

UDK: 314.74(47 Moskva=19)

Prethodno priopćenje

Primljeno: 12. 04. 2006.

Prihvaćeno: 12. 06. 2006.

TAMARA A. GALKINA

*Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences,*

*Moscow*

*ta@dataforce.net*

## **Contemporary Migration and Traditional Diasporas in Russia: The Case of the Armenians in Moscow**

### **SUMMARY**

The disintegration of the USSR caused certain new social and demographic developments in the Russian Federation. Immigration from the former Soviet republics, mainly to Russia's largest cities, is a new phenomenon for Russia. This process led to the formation of new diasporas in Russia and to the development of the traditional ones. This article examines the case of the Armenian diaspora in a great megalopolis, i.e. in Moscow. The Armenian diaspora in Moscow is a very old phenomenon, well integrated into Moscow society and very diversified. New immigrants from the CIS countries are entering Moscow Armenian society, changing its characteristics and increasing its social and cultural variety. Their crucial problem is integration into the host society, without the loss of their identity. These migrants could help in resolving the economic problems of the Republic of Armenia (first of all, of their own families), as well as some demographic problems of the Russian Federation.

**KEY WORDS:** Armenian diaspora, Moscow, immigration, host society, social integration, economic integration, cultural integration

### **New problems after the collapse of the USSR**

The collapse of the USSR caused political instability and an acute economic crisis in the post-Soviet region. As a result of this new situation, certain new social and demographic developments took place, such as the depopulation of Russia and emigration (in particular, the "brain drain") to Western Europe, Israel and the USA. A new phenomenon for Russia is also immigration from the former Soviet republics, mainly to the Russia's largest cities. These problems were significantly moderated by some factors such as the inclusion of post-Soviet countries into the system of international migration and the market-based transformation of their economies.

These new phenomena provide ethnologists and ethnosociologists, economists and politicians, demographers and geographers with material for discussion. Two main themes predominate in research on population movements: 1) the theme of migration, including internal migration, emigration and immigration (Зайончковская, 1999; Рыбаковский, 2005; Юдина, 2004; Мукомель, 2005) and 2) the theme of new diaspora formation (Попков, 2003; Полоскова, 2002). The first theme has emphasized the ethnic component. The second theme concerns both old diasporas and the processes of new diaspora formation. In modern Russia migrant flows are directed to certain large centres of attraction. The centre with the strongest attraction is Moscow, the capital and the largest megalopolis in the country (Вендина, 2005).

To gain an understanding of these new problems it is important to know their history and origins, aspects that were analyzed by many authors (Арутюнян, 2001; Зайончковская, 1999; Тер-Саркисянц, 2005 and others).

The processes in question effect the formation of new diasporas in Russia as well as the development of traditional ones, for example, the Armenian diaspora. Many works of various experts have dealt with all aspects of the Armenian diaspora (Арутюнян, 2001; Тер-Саркисянц, 2005 and many others). The mass media, likewise, have paid much attention to these issues.

In modern literature on this theme, the terms *diaspora* and diaspora formation or *diasporization* are not always with the same meaning. It is not fully justified to label every ethnic group living outside its country a “diaspora”. Some authors (especially journalists) use the term “diaspora” even to denote groups of persons working abroad on contracts, or having a business abroad. Some researchers apply the term “new diaspora” or “modern migration” to groups of migrant workers. It is necessary not only to study new processes and new facts, but also to make terms and definitions precise.

Two processes – migration and the formation of diasporas – are interconnected. Migration flows increase new diasporic groups in the country and stimulate the development as well as the qualitative transformation of old diasporas, i.e. ones that have existed for a long time. This article deals with the problems of development of an old “classical” diaspora in a large city, under new conditions, i.e. the case of the Armenian diaspora in Moscow. The Armenian diaspora has existed for more than 300 years in Russia, mainly in the large cities, for example in Moscow, which has been a traditional centre in regard to attracting migrants.

