



ECONOMIC ANNALS-XXI

ISSN 1728-6239 (Online)
ISSN 1728-6220 (Print)
<https://doi.org/10.21003/ea>
<http://www.soskin.info/ea/>

Volume 179 Issue (9-10) 2019

Citation information: Chaplynskyi, K., Savishchenko, V., & Shevchenko, S. (2019). Contemporary migration paradigm: managerial, legal, economic and sociocultural perspectives. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 179(9-10), 40-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V179-04>

UDC: 325;338; 351



Kostyantyn Chaplynskyi

D.Sc. (Legal Sciences), Professor,
Head of the Department of Forensics,
Forensic Medicine and Psychiatry,
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs
26 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, 49005, Ukraine
chaplynski@ukr.net
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9922-3743>



Viktoriia Savishchenko

D.Sc. (Legal Sciences),
Associate Professor,
Dean of the Faculty of Law,
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs
26 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, 49005, Ukraine
viktoriia9009@ukr.net
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6278-4774>



Serhii Shevchenko

D.Sc. (Public Administration), Professor, Honoured
Worker of Education, Head of the Department of
Administration and Management,
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs
26 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, 49005, Ukraine
alphabet7373@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0079-3069>

Contemporary migration paradigm: managerial, legal, economic and sociocultural perspectives

Abstract. The article provides a complex analysis of models of interaction between migrants and a recipient society currently existing in the international practice, including new trends in the development of migration policies by various countries. It serves as a ground work aimed at the substantiation of conceptual foundations of the new migration paradigm based upon the change of social conditions and attitudes (from confrontation to acceptance) as well as the creation of legal, economic and social conditions for full-fledged inclusion of migrants into the new culture.

The authors are convinced in the necessity to employ previously unused resources of civilizational reforming, which would not harm both national economies and legal frameworks, as well as individuals and society as a whole.

Keywords: Migration Paradigm; Approaches to the Interaction of the Recipient Society with Migrants; Migration Management; Economic and Legal Problems in the Field of Migration; Multiculturalism

JEL Classification: F6; J61; J68; K37

Acknowledgements and Funding: The authors received no direct funding for this research.

Contribution: The authors contributed equally to this work.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V179-04>

Чаплинський К. О.

доктор юридичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри криміналістики, судової медицини та психіатрії, Дніпропетровський державний університет внутрішніх справ, Дніпро, Україна

Савищенко В. М.

доктор юридичних наук, доцент, декан юридичного факультету, Дніпропетровський державний університет внутрішніх справ, Дніпро, Україна

Шевченко С. О.

доктор наук з державного управління, професор, Заслужений працівник освіти України, завідувач кафедри управління та адміністрування, Дніпропетровський державний університет внутрішніх справ, Дніпро, Україна

Сучасна міграційна парадигма: управлінський, правовий, економічний і соціокультурний вектори

Анотація. У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз існуючих у міжнародній практиці моделей взаємодії мігрантів і суспільства-реципієнта, а також нових трендів у побудові міграційної політики державами. На цій базі обґрунтовано концептуальні засади нової міграційної парадигми, в основі якої лежить зміна суспільних орієнтирів і установок із конфронтації на прийняття, а також створення правових,

економічних і соціальних умов для повноцінного «входження» мігрантів у нову культуру. Автори впевнені в необхідності використання досі не задіяних ресурсів цивілізаційного реформування, які не зашкодять ані національним економікам чи правовим системам, ні особистості, ні суспільству в цілому.
Ключові слова: міграційна парадигма; підходи до взаємодії суспільства-реципієнта з мігрантами; управління міграцією; економічні та правові проблеми у сфері міграції; мультикультуралізм.

Чаплинский К. А.

доктор юридических наук, профессор,
заведующий кафедрой криминалистики, судебной медицины и психиатрии,
Днепропетровский государственный университет внутренних дел, Днепр, Украина

Савищенко В. Н.

доктор юридических наук, доцент, декан юридического факультета,
Днепропетровский государственный университет внутренних дел, Днепр, Украина

Шевченко С. А.

доктор наук по государственному управлению, профессор,
Заслуженный работник образования Украины, заведующий кафедрой управления и администрирования,
Днепропетровский государственный университет внутренних дел, Днепр, Украина

Современная миграционная парадигма:

управленческий, правовой, экономический и социокультурный векторы

Аннотация. В статье осуществлен комплексный анализ существующих в международной практике моделей взаимодействия мигрантов и общества-реципиента, а также новых трендов в формировании государствами миграционной политики. Обоснованы концептуальные положения новой миграционной парадигмы, которая предусматривает изменение общественных ориентиров и установок с конфронтации на принятие, а также создание правовых, экономических и социальных условий для полноценного «вхождения» мигрантов в другую культуру.

Эффективность государственного управления в сфере миграции зависит от многих факторов, в числе которых – разработка и обеспечение полноценной реализации на практике долгосрочных программ, которые бы способствовали снятию социального напряжения в обществе, снижению уровня агрессии по отношению к мигрантам, возникающей на почве религиозных, этнических и культурных разногласий. В свою очередь, рост преступности в регионах, являющихся наиболее привлекательными для переселенцев, обусловлен несовершенством миграционного законодательства, миграционного контроля, миграционного порядка и практики правоприменения. Отсутствие единого и, что крайне важно, комплексного подхода к решению миграционного кризиса в современном мире как на государственном, так и международном уровне, усугубляет существующую проблему – неконтролируемые перемещения человеческих потоков в условиях все более выраженной глобализации экономики.

Стремление руководства стран закрыть границы, проводить политику изоляционизма могут обеспечить лишь временный эффект, а в конечном итоге, станут толчком к снижению темпов экономического и социокультурного развития. Интеграция мигрантов в общество, основанная на идеологии мультикультурализма, этнической и религиозной толерантности при активном взаимодействии правительственных, предпринимательских, медийных и общественных институций – единственный путь цивилизационного реформирования в миграционной сфере, позволяющий гармонизировать потребности национальных экономик и правовых систем в развитии и соблюдении прав человека.

