

Comparative Analysis of Migration Policy of 18–19th Century Kazakhstan and 20–21st Century Italy¹⁸

AIGUL B. TASKUZHINA

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

LEILA A. KHAMZINA

Kazakhstan University of Innovation and Telecommunication Systems, Uralsk, Kazakhstan

AIGUL M. BALZHANOVA

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

TOLKYN A. ERISHEVA

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

OTEGEN I. ISSENOV

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

AINASH B. ANASOVA

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

ZAMZAGUL B. SHAKHAMAN

Kostanay State Pedagogical Institute, Kazakhstan

The article shows that for over a century Kazakhstan has been a region of active migratory movement. Intensification of some migratory processes in most instances was a consequence of a certain state decision. Italy was chosen as the study object in the Mediterranean region, as the country mostly exposed to illegal migration in terms of acceptance of people for residential stay. Research in migration and integration processes in the EU countries as a political, legal and socio-cultural phenomenon has been of great scientific and practical interest. The article

18 The authors are very grateful to Zhanna A. Khamzina and Yermek A. Buribayev for their valuable contribution while preparing the current study. The authors also express their gratitude to the editorial office of the International Journal of Euro-Mediterranean Studies demanding high publication standards but respecting the authors' point of view.



provides a detailed analysis of the legal, historical, and social spheres of the Italian society, and offers to use Kazakhstan's experience in resolving the issue of illegal migration.

Key words: resettlement of the nation, migration trends, use of historical experience, Mediterranean region, historical time perspective, multi-ethnic society

INTRODUCTION

After gaining its Independence, the Republic of Kazakhstan has faced many problems, and the very existence of the young state depended on these problems to be resolved. The history caused that Kazakhstan in the 20th century became a new native land for many thousand immigrants, who in their majority arrived there against their will. After the USSR disintegration, the Republic inherited its polyethnic population structure with all the arising consequences. The inertness of the “migratory” period when mainly European population was arriving to Kazakhstan is still in place nowadays, and will be there for a long time to come. The large-scale immigration niche that was formed in the first half of the 20th century turned after the USSR disintegration into the intensively producing emigration niche. All this would inevitably affect the dynamics of sociopolitical and economic development of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The reasons of many modern problems of multinational Kazakhstan date back to the events of the first decades of the Soviet power. Reconstruction of historic realities can facilitate understanding of ethnic issues and their resolution in the field of ethnic culture development, working out measures to safeguard and protect the rights of the peoples of Kazakhstan. The migratory movement of the European ethnic groups into Kazakhstan and Central Asia was one of the key components of the large-scale processes of Eurasia arid belt development from the north and the northwest.

There are some social problems that are tackled in the article. They are based on some defining factors in the formation of the polyethnic population structure of Northeast and Western Kazakhstan in the 18th – the beginning of the 20th centuries. They are as follows:



1. Dzhungar and Bashkir attacks on Kazakh camping-grounds;
2. Accession of Junior and later Middle and Senior zhuzes to the Russian Empire, and as a result, the colonial policy of the Russian Empire in Kazakhstan;
3. Russia's migration policy to Kazakhstan in the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries.

So, we tackle with the effects of international migration on local societies and work on understanding of the multiple effects of international migration via different types of migration policies and exposing investigated effects on socio-economic responses of local communities and state responses via legislation to address the social responses. The thesis is: The integration of migrants on the basis of the formation of the civic identity, meaning the empowerment of a person, rather than an ethnic group, was successful in Kazakhstan but has so far failed in Italy.

After the end of accession of the Western Siberia, in the end of the 16th century the Russian Empire borders closely adjoined the camping-grounds of the Kazakh khanate in the steppe Irtysh Land. In attempt to reinforce its positions in the region, and to ensure the security of its new eastern frontiers, the tsar government set up a number of military-administrative fortress localities and stockade towns. In the beginning of the 18th century, the government of Peter I decided to seize the upper reach of Irtysh, and the eastward lands behind it with the aim of further colonization of the region.

THEORETICAL OUTLINE ON INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

From the beginning of the 18th century, the tsarism began to carry out its systematic penetration into Kazakhstan as the integral part of its state policy, in two directions: in the Junior zhuz (the western part) and in the Middle zhuz (the northeast part). Owing to the establishment in the 30–70s of the 18th century by the tsar government of a number of defensive strongpoints on the territory from the Caspian Sea to Transbaikal, and strong fortresses from Verkhoyaisk landing stage down the rivers of Uj and Tobol to Tsarev town for strengthening its military presence in the east



