RUSSIA’S AND EU’S MIGRATION CHALLENGES IN 2019: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Milka Malfait

Abstract: The EU and Russia – as exponents of the developed world – both encounter challenges, opportunities and threats which come with one of the most important global phenomena at the turn of the millennium: migration. There are some common challenges as well as some differences regarding the migration issue. This paper elaborates on the different approaches and needs, differences in types of migrants, and contrasts the experience of the EU with Russia’s historical and cultural background in order to achieve a better understanding of today’s migration dilemma. The author concludes by highlighting the common threats to national security as a possible way of establishing a better partnership. The comparative method was used as well as the statistical and logical method of research. As a conditional limitation of the comparison between the EU and Russia it must be noted that it is not completely appropriate to compare a single country with an integrative union of several countries. Moreover, migration, globally is multidimensional. The main conclusion of the article is that there are three major differences: different migration challenges and needs (1), different types of migrants (2), and different migration histories and patterns embedded in different political constellations (3). Yet, they have some challenges in common, such as the security challenge, which asks for a worldwide cooperative approach.

Different migration challenges

Both the EU and Russia must deal with aspects and challenges that stem from international migration, such as reinforcement of the economy and the labor market, development issues, the humanitarian component, human rights as well as threats to national security such as crime. Similarly to the EU, Russia has a multicultural society. Russia is one of the largest migrant-receiving countries in the world. According to the UN, the Russian Federation hosted the fourth largest number of migrants worldwide (11.7 million). To compare: In 2000 the Russian Federation (11.9 million) was second only to the United States (34.8 million) in terms of number of migrants. Now countries as Saudi Arabia (12.2 million) and Germany, a EU country (12.2 million), surpassed Russia. Probably, the EU refugee crises due to the confrontations in the Middle-East contributed hereto. Both are attractive places for migrants, yet they experience different types of migrants and also some different migration challenges. The major difference today lies in the fact that the EU has to cope with a refugee crisis since 2015, contrary to Russia, which is not really facing this challenge, but instead is experiencing a huge deficit of workforce. To illustrate: according to UN data 141,475 arrivals of refugees have been assessed in 2018 with as main countries of origin: Algeria, Afghanistan and Syria.


Morocco, Guinea, Mali, Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Algeria, Tunisia, Côte d’Ivoire and others.\(^3\) The peak of this crisis has been identified in 2015 with 1,032,408 arrivals.\(^4\) In the EU there is currently a general trend to tighten the borders. This is due to the burden of this migration crisis and due to some issues related to the national security. As a result of its need for a young and foreign workforce and as part of its labor migration policy, Russia stimulates former Soviet Republics to send their workers to Russia. Thus, in the year 2019, they both have different migration challenges and approaches. The types of immigrants are distinct as well. The EU experiences refugees coming from the MENA region and is home to immigrants from former African colonies who came to the EU during earlier migration waves. Russia is in need of extra workforce and aims to attract and resettle former compatriots from other ex-Soviet states and ethnic Russians living abroad. Moreover, Central Asian states are the main forces behind labor migration to Russia today. Central Asian Migration is migration maintained mainly by three countries: Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan.\(^5\) According to the statistics of Russia’s Federal Migration Service, there were 9,881,503 foreign citizens and stateless persons residing in Russia as of January 2016. More than 85% of them were nationals of ten countries: nine post-Soviet states and China, the only non-post-Soviet country completing the list.\(^6\) Eight of the nine post-Soviet countries sending migrants to Russia are members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), which is a political union of post-Soviet countries, while the ninth is Ukraine, an associate member of CIS. These migrants also have a different purpose. Citizens of the former Republics of the Soviet Union are mainly driven by a socio-economic goal, i.e. to improve salaries and many of them peacefully share the same cultural and linguistic heritage. In the EU, there are currently thousands of war/political refugees. Another point of alertness are the immigrants or naturalized EU citizens with foreign roots who have not successfully integrated in the European society, which has a fundamental basis: the Industrial Revolution, the ideas of the Enlightenment, the Judeo-Christian civilization and the modern technological advancement. Some EU countries, like Belgium for example suffer today from overcrowded populations and struggle with some immigrants who don’t use the social welfare system in the way it is meant to be, receiving higher social benefits than if they would accept a paid profession. The capacity of the population is not able anymore to carry this burden and interethnic conflicts rise between the indigenous population and the non-working immigrant population. Concerning labour migration, the EU and the EAEU (with Russia as the main centre of attraction) have something in common: the four freedoms of movement of goods, persons, capital and services. Citizens of the EAEU and thus by definition former Soviet citizens can move freely to Russia to work. Similarly, the EU promotes internal labor migration within the Single Market in cases where skills are required which cannot be fulfilled by the indigenous population. The EU foresees for this the same benefits as Russia, such as countering problems caused by the ageing population and reinforcement of the economy.
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3 Arrivals include sea arrivals to Italy, Cyprus and Malta and both sea and land arrivals to Greece and Spain.
6 Троицкий К. Административные выдворения из России: судебное разбирательство или массовое изгнание. М., Комитет «Гражданское содействие», 2016. Режим доступа: https://www.refworld.org.ru/type,COUNTRYREP,,RUS,579a18b34,0.html [Troitskii, K. Administrativnye vydvorenia izRossii: sudebnoe razbiratelsctvo ili massovoe izgnanie? (Administrative Expulsions from Russia: Court Case or Mass Deportation?)].
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**Different migration history and patterns**

