

THE STATE POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ON THE NORTHERN AND ARCTIC TERRITORIES IN THE 1990S: STAGES, PRIORITIES, MECHANISMS, AND RESULTS

Kovalenko S. G.¹, Yanchev D. V.², Shestak O. I.³, Boldyreva S. Y.⁴, Boldyrev R. Y.⁵

¹Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Research Fellow at the Department of Social and Political Studies, Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Peoples of the FarEast FEBRAS, Vladivostok, Apt. 131, 16 Gamarnika Str., Vladivostok city, Russia, ²Candidate of Historical Sciences, Research Assistant, Department of Ethnography, Ethnology and Anthropology of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Peoples of the Far-East, Far-Eastern Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok, Russia, ³Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education, the Far-Eastern State Technical Fisheries University, Vladivostok, Russia, ⁴Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Area Studies, International Relations and Political Science, the Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Russia, ⁵Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, at the Department of General History of the Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Russia.

Email: a.tytkalo07@gmail.com

Article History: Received on 29th September 2019, Revised on 30th October 2019, Published on 18th November 2019

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the study is to determine the state policy of the Russian Federation on the Northern and Arctic territories in the 1990s.

Methodology: This is analytical-logical research that has been done through content analysis and documentary and library research.

Result: Results showed that First of all Russia abruptly changed the priorities of its policy to the Far North setting the course to leave the region in all spheres. Dozens of polar expeditions from the USA, Norway, and Germany were sent to the Russian sector of polar lands. Russia itself rapidly turned off its economic presence in the North. "The North Pole-31" (drifting polar station) was stopped for 12 years on June 25, 1991.

Applications: This research can be used for universities, teachers, and students.

Novelty/Originality: In this research, the model of the state policy of the Russian Federation on the northern and arctic territories in the 1990s is presented in a comprehensive and complete manner.

Keywords: *state policy, Russian federation, northern and arctic territories, stages, priorities.*

INTRODUCTION

The crisis of the "dashing 90s" concerned all spheres of the country's life. It could not have been otherwise because going through the point of bifurcation (choice) implies that the system will make a choice that requires minimal energy consumptions. In social situation it means a catastrophic fall of all parameters of domestic life and existence of the country in the condition of survival strategy.

At the beginning of the 1990s, the whole system of coordinates changed in which economy of the USSR's regions was developing. The former country ceased to exist. The Soviet model of government was completely destroyed. Russia consciously chose a liberal and monetarist way of transition to market relations. Most of leading analysts have the same opinion that a proposed principal by B.N. Yeltsin has played a determining role in this process: "...take sovereignty as much as you can". It was he who led to reforms the price of which was extremely high. On the one hand, for nations: the Nenets, the Nganasans, the Lapps, the Chukchi and the Eskimos who lived in the Arctic that period gave an opportunity to claim their rights at the Soviet of People's Deputies. However, those nations didn't get a right to use the natural resources of their land in spite of the assistance provided by E. A. Gaer. The only thing they could achieve was independence from the center that generated lots of difficult problems to be solved. Arctic environmental management led to reduction of consumption by industrial facilities during the period. The cessation of the Arctic development in comparison with other developed countries led to the appearance of many trash dumps (they became expanses for white bears) and to abandoned industrial facilities that were dangerous for inhabitants.

Thus, we can note the double attitude to the ecosystem's issues of the North nations during this period. On the one hand, there was an attempt to control natural resources of the regions. On the other hand, it failed.

METHODS

This is analytical-logical research that has been done through content analysis and documentary and library research.

RESULTS AND ITS DISCUSSION

The denationalization began in the Russian Federation. New forms of reorganization appeared. A catastrophic slump in

production happened under conditions of hyperinflation (table 1). Only resource-extracting regions with exported raw materials abroad turned out to be an advantage. Arkhangelsk Region started to export woods, the Yamal-Nenets and the Nenets Autonomous Districts exported hydrocarbon.