of the country, and protection of the colonized territories from attacks of “nomadic, wild hordes” (Alekseev 1995, 144). Strong fortresses were constructed from Verkhoyaitsk landing stage down the rivers of Uj and Tobol to Tsarev town. Small redoubts were erected between the settlements to accommodate guard teams, and as refuges from enemy attacks. The redoubts were fitted with high guard posts, so that the sentries could have a good view of the enemy (Archives of Russian Empire Foreign Policy). Fortresses, outposts and redoubts from Alabuzhinsky to Ozernyi troops were manned by Orenburg Cossacks. The part of this line was called the Orenburg line, the other part was manned by Ural Cossacks (Mukanov 1991, 8). The aforesaid Cossack troops were formed at different times, with their neighbors being: Kazakhs, Nogais, Tatars, Bashkirs. The Cossacks included Kalmyks, Turkmen, Karakalpaks, Germans of Volga region, Uigurs, Dungans, and peoples of Siberia. The Volga and Yaitsk Cossack troops were the first to be formed in the region. Yaitsk Cossacks were natives of the disintegrated Volga Cossack community, and they settled on the river of Yaik (Bekmakhanova 2000, 3–4). The ethnic structure of Yaitsk Cossacks was diverse. It was manned at the expense of fugitive peasants from the central and northern regions of Russia, as well as by people of Turkic and Iranian origins: Nogais, Tatars, Kalmyks, Bashkirs, Karakalpaks, etc. The Cossacks consisted of Bashkirs, Meshcheriaks, Kalmyks, Cossacks, captured Poles and Swedes, as well as of Don, Ural and Zaporozhye Cossacks deported for crimes to Siberia. They consisted of convicts, ‘free’ people, state peasants, etc. (Mikhailovich 1896, 24). According to R. Pierce, S. Zenkovsky, and other Western historians, the construction of towns and fortresses, fortification lines, and even the very Cossack troops located on the territory of Kazakhstan didn’t guarantee the stability of the “Russian supremacy” in the region (Zenkovsky 1960, 68–9; Pierce 1960, 108–38).

The issues and special aspects of a combination of cultures of migrants and the host society have been studied on the basis of the four theories of integration: the concept of assimilation (the “melting pot”), multiculturalism, structuralism and complete assimilation. The most frequent approach is called “multiculturalism”. And feature of its application in Italy and Kazakhstan is its organic origin. If in the countries neighbors there is an attempt integration of migrants, and also representatives of



nonconventional ethnoses into current state of an ethnic picture of the explored countries, then at Italy and Kazakhstan at the considerable prevalence of the title nations there is a larger share of ethnoses which for the economic, social or cultural reasons became citizens of the country (Kosinov 2016). In Italy it will be fair to note and for Kazakhstan – there is a development of these cultures through a prism of identity and loan of elements of cultures to gradual adaptation of citizens to traditions, laws and living conditions. It allows to realize a possibility of application of multicultural approach without excess problems.

The Kazakh and Italian cases actually are two similar approaches to international migration management. A detailed analysis is given in the legal, historical and social spheres of the Italian society and it is suggested to use the experience of Kazakhstan to solve the problem of illegal migration. Modern Europe is focused on the formation of migration policy, which facilitates legal migration, restricts illegal movements of persons, simplifies the rules for the entry of qualified specialists and scientists, the integration of all living migrants in the territories of the EU member states. In practice, this means the EU's desire to create a single legal and integration field for regulating issues of migration and internal affairs, as was envisaged in the creation of the EU.

The main difference in the approaches of these countries here is the integration of migrants on the basis of the formation of civil identity, that is, the granting of rights is a person, and not an ethnic group, which happened in Kazakhstan, but it does not work in Italy. Supporters of multiculturalism believe that the state should support not only the preservation of the identities of immigrants, but also contribute to their development, that is, to support and strengthen the differentiation of society (Veretevsckaya, 2010).

STUDY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC MIGRATION EFFECTS IN 18–19TH CENTURY IN KAZAKHSTAN

In the 17th – the beginning of the 18th centuries, the Irtysh steppe lands, extensive and rich in pastures, and inhabited by Kazakh nomads were subject to frequent devastating attacks by Dzhungar khanate, thus urging the tsar government to temporarily discontinue its offensive movement, and forcing it to pay



