

Irina Molodikova

*CENSE Center, Central European University, Budapest*

## **“Migratory Processes in Europe: evolution of the migratory interactions between the EU and Central and Eastern European countries”**

**(Some conclusions on the International Conference in Odessa, 24-25 September 2010)**

To understand the evolution of the European Migration System one has to recognise that European states have again been facing significant changes in political, economic and social conditions over the last 20 years, which have led to a restructuring of their interactions. The collapse of the socialist system at the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s was accompanied by the emergence of new economic systems in these countries and changes in European administrative and territorial divisions.

Until 1989, Western Europe had to deal with the socialist bloc, consisting of Yugoslavia, countries of Central Europe and the USSR. After the collapse of the socialist system, 27 independent states and at least 5 formerly unrecognized countries emerged, with specific relationships, both among themselves and with the EU countries. Some of them joined the EU and the accession to the EU community created new relations and opportunities in population mobility. However, others have formed various political and economic alliances also accompanied in some cases by free visa movement.

The collapse of the USSR and Former Yugoslavia (FY) did not destroy their migration systems but gradually transformed them. Their former socialist and historical past determined to a large extent the direction of the movement of their people across Europe. The structural transformations at the meso country level have reproduced and supported the direction of migration flows. In the border areas, specific conditions of mobility apply as people have equal opportunities to participate in both systems. There are open channels between the EU and CIS migration systems and the EU and FY systems of population movement.

Migration flows to EU countries which, after the collapse of the socialist bloc were characterised by forced and repatriation migration, formed new Diasporas from South-Eastern and Eastern Europe in the European Union, which have quickly built up bridges with their home countries and close connections have been

established since the beginning of the 2000s. Forced migration morphed into labour petty trade circular migration with some specific characteristics, but later continued developing into the form of constant occupation, thereby also expanding the network and binding EU countries with their (eastern) neighbourhood.

The EU enlargement in the 2000s has created new border regions and the EU has made significant efforts to formulate a new, more adequate security system for border control. A new common policy has been developed since 1999 in order to: manage legal migration more effectively, increasing co-operation between Member States to reduce illegal migration; strengthen integration policies for immigrants to create a common European asylum system; as well as improve co-operation with third countries on migration issues (Pratt, 2009).

The common EU immigration policy has been developing for nearly 10 years and the European Commission makes great efforts to introduce various programmes and initiatives in this direction. But there is still no unified European migration policy and there is no unified EU migration policy. There are, however, European migration policies (Ruspini, 2007). These statements are especially relevant for the implementation of the South-Eastern dimension of European Union migration policy (covering former socialist countries from the Balkans to the Eastern EU borderland).

The EU countries enjoy free movement, while their South-Eastern neighbours (the CIS and FY countries) also have the same free population movement within their former systems. The main distinctive feature of the European Union are the strong integration processes within the EU, including a common circulation of labour, goods and services, a common currency, common law and common policies for homogenising living standards among EU and accessing countries.

The main centres of migration gravity on the European continent are the EU and Russia, which to some extent are competing for labour. Growing economies and a lack of demographic resources determine their willingness to use foreign labour, especially skilled labour. However, the rapid growth of ethnic diversity induced by immigration leads to a change in the political, economic and ethnic situation of these countries, which in turn creates internal tensions in the host communities and requires new mechanisms for migration management, both in the EU and Russia. While EU countries are experiencing integration processes, former socialist countries are observed to have both integration and disintegration tendencies, which accordingly affects the migratory behaviour of the population of these countries.

The CIS countries' system gravity is supported by efforts of Russia and some sending CIS countries, but in the case of former Yugoslavia (FY) countries there is no significant power that has sufficient authority and gravitational force. Both sy-

stems (CIS and FY) are gradually decaying and the differences between their countries are growing. In contrast, the other former socialist countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria) avoided ethnic conflicts and since EU accession have already been characterised by positive net migration, despite the active participation of their population in international migration to the EU.

Countries in an overlapping position between the EU and Russia (such as Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus) experience population movements in both directions and are characterised by high migration activities (Molodikova, 2008). Russia actively attempts to expand free visa regimes with European Union countries, but without visible success. In spite of some steps on simplification of visa applications, the EU is not ready to open its borders to citizens of Russia, because of the considerable flow of asylum seekers it gets due to the Caucasus conflicts.

To get some retribution for this unsuccessful result with the EU, Russia is searching for different opportunities in liberalization of the visa regimes. In 2008, it introduced free movement for non-citizens of the Baltic States. These people now enjoy the opportunity to go and work in EU countries and in Russia. It established co-operation in free visa regimes with the majority of Western Balkan states (former Yugoslavia) in 2007–2008. Even Croatia, which is close to entering the EU, has permitted Russian citizens to visit the country without visas during the summer period (for tourist purposes) since 2009. At the same time, the majority of Balkan countries have the opportunity to participate in free movement with EU countries, creating a bridge between EU and non-EU European countries.