Ключевые слова: миграционная парадигма; подходы к взаимодействию общества-реципиента с мигрантами; управление миграцией; экономические и правовые проблемы в сфере миграции; мультикультуралізм.

1. Introduction

The topicality of the migration discourse in scientific research has been steadily increasing over the past decades. The world is in constant dynamic change which is primarily linked to the globalization of economies, collapse of the bipolar system of international relations, demographic imbalance (resulting from the declining population growth rate in developed countries and overpopulation in low-income countries), increasing economic inequality between countries, which eventually leads to growing public frustration, aggravation of political crises and armed conflicts. Under such conditions, activation of migration flows from economically disadvantaged countries into regions that are potentially more attractive for living is observed.

In its primary meaning, migration is relocation of an individual as a bearer of social and cultural potential (values, norms, models of social relations, traditions, etc.) into new realities of life - legal, economic and cultural. The choice of a new location is conditioned, first and foremost, by the presence of conditions for self-realization and provision of decent standards of living. Simultaneously, globalization of economies has led to the transformation of the labour market - presently it is an open and highly structured transnational space. Correspondingly, migration assumes new forms

and transforms into a multi-factor, often unpredictable process resulting in outbreaks of armed conflicts and civil wars.

Novel practices of labour migration now represent not one-time individual trips, but a long-term or permanent residence in the territories of other countries of an entire ethnic conglomerate with the relocation of the full scope of powerful manufacturing complexes and utilities infrastructure into this territory. Experts claim the emergence of the so-called «ethnic economies» in the territories of individual countries.

One of the contemporary trends is the emergence of a new form of migration such as indirect or electronic migration when production objectives and functions are realized through the Internet.

Further, individuals consider themselves to be employees in another country; their social contacts expand, while the value maxims in the conditions of the new labour relations also undergo changes. Simultaneously, there is no spatial relocation into this country and, similarly, direct contacts with bearers of another culture do not occur.

Emergence of new forms of migration does not offer a solution to the conflict between the host culture and the foreign culture, which becomes increasingly relevant. The fact that a substantial part of migrants not only does not assimilate but also absolutely refuses to live by the rules of a recipient country can be explained, to a considerable extent, by the persistence of those migrants' own cultural space. The new realities impact not only the physical condition of individuals, but also their spiritual world (languages, habits, traditions, mentality of the nation) all of which are impossible to rid of upon command from the host side. Conflict-free encounter of cultures is possible under the condition of a continued dialogue, search for compromises, creation of long-term migrant adaptation programmes at the level of governments and entire international community. However, governments of the countries which are deemed most attractive for migrants demonstrate predominantly formal approach to solving the problem of growing migration flows. In the best case, this approach is substantiated by financial subsidies for migrants that are sufficient for living, while, in the worst case, it is accompanied by strengthening of control and border closures.

International practice of government management of migration processes does not have a comprehensive all-round basis or, in other words, a scientifically substantiated methodological foundation, i.e. a complex of measures, approaches, value maxims within economic, legal, sociocultural and other dimensions of social life. We deem it appropriate to employ a notion of «migration paradigm» to construct such a basis, which we perceive as a certain sum total of guidelines of theoretical and applicable nature for effective management of migration processes both on international and national levels.

Hence, there exists a pressing need for a new migration paradigm, which would stipulate realization of measures aimed at the change of social maxims and attitudes from the position of confrontation to the position of acceptance (subjective measurement) which would account for the interests of both sides at the intergovernmental level. Is it possible to develop such a universal model and would it be sustainable in a multi-polar, economically and culturally diverse world? The presented article will attempt to respond these questions.

2. Brief Literature Review

In the last decade, research interest to the problem of migration in the contemporary globalized society has been steadily growing. For instance, considerable attention is given to the role of migration in the processes of social mobility, its impact upon the change of the social status of an individual and a group, and the social profile of modern migrants (E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2014); A. White (2016); V. Redclift & F. Rajina (2017); B. Wielgoszewska (2018)). Particularities of the migration policy of countries and intergovernmental associations against the background of global social transformations have been investigated by E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, S. Snyder & J. Saunders (2016); S. M. Kunz (2018); J. Vearey, M. Orcutt, L. Gostin, C. A. Braham, P. Duigan & M. Simon (2019).

Economists regard migration flows within the context of forming labour resources of countries or intergovernmental associations, provide evaluation of their influence upon the infrastructure and production rates within specific territorial boundaries and timeframes (C. Halls (2009); D. J. Messtres (2012); J. Stuhler (2014); C. Dustmann, F. Fasani, T. Frattini, L. Minale & U. Schönberg (2017)). Dealing with cultural studies, scholars focus their attention on the problem of the cross-cultural dialogue and the complexity of forming ethnocultural identity in the globalized society (A. DelPerio (2016); K. Hammer (2017); M. Berg & M. Nowicka (2019)).

Researchers on the migration phenomenon, in the most diverse aspects of its manifestation, rely largely upon the theoretical elaborations and considerations by A. J. Toynbee. In his work «A Study of History» (1934), A. J. Toynbee laid the foundations to solve problems relevant to multiple issues related to migration both within the global and the local context. Great theoretical significance is displayed by the works from world-renowned thinkers who either directly or indirectly investigate the problem of migration as a sociocultural phenomenon. M. Heidegger, G. Simmel, A. Giddens, U. Beck, H. Lefebvre, U. Eco are among them. For instance, A. Giddens (1994) studies the correlation between the notion of «place» as a physical phenomenon and the notion of «space» as a social one. He focuses on the fact that in the contemporary world the phenomenon of «co-presence» is becoming increasingly relevant, while breaking the ties with the «place» does not imply the loss of connections to the «space». Individuals reproduce social relations, values, norms and characteristics of their «space» even being physically detached from it. Hence, Giddens is one of the first to consider the issue of perception of migrants as bearers of their own cultural space, which they continue to preserve within the new cultural coordinates of the recipient country. U. Eco points to the fact that migration has ceased to be local and gained the pattern of mass flows of certain culture-bearers who exert considerable impact upon the identity of the recipient nation.