attention to the strengthening of its borders. Strengthening of Dzungaria in the 30–40s of the 18th c. prevented Russians lasting settlement, forced them temporarily to refuse offensive movement, and pay attention to strengthening of borders. In 1745 the government made a decision to strengthen the existing fortresses, and to build up additional fortification facilities (outposts, redoubts) in the line stretching by more than 960 km from Omsk to Ust-Kamenogorsk. With the construction of the Irtysh fortresses, Russia took over the portion of the Dzungaria territory (Shuldyakov 2002, 7). With the increasing role of the fortresses, the government began to pay more attention to strengthening of the available armor, and increased recruitment of the Cossacks at the expense of deported persons and POWs. Throughout the 18th century, town Cossacks were temporarily taken to serve at the fortification line. All attempts of the Command to transfer them to regular service at the fortification were futile. The possible reason was the fear of the tsarism to weaken the internal guard garrisons in troubled Siberian towns. For that reason, in 1747 the tsar government initially sent five dragoon regiments to Kolyvansk and New Ishimsk fortification lines (Minenko 1975, 44). Then in 1758, for reinforcement purposes, it sent thousand-men detachments of the Don and Ural Cossacks, and five-hundred-men detachments of Bashkirs and Meshcheriaks, arranging for their annual turnover (Petrov 1965, 208). In 1758, the report was sent to the Government Senate, which informed on sending Meshcheryaks totaling five hundred persons who were a source for strengthening the colonization of the frontier lines (Russian National Military-Historical Archives). The formation of some strong points, such as fortresses, outposts, redoubts, was the beginning of the long process of the Russia's colonization policy in the steppe, the formation of resident population and concentration of agricultural settlements in these places.

The Russian government was interested in the territory of Kazakh camping places most of all from the economic point of view. Orders were given to military troops of Cossacks and administrative persons to learn about the locations of the Kazakh winter and summer camps, to find out whether merchant caravans could safely pass the Kazakh steppe (Kussainuly 2001, 18).



With political processes occurring in the first half of the 19th century, the location geography of Slavic settlements in the territory of Kazakhstan extended considerably, and the first settlements of Russian peasants of the Ural and Siberian Cossacks were set up inside the Kazakh camping areas. The steppe areas of the Western Kazakhstan were most intensively inhabited and cultivated, that was closely connected with building up of the New Iletsk division. The adoption of the Legal Act of April 10, 1822 stimulated the migration of Russian peasants from the European provinces of Russia to various regions of the Northern and Eastern Kazakhstan.

The formation of strong points, fortresses, outposts, and redoubts caused the process of native population settlement. Kazakhs of the Kypshak family – toryaigyrs (altybasses), karabalyks and kuldenens settled first. Their location included the areas of the lower reaches of the Tobol and Uj rivers. The Kypshak tribe Kazakhs of the Dambarsk volost (district) occupied Novolineynyi district, and in the middle of the 19th century, in connection with the building up of Cossack settlements, they moved to the Tobol river area. The Syr-Darya Kazakhs from the Kypshak altybas family joined them and occupied the territory along the lower reaches of the Tobol river, and in Arakaragai pine forest (Tolybekov 1959, 311–312). Kazakhs of the following Argyn families resided in Amankaragai volost: yermens, alimbets, and kyrykmyltyks (Tolybekov 1971, 427). The Kazakhs called “internal Kirghizs” inhabited the territory of Kurgan, Ishim and Omsk areas of the Tobol province. The native population living in the territory of the Omsk region were called “Siberian Kirghizs” (Ermekbayev 1999, 114). The native population called the Siberian Kazakhs were the main residents of the region, and was ruled by the special establishment through the district orders subordinated to the regional management board. The population structure included Kazakhs, Tashkents, Bukhars, Kokands, etc. The demographic situation in the given period was as follows. The Kazakhs reached a total of 370,000 people, Russian population amounted for 18,000 people (Starkov 1860, 96–8), and the number of foreigners amounted for 479 people (Central National Archives of Republic of Kazakhstan).



Along with the native nation, representatives of some other nations inhabited the steppe area. In 1825, Semipalatinsk district was the residence place for 12 people of “Judaic religion”, of which 8 were men and 4 were women. It is very likely to assume that these people were Jews-ashkenazi, and not the Bukhara Jews. In 1825, according to the official report of the governor – general of the Western Siberia, Jews lived along the military fortifications line which separated the internal part of the Omsk region from the so-called external one, where the monad Kazakhs moved. The deported Jews were settled in special localities situated in remote places. Siberia was a permanent place of residence for the Jewish population until 1837. Each Jew had to be attributable to the tax-paying social category: the peasantry or the lower middle class (Volkova 2001, 8–10).

Life realities forced both sides to take steps towards each other. Among merchants there were many natives of the Central Asian territories. Most frequent visitors of East Kazakhstan fortresses were Bukhars. They brought cotton fabrics, skins of wolves, foxes, lambskins, shipskin coats to Siberian fortifications from Dzungaria and Tashkent. In the 40s of the 18th century Kazakhs of the Naiman tribe (a total of 40 persons) of the Middle zhuz visited Jamyshevsk fortress with their goods (horses, furs, lambskins and shipskin coats). In 1747 Asian and Middle Asian merchants delivered goods to Semipalatinsk and Yamyshevsk fortresses in the quantity of 9,749 bales (Kassymbayev 1986, 65–6). Tashkents, Bukhars from Bukhara Minor, as well as Kashgars with their own and Chinese-made goods arrived to Ust-Kamenogorsk and Semipalatinsk fortresses for trading (Slotvsov 1886, 223). There were many facts in the history when Asians (Tashkents and Bukhars) were attributed to Kazakh volosts. The border administration made the decision to expel from external districts all Uzbeks, Bukhars and other Asians who lived in the volosts without any specific purpose. If they wish they could engage in trading in these districts and localities as merchants (National Archives of Omsk oblast of Russian Federation). In the opinion of the infantry general G. Gasfort, the purpose of the government was in admitting Bukhars, Uzbeks not having Russian citizenship to bring their goods within our territory, to allow them to conduct wholesale