The influence of economic, demographic and political factors is constantly changing the interaction of the EU countries and those countries that are not included in its alliance. The geography of the borderland areas, affecting the mobility of the population, is also changing. Thus, the transformation of the Schengen area and the liberalization of the visa regime already includes some countries of Southern Europe (Serbia, FYROM and Montenegro), which also have a free visa regime with many CIS countries.

This step has created the visible changes in migration flows from these FY countries since 2010. It has related especially to asylum flow. The number of applicants from FY in Hungary has dropped twofold and, in contrast, their number has risen in Germany and Sweden according to the statistical information of all these countries.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/World-News/2011/01/04/Rise-in-asylum-seekers-in-Sweden-in-2010/UPI-63451294187086/Newsletter\\_Ausgabe\\_1\\_Januar\\_2011,\\_Deutschland:\\_Mehr\\_Asylandr%C3%A4ge,\\_geringere\\_Schutzquote:\\_http://www.migration-info.de/mub\\_artikel.php?Id=11010.;](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/World-News/2011/01/04/Rise-in-asylum-seekers-in-Sweden-in-2010/UPI-63451294187086/Newsletter_Ausgabe_1_Januar_2011,_Deutschland:_Mehr_Asylandr%C3%A4ge,_geringere_Schutzquote:_http://www.migration-info.de/mub_artikel.php?Id=11010.;) Hauptherkunftsländer im Januar 2011 in <http://www.migrationsrecht.net/nachrichten-asyrecht/1734-asylbewerberstatistik-januar-2011.html>; [http://www.migration-info.de/mub\\_artikel.php?Id=110102](http://www.migration-info.de/mub_artikel.php?Id=110102;); Homepage of Office for Immigration and Nationalities <http://www.bevandorlas.hu/statisztikak.php>.

The liberalization of the visa regime for these countries in the EU supported the transitional nature of EU peripheral countries (such as Hungary, for example). The same tendency is observed in the situation of Italy with Tunisian asylum seekers and migrants. This situation has created a new scandal between EU countries and has lunched discussion about the restoration of Schengen borders in some parts of the EU.

The development of the European Neighbourhood Policy Action Plan, as well as the re-admission agreements with Russia, Moldova and Ukraine and some countries of the FY, will definitely spark further migration flows between non-EU neighbouring countries and the EU. It is also related to the implementation of the Dublin II regulation, which stimulates the so-called forced circulation of asylum seekers between EU countries and between the EU and its neighbourhood as well.

Within the frame of ENP and EU-Russia cooperation, Russia, Moldova and Ukraine signed a re-admission agreement with the EU in 2007 and ratified it in 2008 with amendments to the laws “On Foreigners” and “On Refugees”. The effective realization of a re-admission agreement required the simultaneous creation of a chain of similar re-admission agreements with Belarus, the Caucasian states, China, and some other Asian states. In order to work effectively, such re-admission agreements also require an effective information system, but none of the CIS countries has such a system yet, although the Russian Federation has started to create one (Федеральная миграционная служба, 2009).

The expansion of the Schengen zone to the East and the introduction of a 50-km “small borderland traffic zone” between Hungary and Poland, the Slovakia borderland and Ukraine, and Romania and Moldova stimulated some circular mobility of the population in these regions. The discussions on new neighbouring countries involvement into “small borderland traffic zones” (Belarusian – Lithuanian and the Kaliningrad oblast /Russia/ – Poland, Baltic States) clearly indicates the willingness of the EU to develop preferential liberalization in the Eastern-Southern nexus. The new Schengen borders generate circular, transit and irregular flows with both positive and negative consequences for the countries involved.

The lack of coordination between the European Union and the neighbourhood raises questions about the need on the agenda for more concerted political action among all European countries. The current economic crisis also poses a number of challenges for European countries related to the mechanisms of emergence, directions of flow and extent of return migration. This, in turn, leads researchers to more detailed study of migratory strategies, flow directions and new migrant priorities.

Previous research seldom discussed the South-Eastern nexus of the European migration system’s development and the differences in migration policy of the

frontier countries of the EU Migration System in their relations with borderland non-EU countries support. But the relations of some countries such as Hungary can be characterised as support of a subsystem within the European system. Twenty years ago in 1992, only 4 such subsystems were pointed out by Zlotnik (1992), and Massey assumed that 6 core zones existed during the 1980–1990 period within the European migration system, applying the theory mainly to countries of Western Europe with extensive migration flows. According to Massey et al. (1998), migration systems are international labour markets on certain territories, the terrains of which are created by various treaties and trade agreements. "...Countries may join or drop out of a system in response to social change, economic fluctuations or political upheaval" (Massey et al., 1993: 454).