American psychologist Harry Triandis (1996) introduced the notion of «cultural syndrome» which represents a pattern of shared attitudes, beliefs, norms, social roles and values at the level of consciousness among individuals that speak a similar language, live in the same historical period and in the same territory. As a consequence, there occurs a clash of several «cultural syndromes», each of them being a unique combination of elements. The outcome of such a clash is predominantly the rejection of the foreign culture (aggression or dissociation) which leads to growing social tension and conflicts.

3. Purpose

The purpose of the article is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of models of interaction between migrants and a recipient society that exist in the international practice as well as to research new trends in the development of the state migration policy, consequently using it as a basis to substantiate the conceptual foundations for an efficient solution to migration crisis in the contemporary world

4. Results

4.1. General overview of migration processes: contemporary trends and prospects

Experts estimate that over 20 million of legal migrants alone currently reside in the countries of Western Europe. Civil wars, economic and political instability in «Third World» countries cause new waves of migration to European countries and North America. Massive migration flows bring about significant changes to demographic, ethnic, religious, economic, political and cultural landscape of the western world. According to A. King and B. Schneider (1991) of the Club of Rome, these changes in many respects create an objective basis for growing «demographic aggression» and «defensive racism» in recipient countries in relation to immigrants.

According to the data of the International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2019), the number of international migrants around the world has been constantly increasing over the past 30 years (Table 1).

Table 1:
Number of international migrants in the world

Year	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2019
Number of international migrants, mln.	153	161.3	173.6	191.6	220.8	248.9	271.6
Percentage of the total population, %	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.5

Note: Statistical data refer to international migrant stocks. Stocks include all foreign-born residents in a country regardless of when they entered the country. As such, the number of international migrants may not include second-generation migrants that were born in the country but have parents who migrated. Stock data should also not be confused with annual migration flow data (i.e. the number of migrants that entered or left a country within one year).

Source: IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) (2019):
https://migrationdataportal.org/?i=stock_abs_&t=2019

The most massive wave of migration occurring in the past 10 years started in the autumn of 2015 and lasted throughout 2016. Activization of migration processes was caused by civil wars in Iraq and Syria, military conflicts in Afghanistan and Libya, the ongoing military operations against the Islamic State, the crisis in Serbia and Kosovo, conflicts in Yemen and Pakistan and religion-inspired clashes in Nigeria. In 2015, over 1 million people arrived in Europe from zones of military conflicts as well as from West African countries. The most attractive for migrants were the countries which could be reached with sea routes. Table 2 provides data with regard to the number of migrants who arrived to corresponding European countries during the same periods (from January 2015 up to and including June 2019) in the past five years.

Leaps in the indicators testify to the efforts by the governments of the countries, which suffer from the influx of migrants, to remedy the situation by means of international agreements and internal constraints. At the same time, such steps mainly cause threats to other countries to aggravate. For instance, in 2017 the number of migrants to Italy increased after the sea lanes through Greece and the Balkans were blocked on the basis of agreements between the EU and Turkey. According to this agreement all illegal migrants arriving in Greece from Turkey would face immediate return. With regard to Cyprus and Malta, the rising demand for citizenship of these countries can be explained by loyal pricing policy and simplicity of the process of obtaining their national passport.

The IOM is conducting a continuous analysis of the total number of international migrants in the countries which are considered the most attractive for those who wish to change the place of residence due to various reasons (Table 3).

The growing share of migrants triggered the change in the vector of migration policy, particularly towards the prohibition of entry, in multiple countries. However, a solution to the migration crisis largely depends not only upon border closures and strict filtering of the newly arrived. Unjustified restrictions and bans give rise to new, and often more dangerous, means of refugee transit to economically developed countries. Overall, restrictions related to free movement may be treated as a violation of the established norms of international law, in particular Articles 12-13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution on 16 December 1966.

The major challenge lies with the necessity to form an effective system of relations of the society with the migrants and their descendants who have already acquired the citizenship of the recipient

Table 2:
European countries the most attractive for migrants

Country\period	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Italy	70,354	70,222	83,752	16,577	2,779
Greece	72,442	160,115	10,679	22,899	18,448
Spain	3,150	4,606	6,464	17,950	13,263
Bulgaria	24	4,954	391	589	836
Cyprus	-	-	273	108	3,935
Malta	-	-	-	234	1,276
TOTAL	145,970	239,897	101,559	58,357	40,537

Note: Data for Cyprus in 2015-2016 and for Malta from 2015 to 2017 are unavailable.

Source: International Organization for Migration (2019): <https://migration.iom.int/europe?type=arrivals>

Table 3:
The total number of international migrants in the countries attractive for migrants

Country	Number of migrants (mil)	Total population (mil)
United States of America	50.7	332.8
Germany	13.1	82.9
Saudi Arabia	13.1	32.9
Russian Federation	11.6	144.5
United Kingdom	9.6	66.5
United Arab Emirates	8.6	9.9
France	8.3	66.9
Canada	8	37.6
Australia	7.5	24.6
Italy	6.3	60.5
Spain	6.1	46.7

Note: data with regard to the number of migrants is as of the first half of 2019

Source: IOM (2019): https://migrationdataportal.org/?i=stock_abs_&t=2019

countries by birth. To a great extent, a solution to this challenge depends on the capacity and willingness of migrants to overcome the so-called culture shock which occurs when individuals either find themselves in a foreign cultural environment or encounter other social, legal and cultural norms. The «meeting» of cultures generates a sort of cognitive dissonance when established perceptions and values of the own culture come into contradiction with the local realities of the society which accommodates the migrant.