### **Migration flows within the post-Soviet region**

The sudden and intensive growth of migration flows between the former Soviet republics was provoked, additionally, by ethnic conflicts. One factor in this development was the fact that the borders of the newly emerged states did not coincide with ethnic boundaries. At the time of the 1989 census, over 73 million Soviet citizens, a quarter of the total Soviet population, lived outside “their own” national territories (or belonged to small nationalities, without a national territory of their own). To give just a few examples: 17 percent of all Russians – 25 million in all – lived outside Russia. Another 12 million lived in non-Russian national territories within the Russian republic. A third of the Soviet Armenians lived outside Armenia (Brubaker, 1994: 57).

In the Soviet Union there existed two independent, even incomparable definitions of nationhood: one was territorial-political and the other was personal-ethnocultural. Elements of both models were institutionalized in the Soviet Union. On the one hand, the territory of the state was divided into national polities with a particular national culture (the Soviet Socialist Republics, Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Districts). On the other hand, the population was divided into non-territorial national groups, whose nationality was independent of its place of residence. The tension between territorial and ethnocultural nationhood, and between territorial and extraterritorial national autonomy, was endemic to the Soviet nationality regime (Brubaker, 1994: 60).

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, former internal migration became trans-border migration between Russia and the new independent states, the former Soviet republics. As a result of the disintegration of the USSR and the establishment of new state borders, former internal diasporas were transformed into diasporic groups. In the period 1992–2002 the population of Russia increased by more than 3.5 million people, due to migration from the “new abroad”. The main direction of migrant flows inside the former borders of the Soviet Union was from the new states along Russia’s southern border to the north and north-west, mainly to large cities. Russia received migrants first of all from Moldova, Ukraine, the republics of the Caucasus and (with a big backlog) from Kazakhstan and Central Asia. As to domestic Russian migration to the big cities, there was an active movement from the east and the north of the country to the centre and the south. Thus Moscow, St. Petersburg, and especially the Krasnodar and Stavropol provinces attracted large numbers of migrants from the rest of Russia and from the former Soviet republics, and consequently became centres of social and ethnic tensions.

In the post-Soviet region, two stages of migration development can be distinguished. In the first years after the disintegration of the USSR, migration flows were dominated by refugees from the former Soviet republics. Among them Russians were predominant. However, migration flows from Armenia and Azerbaijan included not only Russians, but also representatives of other nationalities. A significant part of them were Armenians from both republics. Emigration from these two republics was caused by different reasons. The reason for the refugee flow from Armenia was the earthquake of 1988 and the destruction of the cities of Leninakan (Ghiumri), Spitak and others. Armenians, Russians and others left Azerbaijan because of the tragic ethnic tensions (pogroms) in Soumgait and Baku.

In the beginning of the 90’s Russians made up about 2/3 of all refugees from the former Soviet republics. In 2004 only 56.2% were Russians (51.9% in 2003). Today, local nationals predominate among migrants from the Transcaucasian states: 2/3 of the migrants from Armenia are Armenians, 1/3 of the migrants from Azerbaijan are Azerbaijanians and 2/5 of the migrants from Georgia are Georgians, local Azerbaijanians and Ossetians (Мукомель, 2005: 54).

The migration peak was in 1994, and since 1999 migration flows declined, except to several large cities and to certain regions. The migration processes and the migration situation in Russia differed in the 1990’s and the 2000’s. In recent years forced migration flows ceased, immigration to Russia and emigration from Russia declined, but external labour migration flows rose sharply. A new problem has now emerged: at present immigration offsets only 5–7% of the natural decrease of the population of the Russian Federation (Мукомель, 2005: 5).

In Russia today there are only a few centres and regions that attract large inflows of migrants. These are, first of all, Moscow, followed by St. Petersburg, the Tyumen area, the Hanty-Mansi and Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Districts, the Krasnodar and Stavropol provinces, Rostov-on-the-Don and the Belgorod regions. Moscow and the Moscow region receive about 75% of all migrants to Russia (Блинова and Симакин, 2005).

### **The ethnic structure of Moscow’s population**

Moscow, as the capital of a great multiethnic state, was also a multiethnic city practically during all of its history. According to Russian State Statistics, the population of

Moscow, one of the largest cities of the world, includes 10,382,754 people, 96% of whom (10,010,156 person) speak Russian.

In Moscow, according to state statistics, the largest ethnic groups, besides Russians, are the Ukrainians, Tatars, Armenians and Azerbaijanians (Table 1).

