

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
 GIF (Australia) = 0.564
 JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
 PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939
 ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
 SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
 PIF (India) = 1.940
 IBI (India) = 4.260
 OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)
 International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science
 p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)
 Year: 2023 Issue: 08 Volume: 124
 Published: 05.08.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article

**Artur Alexandrovich Blagorodov**

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) of DSTU
 Master

Vladimir Timofeevich Prokhorov

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) of DSTU
 Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor,
 Shakhty, Russia

Maria Lvovna Vilisova

Institute of Service and Entrepreneurship (branch) of DSTU
 Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor

Galina Yurievna Volkova

LLC TSPOSN «Ortomoda»
 Doctor of Economics, Professor
 Moscow, Russia

ON THE POSITIVE PROCESSES OF CONCENTRATION OF INDUSTRY AND THE POPULATION OF SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED CITIES WITHIN THE ARCTIC REGIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AS A FRONTIER

Abstract: *the article proposes to consider the phenomenon of Arctic urbanization as a frontier - a zone where new technologies and institutions are being developed. Parallels are drawn from the classical theory of the American frontier to the prospects for the development of cities in the Russian Arctic as potential centers of innovation - in architecture, life support technologies, the institutional arrangement of communities with a large proportion of migrants, etc. The main approaches are considered and specifics of modern Russian historiography of the theory of the frontier. Based on the analysis of the works of various researchers, for the first time, directions in the domestic historiography of the problem were identified.*

Key words: *frontier, Arctic, cities, urban studies, F. Turner, Russian historiography, socio-geographical direction, civilizational direction, alternative direction.*

Language: English

Citation: Blagorodov, A. A., Prokhorov, V. T., Vilisova, M. L., & Volkova, G. Yu. (2023). On the positive processes of concentration of industry and the population of small and medium-sized cities within the Arctic regions of the Russian Federation as a frontier. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (124), 83-90.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-124-11> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.08.124.11>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction**UDC 911.31:913.52.**

At the end of XX - beginning of XXI century. system of methodological approaches and standards of domestic historical science has been sharply criticized and partially revised. A kind of "ideological freedom"

in the development of a methodological approach made it possible to attract foreign theoretical attitudes to the consideration of Russian phenomena. One of the incarnations of this process was the adoption of the American theory of the frontier.

The terminological category "frontier" was introduced into scientific circulation by the American

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

researcher F. Turner, who first used the specific concept in 1893 in his report "The Significance of the Frontier in American History". Without offering a clear, holistic definition, in general, F. Turner interpreted the frontier as the border between developed and undeveloped lands, as "the process of a meeting, an unexpected collision between the colonialists, the local population and the environment." Later, in the presentation of another American scientist E. Furniss, the frontier looked like "a point or moment of a meeting between savagery and civilization." F. Turner put forward the idea of geographical determinism, i.e. the idea that the originality of the environment and the geographical border as its component predetermines the specifics of the development of society and civilization. The attractive side of the concept was the combination of spatial and temporal paradigms. Despite on the priority of the geographical factor, for American researchers, the frontier acts as a connecting link of various historical periods, since it is an event that is not a one-time event, but an extended one.

The concept of the frontier in Russian historical science turned out to be in demand, first of all, by scientists - specialists in the history of Siberia. The European part of Russia (with some exceptions), with a wide scientific and physical-geographical potential, remained aloof from this process.

Siberian researchers accepted the concept of the frontier in a way. The theoretical development of the idea proposed by F. Turner was aimed not at an in-depth study of the methodological components of the phenomenon, but at constructing lines for a comparative analysis of the American and Siberian frontiers. This implies another feature of the problematic - a small number of historiographic works. The first attempt at a historiographical analysis of the theory of the frontier was made by the famous Siberian scholar D. Ya. Rezun. The subject of his study was the 1997 publication "American Studies in Siberia. American and Siberian Frontier. Analyzing the key points of the collective monograph, the author quite rightly noted that the book is a reflection of Russian historians on similar moments in the history of Siberia and America. Central to the article devoted to the consideration of two works - A.D. Ageeva and N.Yu. Zamyatina. D.Ya. Rezun analyzes these works in detail, reveals causal relationships in the author's conceptual constructions, and provides counterarguments that refute the original theses. However, for all its merits, the article by a Novosibirsk researcher is based on an analysis of a minimum number of studies.