In his work «Culture Shock: A Reader in Modern Cultural Anthropology», Philip K. Bock (1970) highlights several strategies of overcoming culture shock: ghettoization, which stipulates the self-contained habitation in a narrow circle of the individual's own ethnic group, minimization of contact with the native population; assimilation - renouncing the individual's culture and striving for adoption and intrinsic acceptance of the culture of the country of residence; colonization, when migrants attempt to impose their cultural values, behavioural norms and even their languages on local inhabitants; integration - striving not only for adopting the new culture, but also for enrichment of it with the elements of the migrant's own culture, thanks to which there occurs a mutually beneficial cultural exchange. It is namely the integration that serves as the most productive strategy for inclusion of migrants into the new culture while preserving the national identity of the recipient society. At the same time, the majority of recipient countries are not inclined to employ exactly the same strategy. Within the scope of the presented research we have attempted to clarify the reasons why the process of interaction with migrants often results in the preferred application of non-productive strategies and the ways how this reflects upon economic and socio-cultural development of countries.

4.2. Approaches to the interaction of the recipient society with migrants and consequences of their implementation

Within European practices, there exist three approaches to the interaction of the recipient society with migrants which are considered to be most common. For example, the assimilation model, specific to France that represents a formalized approach according to which the French citizenship can be acquired by birthright with all applicable preferences. In the past decade, an additional requirement for migrant children has been introduced - mandatory knowledge of the French language. On an annual basis, a considerable share of budgetary funds is allocated for integration of the newly arrived into the social life. Courses in language learning, fundamentals of law and history of the country, local traditions and social norms are conducted for immigrants on a preferential basis.

Nevertheless, these efforts by the government prove to be futile due to the unwillingness of immigrants - in particular representatives of Algerian, Moroccan and Tunisian cultures - to accept the rules of life of the native population and to interact with the society beyond the limits of the ethnic community. Financial aid obtained from the French government is entirely sufficient to provide for regular living standards. The unemployment rate among immigrants reaches 23% on average in comparison with 8% among the ethnic French. Furthermore, children and teenagers of African descent become criminals 3-4 times more often than the ethnic French. Expectations of society, that acquisition of citizenship automatically transforms the natives from other cultural and religious «dimensions» into French natives with corresponding value maxims, are unjustified and quite often become the foundation for the escalation of violence on ethnic and religious grounds. Generally, the problem of illegal and even legal migration is a constant destabilizing factor within the country's political and economic life. Thus, the French model of interaction with migrants stipulates that migrants and their descendants (which acquire citizenship automatically by birthright) accept the norms, rules of conduct and values established within the society.

An alternative is the practice accepted in Germany, when the priority consideration is given to the so-called «right of blood», i.e. society is divided into immigrants and German citizens. The basis for the segregation is the temporary nature of stay of the newly arrived in the territory of the country, which means that the local community does not expect migrants and their descendants to accept the principles, cultural values and traditions characteristic of Germans as an ethnic community. Such attitude gradually leads to sociocultural inequality and minimization of contacts between local population and migrants. A logical outcome of such fencing off «locals» from «aliens» can be traced in the revitalization of the «National Socialist Underground», whose members murdered 9 migrants and a policewoman, committed 15 robberies and three terrorist acts with the use of explosives in the period from 1998 to 2011. Having confessed their guilt, two of the members of

that group committed suicide in 2011. However, the greatest problem which is to be considered in this case is the attitude of society, particularly the absence of concerns over insufficient attention of the police to crime investigations, the spirit of indifference and non-involvement in these events. At present the situation has aggravated: in many big cities there have appeared areas uncontrolled by the local law enforcement authorities, the existence of which even the German Chancellor Angela Merkel was forced to acknowledge. These areas serve namely to house a considerable share of migrants who create enclosed enclaves or the so-called «homeland».

The third approach is widespread in the United Kingdom. The interaction with the migrants can be characterized as integration-based. Complexity of visa and permission to stay (known as «leave to remain») application procedures is compensated by broad opportunities and rights which ethnic communities of migrants obtain to preserve their cultural peculiarities. As a result, an interpenetration of cultures occurs, migrants integrate into the society contributing their national practices to the established sociocultural space and simultaneously adopting local traditions and rules. Subsequently, both cultures experience the effects of the mutual impact. The extent to which these consequences prove to be positive or negative will be investigated in the course of further analyses of the empirical base on the given subject.

Apart from the identified approaches which reflect various methods of integration of migrants, there exist a number of alternative variants. The majority of them are deeply rooted in historically established practices of interaction between the host country and migrants. An interesting approach is demonstrated by Switzerland, which can be characterized as a distance approach. For instance, the system of migrant integration into society is built upon the delimitation of «three circles»: workforce from the EU member states, Eastern European and other countries. The migration policy of the country is aimed primarily at highly-skilled professionals and seasonal workers from the south of Europe. No actions are stipulated with regard to the integration of migrants arriving to Switzerland, as well as any social or other support for their adaptation (except for the category of refugees, for whom all the regulations established by international acts are being strictly followed). Through the system of referendums, the government managed to assert the restrictions on entry to the country, having introduced a quota of 25% from the total population. Ten years ago, the country already implemented the string of restrictions and prohibitions that significantly impacted the state of migrants. Restrictions were imposed on the construction of minarets and mosques; automatic deportation of migrants that committed major offences was enforced; labour quotas for migrant workers from Romania and Bulgaria were introduced. Introduction of quotas in Switzerland occurred also with the purpose of protecting ecology and natural areas. The government publicly states that in the interest of its citizens it does not deem it necessary to assume any obligations with regard to migrants. This level of independence in formulating migration policy became possible due to the fact that Switzerland is not an EU member-state.