trade at exchange yards and bring their goods to Russia (Russian National Historical Archives). In 1850–1851 Asian merchants delivered yuft leather skins, tanning products, knee boots, shoes, mittens to Altay fairs. The merchants brought such food products as tea and sugar for sale by tradesmen from Semipalatinsk and other places. On the way back, merchants purchased at Altay fairs bread, honey, and furs. These commodities were brought by trading people to Ust-Kamenogorsk, Semipalatinsk (Shcheglova 1999, 47). According to the data of 1860, about 280 families of Bukhars, Tashkents, and Kokands totaling 526 men and 539 women not having citizenship of Russia resided in the towns of Ust-Kamenogorsk, Semipalatinsk and Petropavlovsk (Russian National Historical Archives). Many of them chose trading as the main occupation. The government continued to demonstrate its interest in the expansion of the trade and economic relations with the Central Asian khanates by encouraging in every possible way the settling of towns and other localities of Kazakhstan by Bukhars and Uzbek merchants (Kassymbayev 1986, 99).

With the introduction of the “1846 Act” with the purpose of strengthening the Siberian troops, a decision was made to forcibly send the part of Cossacks residing at the fortification line inside the steppes, and to settle nearby up to 5 thousand peasants from Little Russia provinces who wished to move to Siberia, inducting them into the Cossacks. It was the beginning of the formation of Shchuchensk, Koturkul, Zerenda, Aryk-Balyk and other villages. There were a total of 13 settlements settled by immigrants from the European Russia, namely the state peasants (Katanayev 1904, 10). The situation in the agricultural development of the region changed due to the arrival in 1849–1850 of peasants from land-poor Orenburg and Saratov provinces bordering the Siberia. The number of peasants amounted for 3,852 people, later on they were attributed to the Cossack social category (Krassovsky 1868, 387). Among them were descendants of the Kalmyks, Bashkirs and Mordovians. The Cossacks who in their homeland had been used to agriculture, soon accustomed to the new life conditions. The agriculture was most intensively developing in the internal districts inhabited by the Russian population, namely in Petropavlovsk, Omsk and Semipalatinsk



than in external districts of Ayaguz, Bayan-Aul, Karkaralinsk and Kokpekty (Apollova 1976, 185).

The period from 1847 to 1855 in the history of the migration movement was considered as of particular importance because the government provided peasants with the opportunity to migrate, thus resulting in a great flow of migrating peasants. The migration movement contributed to the agricultural development along the fortification lines. The conditions of immigrants were adequately provided with the works and trades. In 1848 the Imperial order was issued on the settlement of 3,600 peasants from land-poor internal provinces, and also of Little Russia Cossacks in the area of the Kokchetav district (Morozov 1900, 84–5). The migrating peasants were given monetary travelling allowances in the amount of seven silver kopecks per person. The arrived immigrants were enrolled into the Siberian maneuver Cossack troops to form the Cossack regiment. From 1849–1851 there was an essential growth in the number of enrolling peasants into the Cossack troops under the government orders. So, a total of 7,500 persons were enrolled into Cossacks troops. Those were the natives of the following provinces: Saratov, Orenburg and Kharkov (Ussov 1879, 74).

In the middle of the 19th century the tsar government carried out re-organization of its administration of Kazakhs and the migration movement. The improvement of the administrative system and the settlement of peasants were necessary for more intense submission of Kazakhs into the Russian empire. This period of time included changes in the demographic situation in the region. The changes were associated to the political and economic colonization of the steppes by the tsar government. According to the 1840 data, the population of the north-eastern Kazakhstan owing to its geopolitical position increased by 31,908 people of both sexes. The given region experienced powerful influence of the migratory flows and caused the peculiar aspects of the demographic situation in Kazakhstan (native population and the Slavs) (National Archives of Omsk oblast of Russian Federation). In Akmolinsk district there were a total of 1,096 male and 325 female Russian residents, in Aman-Karagai district: 459 male and 82 female, in Ayaguz district: 531