Tomsk scientist M.Ya. Pelipas reviewed American scientific surveys in the frontier plane. The undoubted advantage of the author's approach is a more detailed disclosure of the ideas of the founder of frontierism F. Turner. The works of modern Russian historians are considered inextricably linked with the

provisions of the American colleague. In our opinion, this opens up broader prospects for research work, since Turner's concept is often reduced solely to the idea of a "moving border", which, of course, is a narrow view of the problem. Despite the initial historiographic message of the article, its main content is an analysis of a number of scientific events devoted to the study of the theory of the frontier.

Significant contribution Krasnoyarsk researcher A.S. Khromykh. To date, his authorship belongs to the most holistic historiographical work, which puts the focus on the evolution of research thought in the theoretical plane of the frontier, and not abstract concepts and categories. The author carried out a thorough and painstaking analysis of the works of historians, which is an indisputable merit of the study. A.S. Khromykh not only reveals and, often, subjects the positions of various scientists to critical examination, but also compares them with each other, finds nodes of contradictions, and indicates the logical connections of individual elements of the position. A peculiar approach to the vision of the historiography of the theory of the frontier is presented in the work of V.P. Rumyantseva and E.V. Khakhalkina. The system-forming element of the study was a correspondence comparison of European historical works on frontierism with modern Russian works. When constructing reasoning, a problematic principle was used, which violates the logical integrity of the concepts presented. In addition, the range of domestic works used by V.P. Rumyantsev and E.V. Khakhalkina, is incomplete, and the already existing historiographic reviews are not affected by the authors.

Thus, despite certain merits, it is premature to say that the study of Russian historiography of the theory of the frontier has been completed. Until now, no directions in the historiography of the phenomenon have been identified, the author's positions are considered in isolation, attempts to find common features in the logical constructions of researchers remain isolated. In turn, our analysis allows us to identify three main directions in the national historiography of the concept of the frontier: socio-geographical, civilizational and alternative.

The socio-geographic direction is characterized by a judgment about the primary influence on the frontier of a geographical or spatial factor, which is in close connection with social categories. These definitions are defended in their works by several scientists, one of whom is N.Yu. Zamyatin. Her conceptual position is distinguished by the desire to define the phenomenon under consideration and to analyze the relationship between the components included in it. Initially, the frontier was perceived by N.Yu. Zamyatina in general terms as a specific institution that contributes to the formation of American society. In his next article, the scientist points out that "the frontier is a zone of special social

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

conditions, that is, a territory, social and economic processes, on which are determined by the ongoing process of development." In other words, the geographical factor is primary, expressed in the specifics of the course of integrative phenomena. With this approach, the most important structural element of the frontier, according to N.Yu. Zamyatin, is an unstable equilibrium. Concretizing this category, she singled out two types of instability: natural extremeness and military-political instability. We share the position of the researcher regarding the second type of instability. At the same time, the thesis of natural extremeness deserves a more detailed study. Not all geographic regions, in the study of which the concept of the frontier is used, are geographically extreme. Most likely, we should not talk about natural extremeness, but about natural originality as a factor of instability. An integral part of the definition of "frontier" for N.Yu. Zamyatin is the provision on the social frontier.