The EU and Russia have a different migration history which explains why they both look at migration from different angles. Many
European states have a colonial past on the African continent and experience immigration waves from these former colonies. The EU, as a united force, is only a recent reality which is fragile and not yet an established player. The different Member States of the EU are so diverse in culture and history to the extent that they are all marked by the many wars and conquests their people experienced. Long before the EU was established, the different states did not trust each other enough. As many European states became dominated by neighbouring oppressors and regimes, some of them are still skeptical towards domination by foreigners, whom they see as aliens or strangers, and who, in this case, are the mass influxes of immigrants. For centuries, there have been many military conflicts in Europe, comprised of numerous empires which were constantly subjected to reconquests and reorganisation. It occurred in West and Central Europe as well as in East Europe, Scandinavia, the Balkans and South Europe. Domination of the indigenous people by foreign rulers is thus still in the collective memories of some people. That is why there is no consensus on the migration issue today between the EU Member States. Today the EU is mainly an economical union, while the concept of a political union is still frail. The most important feature of the union is that it eliminated the long-lasting confrontations in the axis France-Germany.

Russia has a different migration history and migration patterns distinct from the EU and these are, therefore, not comparable. Russia is a federal state which is comprised of more than 200 nationalities and people of different cultures who are accustomed to cohabiting for centuries with each other and especially during the Soviet-era of internal migration between the Soviet states. Many religions are rooted in Russia’s hybrid culture. It is important to note that in Russia the ‘host’ society and those who are now referred to as ‘migrants’ were, until recently, part of the same political and cultural community: they were all compatriots. This unity of socio-cultural space and identity makes Russia distinct from other post-colonial/post-imperial contexts where immigrants from former colonies were largely alien to the population of the former metropolitan centers. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation (1991) became home to a large number of immigrants from former Soviet states. Yet, historically immigration, especially in the sense of crossing physical borders – never played an important role for contemporary Russia, or, for that matter, its predecessors, the Soviet Union and the Russian Empire, as people did not view this process as migration. The 20th century was characterized by the Soviet-era migration. During that time, the borders between the Soviet republics only had an administrative purpose: they were no barriers to migration. The Soviet Era was mainly characterised by internal migration, including the centrifugal migration from Russia as a core of the vast empire ‘which was constantly colonizing itself’, to its peripheries
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which defined the country’s migration story prior to the 1980’s. The main goal of internal migration was the redistribution of labor. Millions of people of these Soviet republics were on the move. External emigration was only allowed after the collapse of the USSR. Today, Russia succeeds quite well in advocating for tolerance among different cultures and religions present on its territory. Russian citizens share the same Soviet heritage and are therefore the same legacy in terms of culture and society, but even ethnically if their roots cross-over, logically there is more tolerance. They have been part of the same community for about one century (70 years of Soviet Union and 27 years of Russian Federation) and even long before in the Russian Empire there was assimilation of communities. Apart from that, Russia has another good strategy for keeping its people in harmony with each other: namely the preservation of the common Russian language. The Russian language unites everyone from former Soviet countries and cultures, far away and nearby. The Russian language is an element of identity and a communication resource, which unites citizens of Russia, countries of the former Soviet countries, and far abroad and plays a considerable role in the statement of contemporary political, economic and educational dialogue. It is a native tongue for more than 168 million of people; more than 114 million of people are fluent in Russian as a second native language (in the CIS and the Baltic countries dominantly) or speak Russian as the foreign language (in countries far abroad). The