Table 1: The indices of industrial production in the subjects of the Russian Federation's Arctic zone, per cents (1990 - 100%)

Subjects of the Russian Federation	1991	1995	1998	2000
Krasnoyarsk Territory	93	44	44	54
Republic of Komi	94	57	52	56
Republic of Sakha (Yakutiya)	98	75	78	87
Arkhangelsk Region	95	58	57	90
Murmansk Region	97	61	61	70
The Nenets Autonomous District	99	77	97	124
Chukotka Autonomous Area	92	48	43	44
The Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District	99	75	73	74
Total in Russia	92	50	46	54

Note: the table is worked out by sources: Regions of Russia: the main characteristics of the subjects of the Russian Federation. Statistical collection. Rosstat Publ. Moscow. 2013. 645 p.; Industry of Russia. Statistical collection. Rosstat Publ. Moscow. 2012. 445 p.

The influence of the state and its role in the socio-economic development of the Arctic territories came to naught and the previous economic relations between the regions began to break. Especially the weakening of the state regulation negatively reflected on the social level of the northerners' lives. The reforms came into conflict with the Soviet policy of state protectionism concerning the Arctic regions. The liquidation of centralized logistical support broke the import's regularity of necessary products. As a result, there were interruptions with the northern deliver (Zafesov Yu, 2006). At the beginning of 1992 the inflationary shock practically destroyed the working capital of enterprises and money savings of inhabitants of the North. It also destroyed the main factor compensating living in uncomfortable conditions. As a result, a number of problems arose. They were connected not only with further development of the Northern territories but with survival of people in the North. The number of inhabited villages and cities decreased by almost a third. Created during the Soviet Union, a military foothold was almost disappeared. Moreover, the established state benefits and wage increments lost a stimulating role because of rapidly increasing inflation. They didn't support a good standard of living. As a result, a massive outflow of pupation started from the regions of the Far North.

For the period between 1990 and 2000, the population of the Russian Federation's Arctic zone decreased by 1.1 million people or 12.1 percent. The largest outflow of the population was in the Chukotka Autonomous Area, the Nenets Autonomous District and the Murmansk Region. By 2000 the Chukotka Autonomous Area lost 63.3 percent of population from the population that was in 1990. By a percentage the number of people employed in economy reduced by 2 times compared with depopulation. The curtailment of production led to outflow of workers attracted from other regions. The largest outflow of employed people was in the Chukotka Autonomous Area, the Republic of Komi and the Krasnoyarsk Territory (Norilsk). The Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District, the oil and gas-bearing region, was in more favorable conditions. The stability of population with some growth by 2000 was marked in the 1990-s (table 2).

Table 2: Dynamics of the population in the subjects of the Russian Federation's Arctic zone in 1990 and 2000

Subjects of the Russian Federation	The average annual number of employed people in the economy, thousands				Population, thousands			
	1990	2000	Growth		1990	2000	Growth	
			Thousands	%			Thousands	%
Krasnoyarsk Territory	1880,6	1409,4	- 471,2	-25,1	3163,4	3000,9	-162,5	-5,1
Republic of Komi	675,8	459,9	- 215,9	-31,9	1239,9	1042,9	- 197,0	-15,9
Republic of Sakha (Yakutiya)	597,7	459,7	- 138,0	-23,1	1119,0	957,5	161,5	-14,4
Arkhangelsk Region	764,7	594,4	- 170,3	-22,3	1568,9	1369,1	-199,8	-12,7
Murmansk Region	567,4	432,9	- 134,5	-23,7	1188,8	922,9	- 265,9	-22,4
The Nenets Autonomous District	27,3	20,9	- 6,4	-23,4	51,7	40,9	- 10,8	-20,9
Chukotka Autonomous Area	98,6	32,7	- 65,9	-66,8	158,1	57,5	100,6	-63,6
The Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District	297,4	312,7	15,4	5,2	488,6	498,3	10,3	2,1
Total in the Russian	4909,4	3722,6	- 1186,8	- 24,2	8976,4	7890,0	- 1086,4	-12,1

Federation's Arctic Zone

Note: the table is worked out by the source: Regions of Russia: the main characteristics of the subjects of the Russian Federation. Statistical collection. Rosstat Publ. Moscow. 2013. 645 p.