Experience of countries such as the USA and Canada also deserves attention. It is common knowledge that the population of these countries has been formed by migrants and massive migrant flows have become a defining point for completing their national «portraits».

Canada's attitude to migrants is based upon the ideology of multiculturalism. Such an approach mitigates the issue of confronting ethnicities, ethnic separatism and channels it on the constitutional track, focusing on searching for compromise solutions and creating a uniform state and political identity, the part of which can be formed by the national group and regional identity. Historically, migrants in Canada are considered an important part of the society, even though the issue of interaction and equality (with consideration for the French- and English-speaking population) still remains one of the crucial problems for the government. Back in the day, an entire complex of measures was directed at maximum integration of migrants along with preserving their native identity. However, the migration policy in Canada has undergone significant revision since 2001. The reason for it was the fact that those responsible for organizing the September 11 attacks obtained American visas in the course of crossing the border with Canada. As a consequence, the attitude of the government to migrants presently has a pattern of pendulum: from considerable liberalization, which concerns primarily highly-skilled professionals, to strict filtering of all other less professionally skilled individuals willing to settle in the country.

The Canadian government has promulgated an idea: those who would like to become Canadians must accept not only the legal status, rights and duties of a citizen, but also the responsibility for the historical background and past of the country. However, this political decision is difficult

to implement because due to a large-scale nature of migrant flows, the majority of ethnic migrants have not got dispersed within the Canadian society but rather created cultural enclaves, heterogeneous in their social attributes however homogeneous by their ethnic and cultural composition. Within these communities, laws and regulations carried over from another culture rule supreme.

If a comparison is drawn between the following two migration spaces, namely North American and European, the approach of the European Union is defined by higher complexity and consistency. This is reflected in accounting for migration issues within economic development programs, in greater attention to protection of rights and freedoms of an individual irrespective of his or her ethnicity. US initiatives in the domain of migration policy are primarily focused upon the issues of safety and increased border control. Restrictions on entry are considered by the majority of heads of government authorities (including the stance of President D. Trump on this issue) as the only viable and highly efficient method of combating the consequences of migration crises.

American practices of integration and interaction between the recipient society and migrants have a lot in common with Canadian practices. At the same time, their formation and further transformation occurred differently. For instance, migrants in America found themselves within the system of integration policy commonly referred to as the «melting pot» when the condition for successful induction of the newly arrived into American society is to renounce their identity, including their ethnic identity. The narrative for forming the new civil identity at the time was realized in the «American dream», not the national past. Such policy contributed to active assimilation of migrants. It must be noted that within American and Canadian practices assimilation was not associated with the negative perception of the term as was the case in Europe.

Gradually the practice of the «melting pot» mitigated, and in the 1980s the issue of ethnic and cultural diversity and multiculturalism gained high topicality. However, the situation was aggravated by a long-standing practice of segregation and rejection of identity, while the new policy played its positive role predominantly in the fate of young or newly arrived migrants. For instance, to satisfy the wish of descendants of the Irish settlers to find «their roots», a specialized service of the Irish Emigration Museum in Dublin was developed.

For a long time, the policy of the USA related to integration of migrants was liberal and similar to the one adopted in France. However, after the terrorist attacks of 2001 the government imposed strict control over arriving migrants, gradually reverting to assimilation policy. President D. Trump repeatedly stresses the necessity of a new course with regard to solving the migration crisis. The practice of zero tolerance by the US government towards migrants in 2018 resulted in underage children being taken by force from parents who attempted at illegally crossing the border.

Presently, according to the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the American citizenship is granted to every child born in the territory of the USA irrespective of the citizenship of their parents. Trump considers such practice a «magnet for illegal immigration» and voices the necessity for its repeal. The pendulum pattern fluctuations in the attitude to migrants are characteristic of the contemporary American society as well. On the one hand, combat against discrimination related to immigration status or national origin is ongoing. Particularly, in New York, a substantial fine (USD 250,000) is imposed for use of the term «illegal alien». The Commission on Human Rights reached the conclusion that this term is predominantly used with the purpose of discrimination. Further fines might be imposed for threats by landlords to file a complaint to immigration services against the migrant residents in case of conflicts or for the demand to «speak English or get back to your country». On the other hand, there are registered facts of inhumane treatment of children taken from illegal migrants, including their prolonged detention in unsanitary conditions. At the same time, despite such dire prospects migrants from Latin America continue departing for the United States. According to forecasts, the end of 2019 will see approximately 1 million people reach the southern border of the USA - this makes it twice the quantity of migrants than in the previous year and the largest overall quantity in the past 18 years.

An analysis of the most globally widespread models of interrelations between the recipient party and the migrants would not be sufficient without the experience and practices of the countries aimed at strict isolationist policy. This refers to practices of Japan and China which for a long time were virtually closed to migration flows from other countries.

The leader in promoting high technologies - Japan - for centuries has been following the practice of distancing and disassociation, attempting at keeping the borders «closed» to foreigners

who appeared in this country only in the mid-19th century and in small numbers. The country has created one of the most complex systems of passing the migration control with stringent rules of naturalization in case of successful assimilation. According to the 1951 Immigration Control Act the entry for the purpose of permanent residence was either not considered at all or considered only under the condition of a long duration and success of proving one's trustworthiness and integrity. In the years to follow the attitude towards migrants became slightly more flexible, however this mostly concerned highly qualified professionals. Such a restrictive migration policy was justified by the government through the wish to avoid social upheavals caused by differences in culture, language, traditions and lifestyles between labour migrants and the native population. In 1970s, a stringent system of interaction with migrants was elaborated, which stipulated their residence in special settlements, complex interviewing, language training, positive attitudes towards productive and highly dedicated labour. In their entirety, these measures were intended to ensure functional adaptation of migrants to existing conditions, not to create conditions for their cultural integration.