Table 1: Ethnic structure of Moscow population, 2002

NN	Nationality	Number of people	% in the population of Moscow	Number of Russian speaking persons	% of Russian speaking persons in each nationality in Moscow
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Russians	8 808 009	84.80	8 745 209	99.3
2.	Ukrainians	253 644	2.40	251 982	99.2
3.	Tatars	166 363	1.60	164 705	99.4
4.	Armenians	124 425	1.20	122 155	98.4
5.	Azerbaijanians	95 563	0.90	92 721	96.9
6.	Jews	79 359	0.80	78 755	99.2
7.	Byelorussians	59 353	0.60	59 061	99.5
8.	Georgians	54 387	0.50	53 410	98.2
9.	Moldavians	36 570	0.40	36 141	98.6
10.	Tadjiks	35 385	0.30	33 866	95.8
11.	Peoples of Northern Caucasus (without Chechens)	30 098	0.30	29 603	98.3
12.	Uzbeks	24 312	0.20	23 593	97.1
13.	the Vietnamese	15 616	0.20	12 110	77.6
14.	Chechens	14 481	0.10	14 002	96.6
15.	the Chinese	12 801	0.10	10 903	85.1
16.	Koreans	8 630	0.10	8 387	97.7
17.	Kazakhs	7 997	0.10	7 902	98.8
18.	Germans	5 271	0.05	5 219	98.1
19.	Poles	4 456	0.04	4 426	99.9
20.	Kirghiz	4 102	0.04	4 016	97.6
21.	Abkhazians	3 687	0.04	3 624	97.3
22.	Arabs	3 679	0.04	3 417	91.9
23.	Turkmens	3 526	0.04	3 414	97.1
24.	Turks	2 358	0.02	1 956	83.3
25.	The persons who have not specified their nationality	30 098	0.30	29 603	98.3

Source: All-Russia population census, 2002

Yet it should be noted that there is no exact statistical information about the number of ethnic groups in Moscow. Today it is very difficult to monitor and estimate immigration. Experts believe that the data of the latest Population census is significantly different from actual fact (Блинова and Симакин, 2005).

Earlier, in the Soviet period, only internal diasporic groups were represented in Moscow. They consisted of representatives of the nationalities of the USSR who lived outside their Soviet republics or autonomies. Now, after the collapse of the USSR and the establishing of new independent states instead of the former Soviet republics, these ethnic groups have become in a real and formal sense diasporas.

Some authors denote such ethnic groups as “diasporas of cataclisme” (Brubaker, quoted by Попков, 2003). R. Brubaker applies this definition to a special type of diaspora, formed as a result of the disintegration of large states. The main feature of such diasporas is the changing of borders without a population movement over the border. A “diaspora of cataclisme” appears instantly, as a result of the sharp change of the state system, against the people’s will.

Yet in our opinion, the term “cataclisme diaspora” has two different meanings:

- 1) Diasporic groups that existed in the country prior to the changing of state borders and represented an internal diaspora, but after the disintegration of the state and appearance of new state borders became formally diasporic. These groups are deeply rooted into the life and culture of the host country.
- 2) New diasporic groups, whose formation in the country was provoked by the new borders and ethnic conflicts in their new states (as was the case after disintegration of the USSR). In an initial period these ethnic groups do not have stable links with the local population, or with local diasporic groups. It would be an error to consider them true diasporas. Yet, later they might be included into diasporas that existed earlier in the country, or else could constitute new diasporic groups.

We can examine these processes in the case of the old Armenian diaspora and the new Armenian migrants in Moscow.

### The origin of Armenian migration to Moscow

The Armenian diaspora in Russia in general has a long history. The first documented record of an Armenian presence in Moscow dates from the year 1390 (Мирзоян, 2002). The Armenians were already numerous in the city during the reign of Peter the Great.

In contrast to the Azerbaijanians and Georgians who emigrated to Russia mainly from their own countries, Armenians come from not only Armenia, but, even more, from Azerbaijan, and also from the Northern Caucasus and from other regions of the Russian Federation (part of this movement involves secondary migration). Many ethnic Armenian migrants to Moscow from other regions of Russia are citizens of the Russian Federation. They have an Armenian ethnic identification, but they are not citizens of Armenia.

