

PAIN EMIL

CULTURAL DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT IN THE CITIES: NEW PARADIGM FOR ETHNOPOLITICAL REGULATION IN RUSSIA

DOI: 10.22394/2070-8378-2016-18-6-66-73

Modern Russia faces the need to update theoretical paradigms in different areas of public administration, including regulation of ethno-political relations (ethnic, religious, federal, etc.). The paradigm of “national policy”, which in the USSR and post-Soviet Russia for a long time has been the only theoretical basis for such management, today requires corrections and additions based on the new political realities and contemporary theoretical views. Thus, in this project we proceed from the assumption that the ethno-political situation in Russia at the beginning of the XXI century has changed significantly compared to the 1990s, while the methodology of regulation of these processes and the formation of national policy lags behind these changes.

New Paradigm to Reflect the New Trends

In the 1990s, the main problems of interethnic relations in Russia linked to the mobilization of ethnic groups, the so-called “titular nationalities” in the Russian Federation republics, flowed through a process known as the “parade of sovereignties”. In the first fifteenth of the XXI century, the sharpness of “vertical” conflicts over sovereignty between the republics and the federal center has weakened, and “horizontal” conflicts between groups in the cities began to show noticeable, primarily due to the unprecedented influx of migrants [Pain, 2013]. Therefore, geographic and substantial characteristics of ethno-political problems have changed: *the contradictions often referred to as inter-ethnic or inter-religious conflicts of interest of migrants and the host community in the cities and agglomerations come to the fore*. However, the understanding the specifics of these “urban”,

“horizontal” conflicts so as the development of new approaches to solving them keep lagging behind modern challenges. The presented research project aims at a comprehensive analysis of the problem.

In the 2000s, ethno-political and ethno-cultural situation in Russia has become in a greater extent than in the 1990s, similar to the problems of the global North countries. All the countries of this type are characterized by a predominance of urban population and the general problem of interconnection between traditional and modern cultures. All of them, including modern Russia, have faced the need to ensure peaceful coexistence and efficient cooperation of people (not only migrants, but also long-standing inhabitants) with different ethnic and cultural identity, living in accordance with their own normative guidelines. Cities, besides a place of population concentration, become the main drivers of the modern state and society in almost all their facets [Zubarevich 2010. P. 5-10]. However, the development of a national policy strategy is carried out only within the framework of the whole country and regions. As for cities, including the largest ones, they are still out of sight of the strategic development in national policies with the exception federal sub sovereign cities: Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Besides national policy strategic planning system, adjustments are required in national strategy implementation system. An example is one of the most important tasks set by the State national policy strategy up to 2025: development of a civil consciousness. In our opinion, this task is interpreted too narrowly by government officials, members of the Federal Agency for Nationalities (FADN), deputies, publicists, and a significant part of the experts

УПРАВЛЕНИЕ КУЛЬТУРНЫМ РАЗНООБРАЗИЕМ В ГОРОДАХ: НОВАЯ ПАРАДИГМА В РЕГУЛИРОВАНИИ ЭТНОПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ В РОССИИ

ЭМИЛЬ ПАИН, доктор политических наук, профессор Научно-исследовательского Университета – Высшая школа экономики (НИУ ВШЭ), главный научный сотрудник Института государственной службы и управления Российской академии народного хозяйства и государственной службы (РАНХиГС) при Президенте Российской Федерации, руководитель проекта по гранту РНФ (119571, Москва, проспект Вернадского, 84). E-mail: painea@mail.ru

Аннотация. В статье излагаются основные концептуальные положения научного проекта по гранту РНФ «Новые подходы и методы регулирования этнополитических отношений на территории крупнейших городских агломераций России». В ней обосновывается как необходимость корректировки национальной политики, так и новая парадигма такой политики – «управление культурным разнообразием», обладающая целым рядом преимуществ в сравнении с традиционной.

Ключевые слова: национальная политика, этнополитические отношения, гражданское участие, городские агломерации, управление культурным разнообразием.

Статья подготовлена в рамках научной работы по гранту Российского научного фонда (РНФ) №15-18-00064.

in the field of national policy, who mainly reduce this task to social engineering performed by the government and with the use of state-controlled information and cultural resources, including education, art, and mass media¹. However, the approval of civic identity and civic engagement demands not only to include of this topic in education and mass media broadcast system, but also to elaborate a real self-regulation practices, new forms of people's participation in public life. Such changes, in turn, depend on the development of civil participation legal basis, as well as on administrative practice of the authorities, including urban authorities.