Interregional associations of economic interaction began to form in order to maintain economic links and industrial manufacture by the initiative of the Russian Federation's subjects since 1991. The state started to regard them as one of the elements of federalism in Russia. The federalism strengthening the independence of subjects could direct their initiative to organize a single Russian market. As time showed the practice of forming up new relations between the subjects of federation and federal center was worked out in associations. Associations also contributed the integration of regions' economies to use natural resources rationally. Eight interregional associations of economic cooperation were created. The northern territories were included in 4 associations: "North-West" (the Republic of Komi, the Arkhangelsk and Murmansk Regions, the Nenets Autonomous District), "Bolshoi Ural" (the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District), "Siberian Agreement" (the Krasnoyarsk Territory), "Far East and Transbaikalia" (Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), the Chukotka Autonomous Area) ([The bank of cultural information Publ, 2007](#)). However, their establishment could not turn the processes taking place on the Northern territories in another direction. As we mentioned the local elite and national intelligentsia were busy with talks at that period. The mechanism of solving those serious issues was not clear and remained just a conversation by the principle of Repitilov from "Woe from Wit" - "We make a noise, brother, we make a noise..."

Nevertheless, Russia kept conventionally its presence in the Arctic. The State commission of RSFSR (the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) for the Arctic and the Antarctic affairs was formed in 1991. It was renamed into the Interdepartmental Commission on the Arctic and Antarctic Affairs in 1992 ([The Government decree of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, 1991](#)). That Commission was to coordinate scientific, socio-economic, economic and nature-oriented activities in the Arctic (including the Svalbard archipelago) and the Antarctic. It was also to control the fulfillment of decisions of the supreme authorities of the state power, decisions of the President of the Russian Federation and of the Government of the Russian Federation in those regions. But as a final result its real activity was only the acceptance of different documents and provisions that had not had enough effect on making decisions.

The All-Russian Scientific Coordinating Center on integrated issues of the North, the Arctic and the life of small-numbered nations of the North was formed by the Government of the Russian Federation in 1992. It was created in order to provide a complex study of the problems of the North, the Arctic and the life of small-numbered nations of the North and to improve research coordination on those problems. The All-Russian Scientific Coordinating Center is a coordinator of the scientific research institutes that study the development of the regions of the North, the Arctic and the problems of small-numbered nations of the North. Despite this, the volume of financing of Arctic research in Russia at the beginning of 2000 was 10-15 times less than in the USA. Though Russia is noticeably more Arctic than the USA is ([Selin and Tsukerman, 2008](#)).

The United States and Canada live well financially and legally especially the Eskimos and the Indians. But the passivity of the national intelligentsia of the indigenous nations of the North and no interest of central and local authorities for better life played a bad joke with people during that period. There were possibilities to protect the interests of the indigenous nations during the period but they were not used on a proper level. They didn't know how to do it. Everything was new. For example, the Nenets formed a national community "Hunter" that existed not long till 1997 and disappeared. There were created family clan communities "Vark", "Yalumd" ("Sunrise") in 2004 and "Dyanki Koi" in 2001 which consisted of 38 people and about 1000 deer. "Myadekotsya" (chum that looks like a small tent), "Limbya", "Eagle" and "Pul-eh" were created on the 8th of February in 2010. The situation with the Nenets clan communities is a little bit better than the Koryaks and the Itelments' situation.

The traditional model of indigenous small-numbered nation's life has been forming for a long time. Though the Chukchi learned to cultivate potatoes and breed horses. They adapted to modern civilization. The fixed gill nets of another type were used on the coast of the Okhotsk Sea in the past. They were set from the coast with the help of a long pole with a crotch at the end. Such nets were widely spread among the Koryaks, the Chukchi, the Eskimos, and the Evens. As we mentioned they used fixed gill nets with the help of a long pole with a crotch at the end. They dug small ice-holes along the nets at a distance from each other and they pulled a rope and a net with it under the ice from hole to hole using a special pole.