Table 2: The Armenian migrants in Moscow by their origin

<i>Geographical origin of migrants</i>	<i>1987</i>	<i>2000</i>
Armenia	44	50
Georgia and Azerbaijan	31	39
Russia and other post-Soviet republics	35	11

Source: Арутюнян, 2001

The Transcaucasian migrant group is the largest. In contrast to the other republics of the Soviet Union, migration from Transcaucasia was on the increase even before the disintegration of the USSR, provoked by the earthquake of 1988 in Armenia, the

tragic events in Sumgait and Baku and the general socio-economic situation. More recent large migration waves, caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union, war in Abkhazia, economic crisis in this region, were directed to the traditional centres of immigration. This, first of all, applies to the Armenian and Georgian diaspora, which have deep roots in Russia, especially in Moscow. The Azerbaijan diaspora was not so large before, and its active formation in Moscow and in other cities during last 15 years is evident.

In the 90's, after the end of the war in Abkhazia (1994), migration from Transcaucasia declined, but soon there was a further increase of migration from Transcaucasia, mainly for social and economic reasons. The emigration of Armenians from Armenia proper sharply increased. The old intelligentsia of Armenia did not leave the native country recently, but rather educated young people, who had financial possibilities, preferred to go to Europe or to the USA.

According to different estimations, during the 90's about 500,000–700,000 Armenians (about 20% of Armenia's population) left their homeland in search of a job in other countries, first of all in Russia, in other CIS countries and in USA (Мукомель, 2005; Погосян, 2005; Полоскова, 2000; Арутюнян, 1999). After the disintegration of the USSR the number of Armenians in their homeland declines catastrophically: from 3.2 million in 1989 to 2.5 million in 2000 (Вендина, 2005).

In recent years a significant new inflow of Armenian migrants to Moscow comes from Georgia, more precisely from the Dzhavaheti area along the Georgian-Armenian border, populated mainly by Armenians. This movement has been provoked by political and social instability in Georgia.

Thus we can see a considerable change in ethno-demographical development in Armenia. The tendency towards an Armenian concentration in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic of the USSR has been replaced by increased emigration from the Republic of Armenia. Moscow has become an important destination for new Armenian migrants, and a significant centre of their concentration. According to some estimations, Armenians in Moscow number over 160,000, or even reach 500,000 (Мирзоян, 2002: 85).

### **Socio-cultural groups of Armenians in Moscow**

Despite the fact that Armenians in Moscow have a common ethnic identity, many research studies break them up into 3–4 different groups: Armenians from Armenia, from the Caucasus, from Central Asia, local Armenians in Moscow, etc. (Попков, 2003: 146; Полоскова, 2002: 148; Арутюнян, 1999: 149). However, the different social and economic status and origin of the Armenian population in Moscow enables us to differentiate them more fully and to distinguish seven different groups:

- 1) Armenians from the Republic of Armenia. They maintain relations with their native country, attach a great importance to knowledge of the Armenian language and traditions. They speak Armenian, and almost all of them speak also Russian.
- 2) Armenians from the Caucasus in general (apart from Armenia). These are migrants from Azerbaijan and Georgia (including Abkhazia). In general they have more of a "Caucasian" identity than an Armenian one. They prefer to speak Russian, but many of them know Armenian language. Among Caucasian Armenians there are two spe-

cific subgroups: Armenians from Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, and Armenians from Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia. The Baku Armenians are particularly specific, since they used to live in a large multinational city. Tbilisi arose historically as a city with a great proportion of the Armenians in its population. The Armenians from Baku practically do not speak Armenian.

- 3) Armenians from Central Asia, i.e. from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and other republics of Central Asia. They have the weakest Armenian identity and identify themselves as citizens of the former USSR. They have an internationalist mentality and speak mainly Russian.
- 4) Armenians from the former republics of the European part of the Soviet Union. They constitute a small proportion of the Armenian migrants. They speak Russian.
- 5) Armenians from the former republics of the USSR, who tried to settle in Armenia, but left it for Russia for various reasons, first of all because they did not speak Armenian.
- 6) Armenians from regions of the Russian Federation, mainly from large cities. This group is the smallest in number. They speak Russian.
- 7) "Native" Armenians who were born in Moscow or lived in Moscow for over 20 years. They are well integrated into Russian life and culture. Their Armenian identity has become more important for them only during the last several years. This group is more closely associated to the indigenous population of the city, than to the Armenian migrants. Many of its members have a dual (or mosaic) identity: ethnic and territorial (Moscow, Russia). Only some of its members speak Armenian, but all of them speak Russian.