As part of our project, the main types of city government strategies for Russia in prevention and resolution of conflicts are examined through the examples of Moscow, Ufa, Rostov, and Perm agglomerations. The most common types can be formulated within the framework of cultural diversity management concept (cultural diversity management), as follows:

Cultural Diversity Restrictive Policy, primarily through the adoption of restrictive rules in relation to the migration processes;

Cultural Diversity Augmentation Policy, in order to prevent the formation of closed mono-ethnic or monoconfessional newcomers communities;

Cultural Uncertainty Restrictive Policy within the "traditionalisation of culture", id est engaging religious figures, ethnic leaders, elders, etc. in conflict management;

Policy of Cultural Dominance at the expense of a return to the Soviet practice of some work in urban communities with the help of, for example, early socialization of children through sports, clubs, supervised youth organizations, etc.

Our researches will allow assess, besides particular strategies efficiency, the basic principles of conflict situations regulation – command or communicative, as well as to evaluate the different types of actions of civil society institutions in cities and metropolitan areas in connection with the said issues.

The first results of this research in focus groups held in Ufa, as well as expert interviews in Ufa and Rostov-on-Don show that there is a practice of self-regulation in major cities, which actually prevents a significant portion of the conflicts, but remains completely ignored in the national policy documents. That is why our research team aims to study urban agglomerations not only as objects, but also as subjects of ethno-political and ethno-cultural process management.

Another important change in the scheme of things, still unreflected neither in mass consciousness, nor in the practice of management, but that has already found its way in scientific studies, is that propensity towards conflict in modern cities rather than anywhere else *cannot be clearly defined as inter-ethnic, inter-religious or as*

a clash of migrants and the host population. These signs of conflict are only the "tip of the iceberg" that obscures a range of hidden, diffused and unformed social and political discontents appearing in different forms: in clashes with migrants (Kondopoga, 2006, and others), manifestations under nationalist slogans (Moscow, Manege Square, 2010), political demonstrations (Moscow and St. Petersburg, 2011-2012). Arising in social turbulence yet unclear, the outbreaks of xenophobia and negative urban consolidation lead to rapid changes in the image of enemy, which may act then as ethnic, religious, or political "alien". Thus, sociologist Lev Gudkov notes that today in Russia "a set of social resentment is growing, but it does not become socially colored and takes the form of national resentment, feelings of oppression by others, ethnically foreign, domestic opponents and enemies" [Gudkov, 2002]. The uncertainty of this diagnosis leads to difficulties in the development of state policy of regulation of the ethno-political and ethno-cultural processes, the content of which is not sufficiently clear.

Take the example of a fundamental document in the field of Russian national policy - Strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation for the period until 2025. This document meets the concept of "Russian nation" as a political category, but more often the words that contain the root "nation" ("multinational" and "international relations"), are used as synonyms for "multi-ethnicity" and "ethnic relations" (section II, in particular p. 9 of the Strategy). From the context, it is clear that the terms "nation" and "ethnic group", "nationality" and "people" mean to the authors of the document about the same thing. The entire document focuses on solving purely ethnic problems, though in practice they are mainly inseparable from the other ones – religious and migration, political and socio-economic problems.

Approximately so were the concepts of national issues and inter-ethnic relations in many Western countries as early as in 1950s, but since then these concepts have changed, and with them have changed the research priorities. With a certain degree of simplification and generalization it is possible to distinguish several stages of development of this research area that preceded the emergence of the paradigm of Cultural Diversity Management (CDM).

1960s – 1970s. These years has shown a considerable increase of researchers' and politic person's interest to the joint analysis of the problems of culture and political strategies. Thus, the concept of multiculturalism originated in Canada, in October 1971 has become the official ideology of Canadian public policy, held under the slogan "One nation, two languages, many peoples and cultures". Then, this ethno-political theory began to spread rapidly around the world [Pain, 2011]: the first fundamental works mentioning the term of cultural diversity have appeared, including in relation to the urban environment; moreover, they have denoted a bond of these problems with various aspects of the state, regional and local (urban) policy [Ward, 1982; Van Dyke, 1985].

1980s – 1990s. Center of gravity has moved to the research scope of migration issues, issues of integration

1 Litavrin M. Spiritual bounds: whether there'll be 'lessons of patriotism' in Russian universities // Open Russia, 30.10.2016 // <https://openrussia.org/post/view/19178/> (last accessed 14.11.2016).

of urban communities and issues of citizenship. It has defined the revision of the interpretation of many concepts, and, primarily, of the key term “ethnic minority”, as applied to urban realities. At this particular time, academics and legal practitioners have begun to formulate the main features of the state and municipal policy: cultural diversity management, which implies in particular, the extension of civil self-organization. Initially, all these trends have manifested only within the boundaries of the theory of multiculturalism [Taylor, 1994; Kymlicka, 1995].