Almost in parallel with N.Yu. Zamyatina, the concept of the Irkutsk historian A.D. Ageeva. He considered the relationship between such concepts as the American "frontier" and the Siberian "frontier" in the context of the so-called civilizational break. According to the scientist, initially there was a movement of two opposite frontiers: "Russian-Siberian" and "American". Their meeting took place in the Pacific Ocean, and the result was a collision and the emergence of a civilizational fault. Criticizing this thesis A.D. Ageeva, A.S. Khromykh notes that the meeting point of the two moving forces was the contact zone. However, the Krasnoyarsk researcher made a methodological inaccuracy by replacing the concept of "frontier" used by A.D. Ageev, the concept of "civilization". In the position of A.D. Ageev, these terms are not synonymous. The Irkutsk historian in his reasoning relied on the position of A.I. Nekless that the "historical space of the New Age" has been exhausted, the lack of potential has led to a "crisis of the civilizational model". In this regard, one should not see in the concept of A.D. Ageev the priority of the civilizational model, especially since the historian himself noted the high role of several factors in the emergence of the frontier: climate, space, capital. Without highlighting more or less significant components, the author did not outline the system of priorities. Nevertheless, even a primary analysis makes it possible to combine climate and space into one component that influences the formation and emergence of the specifics of the frontier - geographical. It is he who appears at A.D. Ageeva primary. As for capital as a factor in the evolution of the frontier, this position was convincingly refuted by D.Ya.

Representatives of another trend, the civilizational one, perceive the frontier in a completely different way. The geographical factor acquires a secondary meaning for them, and the

interaction of the newcomer and autochthonous population comes to the fore. At the same time, each of the two sides is a representative of a separate civilization (or culture as one of the options). Among the first to substantiate this position was D.Ya. Rezun. In one of his works, he notes that the term "frontier" is usually understood as "the place or moment of the meeting of two cultures of different levels of development." Somewhat expanding this interpretation, the respected author notes that the frontier is possible only when two cultures of different levels of civilization meet and contact. The argumentation of this position is based on the assertion that when cultures of the same level come into contact, the frontier is impossible, because a community of a new quality is not born. These provisions of D.Ya. Rezun should be considered key due to the fact that the rejection of the geographical priority and the evolution of the social factor into a civilizational one are the author's innovation. Discussing the dynamics of the frontier, in particular the Siberian one, D.Ya. Rezun identifies several indicators that influenced its formation: historical background, space, climate and relief. In the context of substantiating the influence of the historical background on the variability of the frontier (on the example of Siberia), the author notes that the development of the region in the 17th–19th centuries. proceeded under the significant influence of the Russian centralized state. However, it seems to us that this judgment is debatable. The central government had only minor levers of control over the administrative.

In a slightly different direction, the scientific research of M.V. Shilovsky. Without discarding the idea of civilizational contacts as the driving force of the frontier, the Novosibirsk researcher traced the evolution of the frontier. In this regard, he managed to build one of the clearest concepts for understanding the essence of the frontier. M.V. Shilovsky identified several types of frontier (in the context of the history of Siberia), successively replacing each other. In accordance with the author's opinion, an external frontier first arises, during which there is an acquaintance of civilizations that have not yet entered a kind of "enclosing field" of colonization. The outer frontier passes into the inner one, provided not only the inclusion of territories into the state, but also the registration of tributary relations with the autochthonous population. The greatest interest, according to M.V. Shilovsky, represents precisely the inner frontier, i.e. points of contact of permanent Russian settlements with the place of residence of local peoples inside the emerging frontier. The final type of frontier is internally civilizational, which is associated with the emergence of a specific local culture, the formation of a special mentality.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Main part

The Arctic space is changeable: climate change is stronger here than in the middle zone, cities and towns appear and disappear faster, large projects begin and stop. The volatility of the Arctic has a transformative effect on many institutions and phenomena. This is the basis of the view of the Arctic cities as a potential frontier of urbanism - a natural environment for the development of institutional, technological, planning innovations developed in the Arctic and subsequently applied in other cities of the world. The article is based on a generalization, on the one hand, of the experience of developing strategic planning documents for a number of municipalities in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation, carried out at the Center for the Economy of the North and the Arctic SOPS in the last decade, and on the other hand, a theoretical study of the principles of modern.