These groups differ in many characteristics and have different prospects. There are few contacts between them.

These groups differ from the point of view of language use, depending on the duration of their permanence in Moscow, as follows:

1. Armenians deeply rooted in Moscow society, with several generations that have lived in Moscow (Russian-speaking). About 38% of these Armenian Muscovites speak both Russian and Armenian in equal measure (Арутюнян, 2001).
2. Armenians – immigrants from the 90's, from different places of the former USSR (mainly Russian-speaking).
3. Recent Armenian migrants, mainly from Armenia and Georgia (Djavakhetia, Abkhazia), are different: migrants from Djavakhetia are Armenian-speaking, those from Abkhazia speak Armenian and Russian.

The first group practically is not distinct from the other native inhabitants of Moscow. Many of its members do not speak Armenian, yet keep their national identity and maintain connections with their relatives in Armenia, or in the Southern Russia.

The second group is represented by rather long-time residents, who arrived mainly from Georgia, Azerbaijan and in part from Russia. They also speak Russian. Only a few of them speak Armenian, and they are already rooted into Moscow society.

The third group is represented by newcomers, mainly Armenian-speaking people. They were the reason why Armenian schools became necessary in Moscow in the last years. The Armenian Embassy in Moscow organises Armenian language Sunday

schools for children and adults. In the state education system, there are five Russian-Armenian schools, where children study some subjects in Armenian and the Armenian language (Мирзоян, 2002: 54).

Russian speaking Armenians are more educated in comparison not only to “Armenian speaking” Armenians, but also to Russian Muscovites. Among the first group of Armenians, about 75% have completed a higher education level (among Russian Muscovites about 30%–60% have completed higher education, depending on their age groups) (Вендина, 2005). Armenians that arrived in Moscow recently have a much lower educational level. Such data would indicate a rather high status of the Armenians – long-time residents of Moscow. Recent Armenian-speaking immigrants have a low social and professional status. In general, Armenians are one of the most educated ethnic groups among ethnic minorities in Moscow, and they formerly lived in large big cities.

There are also evident differences in the general cultural orientations of different groups of migrants. New migrants are oriented foremostly to Armenian culture, as opposed to Moscow Armenians, who have been residents of Moscow for a long time or are Moscow-born. Ethnic self-identification is more pronounced among new immigrants, while Armenians resident in Moscow for a long time prefer to identify with a suitable poliethnic social stratum of Moscow society.

In the new ethnic and language environment, new Armenian migrants in Moscow must go through a certain transformation, a certain internationalization of their ethnic identity, which is transformed to a territory identity.

### Professional niches

Armenians who have been long-time residents of Moscow or, especially, Moscow-born Armenians, differ from newly-arrived Armenians, not only in their higher educational level, but also in regard to their professional niches and mentality. There is also a difference between Armenians who settled in Moscow in the 90’s and Armenians who arrived recently.

Almost half of the Russian-speaking and well-educated Armenians are employed in science, education and culture; they are also represented by rather small groups in industry, transport, construction and trade. In contrast, new Armenian migrants are occupied mainly in trade, transport, communication, industry, construction, and, to a lesser degree, in education, science, public health services and culture (Table 3).

Table 3: Occupation distribution of Armenians employed in Moscow in 2000, in %

<i>Groups of Armenians</i>	<i>Industry, construction, transport, communications</i>	<i>Trade, services</i>	<i>Education, science, public health, culture</i>	<i>Whole</i>
Old residents	29.0	27.0	44.0	100.0
New immigrants	34.0	47.0	19.0	100.0

Source: Арутюнян, 2001

Old resident Russian-speaking Armenians are occupied mainly in the public sector. New Armenian-speaking migrants are employed in private companies (50%) or else en-



gaged in individual labour activities (22%). Only 19% of them work in the public sector (Арутюнян, 2001).