Despite common historical premises with Japan, a somewhat different model of relations with migrants was formed in China. Even though the borders of China became open later than those of Japan - only in 1980s - the migration processes there have been developing more actively. The reason for it was the necessity to respond to the needs of the economy which was in the process of dynamic development. It was precisely the reason why the government of the country created extremely favourable and flexible conditions for the stay of highly-skilled labour migrants as well as students that had the opportunity to study within the scope of international programmes and would subsequently stay to work at Chinese enterprises. Hence, the Chinese migration policy was aimed at actively attracting migrants and organizing their integration into the society, while Japan chose the tactics of distancing. Nonetheless, the Chinese approach is still plagued by numerous problems connected with imperfect migration legislation and absence of institutions directly concerned with the migrant question. For instance, refugees and illegal migrants are dealt with by the same institutions that regulate the life of common citizens.

4.3. Conceptual framework of effective solution to migration crises in contemporary world, its economic and legal justification

Until recently, every European country has been trying to independently solve the issues related to migration, proceeding from its own national interests. For instance, when in the 2000s Spain witnessed huge influx of migrants from West Africa, the government of the country chose the way of bilateral negotiations with African countries - both migrant home countries and countries of migrant transit. The Spanish obtained certain financial backing from the EU budget. However the decisions with regard to the strategy of overcoming the problem were solely and exclusively made in Madrid. Similar pattern was followed by the events in Italy where, at the same period, the mass arrival of migrants from Central and East Africa through Libya was occurring. The Italian government implemented a set of measures to resolve the problem. Even though, due to a strong collaborative relationship with the authoritarian Libyan ruler Muammar Gaddafi, such measures evoked wide criticism on the part of the international community, they were conducted with the good will of the government and did not stipulate any involvement of the EU institutions. Such striving for autonomy in resolving the mounting problem of growing migration flows eventually resulted in negative consequences. In 2015, with the onset of the crisis, when migration assumed mass pattern and uncontrolled character, the efforts of individual countries proved insufficient. The scope and the intensity of the pressure of migration immediately demonstrated the incapacity of individual national approaches to solve the problem.

The majority of Central European countries unilaterally closed their borders, thus crippling the principle of solidarity of the Schengen countries and violating the Dublin Regulation which defines the order of consideration of applications for international protection. As a consequence, the migration wave hit Greece the hardest with its shores being crowded by landing migrants who had no possibility to move further.

Having recognized the necessity for consolidated actions, the EU member states managed to stop chaotic migration flows and establish control over them as well as to renew the implementation of procedures stipulated by European regulations. However, does this testify to the fact that a solution to problem was found and joint effort for interaction between countries was elaborated?

On 10 December 2018, representatives of the UN member states signed the so-called «Global Migration Pact» in Morocco (full title - «The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration»), intended to establish generally accepted standards of migrant treatment. Even though this document is not legally binding, it stipulates the creation of conditions for a closer cooperation in the field of migration without infringements against sovereignty of states. Out of 192 countries participating in its development and negotiations, 28 countries did not put their signature under the document.

The adoption of such a pact was at the right time. Refugees from military conflict zones and those persecuted on political reasons are within the scope of the Geneva Convention; their problems are attended to by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). At the same time, labour migrants leaving for economically developed countries in search for work or with the purpose of education are not within the scope of such convention and require a document which would protect their rights.

It should be noted that opponents to signing the Pact were not only the countries of the Visegrád Group (Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic), which had an extremely strong position with regard to migrants from the onset of the global migration crisis. The Pact did not receive support on the part of Austria, which presided in the Council of the European Union at the time, as well as on the part of other European countries - Italy, Bulgaria and Croatia. The United States of America, who began an active counteraction against migration flows not only from Latin America but also from the East under the presidency of D. Trump, initially dissociated from this document. Refusal from signing the compact was provided by Australia, Israel, the Dominican Republic, etc. Ukraine was among the countries who did not sign the compact, motivating the refusal by insufficient coverage of the problem of internally displaced persons within the scope of the Pact.

The compact does not declare any new right, but it rather corroborates the thought that migrants as well have rights that must be protected. In the course of discussions on the Pact, the Secretary-General of the United Nations emphasized that over 60 thousand migrants had perished on their way to «a better life» since 2000: they take the risk because they have no choice, no future, there exists no safe and legal alternative to migration. Avoiding «collective shame», in his opinion, is only possible through joint effort and on the basis of international agreements.

The key provisions of the Pact are:

- 1) creation of favourable political, economic, social, environmental conditions in donor countries which would objectively decrease the number of people willing to abandon their homeland;
- 2) provision of migrant safety;
- 3) creation of conditions for full-scale integration of migrants into the new society;
- 4) establishing closer cooperation between countries on the issue of human trafficking;
- 5) coordination of actions and information exchange between countries.

These provisions are stated in 23 objectives, each of them accompanied by a list of commitments and corresponding actions.

Despite the positive context of the document, it caused a string of political crises in certain countries (e.g. Belgium) and became instrumental in the matter-of-fact «splits» within governing coalitions of the majority of European countries. P. Pellegrini, a then Prime Minister of Slovakia, discussing the document, characterized migration for economic reasons as «illegal, harmful and posing a threat to national interests of the recipient country».

Taking into consideration such perception of the provisions of the Pact by European countries it becomes apparent that there occurs a growing new wave of negativity with regard to migration as a phenomenon. To ascertain whether social and economic grounds for this trend exist, we have analyzed the changes in the largest recipient countries since 2015 (the onset of the migration crisis) related to indicators of GDP per capita, the unemployment rate, the crime index and the global terrorism index in the timeframe from the onset of the migration crisis until 2018 (Table 4).