Different countries have their own "springs" of development, and very often such a spring is not rich resources and the convenience of the situation, not a gift of fate, but, on the contrary, a problem in the solution of which the country acquires its own advantages. The small island space taught the Japanese how to conserve resources. The boundless expanses of the North American mainland have created an outstanding automobile power - the birthplace of mobile homes and food on the go. European history and economics were born in the cramped quarters of walled cities. In Russia, such a spring, apparently, should be considered the development of the North.

The title of the article mentions "frontier". This term has firmly entered the dictionary of scientists writing about the development of new lands. The frontier is usually called the cutting edge of development, but in fact the term is more capacious, so it is difficult to accurately translate it into Russian. Neither the "edge", nor the "border", nor the "frontier" convey the most important thing - that transformative power with which frontiers and edges influence those who overcome them. The frontier is best translated as a "challenge", the need to respond to which stimulates experimentation, development, and evolution. The Arctic is just such a challenge for Russia.

Few people correctly define the main property of the frontier. Resource reserves are not a frontier if they can be mastered by standard methods: not every mining activity is a frontier. The prerequisites for a frontier are risk and uncertainty in the name of a meaningful goal. The frontier is necessarily associated with the need to respond to this challenge of uncertainty, it is an environment for the generation of new institutions, technologies, social relations, an environment for the formation of a new development trajectory, a kind of point (more precisely, a zone) of bifurcation.

The concept of the frontier was introduced into scientific circulation by the American historian F. J.

Turner at the very end of the 19th century. Turner's work was entitled "The Meaning of the Frontier in American History": its significance was to discover the educative, transformative impact of the frontier experience on young American society. Europeans who explored the American continent faced a host of challenges of uncertainty: the need to understand a different Indian civilization, to apply new agricultural practices in the cultivation of prairie black earth, to solve the problem of transporting people and products across half the continent, to establish supplies for remote gold mines, to solve the problems of interaction between migrants from different social strata, nationalities and skin colors.

The image of the frontier - open horizons - not only uninhabited, but undeveloped in every sense of the word, the horizons of the misunderstood. It is characteristic that in Russia interest in the frontier grows during transitional epochs, during periods of uncertainty. The surge to the topic of the frontier in the scientific works of the 1990s is memorable (especially bright in this sense was the work of Elena Petrovskaya "Part of the World" [Petrovskaya 1995]. The Arctic Strategy of the Russian Federation was adopted, the land borders of the Arctic were finally determined by presidential decree, Arctic expeditions are financed after a long break. , to the success stories of former pioneers. Therefore, we conceived a book about the Arctic as a frontier right now, in the midst of a general search for ways to develop the country, a national idea, national pride: it seems to us that in these searches it is impossible not to turn to the Arctic.

Today, when Russian history seems to be going through another point of choosing a path, a bifurcation, it is important to realize that although interest in the Arctic fades, then flares up, the Arctic is a permanent challenge that Russia will always have. In this sense, the Arctic is a special frontier. Other world frontiers were associated with uncertainty, unexploredness in some specific, finite period of time: uncertainty was associated with the fact that some territory, area of knowledge was not yet mastered at that moment. The line can be passed. But the Arctic cannot be "forever", finally mastered due to its specific natural, social, spatial conditions; The Arctic will always be a challenge for humans. Back in the 60s, both in the USSR and abroad, there was an illusion of the possibility of a "final" development of the Arctic, there were projects to create comfortable arctic settlements. For the sake of this, in Sweden (Kiruna), and then in Canada (Resolute Bay and Fairmont), cities were surrounded by windproof walls; in the Soviet North in the same years, projects were born to create giant residential complexes designed to replace entire urban areas. But all these were stable, "for centuries" forms - those projects are very much. We are talking about the famous "pyramids" of Alexander Shipkov and colleagues, which were designed to remind the dream of creating

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

settlements on other planets - as well as the “apple trees on Mars”, turned out to be unviable. Today it is obvious that a different strategy is more natural for the Arctic: not rigid, large-scale solutions “forever”, but, on the contrary, mobile, modular, mobile, flexibly adaptable to specific conditions.