Beginning of the 2000s. The paradigm of Cultural Diversity Management started to change with the criticism of multiculturalism as a concept as hindering the integration of ethnic migrants in the cities and exacerbating the issue of monocultural enclaves emergence and expansion. In expert circles substantiated alternative ethno-political ideas, for example, the *concept of interculturalism*. It has also originated in Canada, which came to in the 1970's and which has revealed its shortcomings earlier than in other countries [Bouchard, 2011]. Finally, in 2004 was published the famous UN report on Human Development, by which Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen and his co-authors has called on United Nations governments and public, noting that “managing cultural diversity is one of the central challenges of the time”².

Changes in priorities in Russian studies of ethno-political problems mainly repeat similar changes in the world, albeit with some delay. Until now, the issues of inter-ethnic, inter-cultural and inter-ethnic relations have been studied in Russian science mainly in the framework of sociological and anthropological approaches. The political component of intercultural relations has been studied much worse, and the least studied is such angle of this scientific area as the role of political institutions and the various types of relations between the authorities and society in the regulation of ethno-political problems in the cities. This causes a particular practical and scientific relevance of our project that is *aimed at improving the methodological foundations of national policy through the expansion of its subject areas, at better understanding of the socio-political causes of negative mobilization in urban areas, and at the analysis of national policy connection with state and municipal government and civil participation.*

The novelty of our project consists, first of all, in the proposed extension of the subject of strategic planning of the national policy *due to inclusion of the problems of cities and urban agglomerations.*

This in turn entails the need for certain changes in methodology.

First, the targets of national policy settings need to be clarified, because the idea of a civil society, proposed for the whole country, is not realizable on the level of any specific city. In addition, the city and especially the largest metropolitan area has always been a high level of so-

cial, cultural, ideological diversity and the large number of groups. Possibility of a peaceful coexistence of these diverse communities has always been determined not so much by the unity of value characteristics as by the *system of checks and balances*. Therefore, our team sets the problem of analysis of social mechanisms, balancing and compensating intercultural conflicts, and investigates the *factors that make cultural diversity a source of conflict in the maintenance of stability*. For example, three people in Ufa (Bashkortostan, Russian and Tatar) have formed such a system historically.

Second, we are talking about the addition of a new paradigm of Cultural Diversity Management to the national policy paradigm that is not limited to ethnic (national) and provides for the consideration a set of ethnic, religious, locally-cultural and socio-cultural phenomena, and can therefore act as a unified framework for a set of interrelated “sectoral” policies – ethnic, religious, migration, cultural, educational and other. This addition is especially important now, when religious extremism (such as jihadism) acts as the greatest threats. In addition, the Cultural Diversity Management concept implies, more than actually, the combination of “vertical” administrative and “horizontal” society-centric forms of governance.

Third, it is necessary to revise the basic theoretical postulate of national policies that implicitly repeats the previously adopted in the USSR idea of “catch-up modernization” (“catch up and overtake”) and ranks cultures according to the degree they reach certain standards (civil solidarity). Substitutionally, we suggest focusing on the concept of “multiple modernities” that allows a much greater flexibility in the assessment of cultural processes management and that infers to find local, specific assets of modernization. In particular, the adopted in national policy orientation on the formation of a civic nation should be supplemented with concern to fully use the existing traditional forms of intercommunication of the population in the cities.

Fourth, we believe that it is important to change the traditional ethno-political science research methods and shift the focus of research to analyse the causes of “occurrence” of ethno-political conflicts in the cause of their “non-occurrence” under the influence of proactive management of public or self-regulation. This approach has largely determined the selection of the subject of our research. In the most urbanized regions of Russia we selected a relatively less conflictive city: in the Volga region – Ufa as opposed to Kazan; in the Urals – Perm as opposed to Yekaterinburg; in the South – Rostov-on-Don, where the post-Soviet years, there are fewer conflicts than in Stavropol, Volgograd, Voronezh, and Krasnodar.

Theoretical Basis of the New Paradigm

The theoretical foundation of the considered research supports the theory of «multiple modernities”, which can serve as a basis for the integration of private theories and concepts of National Development [Eisenstadt, 2003]. To some extent, this approach is a philosophical expression of the ancient postulate “unity in diversity”. This theoretical approach considers the universal human

2 Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World, P. 1// <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2004-russian>.

development as an important direction of the main line and, at the same time, leaves a lot of space for variety in the manifestation of cultural differences, seeing in them not only the legacy of the past, but also a permanent factor of modernity.