strengthening of positions of Russian is a strategic national priority of the Russian Federation. Its preservation and the popularization of the Russian culture in the CIS countries thus contributed to the fact that in Russia there are far less interethnic conflicts. People live more in peace with each other. The EU, on the other hand, has many different languages and different cultures that still belong to the various countries, their sovereign governments and political leaders. However, there are no tensions among Europeans but there are sometimes between the indigenous population and some migrants coming from less developed countries whose ideas are diametrically opposed to those of the rich and progressed west. In its most extreme form, these tensions have manifested themselves in the form of terror attacks against the local citizens. The migration patterns in and out Russia are also not comparable with the EU. Russia has a history of migration with the former Soviet states (i.e. internal migration), and with some Asian countries such as China and the DPRK and other former socialist states (i.e. external migration). The latter is an absolutely different story compared to internal migration between the republics within the USSR. The EU is a historical mixture of people coming from West-Europe, the Mediterranean countries, Scandinavian countries, Central and East Europe, Russia, the Maghreb region and some former African colonial states.

Common security threats

A large migration flow from the MENA region to the EU in 2014 and 2015 caused negative social and economic processes in the European countries and facilitated illegal entry of criminal, terrorist and extremist groups. Logically, threats to national security are also a migration challenge in the year 2019, but
a negative one, especially in the extremely divided world we live in today, between the highly developed countries and the developing world. This is a common issue for both the EU and Russia. These security threats are especially coming from people of countries or regions with unstable socio-economic situations. In the past four years in the EU, the number of terrorist attacks committed by naturalized foreign citizens and immigrants on ideological and extremist grounds has grown, although there has been a decline in terror activity in the last few years. However, the extremists who committed the terror attacks in the EU were no war refugees but radicalized naturalized EU citizens or immigrants who came to the EU in earlier migration waves.¹⁴ Radicalization and the problem of FTFs is embedded not only in the second but sometimes also in the first generation of migrants coming from these poorly developing countries. In Russia it is similar: Russia’s terrorists were and are mainly the citizens of Russia and thus mainly born in Russia. In other words, they were no immigrants (anymore). Although Russia did experience less terrorist activity in that period, for the last year, migratory activity at the external borders of the Russian Federation and its area of interests has experienced significant growth. These negative events which happened in the EU may pose a threat both to the Russian Federation and neighboring countries."¹⁵ Logically, in Russia there are similar concerns with regard to terrorism, but they don’t resonate as loudly. The security problem is also handled differently, with more circumspection since Russia is home to many religions and cultures. With respect to the migration-security nexus, Russia succeeds elegantly in reconciling the pros and cons of migration, due to the power of a shared cultural heritage and the preservation of the Russian language. Although migration can in no way be equated to terrorism, it is a fact that mass migration from certain areas can entail more security problems such as terrorism, other forms of transnational criminality and illegal immigration. In the same context, it is delicate to prove a direct causal relationship between migration and criminality. This is in many countries a very politicized discussion. Criminality has no nationality and existed at all times. It is even so that some national police agencies, such as the Belgian Police, do not register their crime statistics on the basis of nationality or origin, which is intelligent. It can also be an unspoken policy of a country not to link migration with criminality in the public debate, in order not to stigmatize or make the tensions worse. Official statistics, retrieved from the website of the Russian Ministry of Interior and the Attorney General, prove that only about 4% of all (detected) crimes in Russia are committed by foreigners and stateless persons.¹⁶ More concretely, the annual rate amounted to 3.7% in 2017¹⁷ and 3.5% in 2018.¹⁸ However, statistics are relative and 4% of “all detected crimes”¹⁹ does not elaborate on specific crimes