male and 114 female, in Bayan-Aul district: 356 male and 131 female, in Karkaralinsk district: 1,025 male and 316 female, in Kokchetav fortification area: 1,112 male and 520 female, in Kokpekty district: 202 male and 182 female Russian residents (Central National Archives of Republic of Kazakhstan). Among Moslems there were representatives of the native population totaling 274,436 persons, 1,189 Tatars, Bashkirs, Uzbeks, Kirghiz, Misharis, and Karakalpaks. The native population prevailed and amounted for 91.8%, while other natives amounted for 8.2 % (Bekmakhanova 1980, 168–71). By the middle of the 19th century the territory of Western Kazakhstan included into the Orenburg Kazakh Region was inhabited by 63,957 persons of non-Kazakh population: Russians, Kalmyks, Bashkirs, Misharis, Tatars, Uzbeks, and Karakalpaks. The overwhelming majority of non-migrating inhabitants of the Western region of Kazakhstan belonged to the Ural Cossack troops. By that time the troops population remained polyethnic by its composition. It included natives of many Turkic and Mongolian people of the Volga region and Southern Ural along with the people of Slavic origin.

These kinds of processes, which involve the integration of diverse ethnicities and cultures, have currently been closely associated with the European Mediterranean. The political and historical issues in the Middle East have caused to the ongoing mass migration, including the illegal migration into the territory of the European Union. The migration route can conditionally be divided into the following three corridors:

Western Mediterranean Corridor: A small portion of refugees reaches Europe, travelling from Morocco and Algeria to Spain. According to the IOM, in 2015 alone, this route was used by 3,845 asylum seekers. In addition, on a regular basis, asylum seekers from Africa are trying to penetrate the Spanish-Moroccan border guarded by the military and representing a 7-meter-high fence.

Central Mediterranean Corridor: A large portion of asylum seekers moving from sub-Saharan Africa (Eritrea, Nigeria and Somali), as well as from Libya, is using the sea route to get to Italy. During 2015 alone, 150,317 asylum seekers landed in Italy. This route path is much more dangerous than the Turkey – Greece route; according to the IOM, in 2015 alone, a total of



2,889 people died using it. Asylum seekers who arrive in Italy are also moving in the direction of Germany and Sweden passing through Austria.

Eastern Mediterranean Corridor: The easiest, cheapest, and safest route to Europe passes through Turkey to Greece. It is the very route used by refugees from Iraq and Syria. There are two ways to get to the destination: by land and by sea. The first way is to take a bus from Istanbul to Greece. This route is chosen by the minority of refugees, because it involves passing through border control points. During the 2015 alone, the Turkey – Greece sea route was used by 801,919 people. Because of the danger of the route, a total of 709 people died during 2015 alone. There is also a number of Syrians coming to Greece by sea from Egypt. Once in Greece, the refugees move through Serbia, Macedonia and Hungary to the north, to reach Germany and Sweden. Due to more rigid border control, refugees are trying to bypass Bulgaria and Romania, which are also on the way (Leto et al. 2016, 789–828).

This process corresponds with the procedures and migration trends, as well as the existence of the multi-ethnic people of Kazakhstan described above.

1. The arriving people do not have a common social platform and long-term living together, as exemplified by Kazakhstan (the former USSR).

2. Religious and ethnic differences are fueled by difference in the standards of living, employment opportunities, assimilation and education and training backgrounds.

STUDY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC MIGRATION EFFECTS IN 20–21ST CENTURY IN ITALY

The host country, which experiences the primary burden, is Italy, since it is genuinely the only G7 member country with the largest contribution to the initial reception of refugees. It is necessary to identify the problems that arise because of the above in Italy as a development driver of the Mediterranean region.

The cooperation of Italy and other Member States of the European Community in the field of justice and internal affairs



began with the conclusion of the Convention of Naples on cooperation and mutual assistance between local authorities (1957), which laid the foundation for the exchange of information and experience in this field. Since 1975, cross-border cooperation began to develop outside the legal framework laid down by the European Union, particularly in matters relating to immigration and granting asylum. At that time informal conditionalities existed in the exchange of best practices, information, expertise, and ways of development of such relations between the Member States were established. With the same purpose, working groups were established, in particular, the TREVI Group, consisting of the Ministers of the relevant agencies of the Member States. The main issues of this Group were primarily the internal security and anti-terrorism activities, as well as problems of illegal immigration and organized crime.

The Italian immigration laws have passed a long way of development, depending on the pro-governmental policies of the respective parties, and the parliamentary majority of, in turns, lefts- and center-rights. Accordingly, the policy towards migrants and the development of the appropriate legislation was formed based on the liberal attitude towards illegal migrants, their integration into the Italian society, or based on radically opposite positions, and transfer to a more rigid model in the regulation of migration flows (Chu 2016, 403–21).

The dynamic development of the Italian economy in the 80–90s of the 20th century, and the increased demand for foreign labor force have gradually made Italy attractive for the “economic” immigration. For instance, K. Leto (2016) classified the immigrant worker as a hard-working, a person that costs the employers/scientists much less than the Italian counterpart, and does not compete in the political scene. The researcher raises the question of resolving the problems of immigrants, and proposes not to resort to the traditional tightening of security measures, but rather seek to integrate them into the Italian society.