It should be mentioned among the fixed gill nets the nets "ohana" and merezhi (a net) "tymr" were used to catch great Siberian sturgeons, sturgeons, and large ordinary fish. "Ohan" is a net with length of 20 meters and height of 3 meters with a large mesh up to 30 centimeters. It was held by anchors at the bottom of a river. Merezha "tymr" known as "dzhiharka" had a form of a funnel-shaped bag. It was put in deep pits during winter. It had a simple construction that let one fisherman cope with it. "Ohan" was put as a usually fixed gill net in winter. Fixed gill nets and seines were widely used by the Nivkhs during fishing. They were placed in bays or lakes not so deep. Then fishermen in boats drove fish into nets making noise. That way of fishing in rivers, lakes, and bays was famous in the middle of the 19th century by the Lower Amur Nanais.

The floatable net "lyrke" is known among the Amur Nivkhs from the middle of the 19th century. People fished salmon, sturgeon and great Siberian sturgeon using it. The bottom line of the net was supplied with a fish sinker and the framing

rope was held by a fishing float on the water. The net was thrown into the water from two boats in order it could be across the river and go with the stream. The fishery with modernized floating net on pink salmon and chum salmon was widely used by the national collective farms on the Amur. The length of such nets reached 100-150 meters. Besides in contrast to traditional ones they consisted of two or three sides and each of them had its mesh size. Motorboats were used to set such nets. A round net “kyrke” is also a floatable net. The indigenous inhabitants used it to fish carps during ice drift (TaksamiCh, 1967). The living rules in a chum (a small tent) were different for men and women. A woman is in charge of heart and home. Only a woman can touch the heart pole and the hook. She who collects firewood cuts them, dries at the entrance and starts up a fire. She speaks with the flame, gives prophecies listening to the crack of firewood, smoke, strength, and color of the flame. The whole space except the hall of a chum is under her protection.

A man entering a chum cleans shoes and clothes from the snow with a beater. He takes off outerwear and leaves it on the sled. Being inside a man puts on house “kisy” (traditional winter shoes) and house “malitsu” (jumper). Guests men who spend the night are placed in the middle of “simzy” (a supporting pole inside chum). Guests women are placed near the exit. The place a guest occupies depends on respect to him.

In this way, we can ascertain that adaption model of indigenous people was adapted for physiographic conditions of living environment of those ethnic groups but the model didn't allow the traditional economy to function without the state support. The crisis of the 1990s aggravated the social problems of the small-numbered nations of the North. The problems have not found a solution up to the present day. Today half of villages housing stock is in a dilapidated condition in the places of traditional residence of the indigenous small-numbered nations of the North. As a rule, the housing stock is without water supply, canalization, and engineering networks. The high mortality (first of all injuries and poisoning) is a direct consequence of alcohol consumption. The indices of infant (1.8 times) and children's mortality are much higher than the average Russian figures among these nations. There is also a health deterioration of indigenous small-numbered nations of the North. Only 8.5 percent of these nations live till retirement age. The incidence rate is 1.5 times higher than the average Russian figures. There is a considerable increase in such diseases as tuberculosis, viral hepatitis, skin and parasitic diseases. There is availability's reduction in general and professional training. Only 80 percent of these nations have primary and incomplete secondary education. There is a lack of teaching staff, absence of educational and training literature, textbooks for extra class reading especially in the languages of the indigenous small-numbered nations of the North. Schools are badly equipped with modern technical means of education. A separate issue is the teaching of the native language. There is no more than 50 percent (in total among the North regions) of pupils learn it at schools.

About four million people live in the Arctic today. More than half of them live in the polar lands of Russia. The number of resident populations was about 2,331,000 people (1.6 percent of the Russian population) at the beginning of 2013.