Some authors argue that such a system of countries has to have a relatively large and stable quantity of exchanged information with the system being supported by economic, cultural and political relations (Fawcett and Arnold, 1987; Gurak and Caces, 1992; Massey et al., 1998; Haas, 2009). It is also often argued that exchanges of people, goods, and capital have to be more intense within a migration system than with countries outside it.

When analysing the European migration system, some scholars have suggested various binding factors, including, for instance (1) congruence of their migration policies; (2) close economic and political ties between them; (3) a comparable level of economic development (and similar cultural background); (4) geographic proximity; and, (5) common migration patterns (Zlotnik, 1992). Massey adds to this a shared public concern about migration issues (Massey et al., 1998).

Although some scholars have suggested research into various binding factors, the majority of researchers have focused on the EU and applied an EU-centric approach to analysis of the European migration system. However, the development and great expansion of EU relations with third countries located in other parts of Europe clearly indicates the need to apply a more global and balanced approach to evaluating the transformations in relations and interactions between all countries in Europe. The tendencies towards stronger social, economic, and political interdependence between these neighbouring European third countries and the EU are related to some peculiarities of the region's development (Ruspini, 2007).

In this regard, the scientific community's discussions of migration flows, and their location and evaluation raises questions on the existence of a unified "European migration system" or perhaps "European migration systems", which would cover the interactions of Southern and Eastern European countries. Researchers continue actively to discuss the issue of the hierarchy of the European migration systems within the ever-changing boundaries of political and economic alliances.

We can suppose that the number of interaction areas might have increased since then, and the directions and composition of flows might be more complicated because of the existence of new forms of mobility (Düvell and Molodikova, 2009). In the border areas, subsystems with specific conditions of mobility can be formed as people have equal opportunities to participate in both systems. In our case, there are clearly open channels between some parts of the EU and CIS systems.

The development of migration policy in some EU countries clearly indicated that the formation of the EU borderland as a homogeneous system in different geographic areas faced problems of “special” relations of EU bordering countries with third country neighbours. Ethnic borderland migration and circulation of labour between the CIS and EU has become a very sensitive issue (Ruspini, 2007).

Some EU members have their own interests in the neighbourhood where their co-ethnics live. Hungary, for example, pursues a policy of supporting ethnic Hungarians living in third countries (mainly Ukraine and Serbia). In Hungary in 2001, the Parliament accepted a law on providing special status for Hungarians living abroad concerning certain social economic and cultural rights (Melegh, 2001, 2002), and they have also introduced a passport for ethnic Hungarians that simplifies their movement to EU countries. This has led to some new practices of ethnically Hungarian political parties in Ukraine attracting voters through facilitation of their long-term Schengen visas.

In 2007, Poland also introduced some simplifying visa regulations for Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian citizens, as well as ethnic cards for ethnic Poles. The act on cards for Polish co-ethnics came into force in 2008, according to which Polish co-ethnics who live mainly in CIS countries can obtain free multiple long-term visas and work without any work permit.

Romania is following in the same direction and has an interest in assisting the Moldova Bessarabia descendants and other Romanian-speaking populations in surrounding non-EU countries, introducing a new law in 2010 for Romanian descendants to provide Romanian citizenship for Moldovans.

The introduction of special ethnic cards for ethnic Hungarians and ethnic Poles by Hungary and Poland, the new law in Romania, special passports for Ukrainians living abroad (by Ukraine), and discussions in the Russian Parliament on the introduction of special ethnic identity cards for Russians abroad, are real challenges for migration control both for the EU and for the CIS countries.

The analysis of the regional migration systems in Europe supports the idea of significant interconnections between the EU, the CIS and FY migration systems. The restrictive migration policy as in the EU and in Russia does not help to eliminate illegal migration but has rather produced only more illegal migrants and re-oriented

illegal migration flows through some new migration “corridors” from Russia to the EU.

Economic migration is needed by the majority of European countries, because of their ageing populations. This situation pushes many European countries towards liberalising their labour market for foreigners, and Russia took some steps towards the mass legalisation of illegal migrants in 2007. This move attracted migrants into the country and increased the Asian-European transit in the Western direction of nationals from CIS countries. An understanding of the dynamics, scale and trends of migration processes in these systems provides the basis for developing a common migration policy.

The proposed topic for the *Migratory Processes in Europe: evolution of the migratory interactions of the EU and Central and Eastern European countries* Conference that was organized in Odessa in September 2010 tested a new approach for understanding and explaining migration within all of Europe in terms of the various interconnections and interactions between geographical areas. Furthermore, the analysis of migration flows within some changing boundaries in the context of migration systems binds the economic, political and socio-cultural dimensions, and is an important tool for migration research and migration management.