New migrants to Moscow start often in simple occupations and in physical jobs. Among new Armenian immigrants there are many construction workers, road workers, taxi-drivers, machine men etc. The restaurant business serves as a common professional niche for all migrants from Transcaucasia.

As immigrants establish themselves in Moscow society, they turn step by step to the profession that they had in their native country (yet they rarely achieve it). Some pass from small to middle scale businesses, and even to large enterprises. Some Armenian civil engineering firms achieve great success and high positions in large enterprises. Armenian firms are engaged also in the restoration of monuments. Among Armenian migrants there are many lawyers, scientists, doctors, owners of art galleries. In general, Armenians are very actively engaged in business.

### **Settling of Armenians in Moscow**

The successful integration of immigrants in the host society depends on the mode of settlement. If immigrants adapt to the new environment more naturally, they will not settle compactly, or create a ghetto. But the choice of a place in which to settle depends, first of all, on flat costs. Thus, new immigrants prefer cheap lodgings and also prefer to settle closer to their friends and relatives. In this way a “ghetto” can be formed step by step. “Ghettoization” in a city is a negative phenomenon, but, unfortunately, this process is already underway in Moscow. The phenomenon of “ghettoization” practically does not apply to Armenians, and at any rate much less than to other diasporas, due to the old Armenian diaspora that has existed in Moscow for centuries, and which is well integrated into the local population, and scattered all over the city. The Armenian settlement pattern in the city depends more on financial, educational and status levels, rather than on nationality and it practically does not differ from the settlement pattern of other Muscovites.

Recently a new tendency has been observed in the settlement pattern of new Armenian immigrants in Moscow: they prefer to settle outside the city, buying flats in the broader Moscow region, where rent is lower and where immigration is not strictly controlled. Furthermore, in the Moscow region the construction industry is developing very rapidly, and it is one of the most important professional niches for Armenians.

### **Social tensions in areas of immigration and perspectives for resolving them**

Immigrants are necessary in order to resolve the acute problem of depopulation in Russia. Migrants offset the natural population decrease. Furthermore, immigrants can serve as an additional reserve of manpower, since most migrants are people of working age. Among them there are many skilled specialists with the university and technical degrees. Yet the local population often reacts negatively to the ideas of certain economists in regard to the reception of more migrants. The reasons involve common phobias: “migrants take the best work, force down the price for work” etc. (Мартынов, 2005).

This discontent is, however, unreasonable. In Russia there are no obvious cultural and civilizational distinctions between the indigenous population and most migrants. Basically they all come from CIS countries, i.e. from the former republics of the Soviet Union, which was formerly one country, with Russian as the language of intercultural relations. We often call these immigrants “illegal”, yet this is not a sufficiently correct definition. They legally enter Russia, mainly from countries that do not have a visa regime with Russia (Armenia, Azerbaijan and others). Such immigration should be labelled, more precisely, as “unregulated”. For the best regulation and organization of migrant inflows, one needs to know what professions are today necessary for Russia.

Immigration should create new opportunities, instead of new problems for a society. The main way of resolving these problems is to increase the immigrants’ educational and cultural levels, and to help them become integrated into the host society, without the loss of their identity. Although the current economic situation appears to be favorable for the process of integration of migrants, mechanisms of social acceptance are malfunctioning, and xenophobia is presently making its mark both on political discourses and on public opinion.

### **The ways of integration**

A very positive fact for the successful integration of Armenians in Moscow society (Russian in its majority) is the creation of new Armenian cultural and business structures. Among them there are not only purely Armenian ones (schools, gymnasias, the Armenian language centre, the Moscow Armenian theatre, the Moscow Armenian chamber choir), but also international or Russian-Armenian structures (*The Russian-Armenian business magazine*, the Russian-Armenian cultural-didactic centre, the Russian-Armenian Friendship Centre). In Moscow some Armenian and Russian-Armenian newspapers are published both in Armenian and in Russian. The latter are read by Russian speaking Armenians, well integrated into the Moscow society.