The average density is 0.63 persons per square kilometer. The representatives of 127 nationalities live in the Russian Arctic and more than 70 percent of them consider themselves Russians.

The Committee for the Affairs of the North and indigenous small-numbered nations was established by the Federation Council in 1994. It was formed by the members of the Federation Council – senators from the Northern territories of the Russian Federation who represented the interests of the Northern regions in the “upper” chamber. The main directions of its work are economic and social development of the Northern regions, environmental management, indigenous small-numbered nations, and autonomous regions. However, important mechanisms to regulate the development of the North were not worked out in the first half of the 1990-s. They were not developed in spite of lots of standard documents that were to stabilize socio-economic relations on the Northern territories including the Law of the Russian Federation "On the principles of state regulation of socio-economic development of the North of the Russian Federation" No 78-FL (a federal law). The federal law reflected the main principles, mechanisms, aims, forms, and methods of the state regulation of economic development and listed the main directions, forms, and methods of providing with basic state social guarantees and compensations. The law No 78-FL didn't define mechanisms of the state policy on the North which led to its abolition in 2004. However, it can be considered as a prototype of the future Russian Arctic strategy to ensure the development of the Arctic zone and to protect the national interests of the country in this region for long-term perspective.

It is significant that the Decree of CEC (Central Executive Committee) of the USSR of 1926 on the Arctic zone is not mentioned in a single Russian document concerning the Arctic zone of the 1990-s. It shows the intention to start the Arctic policy from scratch, to put new emphases on the attitude to the Arctic countries and not to take into account the experience of the Soviet management.

The weakening of Russia's positions in the Arctic led to the fact that many world-powers (not only subarctic) began to claim the former Soviet territories. They began to seek for changes of the existing borders and relations in the Arctic, to expand their economic and political presence and to strive to the internationalization of the NSR (the Northern Sea Route), etc. Norway with Japan and Russia realized a comprehensive program of the NSR's development – INSROP (the International Northern Sea Route Program) in 1993-1998. 167 books were published (all in English). The way of its realization was discussed many times in Oslo and Tokyo but never in Russia (Karpov, 2014). During the 1990-s the status of the NSR was changed. Earlier the NSR mainly served the needs of the state and the transportation of natural resources. The shift to a market economy, the privatization of steamship companies and ports, the liquidation of state material and

technical supply, the disruption of regional transport and technological bonds led to the disintegration of an integrated economic mechanism of the NSR ([Yakovlev and Lebedev 2010](#)).

Nevertheless, the Merchant Marine Code of the Russian Federation dated April 30, 1999, No 81-FL set basic principles of using the NSR. It gave an interpretation of the NSR water area in the Article 5.1: "The water area of the NSR is the water area adjoining to the northern coast of the Russian Federation, covering internal sea waters, territorial sea, adjacent zone and particular economic zone of the Russian Federation and limited from the east by a sea delimiting line with the United States of America and by a parallel of Cape Dezhnev in the Bering Strait, from the west by the meridian of Cape Zhelaniya (Cape of Wish) to the Novaya Zemlya (New Land) archipelago, the eastern coastline of the archipelago Novaya Zemlya and by western borders of Matochkin Strait, Kara Strait and Yugorskii Strait".

Russia signifies its presence in the system of international relations with the countries of the Arctic region in the 1990-s. The territorial integration of the Northern regions led to the creation of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (1992), the Northern Forum (1992), the Barents/Euro-Arctic Region Council (1993), the Conferences of parliamentarians of the Arctic region (1994), the Arctic Council (1996) and later the European Union project "The Northern Dimension" (1999). In the field of military cooperation combined exercises of military forces of Russia and Norway took place in the waters of Northern Norway's coast in the region from Tromsø to Kirkenes ("Pomor-1994") in 1994. The combined exercises would resume only 16 years later ("Pomor-2010", "Pomor-2011").