The following 11 panels were devoted to discussion on the abovementioned issues:

1. Ukraine in the European migration system
2. “New Diasporas” in Europe after the collapse of socialism: integration or exclusion? Future prospects
3. Ukrainian Diasporas in Europe and in the World
4. Illegal migration in European countries
5. Open or closed borders. Transformation of the European Border Control Systems
6. Social aspects of adaptation and integration of migrants in the countries of post-Soviet space
7. Evolution tendencies of migration policies in Western and Eastern Europe
8. Labour migration in post-crisis Europe: possible consequences and lessons
9. Transformation of migration systems in Europe
10. Transnational migration networks
11. Intellectual migration – post-socialist countries in a battle for talent. Prospects of “brain drain”: East – West



Changes in the political, economic and social systems of countries led to the new architecture of co-operation in Europe after the fall of the Iron Curtain, and the involvement of a large area of Central and Eastern Europe into the world economy and migration system. The creation of the Schengen protected border works as a modern “Iron Curtain” built by the EU but has led since the beginning of 2000s to an asymmetry of relations in Europe, and especially among the former socialist countries. Although the socialist and historical past one way or another determines in many respects the direction of movement of population across Europe, the accession of some countries of the former socialist system to the EU community creates new relationships between them, and new opportunities for mobility.

This evolution of migratory interactions of the EU and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe was the subject of scientific debates at the conference in Odesa, where the possibilities of new theoretical approaches to the study of migration flows were examined. There is no doubt that the establishment of the EU system of relations with third countries, including their neighbourhood, does not allow one to speak about a united “European migration system”, but rather about several “European migration subsystems”.

Papers submitted for the Conference show the diversity of migratory processes and the specifics of the countries involved. Consequently, it is more correct to speak of a hierarchy of migration systems in Europe, which is in constant flux as regards the direction and size of migration flows. There is no doubt that the variety of the presented patterns of migration in Europe can also be seen in other parts of the world, but regional and historical contexts shape and influence the migration process in Europe. Each country has specific socio-economic and political characteristics and that is why the opportunities for comparing research and generalization should be used with a high degree of accuracy.

Eleven panels were devoted to the consideration of the above issues at the Conference, which hosted papers by 65 scientists from more than 15 EU countries and the CIS. There is no doubt that enlargement of the EU since 2004 has changed the shape of European migration space, substantially increasing mobility from the East to the West despite all the efforts of recipient countries to monitor this process. Opportunities of free movement for new EU members from Central Europe (CEE) were accompanied, on the one hand, by greater control of movement for citizens from countries in Eastern Europe. This situation has led to the asymmetry of relations between the EU and the neighbouring third countries, to the transformation of migration flows, and to various types of mobility within the European continent.

Some concluding remarks were made by the panel moderators and are given below:



The Plenary Session was opened with presentations by Zhanna Zaionchkovskaya, “Immigration is a keystone for the future development of Russia”, Olena Malynovska “Urgent problems of legislative and institutional supporting of migration policy of Ukraine” and Irina Molodikova “The migration interrelations of EU and the CIS countries: opportunities and obstacles of co-operation” which defined in many ways the general direction of the discussions of the conference.

All the countries of Europe are experiencing demographic aging, and the efforts to close borders often create the illusion of control, but actually generate illegal migration. The tightening of barriers affects the free circulation of labour and makes people stay longer in the host country. However, the inclusion by the European Union of a growing number of countries in its free movement of people has improved the circulation of the labour force and contributed to a more dynamic development of the territories. The various old and new migrant Diasporas and newly-formed transnational networks help in this process. Participants’ studies presented at the conference showed that some common features exist in the formation of Diasporas in the EU and CIS countries, on the one hand, while there are differences between countries on the other. Central and Eastern European (CEE) and South-Eastern European countries (SEE) have recently faced the arrival of migrants from distant countries. Even during the Soviet era, the socialist division of labour also created such flows, but they were tightly controlled at that time.

Several papers discussed the negative trends in the demographic situation of the countries of the CIS and Central Europe. The EU countries on one side, and Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Belarus on the other will be competing for labour required in the regional context. According to the opinions of participants, many of the CEE countries play the ethnic card with their compatriots as the solution for shortage of labour. In this regard, the development practices of the introduction of dual citizenship would promote the categories of third country nationals with the possibility of free movement.

Many papers by the EU scholars concerned the implementation in practice of the principle of selective integration or assimilation for all types of migrants, despite the declared EU value of equality and non-discrimination. Only a few had done a comparative analysis. The lack on papers with theoretical discussions should be noted.

Most papers presented either specific country situations or the issues relevant to both the host and the sending communities.

The work of the section the “*New Diasporas*” in Europe after the collapse of socialism: *Integration or alienation? Future prospects* (Moderator: Irina Molodikova) showed that there has been a rapid growth in new Diasporas in Western, Central

and Eastern Europe, differentiated by ethnic and gender composition, as well as by labour activities. The formation of a new and preservation of the personal identity among the migrants in the new Diasporas are determined by different strategies of reception, interaction and cultural features of the host societies. Peculiarities of tactics for interaction and integration are determined by migration policy, practices of the host society and the specific characteristics of the individuals. Most of countries recently included in the EU still have barriers to access to the labour markets by certain EU countries.

