

doi:10.17746/1563-0110.2021.49.4.127-139

V.V. Nikolaev and I.V. Oktyabrskaya

*Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography,
Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences,
Pr. Akademika Lavrentieva 17, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia
E-mail: nikolaevv06@mail.ru; siem405@yandex.ru*

Urbanization of Indigenous Peoples of Siberia and the Far East (20th to Early 21st Centuries)

This article integrates studies relating to the history of urban communities of Siberian and Far Eastern indigenous peoples. A multidisciplinary approach to urbanization processes is used; their stages, rates, causes, and principal characteristics are analyzed. The database consists of our own field findings, published results of sociological studies, and those of All-Union and All-Russian population censuses. Three stages of urbanization affecting indigenous Siberians are described, and their factors and mechanisms are evaluated. The process is characterized by intense migration of indigenous peoples to the towns and cities during the recent period, accompanied by large-scale industrial development, and the transition of aboriginal societies from the traditional to the modern lifestyle. The urbanization, however, has not been completed, because of the underdeveloped urban infrastructure and the fact that many indigenous peoples to the cities had retained their rural traditions. The salient characteristic of the urbanization of indigenous peoples in the macroregion is that it was asynchronous, and that its short intense phase, whereby the indigenous peoples mostly moved to nearby towns and urbanized villages in the 1960s–1970s, did not extend to all indigenous communities. Urbanization was incomplete in terms of both quality and quantity, and the integration of indigenous peoples into the urban space has engendered serious problems. According to the All-Russian population census of 2010, only five indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East had completed the urbanization process: Kereks, Mansi, Nivkhs, Uilta and Shors. Currently, most indigenous peoples are medium-urbanized. The lowest level of urbanization is among the Soyots, Siberian Tatars, Telengits, Tofalars, Tubalars, Chulymys, and Tozhu Tuvans. We conclude that urbanization among the indigenous peoples is a long, difficult, and contradictory process, which, in modern Siberia, triggers many ethno-cultural and ethno-social transformations of regional multiethnic communities.

Keywords: *Indigenous peoples, Siberia, Far East, urbanization, migration.*

Introduction

Forty-three indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East, with a total of 1.6 million people (1.1 % of the population in Russia), are known in modern Russia; 37 of them are legally classified as indigenous minorities, with a total population not exceeding 50,000 people. A significant part of the peoples of Siberia live in the regions with a very high level (according to the definition

and calculations of economists) of urbanization: in Kemerovo Region, Irkutsk Region, Magadan Region, Tyumen Region, Primorsky Territory, Khabarovsk Territory, Kamchatka Territory, and Yamal-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrugs (Efimova, 2014: 5). The level of urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia ranges from 0.2 to 100 %. The problem of establishing the ratio between traditional and urban lifestyles, as well as assessment of the role of towns and

cities in elaborating the strategies for the development of the indigenous peoples in the macroregion, has become a priority in modern regional studies and ethnology.

In the administrative space and academic discourse of Russia, cities and towns are considered settlements with the population ranging from several million to several thousand people, and that are centers of trade, industry, and/or administration (Gorod i derevnya..., 2001: 79–81). Their systematic assessment is a subject of research in a wide circle of humanities and social sciences. Traditionally, urbanization is viewed as a historical process of increasing the role of towns and cities in a society, which involves changes in the development and distribution of productive forces and social infrastructure, organization of settlement, lifestyle and culture, and the spiritual values of the population. In a narrow sense, urbanization is interpreted as growth of towns and cities (especially large) and an increase in the proportion of urban residents in the structure of the regional population (Staroverov, 2010: 538).

Problems of the urban settlements and population began to be studied from the interdisciplinary point of view at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries. In the 20th century, new approaches to historical urbanism, new economic geography, and methods of urbanization indexation were developed; and theories of staged and differential urbanization, etc. were proposed (Efimova, 2014; Isupov, 2018; Kolbina, Naiden, 2013; Stas, 2020; and others).