Today there are several Armenian organizations in Moscow: the All-Russian public organisation – “The Union of Armenians in Russia”, the Regional national-cultural autonomy of Moscow Armenians, the Historical-genealogical Armenian society, the cultural society “Ararat”. In 2005 the regional public society “Artsakh” united migrants from Nagorno-Karabakh (Тер-Саркисянц, 2005). These societies play an important role in the cultural life of the Moscow Armenian Community. In the Russian Federation there are near 100 Armenian public organisations (Мирзоян, 2002: 90).

Members of all social strata in the Moscow Armenian community maintain close contacts with Armenians in other regions of Russia and in other countries (both in the former republics of the USSR and in other countries, especially the USA and France), primarily with their relatives.

Different groups of Armenian migrants have different perspectives in regard to returning to the homelands. Return is more possible for migrants from Armenia and, perhaps, for those from Karabakh, but not for Armenians from Georgia and, especially not for those from Azerbaijan (Корякин, 2006). Return depends on the economic and social situations in the republics concerned.

The main problem, and the most pressing task, is the integration of migrants into the host society and tolerance of this society towards the migrants. It would be best for Russian society to accept the idea of ethnocultural variety as positive and as constructive.

Migration may become a very important means of compensating the natural decrease of the population of the Russian Federation, and it might also become a source of manpower, supporting economic development.

## Conclusion

The role of migration in the development of diasporas is ambiguous and calls for further research. It was examined in this article in regard to the case of the Armenian diaspora in a large megalopolis, i.e. Moscow. The Armenian diaspora in Moscow is a very old phenomenon, well integrated into the Moscow society and very diversified. All socio-cultural strata are present in the Armenian community of Moscow. Moscow Armenians are organized into about 20 public societies and maintain contacts with other communities in different regions and cities of Russia and also abroad. Thus we can see that an actual network of communities exists, and we can speak of a true “classical” diaspora.

Today new processes – brought on by the disintegration of the Soviet Union – are under way. Large numbers of Armenian migrants are entering into the community. They are adding their features and peculiarities to the existing community. In the beginning they were not deeply included into Moscow society – either legally (due to the difficulty of receiving registration documents), culturally or economically. For these reasons, new migrants (today they are mainly labour migrants) have not been considered as a real part of the diasporic group. But gradually migrants are finding better occupations, families are joining them, their children are gaining educations and they are passing into a higher social stratum. They have links with Armenian organizations and more and more connections with the local population. In such cases, they become a part of the diaspora.

Their identity is changing, step-by-step, from purely an Armenian one, to a mixed (mosaic) ethnic and territorial identity; they are beginning to feel like Muscovites. It needs to be noted that Armenians in the diaspora maintain their Armenian identity through several generations, even when they do not speak Armenian.

The processes that have been reviewed are very important for resolving the economic problems of the Republic of Armenia, and also of some problems affecting the Russian Federation. Migration may become a very important means for compensating the natural population decrease of the Russian Federation, and it may also become a source of the manpower, supporting the country’s economic development.

## REFERENCES

- All-Russia Population Census* (2002). Moscow: Federal Service of Statistics [<http://www.perepis2002.ru>].
- АРУТЮНЯН, Юрий (2001). “Армяне в Москве (по результатам сравнительного исследования)”, *Этносоциология*, Москва, no. 11, pp. 13–21.
- БЛИНОВА, Екатерина and СИМАКИН, Дмитрий (2005). “Москва мигрантская”, *Независимая газета*, Москва, no. 246, 08. 11. 2005.