Despite the diversity of existing practices on integration of migrants from the CIS countries, the new EU members have their particular course of integration processes, formed by their socialist pasts. These countries have little experience in migration management. The Czech Republic is the only country among the new EU members to have adopted and implemented an integration policy over the last 10 years.

The presented papers showed the diversity of the issues to be solved related to the integration of migrants: language courses, health insurance and other social services, and health and self-identification of migrants. Examples of life strategies for migrant workers show their creativity and desire to remove themselves quickly from the shadow areas and to become legitimate. The freedom of movement is a necessary but insufficient condition for proper integration. The fact of accession to the EU has a dual effect in both the host and the sending community. On the one hand, there still remains the issue of unsettled employment status in these countries for their migrants in certain EU countries while, on the other, willingness to migrate to the Western EU countries supported by free movement from the NMS creates illegal employment. Existing barriers in migrant alienation generate discriminatory practices of exploitation and a xenophobic attitude towards migrants.

The big difference in the level of life between new member states (NMS) of the EU and old member states stimulates migration in a westward direction. Papers have clearly shown how much the migrants' chances for a better life increased after the accession of these countries to the EU. Although each CEE country has its own migration patterns and the geography of flow directions, legal employment and accommodation give more access to a decent life. As a result, the migrants from the NMS experience less discrimination in status after migration. In contrast, citizens of third countries are subject to various forms of discrimination. Visa barriers and ways of migration and integration often affect the stratum of the population that is marginalized and may be subject to over-exploitation.

Issues regarding the meaning of the definition of "legality" of residence and employment were discussed in the context of constant changes in conditions of stay for

migrants, and clearly showed the relativity of the definition, and that it is a legally constructed category of people. As soon as Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU, statistically illegal migrants from these countries became legitimate and legal. But in contrast, the migrants from certain countries of Eastern Europe became “illegal” after the adoption by enlarged countries of the EU norms.

Plans for the implementation of the EU Neighbourhood Policy, as well as a re-admission agreement with Russia, Moldova, Ukraine and the FY countries, according to some papers, have led to changes in the migration flows between neighbouring countries that are not EU members. The negative consequences of the New Schengen borders are generating transit and irregular flows from the third countries. The researchers mainly agree that the main centres of attraction of migrants in Europe now have been the EU and Russia, which are experiencing demographic problems and are constantly trapped between the necessity of migrants for economic development, on the one hand, and the fear of the rising tensions in the local population due to the rapid growth of ethnic diversity in all the countries of Europe on the other.

*The Open or closed borders. Transformation of the European border control systems* Panel (Moderator: Dietrich Thränhardt) was devoted to the eastern border of the European Union. The discussion took place in the context of a broader opening of the borders in a Western direction and, in contrast, to the shrinking the free visa regime with Eastern neighbours. The process of opening EU borders contrasts sharply with the erection of boundary walls in other parts of the world, such as around the USA, India and Israel and now, Greece. Will the EU continue its successful policy of opening up, step by step, to include countries of the Eastern neighbourhood, and where is the final borderline?

The Ukrainian borderland problems were presented in first-hand travel research on the effects of the guarded Eastern border of the EU, between Poland, Slovakia, Romania and Hungary on the Western, and Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus on the Eastern side. The interviews of stakeholders and civil society members on both sides of the border clearly indicated the particularly counter-productive effects of border regulations and border controls: difficulties in cross-border co-operation and trade, dysfunctional effects of the long hours of waiting, sluggish economic development compared to the centres of the countries, and cynicism because of widespread corruption, even when the border guards are paid much more than teachers or other academics.

The paper that supported the idea of the disruptive effects of exclusion through border regimes on the Western and the Eastern sides on the small republic of Moldova, with its struggling economy, the out-migration of large parts of the active

population, the extremely low birth rates, and the many children left behind. This outsider situation will become even more grave when Romania joins the Schengen zone, and thus accepts the Schengen border standards. Border regulations and their effects on the social and economic situation of the people in question should become a subject of intense research in the future, complementing and challenging the security discourse that has driven most discussions up to now.

Problems of social adaptation and integration of migrants in the post-Soviet states (Moderator: V. Mukomel) were the subjects of papers largely dealing with Russia, as the country that is characterized by one of the biggest labour migrants flows. The presentation on the countries of Central and Eastern Europe clearly shows that these countries have only become objects of migratory attraction in recent decades, while their own citizens, in turn, migrate to western countries to become active players in the “new” Diasporas, or new waves of migrants in the “old” EU countries. This Western shift in migrant flows shows that, in fact, no European country (either sending or receiving) can avoid the problem of migrants’ adaptation, and that it should be addressed at macro-, meso- and micro- levels in legislation, management and research. That is why the lack of comparative research projects that can put together sending and receiving and transit countries is needed urgently.