The variability of conditions and adequate flexible adaptation strategies permeate all aspects of life in the Arctic. The volatility of external conditions influences mining strategies, the layout of cities and towns, the life cycles of indigenous peoples and the rhythms of modern migration waves, and institution building. Forcibly, all spheres of life in the Arctic acquire common features, and these features are flexibility, readiness for search and transformation. Otherwise, tough, non-adaptive projects end in failure: degradation of the natural environment, deserted villages, mothballed deposits.

One of the directions of manifestation of the Arctic frontier is the Arctic urbanization. Arctic cities deserve to be considered as a special phenomenon, distinguished at a qualitative level by special patterns of urban development. It should be noted that the trend of increasing attention to the Arctic cities can already be traced in Russian and international practice. In recent years, both in Russia and abroad, more and more work has appeared on the Arctic cities. However, an understanding of Arctic urbanization as a special complex phenomenon has not yet been developed. Therefore, in this paper, the goal is to outline the main directions for the manifestation of the originality of the Arctic cities, based on their frontier nature - as a direction for promising research. Wherein.

The Frontier North, paradoxically, has much in common with the conditions of life in the largest cities, in megalopolises. This is a high proportion of recent migrants and, as a result, the acuteness of adaptation problems, breaking the habitual way of life for new arrivals, and restructuring social ties. This is the acuteness of the problems of arranging everyday life, utilities, living space - in cities due to crowding of the population, in the North - the severity of natural conditions. These are distant, thousands of kilometers away, trade and information communications - a typical feature of both large cities and the Arctic frontier.

Of course, there is a fundamental difference. According to modern views, cities derive their potential for economic growth from internal diversity. The exchange of knowledge in large cities serves to accelerate innovation processes - which is why cities, being at the forefront of innovation, provide an open field for new economic opportunities. A chain reaction is launched: a large number of the population provides demand for a variety of goods and services, a variety of activities creates favorable conditions for the birth of ever new innovations on the "cross-pollination" of different industries and at the same

time attracts even more people. There is a so-called increasing returns effect.

The classical frontier, of course, works differently: here, economic growth, as a rule, is provided by rich resources, for the first time on a large scale involved in economic circulation: land, raw materials. Prominent Japanese economist M. Fujita of Norilsk and Snezhnogorsk described the modern frontier in Southeast Asia, based on the primary involvement in the economy of the huge labor resources of the rural population of the countries of this region. The frontal turning point here is that countries are turning from consumers of mass demand goods into their producers - the whole system of relations in society is changing dramatically. The frontier strikes the imagination of contemporaries: in the frontier regions, in a matter of years, new cities are growing on the site of a wild field or poor villages, new industries are flourishing, and the space is changing radically. Opportunities for education and careers are opening up that the previous generation never dreamed of. Let's look at the transformation of the North in Soviet times - it was growth on the resource frontier. But let's look at modern China - this is growth on the frontier of cheap labor.

However, the frontier state usually passes quickly as the resource is exhausted (in the latter case, labor becomes more expensive as the standard of living rises). And only in the Arctic, as we have already written, the economy, institutions, organization of the territory and all everyday life retain frontier properties permanently. Life in the Arctic adapts to mobility, uncertainty, large amplitudes of changes in natural and economic conditions, and this change of conditions, either closing or opening new opportunities, is a special condition for the development of cities in the Arctic zone.

In this regard, the Arctic cities, we repeat, are a special phenomenon. Cities in the North, in the Arctic, are a real frontier of urbanism, a frontier squared, where the laws of urban development and the laws of the frontier combine and interfere in an amazing way.

Frontier conditions are a constant challenge to the sustainable existence of the city - this challenge creates the conditions for enhanced innovative search. In order for a frontier city to exist, it is necessary to answer a much larger number of questions than for the existence of at least its complete analogue in central Russia. Therefore, in the Arctic cities, the function of an innovation laboratory inherent in cities is carried out - however, the driving forces of this process are somewhat different.