Urbanization itself is a universal process, affected all the inhabited continents of the world, and the largest city and metropolitan area to the greatest extent reflect these universal trends. But at the same time, these processes are not the same in different political systems and different cultural and civilizational communities. Thus, in Russia the ethno-political process management involves both global patterns and significant cultural and historical features that have been yet poorly considered in public administration of the country. However, this disadvantage is typical for the public administration practice in the whole World. I have previously written about this, noting that the *modern theory of public administration* so far is totally westernized, designed for use in the narrow circle of the most developed countries, and does not take into account the modern world's cultural diversity [Pain, 2015]. The shortcomings of modern public administration in terms of reflecting the cultural diversity of states have been emphasised in the United Nations Human Development Report (2004). Indeed, the realization that diversity is an important part of the political process requiring constant and special attention, other than short-term "forced" reaction of the authorities, troubles all countries. It is clear that this problem is challenging for Russia as well.

With regard to the subject of regulation of ethno-political processes, we highlight only some specific features of the socio-political life of Russia, requiring a special approach in *public administration*. Here are the main ones.

Constituent state. In the world literature it is recognized long ago that there is a considerable difference in the essence of ethno-political problems, as well as in relevant policies in the two types of states: "unitary" on one side and "constituent" (sometimes also called "complex") – on the other. State of the latter type can include other public entities, such as protectorates in empires or allied states in the Confederacy, or inevitably include (in federal states) administrative-territorial units with a significant share of political autonomy, such as cantons in Switzerland, states in India and republics in Russia [Chirkin, 2000. P. 157-159].

Canadian researcher Will Kymlicka offers a different classification in part complementary to the first. He also identifies two types of states: "multinational" and "multi-ethnic" [Kymlicka, 1995]. The first type is characterized by different peoples inhabitation – ethnic nations, historically established in a given territory (as in the autonomous regions of India, Spain, Switzerland or Russian republics). In the second group are the countries where multiculturalism is a consequence of immigration (as in the US, Canada, Australia and most advanced countries of Western Europe). It is clear that the differences between the types of countries, as well as their features, determine the specifics of internal national policy, and

limits of the possible borrowing of foreign experience in relation to this policy. In Russia, this policy is not only connected with the development of migrant integration approaches as in most European countries, but also with the harmonization of relations between the autochthonous peoples within the Federation, between them and in their relations with the federal centre. In such societies preserving historical areas of compact settlement of numerous ethnic groups, many of which retain the memory of the former state, the unity of the political culture is the most important condition for peace and sustainable development. In this sense, constituent multinational states should find a different path of development, political nation, than the one that is most often seen in the history of relatively ethnical and cultural homogeneous European countries. There the formation of political nation has historically started with the mobilization and consolidation of an ethnic group. Different sequence seems to be more suitable for constituent states: *from consolidation of civil representatives of different ethnic and religious groups to formation of a unified national identity*. Of course, in this case, within a single national civil consciousness will remain a variety of ethnic and religious identities. At the same time citizens will certainly have to recognize the unity of the basic norms of general policy in the state.

Etatism and the special role of the state in the political system. Sociological and political scientific literature increasingly emphasizes the role of public authorities in the life of Russian society as more significant than in Western countries. In particular, in recent years, Ovsei Shkaratan has proved this idea in his theory of "neocracy". In his analysis, "the Eurasian civilization on the basis of former Soviet Union has formed and developed etocratic societal system <...>, which has become a parallel branch of the capitalist industrial and economic system, but with its own laws of functioning and development" [Shkaratan 2009. P. 466].

Experts apply different judgements to this Russian feature. For example, consultants and speechwriters of the former president Dmitri A. Medvedev, in preparing his address to the Federal Assembly in 2008, have focused on the purely negative role of etatism: "for centuries, cult of the state and the alleged wisdom of the administrative apparatus dominated in Russia, – said the president – whilst an individual, with his rights and freedoms, personal interests and problems was perceived at best as a means, and at worst – as an obstacle to the strengthening of state power" [Medvedev, 2008]. At the same time, the abovementioned professor Shkaratan has advanced a theory. Well-known sociologist, former adviser to Yegor Gaidar, recognizing the supremacy of modern Russian etatism he named an "archaic power-property reference" and has pointed out that in this situation it is necessary to "understand the key fact that capitalism (let alone the capitalism of Soviet spill neophytes) requires reasonable and solid control of the state" [Shkaratan, 2009. P. 471]. Even more specific idea of a special and positive role of the state in the modernization of Russia in these years was has been advanced by the member of the Academy

of Sciences Viktor Polterovich. He wrote: "In period of reforms the role of government increases. In particular, an effective modernization requires the strengthening of the state ("orthodox paradox") "[Polterovich, 2007. P. 425]. It is noteworthy that all the abovementioned interpretations of the role of the state in modern Russia belong to liberal politicians and scientists, which indicates the misconception of liberals as anarchists and anti-etatists that is ingrained in the domestic political discourse. In fact, the discussions between liberals and etatists are not about denying the role of the state in the regulation of socio-economic and political processes, but about the limits, forms and effectiveness of this regulation.