The problems of urban studies became included into the field of ethnographic research in the second half of the 1960s. Soviet ethnologists studied theoretical and applied aspects of urbanism. The methodology of researching urban communities correlated with the concepts of ethno-social processes, which were established in Soviet science with the participation of Y.V. Bromley, Y.V. Arutyunyan, L.M. Drobizheva, G.V. Starovoitova, and other scholars (Budina, Shmeleva, 1977: 26; Sovremennye etnicheskiye protsessy..., 1977; Stas, 2017).

By the end of the 20th century, in Russia, there had emerged a subfield of the ethnography/anthropology of the city, including several areas such as historical and ethnographic research, study of migration and ethno-demographic processes, identification of trends in social and cultural development, and analysis of urban communities in terms of their group identities (Pivneva, 2017; Stas, 2020; Urbanizatsiya..., 2001).

The topic of urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East was actively discussed in Russian ethnography at the turn of the 20th–21st centuries, although interest in it had already arisen in the early 20th century, owing to the processes of modernization of Russian regions, including Siberia. Even at the early period, the indigenous peoples were taken into account as a part of the population structure of

Siberian towns and cities, in the studies of their history and specific aspects by I.V. Turchaninov, G.I. Potanin, A.I. Petrov, and other scholars (see, e.g., (Bakhrushin et al., 1929: 717–724)).

Problems of social transformation (including urbanization) among the indigenous peoples of Siberia became one of the priorities in Russian science in the 1950s owing to the industrial development of resources in the macroregion. In 1955, at the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the laboratory for studying the processes of building socialism among the indigenous minorities of the North was created. By 1960, its employees had prepared about thirty reports on the issues related to the indigenous minorities of the North for the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Council of the USSR, Commission on the Problems of the North, Council for the Study of Productive Forces at the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and other agencies (Dolgikh, 2005: 160).

In 1963, when the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences was founded, a department for the problems of the development of ethnic relations was created at the Joint Scientific Council; and in 1968, a department for integrated research into the problems of the development of the peoples of Siberia was established at the Institute of History, Philology, and Philosophy of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The USSR Academy of Sciences launched a comprehensive program aimed at assessing the social and economic development of the peoples of the North (Programma koordinatsii..., 1987). The content of the program was determined by the objectives of “elaborating the concept for the development of the peoples of the North in the conditions of scientific and technological progress for the future until 2010, establishing the strategy and tactics for managing internationalization processes, designing proposals for planning and regulating social processes” (Nivkhi Sakhalina..., 1988: 17). As a part of implementing this project in 1968–1987, a large-scale survey of the indigenous population of the Amur Region, Yakutia, Chita, Sakhalin, and Kamchatka Regions, and the Baikal-Amur Mainline was carried out (Kultura narodnostey Severa..., 1986; Boiko, 1988; and others). On the basis of the results of these works, conclusions were drawn about the contradictory nature of urbanization among the indigenous peoples: the growth in importance of towns and cities in their lives was accompanied by the exacerbation of social, economic, ethnic, and cultural problems (Kultura narodnostey Severa..., 1986; Boiko, Popkov, 1987; and others).

For comprehensive study of this problem, the Institute of the Problems of Northern Development SB RAS was created in 1985, and the Institute for Humanities Research and Indigenous Studies of the North SB RAS and other structures were established in 1991.

In the 2000s, the growing role of the Arctic and Subarctic in the strategies for the social and economic development of Russia triggered a new round of interest in studying the indigenous population of northern regions. In this context, the problem of urbanization resurfaced as the focus of attention, becoming a part of the projects of the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology RAS, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography SB RAS, Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera) RAS, etc. The methodology of these studies was designed taking into account not only Russian, but also global experience. In the course of their implementation, a series of publications was prepared, wherein the nature of urbanization among the indigenous inhabitants of Siberia was identified (*Perspektivy i riski...*, 2014; “*Resurnoye proklyatiye*”..., 2019; *Rossiyskaya Arktika...*, 2016; and others).

In the latest works of Russian ethnographers, the urbanization of Siberia and the Far East was analyzed in a broad historical and social context. However, no comprehensive comparative studies aimed at identifying the essence of urbanization processes among various peoples of Siberia and the Far East have been carried out.