Furthermore, during the 80s of the 20th century a number of laws relating to migration were adopted. For instance, on the basis of the international legal instruments, the Italian Law No. 948/1986 (the Fosco Act) was enacted with the aim to



implement the principles of the Convention No. 142/1975 ILO UN on the protection of immigrants in the employment market, and on the fight against human trafficking. This Law regulated the conditions of employment of foreign citizens in Italy, as well as represented equal access opportunities to labor and services markets, and raised the issue of family reunification.

Migration flows between the countries of North Africa and Italy represent a particular intensity. This is due to the geographical proximity of these regions, as well as the close economic, political and cultural ties, which were formed back in the colonial period, and strengthened in the framework of the Barcelona Process. For this reason, starting from the early 90s, Italian researchers have begun to call their country a „black door“ of Europe.

This prompted the Italian Government to urgently adopt the appropriate immigration law on February 28, 1990, known as the Martelli law (Col. Martelli was then the vice-president of the Italian Council of Ministers). According to this law, the entry and stay of foreigners in Italy was regulated by the permission issued by the police or the public security commissioner of the respective territory. In addition, the law legalized immigrants and provided for control and deportation of illegal immigrants, introduced immigration quotas, imprisonment and fines for illegal immigration. However, the aforesaid law could not have significant impact on the scale of migratory flows into Italy. Immigration showed steady growth at the expense of refugees from North Africa, the Balkan countries, and the countries of South-East Asia. The Italian Government was again forced to seek a way out of the critical situation prevailing in the country due to the rapid growth in the number of immigrants (Akay et al. 2017, 265–306).

At the national level, Italy continued to improve its national migration legislation. So, the Minister for Social Policy of Italy issued an order of September 08, 1993 on the establishment of an appropriate commission headed by F. Contre, who presented the draft law on the legal status of foreigners. In 1994, before the end of powers of the legislature, the commission had completed its activities, and sent to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers the draft of this law based on the principles of similar laws in the EU countries.



The entry of Italy in 1997 into the Schengen zone, the struggle between center-right and the center-left parties further intensified the development of the new legislation, which provides for the further steps of integration of immigrants into the Italian society. For this purpose, at the end of the 1990s the National Commission for the integration policy of immigrants was established on the initiative of Mr. Prodi, which was headed by J. Cincone, Professor of the University of Turin. Over the period of her chairmanship, the Commission issued two reports, which served as a contribution to the understanding of the Italian immigration context, by forming the basis of the Italian model of integration, and taking into account the experience of other countries and the Italian specifics. It was based on the priorities of recognition the values and rights of migrants, the expansion of cultural exchange between immigrants and Italian citizens. The Commission determined this specific migration model called the „smart integration model“, which was based on the two main interrelated principles: the recognition of the human integrity, and the low level of conflicts during the person’s integration into the Italian society, or seeking positive interaction with the Italian population. The „smart integration“ is based on the recognition of cultural pluralism, the rejection of assimilation and inter-cultural approach, facilitating the exchange between immigrants and the Italian society.

This model became the basis for the continued formation of political and legal integration platform for migrants in Italy, the implementation of which was the adoption of the new law of Turco-Napolitano (Law No. 40 1998) on the regulation of immigration and the status of foreigners, which included the planning of immigration using the annual quotas system, and the right to stay of migrants in the territory of Italy of up to five years (Hwang 2016, 941– 59).

European analysts pointed out that the Turco-Napolitano law was adopted by Italy only following the pressure from other EU Member States with the requirement to tighten its cross-border cooperation and control the flows of illegal migrants. EU expected from Italy the definition of its national policy on immigration within the EU framework requirements, which would provide



for the consistent steps on the issues of monitoring the legal and illegal migration flows. (Brown and Zimmermann 2017, 11–27). In general, trends in the EU migration „containment policy“ provided for the decrease in the flow of immigrants, the requirements for their legal border crossing and, thus, control of the immigration „milestones“. The Turco-Napolitano law to some extent was consistent with the provisions of the European Commission’s proposals, particularly, as regards to the labor immigrants, students and families of non-residents in the EU. In the future, these provisions were included in the Amsterdam Treaty, and became the EU legal framework on the issues of asylum granting and immigration.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Thus, summarizing all above-mentioned information, we can state that migration processes plays a significant role in the development of EU Member States. The development of migration is essential for the quantitative and qualitative economic growth of the countries.

Italy tried to implement the basic EU initiatives on immigration issues into its national legislation through a number of laws (the Bossi-Fini, the Security Package, etc.). However, the contradictions that emerged in relation to the Italian government circles towards migration processes complicated the mechanism of their implementation. On the one hand, there was a firm belief in the fact that the free movement of capital, goods and people were an asset for the further development of the national economy. On the other hand, immigration from third world countries was considered a threat to the national security of Italy.