Furthermore, in relation to ethno-political aspects, it makes sense to use a new interpretation of the terminology developed in the framework of a liberal political science, which since the late 1960s describes two types of relations between the state and the nation, highlighting in this regard two classes of states – "state nation" and "nation state". In 2004 this terminology has been used by Juan Linz and his co-authors to distinguish processes in composite-multinational and unitary, multi-ethnic states [Linz, Stepan, Yadav, 2004. P. 8]. I suggest using this classification for other purposes – to distinguish countries with different levels of maturity of democracy and with different ratios of the role of the state and society in the political system, resulting in significant differences in conditions of formation and functioning of the political nation. Under this classification, Russia could be classified as a *state nation*, where etatism hinders the formation of political civic nation.

Special role of informal norms and intergroup social relations. It is recognized that in countries where etatism dominates in mass consciousness and vertical administrative approaches – in governance, informal rules, including patron-client relations, significantly prevail over formal [Ledeneva, 2013]. According to Alena Ledeneva, these archaic social relations makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to form of a truly strong state in Russia, as the power of the state consists, above all, in building up a clear system of formal rules, based on the law and on the effective leverage of its execution. Some researchers even believe that informal patron-client relations form only political and economic subject in our country. For example, the famous economist, professor Peter Orekhovskiy writes: "Fighting with patron-client networks, which, on the one hand, are a part of the state apparatus, and on the other – a part of civil society, in these circumstances, can only result into struggle between patron-client networks. There is just no other political and economic actors in Russia" [Orekhovskiy, 2012. P. 115-116].

Without entering in discussion on the extent and location of patron-client relations in Russia and in other post-Soviet countries, I strongly disagree with the prevailing literature, unilateral and extremely negative in assessment of patron-client relations as the condition of corruption and narrow orientation of the economy to the resource rent [Levin, Satarov 2014]. My research

shows that traditional relations that in journalism and literature clearly defined as "patron-client" or "clan" often play an important role in the transition period in the life of the new state. In a range of CIS countries such relations do not only compensate the shortcomings of social security (especially in elder- and childcare), but are also widely used in economic development programs [Pain, 2015. P. 39-43]. Thus, the government of Kazakhstan has very skilfully used the traditional family and kinship ties of Kazakhs, dating back to the traditions of nomadism, in mass resettlement of people from South to North Kazakhstan and in their consolidation in Astana [Pain, 2015. P. 41]. Recent studies of 2016 within the abovementioned scientific grant of the Russian Scientific Foundation in Ufa and Rostov-on-Don also show that traditional intergroup relations in many cases are the factors preventing inter-ethnic conflicts. For example, such relations (in some cases as a result of direct agreements) between the leaders of informal coalitions that include both business representatives and public figures of different nationalities and religions, often helped to avoid escalation of competition for economic or administrative resources in ethno-political conflicts.

The predominance of negative assessments of informal intergroup relations can be explained by two reasons. First, the norms of social relations are developed on their reference patterns, rather than the mean values when an anomaly means deviation from the extremes. Second, the signs of reference, "normative" states are described within the model of only one type – Western liberal democracies, though this type is specific for only 10-12% of the countries in the world. This approach is in conflict not only with common sense but also with the modern ideas of renowned experts in the field of political philosophy and sociology. In early 2000s Samuel Eisenstadt has pointed to the contradiction between the uniqueness of the West as a special cultural area and its role model for the rest of the world [Eisenstadt, 2000. P. 56]. This contradiction existed for a long time, but it was seen as politically significant only a few decades after decolonization, the emergence of new states and their involvement in the process of modernization. It was then that a huge difference in forms, pace of modernization and sequence of its stages in different countries has become evident. Later it has been found that some of the local modernization models were successful and competitive, which has allowed putting forward the idea of "multiple modernities". In the framework of this theory, such phenomena as clan traditions cannot be clearly defined as adverse events, or deviant behaviour. Even in the largest cities of Russia, where the role of civil society is more significant than in the rest of the country, and city authorities to a greater extent than in the provinces need to listen to the views of different groups of the population, there is still a shortage of historical experience of self-government; the townspeople here have not yet become a genuine subject of control. Against the background of the weakness of citizens' civil self-organization, the *traditional forms of group identity and self-organization* on the