Modern urbanism is based on the advantages of a large city, where it is a large population that provides a variety of environment as a condition for innovative creativity. The Arctic city is a “creator” and an innovator unwillingly; here, a smaller population is compensated by an increased activity of innovative

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

search. In this sense, even a small Arctic city is “more of a city” than its counterpart in the middle lane. Arctic cities often have a larger range of services, more active population renewal, and large volumes of construction compared to similar southern cities. Thanks to the continued support for vacation trips, the population of the Arctic cities of Russia is more mobile, therefore, in terms of information, the Arctic cities are more open than usual.

The external environment, on the other hand, is hostile. From the point of view of the network approach, the main feature of the Arctic cities is their dependence on “long-distance connections” - this is their fundamental difference from the cities of the main settlement zone, and the reason for their frontier character. A harsh climate limits the growth of population density - and cities that emerge in sparsely populated areas find themselves in fundamentally different conditions than their “moderate” counterparts. The cities of Western Europe and North America, on which almost all modern urban theories were formed, are cities of dense networks (described by Braudel, Rokkan, etc.). Between cities in such a network there is a constant dense exchange of goods and services, knowledge and innovation.

Arctic cities are also interconnected with other cities - but these connections are too far away, and most importantly, the range of such connections is very limited. The cities of the European urban network are linked by many roads: the density of the network insures them against falls; in case of termination of communication in one direction, it is compensated by others. Arctic cities, on the other hand, are often connected with the outside world by only one communication line - the Northern Sea Route, the only route, etc.; the role of air traffic somewhat levels this situation, but in general, the Arctic cities are a kind of modern, “cities of caravan routes of the 20th century (not yet the 21st)”, dependent on events at the far ends of these caravan routes: if caravans stop moving, life will end these cities.

This happened in the industrial, in previous eras - and is happening now, if the role of the city is still understood in a narrow, production sense. However, in the modern world, the role of cities, as mentioned above, is different, it is more and more based on their internal resources, and the main urban function is innovative search. In this regard, even with the reduction of the “caravan” function of the Arctic cities, their life should not stop: shrinking, however, they must be preserved as information bases for the development of the Arctic, as scientific centers - which is happening in the West, where the main functions of many Arctic settlements - scientific.

What areas are being searched? First of all, in those related to the life support of the Arctic as a whole (climate, etc.) - but also in the sphere of life support of the cities themselves: Arctic architecture, urban economy, social institutions.

In this regard, the city of Norilsk was an ideal Arctic city in Soviet times: the institutions that worked to maintain the life of the city worked to generate new knowledge for the country as a whole. Paradoxically, already in Stalin's times, “Architects sought to get to Norilsk, a city that for many cultural and art figures, theater and film artists, and musicians became a place to improve their skills.” It was here that a number of new methods of building on permafrost, methods of arctic agriculture and landscaping of northern cities, etc. were developed. However, in general, the challenges of the Arctic for the city were perceived rather narrowly - mainly in relation to natural challenges - winds, frosts, permafrost. At the same time, in most cases with the exception of individual projects by the Swede R. Erskine, Norilsk architects A. Shibkova, Ya.K. Trushinsh and some others, the main creativity was limited to the adaptation and modification of standard projects of medium latitude to the conditions of the Far North.

However, other aspects of Arctic urbanization are practically not affected - and first of all, this is the search for answers to the challenge of dynamic population changes. High dependence on external development factors, on raw materials industries, the “caravan” nature of many Arctic cities (distant and often uncontested, not duplicated “shoulders” of transport communication) makes periodic fluctuations in the population of Arctic cities their permanent and inevitable, “innate” feature. Therefore, a new, yet untested way of planning is needed here. So far, there are two extremes in the Russian Arctic. On the one hand, these are attempts to build Arctic cities as complete analogues of cities in central Russia - with pompous “Stalinist” architecture in the middle of the 20th century and with concrete high-rise buildings, and even skyscrapers at a later time, with wide streets and squares, regardless of the wind and snow drifts - “according to the latest fashion” of external samples borrowed for the Arctic (this is a feature of Soviet and Russian Arctic urbanization). On the other hand, this is an abundance of temporary, dilapidated housing, being built and occupied forcibly “in anticipation” of the appearance of expensive ones, built from imported materials and not adapted to local climatic conditions, but “normal” concrete high-rise buildings. Obviously, intermediate forms are needed, experiments with quickly erected (but comfortable) and easily transformable housing. It is obvious that it is the Arctic, literally by nature itself, that is intended for new architectural developments, including those in the spirit of the constructivist architecture of the 1920s, with its ideas of mobility, transformability (the famous “living cells” L.