According to most participants in the discussions, serious study of adaptation of migrants is necessary; however, it is hampered by the lack of reliable statistics, and the lack of transparency in action agencies working with migrants (Russia). Among other reasons for the poor adaptation of certain groups of migrants, participants pointed to the inefficiency of the institutions designed to facilitate their rehabilitation and reintegration (Russia), the prevalence of migrant phobia and social practices in the interaction of the host population and local authorities with migrants, and the social and psychological problems faced by migrants. Panel members expressed their views on the need for major institutional reforms in the Newly Independent States, especially in education, the military, law enforcement, judiciary, and media, without which it will be difficult to make progress on adaptation and integration of migrants.

In the panel *Illegal migration in European countries* (Moderator: Franck Düvell) issues of illegal migration in the CIS countries were presented as an example of one of the many types of migration that are not special but are politicised in Europe. Presenters concluded that the tendency of recent decrease in illegal migrants was partly related to the effect of the economic crisis which, according to the researchers, has reduced the number of such migrants. In the opinion of many participants, this phenomenon is related to the fact of lower labour market needs for such migrants workers. There is some asymmetry that often breeds illegality of migrants in the EU and the impossibility of circular legal migration.

According to researchers from Moldova, re-admission agreements signed by the country had a negative impact on Moldova. Concessions by Ukraine, Russia and Moldova to EU neighbouring countries to tighten their immigration laws in exchange for the expected abolition of visas have not actually led to a softening of the visa regime for them by the EU. Thus, these countries have not improved the conditions for increasing the mobility of their populations, but worsened them. In addition, they have to deal with the migrants who were not planned to arrive in these countries. The fears of these countries that they will become reservoirs for illegal migrants increase the xenophobic stance in the societies of these countries.

The *Evolution tendencies of migration policies of Western and Eastern Europe* Panel (Moderator: Tatiana Yudina) was devoted, in fact, to various aspects of migration policy in Russia. The main issue discussed in the section, despite the announced wide regional coverage, was the evolution of migration policy in Russia over the past 20 years. The migration policy of Russia was kept on a 20-year-old path of unregulated migration in the 1990s, followed by rigid restrictive migration policies in the early 2000s, then turning to liberalization in 2007, and then attempts again to tighten migration control because of the fears of the global crisis. Experts have identified six main stages of the evolution of migration policy of Russia, which has been characterized by the situational, temporary, and complete absence of a clearly articulated strategy.

According to experts, the Russian leadership realized the need for more liberal policies, especially in the field of labour migration. Nevertheless, most experts agree that, in practice, there is no integration policy for migrants in Russia. Experts evaluated very positively the system of bilateral agreements to regulate specific issues of protection of migrants that exist between CIS countries. They recognized the high need for immigration for Russia, Ukraine and Belarus as a resource for the development of large cities, such as Moscow, and as a source of improvement of the demographic situation in these countries.

The papers were presented on the basis of econometric analysis, with accounts of the factors influencing the formation of immigration flows into Russia. Three major factors were shown that formed and supported the flows according to the model: ethnicity, migration networks and ethnic networks. However, according to calculations, it was concluded that there is no single factor at present that would contribute to an increase in population growth in Russia in the long run.

Discussion at the *Transnational migration networks* Panel (Moderator: Paolo Ruspini) centred around four presentations covering issues of migrant transnationalism, minority politics, return migration, Diasporas, and migration intentions of students either in Central and Eastern Europe or in the East-West migration perspecti-

ve. The issue of minority situations was discussed on the example of the changing statuses of ethnic Russian citizens from majority to minority in Latvia, and compared with the situation in Bulgaria where the Bulgarian constitution fails to recognize the term *minority*. The paper further highlighted the transnational Diaspora dimension and discussed the difference between the so-called “Soviet Russians”, who are identified as cultural nationalists, and the “Russian Old Believers” as minority nationalists. The evidence of sharp contrast in both countries clearly indicated the importance of measurement of integration. How and what should be measured?

The case of a comparative project on Russian Diaspora in Germany and Norway was presented from different aspects at several panels. The comparative analysis of the Russian Diaspora in Germany and in Norway highlighted the different degrees of activism in strategies of searching for work and study. The Russians in Norway were more active and positive, because of much stronger support from the state. All in all, the four presentations clearly raised the need to avoid any generalization when addressing Diasporas, transnationalism and return migration in Europe. There is time to conduct the research to distinguish between old and new Diaspora phenomena, their different life trajectories, needs, identity construction and mobility intentions. We can already use the experience of American scholars in this field.

In the section *Intellectual migration, post-socialist countries in the battle for talent, prospects for the “brain drain”: East – West* (Moderator: Valery Nikolaevski), a list of conclusions and suggestions was formulated on this topic. The migration of specialists from the CIS to the West is significant. It was suggested that migration policy in the sphere of intellectual migration as a whole is fragmented, and is a collection of disparate measures that are not united by a common plan, goals and objectives. In addition, it is not shaped conceptually or institutionally and has no special regulations.