basis of ethnic, religious, communal and other pre-civil forms of consolidation acquire great importance. With this in mind, as a part of the grant of the Russian Scientific Foundation I make an assumption that the theory of *public administration* needs and can be improved by expanding its conceptual stock. It has to change, to become more flexible to adapt to various conditions of the majority of countries outside of the developed democracies, mature legal states. First of all, it is necessary to find a new approach to integration of deeply rooted social traditions that for a long time, sometimes for centuries, remain in the national culture and mass consciousness. There are good reasons to differentially treat the forms of group horizontal cooperation, which are falsely identified as clan and archaic. In some countries there is a positive experience of legalization not only of nepotism, but also of relations usually defined as corruption [Pain, 2015: 46]. As for the inter-group relations preventing the emergence of ethnic and religious conflicts, it is proposed to scrutinize such phenomena, encouraging relations and forms of communication that do not worsen the socio-political situation and contribute to the harmonization of inter-group relations in urban scale, in regions and in the country as a whole.

Functions and Content of Cultural Diversity Management Paradigm³

Being multidimensional and designed to describe a wide range of phenomena, the term of “(cultural) diversity” can hardly be exactly defined [Wieviorka, 2008: 96]. At the same time, it is not easy to find a substitute for the understanding of a number of issues and trends of the modern world. In this sense, the term of “cultural diversity” is a way to describe the *objective reality* of the various communities and the whole world in the process of rapid transformation under the influence of many factors. Here are just some of them, beginning with the word “growth”: migration flows at all levels, cultural pluralism, the number of random interactions by mobile communications and the Internet, etc. The increase of human life value and the formation of behaviour aimed at personal development modify the system of values of people and entire societies. Of course, all of these trends in various countries occur unevenly and in different pace. However, almost all countries and regions of the world, therefore, are involved in the global processes of *social and legal complicacy and cultural pluralisation*. On the one hand, the growing interconnection and interdependence between different phenomena create incentives for the formation and strengthening of common norms and standards of behaviour; on the other – globalization “opens” the diversity of cultural forms and behaviour models, creating need for maintenance of particular identities and values, not only in groups but also on individual level. Thus, the concept of “cultural diversity” allows us to consider various aspects of globalization of the world and evolution of particular countries and regions

as a set of interrelated problems, processes and trends.

Besides the analytical values of “cultural diversity” concept, it is an important legal and practical function as *a way of perception and attitudes towards diversity on the part of the subjects of social and political action*. In other words, cultural diversity can be understood as a value and as a control object. The concept of “cultural diversity”, placed in a certain social and political context, refers not only to the fact of diversity, but also to recognition of certain cultural differences, as well as to the hidden interests (in the form of requirements to redistribute power and economic resources, rights and so forth).

In precisely this way the term of “(cultural) diversity” has been acquiring such social, economic and political senses since its introduction in the political lexicon of Western societies in 1960-70-ies. Subsequently the popularity of this concept and its polyvariety have even increased. Thus, in 1980-90-ies, as already noted, the notion of “diversity management” has appeared, but its use today is most commonly connected to field of business management and access to the labour market. Philosophical questions of common good, justice and social inclusion go under the brand of “cultural diversity” as well. It concerns in particular the questions of particular identities recognition on the one hand, and the fight against racism and discrimination (based on ethnicity, religion, gender and other characteristics) – on the other [Wieviorka, 2008. P. 96].

In general, it seems important to distinguish a descriptive meaning of “cultural diversity” and its legal and practical value – cultural diversity management. Namely, the conceptualization of the latter term, the analytical and political importance of which we prove, is one of the subjects of this study.

Some forms of cultural diversity management have been characteristic for ancient polities; in other words, since ancient times there existed a problem of combining cultural diversity (linguistic, tribal, ethnic, religious, etc.) with the flexibility of rules, and then the laws in certain areas. Despite the fact that the function of cultural diversity management is characteristic for virtually any organized society, its theoretical and conceptual understanding has become a reality only at the turn of XX and XXI centuries. Comprehensive concepts using the very terminology of cultural development management in the field of ethnic policy of the state are arising before our very eyes. Besides, in Russian ethno-political science, our project perhaps is the first that is based on a similar methodology and terminology, so we offer an author's definition of “cultural diversity management” concept. Thus, ***cultural diversity management (CDM) can be determined as a function of public administration, aimed at co-ordination of social and cultural relations, as well as at practical development of measures to ensure the peaceful and efficient coexistence, interaction between people with different cultural (ethnic, religious, racial, and others) identity within the boundaries of a unified political space, including the city.***

³ This section is written on analytical materials of S. Fedyunin.