In the Arctic, such experiments are in demand, it would seem, by life itself - and it is from the Arctic that the tested models could subsequently spread to other areas - at least in the form of country housing. Among other critical issues where Arctic cities should

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHLI (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

be at the forefront are new, energy-efficient life support systems, "green" technologies, which are undergoing the most severe test of strength in the Arctic. These are the problems of a clear organization of urban transport (in the Arctic, the demand for personal vehicles, public transport and taxi services is higher than in "ordinary" cities due to the severity of climatic conditions - the phrase "our people do not go to the bakery by taxi" is inappropriate here). The acute problems of the Arctic cities are the problems of self-organization of urban communities, urban activism and urban initiatives, urban leisure, problems of adaptation of migrants (including migrants of different nationalities and cultural backgrounds), these are the problems of compensating for the generation gap, typical of northern families. Finally, these are the problems of organizing the urban economy (much more complex than in a temperate climate), the problems of waste disposal and air purity, and so on.

The main obstacle to understanding the frontier essence of the Arctic cities is, paradoxically, the distrust of local communities and administrations in their own capabilities. Setting to imitate in relation to more southern models leaves without support the real results of a spontaneous innovative search - the experiences of individual entrepreneurs, individual craftsmen in ensuring energy efficiency, creating adequate off-road vehicles, local social initiatives (for example, the experience of the children's museum). "If there is no McDonald's in a city, it's not a city," say young northerners⁶, and such a setting for the life of Arctic cities is perhaps more terrible than the frost itself. A reassessment of the situation at the highest level can change the situation - a reassessment of the role of the Arctic as an innovative testing ground for the country as a whole - a place that where it is possible and in demand by life to generate "realistic", non-ostentatious innovations - and corresponding efforts to promote Arctic innovations and the image of the Arctic as a natural environment for innovative search. Ideally, the "tested in the Arctic" brand should become no less powerful in Russia than the "developed at the military-industrial complex" brand, a formula that is used in our country as a guarantee of product quality.

Conclusion

In scientific terms, the most heterogeneous is the alternative direction of interpretation of the frontier.

With regard to it, it is impossible to completely systematize and combine the methodological messages of different authors. Each of them seeks to introduce new elements into the understanding of the frontier, not always correlating them with the general conceptual line of F. Turner. The fact is that, without offering a capacious definition of the concept, the American historian chose a methodological outline, according to which the frontier cannot be considered outside the context of the development process, which means that historicism is an integral feature of this scientific category. The researchers, referred by us to the alternative direction, in their research level the significance of either the spatial or temporal (historical) frontier paradigms.

The circle of authors who can be considered in this context is quite wide. In particular, this is N.N. Prikhodko, A.I. Shirokov, A.A. Tikhonov and others. Let us dwell only on some of them. So, N.N. Prikhodko notes the connection between geopolitics and the concept of "frontier". In his reasoning, the researcher translates the historical term into the modern geopolitical plane and, with its help, seeks to explain the specifics of the course of political processes. Such a peculiar definition of the frontier distorts the idea of the historical process, which is based on the inseparable connection between the past and the present. A.I. Shirokov proposed the thesis about the spread of "waves of the frontier". The author used the concept of "frontier" in relation to the development of the north-east of Russia in the XX century, which he identifies with the second wave of the frontier. In its turn, the scientist relates the events of Siberian history of the 17th–19th centuries to the frontier of the first wave. Trying to develop the main provisions of the American concept, researchers introduce a new term "frontier areas". According to them, "frontier areas are zones of creation and destruction, confrontation between core and periphery structures, which are the source of social change."