In 4 years since the onset of the migration crisis, a predominantly positive dynamic in largest recipient countries was observed in relation to national economies, the global terrorism index and the crime index. At the same time, Great Britain demonstrates the fall in GDP per capita by USD 1,937. A relatively substantial growth of the crime index (from 28.49 to 36.65) was observed in Germany, while certain deterioration of this indicator is also witnessed in Poland and Canada. Further to it, the global terrorism index in Germany increased by nearly 1 point; the same indicator in the United Kingdom remains consistently high (5.61), while the USA demonstrates negative dynamics with regard to this indicator.

Table 4:
Changes of social and economic indicators in the largest countries - recipients of migration

	GDP per capita (USD per one person)	Unemployment rate (%)	Crime Index for Country	Global terrorism index
France	42,878/37,938	9.1/10.4	45.29/49.7	5.48/4.55
Germany	48,264/41,415	3.4/4.6	36.65/28.49	4.60/3.44
United Kingdom	42,558/44,495	4.1/5.4	41.20/42.01	5.61/5.61
Austria	51,509/44,266	4.9/5.7	20.43/26.25	1.85/2.09
Italy	34,260/30,153	10.6/11.9	44.53/47.5	2.74/3.36
Spain	30,697/25,850	15.3/22.1	36.74/33.85	4.02/2.62
Slovakia	19,582/16,198	6.6/11.5	30.15/33.34	0.12/0
Poland	15,431/12,566	3.8/7.5	36.23/32.99	0.72/0
USA	62,606/57,877	3.9/5.3	49.5/49.9	6.07/4.61
Canada	46,261/43,616	5.8/6.9	39.28/37.46	3.53/2.30
Japan	39,306/34,569	2.4/3.4	13.10/20.24	2.99/0
China	9,608/8,167	3.8/4.1	39.44/41.75	5.11/6.29

Note: Data according to each criterion is provided in comparison of 2018/2015

Source: Compiled by the authors based on the following data:

GDP per capita: <https://knoema.ru/atlas/ranks/ВВП-на-душу-населения>

Unemployment rate: <https://knoema.ru/atlas/ranks/Уровень-безработицы>

Global Terrorism Index: <https://knoema.ru/atlas/topics/Мировые-рейтинги/Мировые-рейтинги/Global-terrorism-index>

Crime Index for Country: https://www.numbeo.com/crime/rankings_by_country.jsp?title=2015 ;
https://www.numbeo.com/crime/rankings_by_country.jsp?title=2018

Therefore, we may conclude that:

- 1) the threat of the migration crisis is exaggerated within the social consciousness as there exists no negative impact of the migrant influx upon the economy of the recipient countries (contrariwise, the unemployment rate significantly decreased throughout all the studied regions), its crime rate and the spread of terrorism;
- 2) countries which employ such approaches to interaction with migrants as formalized assimilation, social disassociation and marginalization, implementation of overly stringent measures of control and other repressive measures suffer the most from the growth of migration flows.

When providing a solution to the problem of labour migration a selective approach is being practiced because the economic benefits from the influx of highly-skilled or low-skilled specialists vary considerably - approximately by 3-4 times in favour of the former. Hence, the majority of recipient countries facilitate the conditions for entry to the country predominantly for highly-skilled specialists, simultaneously imposing restrictions for the others. At the same time, increasing the educational level of workers in developed countries leads to the reduction of the labour activity period of the population, increase in the labour cost and eventual shortage of low-skilled workers. N. Harris points to this trend and deduces the following: the higher the relative share of highly-skilled workers among the population of the country the bigger the percentage of undereducated and low-skilled legal and illegal migrants in the same country.

Considering the abovementioned conceptual provisions, we propose an effective solution of the migration issue, which could become the foundation for the development of corresponding strategies, programs, cooperation agreements both at the regional and international levels.

1. *Active implementation of the flexible solidarity method by the international community.* It is imperative to reinforce the collective constituent of the cooperation between recipient countries in the line of equitable distribution of migration flows. Realities of the globalized world make it impossible to endorse the attitude to migrants based upon separation, fencing off and prohibition of entry justified by concerns for national interests.
2. *Exploring and implementing new forms of migration* that comply with contemporary trends of economic development and allow to decrease the indicators of direct displacement of human flows from one region into another. For example, the circulation of the flows of labour migrants depends on the capital movements within the global economic space which increasingly assumes the attributes of a virtual one with the development of information technologies. This novel, dynamically changing space, does not require relocation of specialists to another country or their interaction with clients and colleagues. Such «electronic migration» became widely adopted due to intensified activities of transnational corporations, consulting companies.
3. *Development and implementation of long-term programmes with appropriate legal framework and enforceability* at the level of national governments and intergovernmental associations,

which would level down social tension, aggression on ethnic and religious grounds and cultural confrontations in their entirety. The groundwork for such programmes should be laid by active promotional and public awareness activities within society on the part of governmental, business, media and public institutions. Formation of the tolerant attitude towards the representatives of other cultures, facilitation of their integration into society while ensuring the right for preservation of their identity are the key objectives of these documents.

Practical implementation of such important objectives stipulates, in particular, the rejection of segregation on the grounds of nationality in the process of establishing study groups in educational institutions of all levels. Similarly, it is important to create culturally diversified work teams at enterprises, in the service sector and other professional sectors, as well as to organize scientific, cultural and educational events where native population and migrants would be able to find a point of contact - values and life priorities common to all nations - and become convinced that with all the existing diversity representatives of different nations all form an indispensable part of a single social organism.

For professionals, whose skills are not in demand on the labour market of the recipient country, it is essential to develop and implement a professional retraining and additional training of migrants on an ongoing basis. This would allow to solve the problem of shortage of labour supply related to particular professional domains in the job market, specifically in the service sector. This would simultaneously decrease the share of unemployed migrants that live on subsidies and may potentially join the ranks of criminals, terrorists and other marginalized groups of society.