The implementation of this management function, complex in terms of implementation and requiring an extensive network of institutions and an efficient administrative machine – is an inevitable process in terms of ethnic, religious and, more broadly, cultural heterogeneity within a given territory united by a centre of political power as a result of forced (more peculiar to ancient times) or voluntary (characteristic mainly for the present) neighbourhood of various social and cultural groups and associations. Thus, cultural diversity management function and the policy of its implementation imply a search for balance in the given political conditions.

The fact that the state practices of cultural pluralism regulation existed and developed for centuries and even millennia, and the concept of cultural diversity management has appeared recently, due to the fact that globalization in recent decades has accelerated significantly and became much more multi-dimensional, complex. In the early two thousandth's it has become relatively clear that "recognition of cultural differences as a significant component of the civilizational environment and provision of equal opportunities for all groups in social and political life are problems the solution of which is vital for successful functioning of society" [Naumkin, 2013].

In this understanding the concept of cultural diversity allows to take a fresh look at the essence of political and economic management, establishing links between different subjects and problems inherent in today's complex societies and manifested both at the national and at the local city level⁴.

First, this is about the access of various groups to political engagement and to representation in the structures of power and media. This means the recognition of cultural differences and the right to its public representation, which is directly associated with destruction of social hierarchies and with democratization in the sense of social, political, and, at present, cultural emancipation of individuals [Taylor, 1992].

Second, it is to ensure legal equality, in particular through the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation and the use of political and legal pluralism in the mechanisms of culturally heterogeneous societies (federalism, territorial and cultural autonomy, etc.).

Third, it is the language policy aimed at balance be-

tween the different languages spoken by the citizens of a country in education, public and private spheres of communication and the possibility of language preservation.

Fourth, it is about public and social policy in respect of religions and religious organizations, especially in guarantee of freedom of conscience of individuals and conditions for equal dialogue between religious communities.

Fifth, it implies social and economic policy aimed at correcting existing inequalities, both direct and indirect discrimination of ethno-territorial groups and carriers of certain identities.

Sixth, there are issues of legal protection of indigenous communities and their way of life.

Seventh, it is referred to the problem of legal regulation of immigration, observance of migrants' rights of and their adaptation (as seasonal workers or potential future citizens of the host country) in the new social conditions – in the labour market, education, leisure and work, etc.

Eighth, it is about the policy of cultivation of civil society institutions, creation of mediatory structures and intercultural spaces, and formation of tolerant atmosphere in the society.

The list could go on, as we have only touched upon a limited field of application of the cultural diversity management paradigm in the regulation of ethno-political relations.

It is worth noting that issues of cultural pluralism management are not only included in the agenda of the discussions, but are directly or indirectly (through resolution of other problems) but are likewise the object of actions of various state and public structures. In recent years, various countries have created special authorities and commissions on issues related to cultural diversity management. In other cases, academic experts are involved to clarify concepts and prepare reports on corresponding issues. In this respect, today's Russia is far behind the advanced approaches, despite the increased attention of the authorities to cultural diversity (in form of development of state concepts and creation of special departments, such as the Federal Agency for Ethnic Affairs established in the spring of 2015). This gap is caused by not only political, but also by scientific, conceptual factors, and in particular by preservation of obsolete methodological approaches in national policies. The most important goal of our research project is precisely to fill these scientific gaps, improving the methodology of national policy.

4 Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World, P. 1-16 // <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2004-russian>.

PAIN EMIL, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of National Research University "Higher School of Economics", NRU HSE. Chief Researcher of the Institute of Public Administration and Management (IPAM) of Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA); Head of the project under the RSF grant (119571, Moscow, prospect Vernadskogo, 84). E-mail: painea@mail.ru.

Summary The article presents the basic conceptual statements of a research project under grant of the Russian Scientific Foundation (RSF): "New approaches and methods of ethno-political relations regulation on the territory of the largest urban agglomerations of Russia". The paper has justified the necessity to adjust national policy and the emergence of the new paradigm of such policy called "Cultural diversity management". The new paradigm has a number of advantages in comparison with the traditional one.

Keywords: nationalities policy, ethno-political relations, civic participation, urban agglomerations, cultural diversity management.