In the conceptual plan, intellectual immigration should be a specific part of migration regulation as well as a specific area of migration policy. The concept of regulation of intellectual immigration should be worked out by the specific state authorities responsible for its realization. It is necessary to develop methodology on the estimation of needs of such migrants and the criteria for the evaluation of intellectual workers. The introduction of a points system and a system of preferences for easy entry into the territory by such immigrants, and consideration of the possibility of simplified procedures for obtaining visas, residence permits, temporary residence, and citizenship for persons belonging to the intellectual workers group should be taken into account.

In the opinion of the experts, the most effective ways for the donor countries to reduce intellectual emigration could be:

- Development and implementation of knowledge-based state programs, creation of parks that need to attract large numbers of highly skilled professionals;
- Enhancement of the exchange programs of scientific experts between donor states that are not EU members and the EU, through increasing circulation of scientific knowledge between leading European research institutions and universities for the training of European researchers in the CIS;
- Introduction of the procedures on reimbursement of universities scholarships for the specialists, who are needed in their own country, and for university graduates who study at the expense of the state budget, in case of their emigration abroad. Alternatively, to create a state reimbursement fund of the education costs for citizens of donor countries, who pay for their education abroad and return back to work;
- Recruitment to work abroad with the assistance of the State Employment Centre should be done through procedures of tripartite agreements between the contracting party, the state (represented by the State Employment Centre) and the banking institution to transfer part of the earnings to the home country for pension and unemployment funds;
- Simplification of the procedures for obtaining citizenship for foreigners who have graduated in institutions of higher education of the host country.

The conference also includes two specific sections devoted to the problems of migration in Ukraine such as *Ukraine in the European migration system* (Moderator: Olena Malinovskaya) and the *Ukrainian Diaspora in Europe and the World* (Moderator: Alexei Poznyak). The Ukrainian migration problems and proposed possible solutions coincided in many respects with problems voiced by experts of other CIS countries: Russia, Belarus, and Moldova. The Ukraine, as well as the other CIS countries, needs improvement in migration policy. It was emphasized that the evidence of mass labour migration from Ukraine and its consequences for society and the country are being neglected by the Ukrainian authorities. On the issue of Ukrainians abroad, special programmes should be compiled for migrants who want to return and for their reintegration.

The experts repeatedly expressed the opinion that the mass labour migration from Ukraine should be explained by reasons other than the absence of well-paid jobs in Ukraine. It also has a wider range of non-economic reasons, such as the level



of personal and public security in the country, the reliability of the rule of law and level of corruption, the lack of good life chances for children, etc. In this regard, migration policy should be understood in the context of a broader action plan, and not only as a regulation of migration flows. It should be closely related to economic, social, educational, regional, etc. state policies.

In addition to the policy on regulation of external labour migration, another area of migration policy should be paying attention to the inflow of international migrants to the Ukraine. Their number is not extremely high but it has been growing for the last few years, while the Ukrainian government is not ready to accept any policy for the integration of immigrants from other countries arriving in Ukraine. The unwillingness of Ukrainian society to accept other ethnic groups among their population, as well as insufficient integration efforts, increase the risk of migrant phobia and tensions in society.

*The Ukrainian Diaspora in Europe and the World* Panel (Moderator: Alexei Poznyak) proposed the Concept of a state migration policy of Ukraine, which is now under consideration by the Ukrainian Parliament, and again emphasized the importance of the re-integration of returning migrants, as well as the integration of foreigners in Ukraine. Both these issues have not received sufficient attention as the goals and objectives of immigration policy. New Ukrainian Diasporas were established during the last decade in the majority of EU countries. They should be supported by Ukraine in developing the national cultural context. In particular, there is a need to help the “new” Diasporas in the formation of a Ukrainian national-cultural environment in the host countries, to support them in opening Sunday schools for children to learn the Ukrainian language, and providing textbooks and popular scientific literature. In turn, there is also a need to encourage the participation of Diasporas in the life of the Ukrainian motherland – to involve Ukrainian “fraternities” in activities on solution of specific problems in their city (or village) of origin (restoration of monuments, the purchase of computers for schools, reconstruction of churches, and the like) in co-operation with the local authorities

During the formation of migration policies, it is necessary to recognize that a part of Ukrainian labour migrants will not be returning to their homeland. If emigration and permanent resettlement strategy was not typical, they are common phenomena for Ukraine by now and, therefore, Ukrainian migration policy should propose a differentiated approach to regulating labour migration. Persons who want to return to Ukraine should be involved in the special programmes on their adaptation to Ukrainian society and to finding employment.