The purpose of this study was to establish factors, stages, and rates of urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East in the 20th to early 21st centuries, as well as the reasons for, and consequences of, their migration to towns and cities. The research was based on the field materials of V.V. Nikolaev and I.V. Oktyabrskaya, regulatory documents, published results of sociological surveys, data from the All-Russian (1897, 2002, and 2010) and All-Union (1926, 1939, 1959, 1970, 1979, and 1989) population censuses, as well as other sources, including publications with statistical information on urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East (Bogoyavlensky, 2012; Nagnibeda, 1917; Stepanov, 2008).

Factors, mechanisms, and stages of urbanization

Historical studies based on a wide range of sources point to some specific aspects of urbanization processes in Siberia. The emergence of towns in this region in the 17th–18th centuries marked the beginning of the first stage of urbanization. In the most general terms, their history was determined by a gradual transformation of military settlements into administrative, trading, and industrial centers with a large share of the rural (peasant) population (Goroda Sibiri..., 1978).

According to the 1897 Census, 327,860 persons lived in the towns and cities of Siberia, comprising 9.2 % of the total population; the largest cities were those of Tomsk (52,210 persons) and Irkutsk (51,473 persons). In

the structure of the population in most towns and cities, Russians accounted for 87.9 %; indigenous peoples lived in Ulal (17 % of Altaians), Ust-Abakansk (6.3 % of Khakasses), etc. (Bakhrushin et al., 1929: 705–706, 717).

Evaluation of the social and historical context in terms of the urban studies makes it possible to identify the factors that determined the prospects for the emergence of the category of “urban residents” from the indigenous peoples during this period. These factors include the location of settlements in the areas of their compact residence, the possibility of adapting traditional culture to the emerging urban environment, and a system and intensity of contacts through which future towns generated economic benefits. Urban infrastructure turned into a means of sustaining economic growth, achieving social mobility and the well-being of the population of Siberia. Urban settlements universally shaped the space of social and cultural innovations.

The prerequisites for urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia were the processes of social transformation. In the 18th–19th centuries, the ethnic strata, adapted to existence in the Imperial space, emerged. The practice of administering the Russian state and the proselytism of the Russian Orthodox Church created conditions and resources for the social mobility of the aboriginal population. In the late 19th century, there were the Altai, Kirghiz, Irkutsk, Transbaikalia, Kamchatka, Obdorsk, Surgut, Yenisei, and Yakut missions in Siberia, which were intended for preaching the Orthodox faith in aboriginal languages. By the 1860s–1870s, the missions were united into the Orthodox Missionary Society; in 1909, over eight hundred schools (with classes in Russian and aboriginal languages) operated in Russia, and 19,000 children studied with the Society’s financial support (Nechaev, 2014: 141; Nikolaev, 2009). Although adoption of Christianity was not universal, it had a certain influence on ethno-cultural and ethno-social processes among the indigenous population. Until the early 20th century, growth in the numbers of urban residents among the indigenous inhabitants of Siberia remained insignificant. The reason was that the management practices of the Siberian territories, which had developed since the late 16th century, primarily assumed the stability of indigenous communities in their traditional ways of life. These included the taxation system (gathering of the *yasak* tax), principles of ethnic and confessional zoning, minimal interference in internal affairs, support for internal self-governance, and protection from external enemies. The Russian state was interested in income from *yasak*; and so it expanded its subordinate lands, and tried to preserve the numbers of the indigenous people, as well as the status of territories as lands for traditional use of natural resources by the taxable indigenous population (Skobelev, 1999).

Until the early 20th century, paternalism, which was stipulated in the Charter on the Management of Non-Russians in 1822, determined predominantly conservative trends of ethnic policy at the local level. Only those individual aboriginal communities were engaged in modernization processes that, owing to historical circumstances, were involved in the development of the administrative, transport, and trading infrastructure of Siberia. By the early 20th century, a significant urban stratum had emerged among the Siberian Tatars, Buryats, and Yakuts (Istoriya Buryatii, 2011: 199–204; Korusenko, Tomilov, 2011: 178–183; Palikova, 2010: 28–40; Petrov, 1990; and others).