References

- Bouchard G. What Is Interculturalism? // McGill Law Journal, No. 56 (2), 2011. P. 435-468.
- Gudkov L. O razvitií russkogo natsionalizma [On Russian nationalism development]. Stenogramma kruglogo stola na temu: Russkii vopros v Rossii v fondye 'Liberalnaya missia' Moscow: November 4, 2012 // Etnopoliticheskiy ekstremizm v Rossii: sotsialno-kulturnye istoki i prichiny neeffektivnosti prinimaemih mer protivodeistviya // <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2006/0231/analit01.php> (last accessed 14.11.2016).
- Chirkin V. Gosudarstvovedeniye [Political Science]. M.: Yurist, 1999.
- Eisenstadt S. Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Kymlicka W. Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Levin M. Satarov G. Rent-Seeking Russia // Questions of Economy, No. 1, 2014.
- Linz J.J. Stepan A., Yadav Y. 'Nation State' or 'State Nation'? Conceptual Reflections and Some Spanish, Belgian and Indian Data // United Nations Development Program, Humane Development Report Office, 2004 // http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2004_alfred_stepan.pdf.
- Ledeneva A.V. Can Russia Modernise? Sistema, Power Networks and Informal Governance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Naumkin V. Cultural diversity, democracy and good governance // Russia in Global Affairs, 2013, No. 2 // <http://www.globalaffairs.ru/number/Kulturnoe-mnogoobrazie-demokratiya-i-khoroshee-upravlenie-15956>.
- Orehovskiy P. (2012) Pravo na osparivanie, patron-klientskie seti i korruptsiya [The Right to Challenge, Patron-Client Networks and Corruption] // Voprosy ekonomiki, No 11, 2012. P. 101-117.
- Pain E.A. Etnopoliticheskiy mayatnik. Dinamika i mehanizmy etnopoliticheskikh protsessov v postsovetskoj Rossii [Ethnopolitical pendulum. Dynamics and mechanisms of ethno-political processes in post-soviet Russia]. M.: IS RAN, 2004
- Pain Emil, A Regional and National Diversity as a Factor of Public Administration Theory Development: Problem Statement // Public Administration Issues, Special Issue, 2015. P. 34-49.
- Pain E.A. Trudnii put ot multikulturalizma k interkulturalizmu [The hard way from multiculturalism to interculturalism] // Vesnik Instituta Kennana v Rosii, No. 20, 2011. P. 79-85.
- Polterovich V. Elements of Reform Theory. Moscow: Ekonomika, 2007.
- Shkaratan O. Sotsialno-ekonomicheskoye neravenstvo i ego vosproizvodstvo v sovremennoy Rossii [Socio-economic inequality and its reproduction in modern Russia]. M.: OLMA Media Group, 2009.
- Taylor Ch. "The Politics of Recognition" in Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition / ed. by A. Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992. P. 25-73.
- Van Dyke V. Human Rights, Ethnicity, and Discrimination. Westport, Conn., L.: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Ward D. The Ethnic Ghetto in the United States: Past and Present // Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 1982. P. 257-275.
- Wieviorka M. La Diversité. Rapport à la Ministre de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche. Paris: Robert Laffont, 2008.
- Zubarevich N. Goroda kak tsentri modernizatsii ekonomiki i chelovecheskogo kapitala [Cities as Centers for Economy and Human Capital Modernization] // Obshestvennyye nauki i sobremennost, №5, 2010. P. 5-19.

ЧТО ЧИТАТЬ

**Араловец Н.А. Городская семья в России во второй половине XX в.** М.: ИРИ РАН, 2015. 356 с.

Монография посвящена изучению историко-демографических проблем российской городской семьи в 1927–1959 гг. Автор на основе разнообразных архивных, а также опубликованных нормативных, статистических источников, данных социологических обследований, мемуаров, показал особенности брачно-семейных отношений городского населения Российской Федерации в этот исторический период; рассмотрел изменения традиционных ценностных установок горожан на брак и семью; исследовал демографические показатели семьи, прежде всего, тип и величину, раскрыл факторы, оказавшие наиболее заметное влияние на их трансформацию. В монографии освещена специфика городской семьи в годы Великой Отечественной войны. Особое внимание в монографии уделено изучению внутрисемейных отношений городских жителей. Книга рассчитана на научных работников, преподавателей, студентов и всех интересующихся историей России.

**Рыбчинский В. Городской конструктор: Идеи и города** / пер. с англ. М. Коробочкин. М.: Strelka Press, 2015. 225 с.

Города развиваются не в вакууме. Урбанизм жидется на былом – не только в физическом, но и в интеллектуальном смысле. Чтобы лучше понять возможности и ограничения, связанные с градостроительством, стоит проанализировать концепции, способствовавшие тому, чтобы наши города стали такими, каковы они сегодня. Представления о красоте и комфорте постоянно меняются, на сцену выходят все новые поколения архитекторов и градостроителей, экономисты придумывают новые концепции, а экологи – новые угрозы, и каждый этап преходящей интеллектуальной моды становится частью истории города – идеи о городском развитии не уходят в прошлое вместе со своим временем, но получают физическое воплощение в городском ландшафте, наслаиваются и влияют друг на друга, и на нас, городских жителей. Основные детали интеллектуального конструктора, из которого собран современный город, описывает профессор Пенсильванского университета Витольд Рыбчинский.