5. Conclusions

Approaches to solving the problem of migration adopted in various countries can be generalized within several most common practices that have become established in recipient countries: assimilation of the «aliens» (indirectly or with coercive measures; formally in an expedited manner or progressively with the account for national specificities); fencing off, social imperception, disassociation which eventually leads to the ghettoization of migrants, growing social tension and conflicts; policy of border closure, isolation that could provide only a temporary effect and, in the long run, will give an impetus to deceleration of economic and sociocultural development of the country; integration of migrants into society based upon the ideology of multiculturalism, ethnic and religious tolerance.

It is the last of the above listed approaches that proves to be the most effective and simultaneously the most complex in its realization. For instance, for the United Kingdom, with its long-standing democratic traditions and respect to human rights, tolerance towards migrants is largely common. However, due to growing racist and xenophobic attitudes throughout society (particularly after the race riots broke out in the north of the country in 2001) the situation has gradually changed: migrants are increasingly perceived as a threat to national security. In the popular consciousness, immigrants are associated with drug business, criminal activities and aggression. The fear of the terrorist threat arouses the average citizen's suspicion with regard to foreigners, particularly of Muslim background. Therefore, the complexity of integrating migrants from the so-called «third-world» countries into social, political and cultural life of the country is highly evident at present. At the same time, both government officials and regular citizens understand: hostility, disrespect, fencing off on the part of the recipient society towards migrants is a destructive path which only leads to military conflicts and social upheavals.

To overcome the challenges of migration, which will further become more tangible, it is essential to coordinate actions of international actors, to implement the flexible solidarity approach and to develop multi-level and long-lasting programmes relevant to the «encounter of cultures», which would allow to decimate the existing stereotypes in relation to migrants and to form a tolerant and sympathetic attitude to them on the part of the native population.

References

1. Batalova, J., Fix, M., & Greenberg, M. (2018). *Chilling Effects: The Expected Public Charge Rule and Its Impact on Legal Immigrant Families' Public Benefits Use*. Migration Policy Institute, Washington D.C., United States. Retrieved from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families>
2. Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*, (1th edition). Stanford University.
3. Berg, M. L., & Nowicka, M. (Eds). (2019). *Studying Diversity, Migration and Urban Multiculture: Convivial Tools for Research and Practice*. UCL Press: London, UK. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787354784>

4. Biondo, A. E., Pluchino, A., & Rapisarda, A. (2013). Return migration after brain drain: A simulation approach. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 16(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.2161>
5. Bock, Ph. K. (1970). *Culture Shock: A Reader in Modern Cultural Anthropology*. University Press of America.
6. Del Percio, A. (2016). The governmentality of migration: Intercultural communication and the politics of (dis)placement in Southern Europe. *Language and Communication*, 51, 87-98. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.07.001>
7. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. (2014). Gender and Forced Migration. In: Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., & Sigona, N, (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199652433.013.0010>
8. Dustmann, C., Fasani, F., Frattini, T., Minale, L., & Schönberg, U. (2017). On the Economics and Politics of Refugee Migration. *Economic Policy*, 91(32), 497-550. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eix008>
9. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Snyder, S., & Saunders, J. (2016). Introduction: Articulating Intersections at the Global Crossroads of Religion and Migration. In: Saunders, J and Fiddian-qasmiyeh, E and Snyder, S, (Eds.) *Intersections of religion and migration: Issues at the global crossroad*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York, New York Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10038373>
10. Soledad, S. M. (2019). *The Effects of Immigration Policy on Migration Systems* (Doctoral dissertation thesis). London: University College London. Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10069429>
11. Stuhler, J. (2014). *Essays on Migration and Intergenerational Mobility*. Doctoral thesis. London: University College London. Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1437917>
12. Triandis, H. C. (1996). The Psychological Measurement of Cultural Syndromes. *American Psychologist*, 51(4), 407-415. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.4.407>
13. Halls, C., Dustmann, C., & Frattini, T. (2009). Assessing the fiscal costs and benefits of A8 migration to the UK. *Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration Discussion Papers CDP 18*. Centre for the Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM): London, UK. Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/18263>
14. Hammer, K. (2017). Sociocultural integration and second language proficiency following migration. In: Beacco, J.-C., Krumm, H.-J., Little, D., Thalgot, Ph, (Eds.). *The Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants / L'intégration Linguistique Des Migrants Adultes: Some Lessons from Research / Les Enseignements de la Recherche* (pp. 91-96), (Bilingual edition). Walter de Gruyter. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110477498-012>
15. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966, December 16). *General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>
16. King, A., & Schneider, B. (1991). *The first global revolution: a report by the Council of the Club of Rome*. US: Pantheon Books.
17. Kunz, S. M. (2018). *The «Expatriate»: The Postcolonial Politics of a Migration Category* (Doctoral dissertation thesis). London: University College London. Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10054614>
18. Mestres, D. J. (2012). *Essays on temporary migration* (Doctoral dissertation thesis). London: University College London. Retrieved from <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1338983>
19. White, A. (2016). Polish circular migration and marginality: a livelihood strategy approach. *Studia Migracyjne - Przegląd Polonijny*, 159(1), 153-166. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304588720_Polish_circular_migration_and_marginality_a_livelihood_strategy_approach
20. Wielgoszewska, B. (2018). Onwards and upwards? Migration and social mobility of the UK graduates. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 5(1), 402-411. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2018.1552188>
21. Redclift, V., & Rajina, F. (2017). Rethinking Muslim migration: frameworks, flux and fragmentation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(3), 407-412. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1249494>
22. Vearey, J., Orcutt, M., Gostin, L., Braham, C. A., & Duigan, P. (2019). Building alliances for the global governance of migration and health. *BMJ*, 366, l4143. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4143>

Received 22.08.2019

Received in revised form 12.09.2019

Accepted 17.09.2019

Available online 11.11.2019