The Russian Federation confirmed the UNO Convention on the maritime law of 1982 in 1997 and later chose it as a basic legal instrument for adjustment of a number of problems connected with determination the borders of the continental shelf in the Arctic. Russia refused the sectorial principle of delimitation in the Arctic on the pretext of global warming and the disappearance of specificity of the Arctic Ocean and surrounding areas. That step was risky and poorly reasoned both from legal and political points of view. It is obvious the reason for such a decision was the Convention of 1982 on which most of other Arctic states oriented. But we should not forget that this Convention being an authoritative source of international law cannot replace such a category as national interests, treaties, and agreements. They don't depend on this Convention and it cannot cancel them. Not only bilateral treaties and agreements signed by the USSR (the Russian Empire before) were forgotten. National and international acts accepted before the above-mentioned Convention were also forgotten. It couldn't also substitute norms of customary law that were controlling international relations in the Arctic for centuries. Actually, Russia of its own free will refused the political base and historical advantages on which the Arctic policy was based. Henceforth, Russia could claim only 200 miles of economic zone which was allowed to expand to 350 miles in certain conditions.

CONCLUSION

Only by the end of the 2000-s the Russian policy in the Arctic became more or less regulated and began to concentrate on taking a set of actions and enactments that could support and develop the North and the Arctic regions. The Government adopts Decree No 1664 dated December 31, 1997 "On reforming the system of state support of the regions of the North" in order to increase the effectiveness of state support of the northern regions and to create conditions for their socio-economic development. Among other tasks of state policy were favorable conditions for economic activities and support of commodity producers in the North regions, the formation of labor resources of the North, the optimization of the population, the increasing tendency of state guarantees and compensations, creating favorable conditions for work and life of indigenous small-numbered nations of the North, creating effective mechanisms for delivery of food and fuel and energy resources to the regions of the Far North. The state support program of the Northern territories was to create guarantees and compensations for the North residents. However, the analysis of it shows that realized state measures were fragmentary and unsystematic at the end of the 1990-s.

The importance of targeted support of the Arctic region of the country appeared in introducing the draft law "On the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation". It was to ensure geopolitical interests of the Russian Federation in the Arctic, steady development of the Arctic zone and preservation its unique nature by realization of basic directions of the state policy. The law was not adopted during the 1990-s. It was explained by the inevitable growth of state expenditures due to supplying with benefits the population of the region and diminution of the taxable base which the state could not provide during that period.

The 1990-s was lost for the Arctic policy of Russia. However, it seems to be logical against the background of the breakdown of the Soviet mobilization model of a regular state with a paternalistic basis and search for a new model of state and regional control.

There happened a thing a few people could think in the 1990-s. Without reasonable justifications, Russia refuses the previous policy in the Arctic, breaks the historical continuity of its course and behaves itself on the North as if it is not a country with centuries-old experience of the Arctic territory development but a newcomer in this region. Russia distanced in its Arctic policy as far as possible from accumulated imperial and Soviet experience becoming formally the USSR's continuing state.

What was it reflected on?

First of all, Russia abruptly changed the priorities of its policy to the Far North setting the course to leave the region in all spheres. Dozens of polar expeditions from the USA, Norway, and Germany were sent to the Russian sector of polar lands. Russia itself rapidly turned off its economic presence in the North. “The North Pole-31” (drifting polar station) was stopped for 12 years on June 25, 1991. Russia practically didn’t realize polar geological exploration, ended the plans of charting seabed, stopped well drillings on its shelf and stayed behind the indicator hundreds of times from the USA, Norway, Brazil, Nigeria, and South Korea in the 1990-s.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author confirms that the data do not contain any conflict of interest