A specific aspect of the Italian migration processes is their multi-ethnic nature. Thanks to the close economic, political and cultural relations, Italy remains the regional immigration leader in the Mediterranean. In addition, high intensity migration flows have been observed from the Balkans and the Eastern Partnership countries.

Challenges imposed by the modern-day immigration processes in Italy suggest that neither the host country, nor the



immigrants turned out to be unprepared to address the related migration issues. However, at the same time it has to be acknowledged that immigrants have made a significant contribution to the development of public welfare, by filling the jobs that were not in demand by the national citizens.

CONCLUSION

In virtue of its geopolitical position, Kazakhstan has experienced a powerful impact of migratory flows, primarily from Russia, which greatly influenced the course of ethno-demographic processes and caused the peculiar specifics of the demographic situation in the country. Military Cossack and peasant colonization in the XVIII – XIX centuries, the mass migration from the Russian provinces of the Slavic and other peoples contributed to the formation of a multi-ethnic composition of the population of Kazakhstan, affecting its qualitative characteristics, in particular, the economic structure and the social life.

Among the European countries, despite the high degree of integration within the EU, there is no consensus with regard to the integration of immigrants. Decisions during the formation of the United States and France in the 80s of the 20th century, the assimilation concept were based on the denial on the part of the migrant of its own identity in favor of the identity of the host society. It acquired no relevance during the study period in Italy.

For the multicultural policy, the important issue is the mixture of cultures, which does not lead to their dissolving in the dominant culture. The main feature here is the integration of migrants on the basis of the formation of the civic identity, that is, the empowerment of a person, rather than an ethnic group, which was the fact in Kazakhstan, but so far has failed in Italy. Proponents of multiculturalism believe that the state should support not only the preservation of identity of immigrants, but also contribute to their development, that is, maintain and enhance the differentiation of the society. However, multiculturalism has transformed into its opposite existence of closed communities within the same country.



REFERENCES

- Akay, A., Constant, A., Giulietti, C., Guzi, M. 2017. ‚Ethnic diversity and well-being.‘ *Journal of Population Economics* 30 (1): 265–306.
- Alekseev, V. V., ed. 1995. *History of the Cossacks of Asiatic Russia*. Ekaterinburg: Ur ORAN.
- Apollova, N. 1976. *Economic Development of Priirtyshye in the end of the 16th – the first half of the 19th century*. Moscow: “Nauka”.
- Archives of Russian Empire Foreign Policy. C.130. R.130\2. F.1. L.56.
- Bekmakhanova, N. 1980. *Formation of the Multinational Population of Kazakhstan and Northern Kirghizia: last quarter of the 18th – the 60s of the 19th century*. Moscow: “Nauka”.
- Bekmakhanova, N.E., ed. 2000. *Cossack Troops of Asiatic Russia in the eighteenth century – beginning of the twentieth century: Astrakhan, Orenburg, Siberian, Semirechensk*. Moscow: “Nauka”.
- Brown, A. J. G., Zimmermann, K. F. 2017. ‚Three Decades of Publishing Research in Population Economics.‘ *Journal of Population Economics* 30 (1), 11–27.
- Central National Archives of Republic of Kazakhstan. C.338. R.1. F.389. L.5.
- Central National Archives of Republic of Kazakhstan. C.374. R.1. F.1468. L.2rev.–3
- Chu, J. Y. 2016. ‚Boxed in: Human Cargo and the Technics of Comfort.‘ *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 29 (4), 403–421.
- Ermekbayev, Zh. 1999. *Russian Kazakhs as a Part of RSFSR and the USSR in 1917–1991*. Omsk: OSPU Publishing House.
- Hasanov, E. L. 2016. ‚Innovative basis of research of technologic features of some craftsmanship traditions of Ganja (On the sample of carpets of XIX century).‘ *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education* 11 (14), 6704–6714.
- Hwang, J. 2016. ‚The Second Shift: Assimilation in Housework Time among Immigrants.‘ *Review of Economics of the Household* 14 (4), 941–959.
- Kapitonov, I. A., Shulus, A. A., Simonova, M. V., Sviredenko, D. A., Shreyner, R.T. 2016. ‚Green Energy Revolution Perspectives in Modern Russian Economy.‘ *International Journal of Economic Perspectives* 3 (10): 166–175.
- Kassymbayev, Zh. K. 1986. *Under Reliable Protection of Russia*. Almaty: Gylym.
- Katanayev, G. 1904. *Kirghiz Matter in the Siberian Cossack Army*. Omsk: Science.