In conclusion, I would like to note that the differences between directions cannot be perceived as an insurmountable frontier, and the directions themselves are not antagonistic. Each of them represents an attempt, on the one hand, to expand and scientifically enrich the ideas of F. Turner, on the other hand, to develop a logically complete theoretical model that would allow further consideration of the phenomena of Russian history through the prism of the theory of the frontier.

References:

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

1. Shilovsky, M.V. (n.d.). *Frontier and resettlement* (Siberian experience). *Frontier in the history of Siberia and North America*.
2. Shubenkov, M.V., & Blagodeteleva, O.M. (2015). In search of town-planning principles for the development of northern settlements. *Town-planning*. No. 3 (37), pp. 76-81.
3. Schweitzer, P. (2016). Indigenous peoples and urbanization in Alaska and the Canadian North. *Ethnographic Review*. 2016. No. 1, pp. 10-22.
4. Pilyasov, A.N. (2016). Base cities of the Arctic frontier. *Questions of geography*. No. 141. Problems of regional development of Russia. Moscow: Code Publishing House, pp.503-529.
5. Pilyasov, A.N. (2016). Development of city centers - outpost bases of the northern frontier. *Bulletin of the SVNTs FEB RAS*. 2016. No. 1, pp.107-118.
6. Turner, F.G. (1920). *The Frontier in American History*. NY.
7. Furniss, E. (n.d.). *Imaging the Frontier: Comparative Perspective from Canada and Australia* [Electronic resource]. Retrieved from http://epress.anu.edu.au/dft/mobile_devices/ch02.html
8. Rakhimov, R.N. (n.d.). *Bashkiria is the southeastern frontier of Russia* [Electronic resource]. Retrieved from <http://www.predistoria.org/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=393>
9. Rezun, D.Ya. (2001). On some moments of understanding the significance of the frontier of Siberia and America in modern Russian historiography. *Frontier in the history of Siberia and North America in the 17th-20th centuries: general and special*, Issue. 1, Novosibirsk.
10. Bolkhovitinov, N.N. (1962). On the role of the "moving border" in the history of the United States. *Questions of history*, 1962, No. 9.
11. Khromykh, A.S. (2008). The problem of the "Siberian frontier" in modern Russian historiography. *Bulletin of ChelGU*, 2008, No. 5 (106). Story, Issue. 23.
12. Rumyantsev, V.P., & Khakhalkina, E.V. (2009). *The use of the theory of the frontier in comparative historical research: results and prospects*. "Slavic world" of Siberia. New approaches to the study of the development of North Asia, Tomsk.
13. Zamyatina, N.Yu. (1997). The Image of the Frontier in the USA and Russia. *American Studies in Siberia. American and Siberian frontier*, Issue. 2, Tomsk.
14. Zamyatina, N.Yu. (1998). Development zone (frontier) and its image in American and Russian cultures. *Social sciences and modernity*, 1998, No. 5.
15. Zamyatina, N.Yu. (2007). Norilsk - the city of the frontier. *Bulletin of Eurasia*, 2007, No. 1.
16. Ageev, A.D. (1997). American "frontier" and "Siberian frontier" as factors of civilizational break. *American studies in Siberia. American and Siberian frontier*, Issue. 2, Tomsk.
17. Neklessa, A.I. (2000). *Postmodern world in a new coordinate system. Global community: a new coordinate system*, St. Petersburg.
18. Rezun, D.Ya. (2005). *Introduction. Frontier in the history of Siberia and North America in the 17th-20th centuries: general and special*, Issue. 4, Novosibirsk.
19. Rezun, D.Ya. (2005). *Siberia, late 16th - early 20th century: frontier in the context of ethnosocial and ethnocultural processes*. Novosibirsk.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	РИИИ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350