¹⁸ Attorney General of the Russian Federation. Statistical compilation “The state of crime in Russia in December 2018” 2018. P. 44. Mode of access: https://genproc.gov.ru/stat/data/1541224/Loc.cit. – This concerns all detected crimes because citizenship of a criminal can be known only if the crime has been detected. The total number of crimes is almost twice as big as the number of detected ones (7,5%). 3,2% of the detected crimes have been committed by citizens of the CIS countries. The amount of reported crimes (but not detected) is 0,8% (they were not identified, so it is not clear whether they have been committed by foreigners or nationals of the CIS countries).
such as terrorism. In some cases of terrorism in the EU and Russia, these crimes were definitely committed by foreign nationals or naturalized citizens coming from countries or regions with unstable socio-economic situations or in other words: not by the indigenous population. To conclude: the direct relationship between migration and criminality is delicate, difficult to prove and differs from country to country, seen that not all countries are home to the same type of immigrants, and thus not all share the same positive or negative aspects that come with migration. Since national security could be at stake both for the EU and Russia, this could be a common goal to strengthen bilateral cooperation.

***

The EU and Russia experience today the same 'global challenges' that come with international migration, such as economic development, counteracting a declining population, human rights and humanitarian issues as well as national security threats. However, there are three major differences between the EU and Russia. First, in terms of different challenges: the EU is in the middle of a refugee crises (due to the war in Syria, and other countries in the MENA region) and experienced terror attacks committed by people coming from poorly developed countries which upheld a dissimilar worldview, one could name it a terror crisis. Russia, on the other hand, sees migration from a different angle: a deficit in workforce and the aim to restore the Soviet space. Secondly, the EU and Russia are home to a different type of migrants. As a result of this crisis, the EU has to deal with primarily war refugees (and political refugees) but to a less extent with economic refugees. The EU countries are home to another type of immigrants: naturalized citizens who radicalize due to unsuccessful integration. Russia however, experiences more economic migrants from former Soviet States and to a large extent from Central Asia20 rather than war refugees from the MENA region. Thirdly, the EU and Russia have a totally different history in terms of migration patterns and cultural heritage and therefore have both different, but critical views towards migration. The one is home to various cultures and nations who have been living in tolerance for many years, the other consisted – until the creation of the EU – of different states skeptical towards foreign rulers and of some imperial states with a colonial past. The one is not better than the other, they are just different. The conclusion is that they are not comparable but only to the extent that they have some challenges in common, which are embedded in the global migration issue and ask for a worldwide cooperative approach. For example, the common security challenge. Hence one should be delicate while trying to establish a direct causal relationship between migration and criminality, such as terrorism. It is assumed that the security issues are handled differently by the EU and Russia, due to their different structure of decision-making and cultural heritage. Thus, this common challenge of security seems to be a point of difference as well. Migration has many dimensions with many positive aspects. It must be noted that war or political refugees in need of help are distinctive from economic ones. The brain drain of highly skilled migrants cannot be compared with migration to obtain family reunification or with migration trends from former colonies to the former mother countries. Migration to enjoy the social benefits of a country without contributing to society, unfortunately, also exists in this world. Globally, the less developed countries need to adapt faster and better to the modern society of the developed world in such a way they follow the same line of reasoning in what is good and bad and share the same values. Thus in the year 2019, migration is a complex conundrum, which has the prominent feature to contrast economic progress of states with threats to national security, especially in the extremely divided world we live in today between the highly developed countries and the developing world.
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20 The Central Asian states were also former Soviet Republics.
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