REFERENCES

1. Karpov V.P. (2014). The Northern Sea Route– a tool for the Arctic development. *Ural Historical Journal*, Publ. 2014. No 2 (43). 111 p.
2. Selin V.S., Tsukerman V.A. (2008). Geopolitical and economic factors on providing Russia’s sovereignty in the Arctic. *Russiaandpresent-dayworld*. 2008. 2nded. 76-84pp.
3. TaksamiCh. M. (1967). The Nivhs. Modern economy, culture and life. Science Academy of the USSR. The Ethnography Institute of Miklouho-Maclay. The Science of Leningrad department, Publ. 1967.134-136 pp.
4. The bank of cultural information Public (2007). Yamal in geopolitical and civilized dynamics.The role of geopolitical systems and special ‘social orders’ of the Arctic in Russia’s history. Salekhard. Ekaterenburg. 78 p.
5. The Government decree of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (1991). “The state commission of RSFSR on the Arctic and the Antarctic affairs” dated December 26, 1991 No 75.
6. Yakovlev A., Lebedev G. (2010). Who controls the Northern Sea Route? *Marine collection*. 2010. No 6. 39 p.
7. ZafesovYu.K. (2006). Effective mechanisms of the northern delivery to the regions of the Far North: author’s abstract of dissertation. Candidate of Economic Sciences. Moscow. 2006. 24p.
8. Pavlov, A. J., Batova, V. N., Kovalyova, N. N., Kolesnikov, A. V., Sokolov, A. Y., & Soboleva, Y. V. (2015). Problems of state regulation of innovation policy in the Russian Federation and foreign countries. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 6(4), 802-821.
9. Cerami, A. (2009). Welfare State Developments in the Russian Federation: Oil-led Social Policy and ‘The Russian Miracle’. *Social Policy & Administration*, 43(2), 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2009.00650.x>
10. Papkova, I. (2011). The Orthodox Church and Russian Politics. <https://doi.org/10.2753/RUP1061-1940490100>
11. Fajzrahmanova, A. T. (2014). On organization of the inclusive educational environment in higher educational institutions of the Russian Federation. *Life Sci J*, 11(11s), 59-62.
12. Fajzrahmanova, A. T. (2014). On organization of the inclusive educational environment in higher educational institutions of the Russian Federation. *Life Sci J*, 11(11s), 59-62.
13. Gogoberidze, G., Abramov, V., Rumyantseva, E., Rodin, N., & Vladimirova, G. (2017). Priorities and challenges of the state policy of the Russian Federation in the Arctic science. In *Proceeding volume of the 17th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Geo-Conference SGEM 2017* (Vol. 17, No. 52, pp. 721-726). <https://doi.org/10.5593/sgem2017/52/S20.092>
14. Berkman, P. A., & Young, O. R. (2009). Governance and environmental change in the Arctic Ocean. *Science*, 324(5925), 339-340. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1173200>
15. Huttenbach, H. R. (Ed.). (1990). *Soviet nationality policies: ruling ethnic groups in the USSR*. London & New York, NY: Mansell.
16. Veselovsky, M. Y., Gnezdova, J. V., Romanova, J. A., Kirova, I. V., & Idilov, I. I. (2015). The strategy of a region development under the conditions of new actual economic. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 310. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5s2p310>
17. Gokhberg, L., & Roud, V. (2012). The Russian Federation: a new innovation policy for sustainable growth. *The global innovation index*, 121-130.
18. Makeeva, D. R., Kryukova, E. M., & Konovalova, E. E. (2014). Tourism as preferred direction in the strategy of substitution of industry branches in mono-territories of Russian Federation. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 30(1), 176-178.
19. Makeeva, D. R., Kryukova, E. M., & Konovalova, E. E. (2014). Tourism as preferred direction in the strategy of substitution of industry branches in mono-territories of Russian Federation. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 30(1), 176-178.
20. Luzan, V. S. (2014). Mechanisms of Interaction Between the State, Businesses and Small-Numbered Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation Under Global Transformations. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2006.00514.x>
21. Macfarlane, S. N. (2006). The ‘R’in BRICs: is Russia an emerging power?. *International Affairs*, 82(1), 41-57.
22. Wieclawski, J. (2011). Contemporary realism and the foreign policy of the Russian Federation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(1).