- Khamzin, A., Khamzina, Z., Buribayev, Y., Tileubergenov, Y., Ibraimov, D., Yermekov, A. 2016. 'International Legal Aspects of Exercising Refugees' Rights in Central Asia.' *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics* 7 (4): 835–841.
- Kosinov S. 2016. 'Areas of Social Control: State-Legal Aspect.' *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine* 4 (87): 56–65.
- Krassovsky, M. 1868. *Materials for Geography and Statistics of Russia Collected by General-Staff Officers: Siberian Kirghiz Area*. Saint Petersburg: Transhel Publishing House.
- Kussainuly, K. 2001. *Reading Documents on Kazakh-Russian Relations in 18th–19th centuries*. Almaty: Kazakhstan.
- Leto, K., Arancillo, M., Becker, E.B.E., Buffo, A., Chiang, C., Ding, B., Hawkes, R. 2016. 'Consensus Paper: Cerebellar Development.' *The Cerebellum* 15 (6): 789–828.
- Mikhailovich, A. 1896. 'Russian Colonization of the Altai Mountain Region.' *Tobolsk Provincial Gazette* 37: 24.
- Minenko, N. A. 1975. *Northwest Siberia in XVIII – first half of XIX centuries: Historical and Ethnographic Essay*. Novosibirsk: Science.
- Morozov, A., ed. 1900. *Colonization of Siberia in Connection with General Migration Matter: Edition by Committee of Ministers Office*. Saint Petersburg: Governmental Press.
- Mukanov, M.S. 1991. *Ethnic Territory of Kazakhs in the 18th – beginning of the 20th centuries*. Almaty: Kazakhstan.
- National Archives of Omsk oblast of Russian Federation. C.3. R.2, F.1902. L.20–20rev.
- National Archives of Omsk oblast of Russian Federation. C.3. R.2, F.1995. L.519.
- Petrov, V. I. 1965. 'On the Issue of the Social Origin of the Siberian Cossacks (the 18th – first half of the 19th centuries).' In *Siberia of Feudalism Period*, ed. V.I. Petrov, 210–211. Novosibirsk: Science.
- Pierce, R. A. 1960. *Russian Central Asia, 1857–1917*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Russian National Historical Archives. C.1265. R.9. F.37. L.2.
- Russian National Historical Archives. C.1265. R.9. F.37. L.4.
- Russian National Military-Historical Archives. C.248. R.113. F.1439. L.13.
- Shcheglova, T. 1999. 'Role of Fairs in the Development of Trans-Asiatic Trade in the 19th century: Western Siberia–Steppe Area.' In *Russia, Siberia and Central Asia: Interaction of People and Cultures, Proceedings of II Regional Conference on 26 October, 1999*. Barnaul, Russian Federation.

- Shimanskaya, I. Yu. 2015. ‚Problems of public participation in the preservation of objects of cultural and historical heritage.‘ *Materials of the Afanasiev Readings* 1 (13): 246–250.
- Shuldyakov, V. 2002. ‚Omsk or Omby? Was there Russian intrusion into Kazakhstan in the 18th century?‘ *Third Capital* 23: 7.
- Slovtsov, P. 1886. *Historical Review of Siberia*. Saint Petersburg: IN Skorokhodov Publishing House.
- Starkov, V. 1860. *Short Review of Kirghiz Steppe in Geographical, Historical and Statistical aspects*. Tobolsk: Tobolsk Provincial Publishing House.
- Sulyagina, J. O. 2016. ‚Methodological approaches to the analysis of global processes of labor migration.‘ *Materials of the Afanasiev Readings* 2 (15): 185–189.
- Taskuzhina, A. B., Balzhanova, A. M., Erisheva, T.A., Issenov, O. I., Anasova, A. B., Shakhman, Z. B. 2016. ‚Polyethnic Population Structure of Northeast and West Kazakhstan in the Eighteenth Century to the 1860s.‘ *Anthropology & Archeology of Eurasia* 55 (2): 153–164.
- Tolybekov, S. 1959. *Social-Economic System of Kazakhs in the 17th – 19th centuries*. Almaty: Kazakhstan.
- Tolybekov, S. 1971. *Nomadic Society of Kazakhs in the 18th – the beginning of the 20th century: Political-Economical Analysis*. Almaty: Kazakhstan.
- Ussov, F. 1879. *Statistical Description of the Siberian Cossack Army*. Saint Petersburg: Central Administrative Board of Irregular Armies Edition.
- Veretevskaya, A.B. 2010. Value and importance of multiculturalism. Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences. *Political Science* 1: 29–45.
- Volkova, T.P. 2001. ‚Features of the Jewish Diaspora Formation in Kazakhstan.‘ In *Glimpses of History of Jews in Kazakhstan in the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries*, 7–24. Almaty: Mitsva.
- Zadihailo, D. 2013. ‚Economic policy in the state of legal and legislative support.‘ *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine* 3 (74): 214–221.
- Zenkovsky, S. A. 1960. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