*The Labour migration in post-crisis Europe: possible consequences and lessons* Panel (Moderator: Elena Tyuryukanova) was devoted to various aspects of modern

labour migration in Europe and the CIS. The discussion touched upon labour migration in Russia, playing a key role in the Eurasian migration system. The issues of division of labour and segregation, informal social networks of migrants and economic niches have identified the growing demand in European countries for a foreign labour force. Influence of the foreign labour migration on the labour market needs in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and the EU was shown through the analysis of the structure of foreign labour employment, and its distribution on the level of education and qualification. The gaps between demand for migrants and real job offers for their work were identified.

Issues of return migration in times of crisis were also discussed, based on the case of Spain. Migrants who have returned are facing the realities of the crisis in their home countries, which prompted discussion on the advantage and disadvantage of return strategy and the reality of voluntary returns, and other pertinent factors. The issue of the responsibilities of the home countries for re-integration of the returning citizens was addressed to the governments of sending the receiving countries. The discussion also covered the gender aspects of labour migration. Employment of migrants in the sphere of social care for children and old people paid attention to the most sensitive aspects of that transnational job. There is a necessity to involve anthropological method in the research.

Migration is a multidimensional and multidisciplinary field of study. Different migration typologies were proposed in Europe and overseas to describe the migration space. The research by scholars requires more comprehensive approaches and adequate tools for migration analysis. In this framework, real and effective co-operation between Eastern and Western migration scholars is certainly one essential element for good research and successful policy outcomes.

There are more commonalities in Europe as a geographical space than dividing factors: all European countries as sending and receiving countries are experiencing population ageing and replacement of their citizens who have migrated to other countries by newcomers from Asia and Africa, or from other European countries. In all countries, governments show lack of sensitivity in their policy to the migrants' destiny (as in regard to their own Diasporas in other countries and to newly emerged Diasporas within their countries). As a consequence of these processes and the economic crisis, the majority of European countries are now experiencing an increase of tensions in society and rising xenophobia. There are no purely sending and receiving countries in Europe, but all of them are in constant transformation of flows and ethnic groups. In this respect, the scientific community in Europe should be more collaborative in comparative and multidimensional research.

## REFERENCES

- DÜVELL, Franck and MOLODIKOVA, Irina (2009). "Introduction", in: Franck Düvell and Irina Molodikova (eds). *Transit Migration: Migration Patterns and Regulations*. Moscow: University Press, pp. 9–31.
- FAWCETT, James T. and ARNOLD, Fred (1987). "Explanation Diversity: Asian and Pacific Immigration Systems", in: James T. Fawcett and Benjamin V. Carino (eds). *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, pp. 453–478.
- Федеральная миграционная служба (2009). *Доклад 2009*. Moskva: FMS, <http://www.fms.gov.ru/>
- GURAK, Douglas T. and CACES, Fe (1992). "Migration networks and the shaping Migration systems", in: Mary M. Kriz, Lin Lean Lim and Hania Zlotnick (eds). *International Migration Systems: a Global Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 150–176.
- HAAS, Hein de (2009). *Migration System Formation and Decline: a theoretical inquiry into the self-perpetuating and self-undermining dynamics of migration processes*. Oxford: International Migration Institute (Working papers, no. 19).
- MASSEY, Douglas, ARANGO, Joaquin, HUGO, Graeme, KOUAOUCI, Ali, PELLEGRINO, Adela and TAYLOR, Edward (1993). "Theories of International Migration: a Review and Appraisal", *Population and Development Review*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 431–466.
- MASSEY, Douglas, ARANGO, Joaquin, HUGO, Graeme, KOUAOUCI, Ali, PELLEGRINO, Adela and TAYLOR, Edward J. (1998). *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MELEGH, Attila (2001). "Mondialisation, nationalisme et petit Imperialisme", *La Nouvelle Alternative*, vol. 16, no. 55, pp. 130–142.
- MELEGH, Attila (2002). "Globalization, Nationalism and Petit Imperialism", *Romanian Journal of Society and Politics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 115–129.
- MOLODIKOVA, Irina (2008). "Patterns of East to West Migration in the Context of European Migration Systems: Possibilities and Limitations of Migration Control", *Demográfia*, vol. 51, no. 5 (English ed.), pp. 5–35.
- PRATT, Sandra (2009). "Managing Migration in the European Union", *IMISCOE Intensive Training Course*, 20–24 April 2009, Moscow.
- RUSPINI, Paolo (2007). "Russia and the European Union: Friends or Foes in Migration Management?", in: *Proceedings of International Conference Migration and Development (Fifth Valenteevskiye Chetniiya)*, vol II, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 13–15 September 2007. Moscow: Moscow State University, pp. 488–491.
- ZLOTNIK, Hania (1992). "Empirical identification of international migration systems", in: Mary M. Kriz, Lin Lean Lim and Hania Zlotnik (eds). *International Migration Systems: a Global Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 19–40.