- BRUBAKER, Rogers (1994). "Nationhood and the national question in the Soviet Union and post-Soviet Eurasia: An institutional account", *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 47–78.
- КОРЯКИН, Кирилл (2006). "Проблемы адаптации и интеграции армян-мигрантов в Краснодарском крае", *Этнографическое обозрение*, Москва, no. 1, pp. 62–72.
- МАРТЫНОВ, В. (2005). "Интервью с Отари Аршба: зачем России мигранты?", *Независимая газета*, Москва, no. 138, 08. 07. 2005.
- МИРЗОЯН, Самвел (2002). *Армяне и Москва*. Москва: М. В. Басов.
- МУКОМЕЛЬ, Владимир (2005). *Миграционная политика России. Постсоветские контексты*. Москва: Институт социологии РАН.
- ПОГОСЯН, Геворк (2005). *Современное армянское общество: особенности трансформации*. Москва: Academia.
- ПОЛОСКОВА, Татьяна (2000). "Новые диаспоры в России (внутри- и внешнеполитические аспекты)", in: *Россия и ее соседи: проблемы этнических меньшинств / Проблемно-тематический сборник*. Москва: РАН, ИНИОН, pp. 17–25.
- ПОПКОВ, Вячеслав (2003). *Феномен этнических диаспор*. Москва: Институт социологии РАН.
- РЫБАКОВСКИЙ, Леонид (2005). "Миграционная ситуация в России на стыке XX–XXI веков", available at <<http://chairs.stavsu.ru/geo/conf3.htm>>.
- ТЕР-САРКИСЯНЦ, Алла (2005). *История и культура армянского народа с древнейших времён до начала XIX века*. Москва: Восточная литература РАН.
- ВЕНДИНА, Ольга (2005). *Мигранты в Москве. Грозит ли российской столице этническая сегрегация?* Москва: Центр миграционных исследований.
- ЮДИНА, Татьяна (2004). *Социология миграции*. Москва: Дашков и К°.
- ЗАЙОНЧКОВСКАЯ, Жанна (1999). *Россия: миграция в разном масштабе времени*. Москва: Центр изучения проблем вынужденной миграции в СНГ.

Tamara A. Galkina

## SUVREMENE MIGRACIJE I TRADICIONALNA DIJASPORA U RUSIJI: PRIMJER ARMENACA U MOSKVI

### SAŽETAK

Raspad SSSR-a prouzročio je nov društveni i demografski razvoj u Ruskoj Federaciji. Imigracija iz bivših sovjetskih republika, većinom u najveće ruske gradove, nova je pojava u Rusiji. Taj je proces doveo do stvaranja novih dijaspora u Rusiji te razvoja tradicionalnih. U radu se razmatra primjer armenske dijaspore u megalopolisu, tj. u Moskvi. Armenska dijaspora u Moskvi vrlo je stara, dobro integrirana u moskovsko društvo i jako raznolika. Novi imigranti iz zemalja ZND-a ulaze u moskovsko armensko društvo mijenjajući njegove karakteristike te povećavaju njegovu socijalnu i kulturnu raznolikost. Njihov presudni problem jest kako se integrirati u to društvo bez gubitka svoga identiteta. Ti bi migranti mogli pridonijeti rješavanju gospodarskih problema Republike Armenije (u prvom redu problema vlastitih obitelji), kao i nekih demografskih problema Ruske Federacije.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: armenska dijaspora, Moskva, imigracija, društvo primitka, društvena integracija, ekonomska integracija, kulturna integracija

Tamara A. Galkina

## MIGRATIONS CONTEMPORAINES ET DIASPORA TRADITIONNELLE EN RUSSIE : L'EXEMPLE DES ARMÉNIENS À MOSCOU

### RÉSUMÉ

L'effondrement de l'URSS a provoqué de nouveaux développements social et démographique dans la Fédération de Russie. L'immigration en provenance des anciennes républiques soviétiques, essentiellement dans les plus grandes villes russes, représente un nouveau phénomène pour la Russie. Ce processus a conduit à la formation de nouvelles diasporas en Russie ainsi qu'au développement des diasporas traditionnelles. Le présent article étudie l'exemple de la diaspora arménienne dans la grande métropole qu'est Moscou. La diaspora arménienne de Moscou est très ancienne, bien intégrée dans la société moscovite et très diverse. Les nouveaux émigrants des pays CIS entrent dans la société arménienne moscovite en changeant ses caractéristiques et en accentuant sa diversité sociale et culturelle. Leur problème essentiel est de s'intégrer à la société d'accueil sans perdre leur identité. Ces migrants pourraient aider à résoudre les problèmes économiques de la République d'Arménie (en premier lieu ceux de leurs propres familles) ainsi que certains problèmes démographiques de la Fédération de Russie.

**MOTS CLÉS :** diaspora arménienne, Moscou, immigration, société d'accueil, intégration sociale, intégration économique, intégration culturelle