10. P. 15–22 (in Russian).

Difficulties *reuniting family* (inability to obtain legal permanent residence for a spouse);

Difficulties *raising qualifications or acquiring a profession* (for example, in nursing or welding courses);

Difficulties *raising the level of education* (it is especially important that the relevant diploma be officially recognised).

The ability to *choose a cultural identity* is another factor contributing to successful integration²⁷.

In today's Russia, such concepts as the 'right to identity' (or the 'right to difference') are highly unpopular. These notions are generally met with scepticism by decision-makers and are categorically rejected by civil society. Migrants are expected to fully integrate into their new socio-cultural surroundings; that is, to assimilate. However, as noted above, assimilation is a virtually unrealisable option in modern conditions.

If newcomers are to secure full inclusion in the host society, trust is crucial. European practice shows that a migrant population only feels 'at home' in a new environment when it ceases to experience double standards, as well as rejection and/or aggression. Hence the conclusion on the importance of a *positive social environment*.

To sum up the experiences gained, administrators from EU countries have drafted the following recommendations for state servants and social workers involved in migrant integration²⁸:

- Government structures must work closely with *independent experts and non-profit organisations* that specialise in a particular field (education, healthcare, law enforcement, housing, etc.).
- It is highly desirable for *civic associations of various profiles*, ranging from housing committees to interest clubs, associations for the elderly to youth and athletic organisations, to make *concerted efforts* (and take joint action).
- Participants in the integration process absolutely must be *interculturally competent* (be bilingual, be aware of the socio-cultural norms of the host country and the migrant group).
- *Volunteers should be invited* to help implement integration programmes. This requires overcoming the mistrust that volunteer organisations harbour towards the government in general and its separate institutions in particular.

²⁷ It is important to note that, for young people, this is not a choice between two mutually exclusive options: the culture of the host country, on the one hand, and the culture of the parents' country of origin, on the other. In most cases, young men and women of migrant origin choose a *hybrid identity*. See: Portes A., Rumbaut R.G. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkley: University of California Press, 2001.

²⁸ See: Carrera S., Wiesbrock A. *Civic Integration of the Third-Country Nationals: Nationalism Versus Europeanisation in the Common EU Immigration Policy*. Centre for European Policy Studies. October 2009. URL: <http://www.aei.pitt.edu/15100>; Collett E. *Immigrant Integration in Europe in a Time of Austerity*.

- *Natives of a migrant background* must be involved in integration programmes. Yesterday's migrants are better aware of newcomers' needs than the native population. They are also more capable of fostering trust and the social capital needed for successful integration.

Below are specific steps that Western European governments have taken under their integration programmes, which Russia could stand to borrow:

(1) Rigorous anti-discrimination legislation with regards to employment, as well as strict control over compliance with the law. Punishment is inevitable for Employers who violate the law with respect to wages and/or working conditions and officials who connive to resettle migrant workers into degrading conditions must be held accountable and face the appropriate punishment.

(2) Discrimination monitoring.

(3) Xenophobia monitoring. The European Union's *Eurobarometer* conducts regular polls that gauge public attitudes towards cultural diversity²⁹. The *Eurobarometer* also measures the Multicultural Policy Index, which reflects the degree to which the authorities of a particular country support cultural minorities.

(4) Attention to the role that the media plays in fostering a tolerant social atmosphere. A democratic state has no right to censor the media. However, government officials (especially elected politicians) are in a position to influence public opinion by setting the agenda (particularly via presentations in the media). Furthermore, the humanistic attitudes of civil society and non-profit organisations have a substantial impact on the tone of the information presented about migrants. This makes it possible to stop the spread of right-wing populist ideas, which imply a rejection of immigration and immigrants.

(5) Language courses that are available for the majority (ideally, all) of those in need of learning the host country's language. Prior to the 2008 crisis, language courses were generally free in the European Union. Migrants were simply required to buy textbooks. In recent years, several countries have introduced fees, although they are extremely low, failing to cover even a third of the cost of organising the lessons.

(6) A system of preschool education that helps migrants socialise their children as early as possible. In Sweden, for example, over 80% of all two-year-olds are covered by the nursery school system³⁰.

²⁹ One topic of comparative study is the level of 'multicultural optimism' – society's readiness to live in a culturally heterogeneous environment. Another topic is the level of migrantophobia – the inclination to blame migrants for social ills.

³⁰ See: Starting Them Young: Nursery Schools Are The Latest Front-line In The Scandinavian Integration Debate // *The Economist*. 2010. P. 64. URL: <http://www.economist.com/node/15394132>

(7) A system of school education that places a special emphasis on language training for the children of migrants. Students with weak or no skills in the host country's language are enrolled in special programmes.

Conclusions

The integration of immigrants and their descendants is a complex, multifaceted process. That is why Russia should have a systemic integration policy. All four of the integration aspects mentioned above – socio-economic, political and legal, socio-cultural, and socio-psychological – must be considered when crafting government programmes that address this issue.

The socio-structural factors of integration absolutely must take precedence over cultural factors. Chief among such factors are working and living conditions, as well as the legal status of migrants. Without establishing order in the employment situation and overcoming corruption in the registration and work permit process, Russia cannot solve its integration problem.

Citizenship is a necessary condition for natives from a migrant background to fully participate in Russian society. Generally, the current citizenship law provides naturalisation opportunities to migrants who live in the country legally (the only requirements are to reside in the country for five years and to know Russian), as well as to their children (upon request after reaching adulthood). However, practice is unfortunately far from perfect. Experts have repeatedly pointed out that bureaucratic arbitrariness often prevails³¹.

Given that anti-immigrant attitudes predominate in Russian society, a responsible government policy might consist of breaking this trend. The authorities and members of the expert community need to take on difficult advocacy work. Ordinary Russians should be informed of the contribution migrants make to the country's economic and cultural development.

In order to minimise the potential for conflict associated with the social contradictions that immigration poses, the Russian government should focus on eliminating the key cause of conflict: the social injustice suffered by vulnerable populations, which is channelled into aggression and violence.

The government's integration policy should be specific and targeted. Decision-makers should realise that 'immigrants' do not exist

³¹ The victims of this arbitrariness are often not only migrant workers from the CIS, but also Russian migrants who fall under the law on compatriot support. See: Grafova L. Heroes are Needed. But Citizens? Why 'Captive Illegals' Must Spend Years Proving Their Right to the Homeland // Rossiyskaya Gazeta. March 25, 2011 (in Russian).

as a consolidated whole. Particular groups of newcomers should be highlighted and their needs localised.

Women should be given special attention as a specific category of migrants. They must be considered as a separate target in any integration programme.

Young people (migrants who have barely reached adulthood) and the children of migrants (both those who came to Russia with their parents and those born into migrant families) should also be treated as target groups in state integration programmes.

Knowledge of the host country's language is a fundamental condition for integration. Therefore, in its integration programmes, the Russian government should prioritise mastery of the Russian language among migrant workers. It is counterproductive to shift this task to the migrant workers themselves. Russia needs to establish a wide network of affordable language courses and make special efforts to provide Russian language training for the children of migrants studying in Russian schools³².

Education is the single most vital institution at the heart of successful migrant integration. Thanks to education – primarily school and preschool education – people from a migrant background undergo basic socialisation and have the chance to catch up with their peers from the host country. University education serves as an added social boost, allowing migrants to establish a career and integrate successfully.

The media is also of crucial importance in the integration process. It is the media – more specifically, the selection of facts and methods of interpretation it presents – that determines whether the social atmosphere will be conducive to productive interaction between migrants and citizens of the host country.

³² Encouragingly, the Moscow Government's Department of Education is aware of this problem. In 2012, a total of 28,000 Moscow schoolchildren either did not speak Russian or spoke it poorly. Moscow officials have not only created a system of special groups for these students (differentiated by the level of language knowledge), but have also come forth with an initiative to translate the websites of Russian schools into the parents' native language. In many cases, a lack of knowledge of Russian prevents migrant parents from obtaining an adequate understanding of the goings-on at their child's school.

Russian International Affairs Council

Printed in Russia