The example of Yakutia is especially indicative: its towns developed slowly as administrative, trading, and transportation centers; initially, in their appearance, structure, and social composition, they hardly differed from rural settlements. In 1897, there were five towns in Yakutia; the population of Yakutsk was 6535 persons. In 1926, 10,558 persons, including 3260 Yakuts, lived in this town; 2285 persons, including 231 Yakuts, lived in Olekminsk, and 1334 persons, including 921 Yakuts, lived in Vilyuisk. In total, the number of urban residents in Yakutia in 1926 was 15,698 persons, or 5.7 % of the total population; of these, 32.1 % were Yakuts (Bakhrushin et al., 1929: 723).

With the establishment of the Soviet power in Siberia, the Committee of the North at the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee was engaged in solving the problems of indigenous peoples. The Committee of the North existed in 1924–1935, and was focused on “promoting the systematic arrangement of the minorities of the North” (Dekret VTsIK..., (s.a.)). Its organizational and administrative work was based on the Temporary Regulation on Administration of Indigenous Peoples and Tribes of the Northern Borders of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, from 1926. The norms stipulated by this legislation determined the Soviet model of paternalism; they also implicitly fostered urbanization through the practices of ethno-political and ethno-territorial zoning, “indigenization” of the administrative apparatus, and adaptation of cultural and educational structures to the conditions of the North (Dobrova-Yadrintseva et al., 1931: 865–872).

Growth in the number of urban residents among the indigenous peoples during this period was triggered by changes in the status of settlements in the course of establishing ethnic administrative structures, such as the Buryat-Mongol Autonomous Okrug in 1921, Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1922, Oirat Autonomous Okrug in 1922, Gorno-Shor Ethnic District in 1926, the Khakass Autonomous Okrug in 1930, Ostyak-Vogul Ethnic District in 1930, etc. The layer of indigenous peoples—Buryats, Yakuts, Altaians, Khakasses,

Shors, etc.—increased in the capital towns of these autonomies, the status of which changed over time.

Some of the historic towns became industrial centers. The Soviet state policy of modernization led to the emergence of industrial towns and urban-type settlements in Siberian and Far Eastern regions, which attracted the indigenous population with new working and living conditions. People fled to towns and cities from fear of hunger, dispossession, and persecutions (Boiko, Popkov, 1987: 95).

The situation in the Kuznetsk Territory was typical of this period. That region had been actively developed since the 17th century; then, within the boundaries of the Teleuts and Shors dispersal area, new settlements appeared, including those of the urban type, such as Kuznetsk Sibirsky (since 1931, Novokuznetsk), which was founded as a fort in 1618.

In the early 20th century, there were four towns in Kuznetsky Uyezd (since 1948, Kemerovo Region). By the late 1930s, there were twelve towns in the region. The number of settlements having the status of towns and urban settlements further increased rapidly. The indigenous inhabitants mostly remained rural residents, although some of their settlements were located on the outskirts of new towns. According to the 1926 Census, only seven out of 1898 Teleuts and 83 out of 12,601 Shors were urban residents. From 1939 until 2002, the Teleuts were counted as a part of the Altaians. According to the 1970 Census, more than 50 % of the Shors lived in towns and cities (see *Table*).

Analysis of the sources makes it possible to consider the 1950s–1960s as the beginning of the second stage of urbanization. This time was associated with large-scale social and economic transformations in the east of the USSR, which involved mining of the deposits of natural resources, development of energy supplies, industrial development of territories, reorganization of agriculture on industrial basis, liquidation of “depressed” villages, and consolidation of administrative centers (Slezkin, 2008: 383–385).

In 1957, the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the USSR “On the Measures for Further Development of the Economy and Culture of the Peoples of the North” was issued. The Resolution stated that as a result of socialist transformations, the peoples of the North “mostly shifted to sedentary way of life, ensured the growth of economy, raised a significant group of their intellectuals, have a network of schools, health-promoting and cultural and educational institutions, built comfortable villages in a number of places, and have great opportunities for further development of their economy and culture” (Postanovleniye..., 1957). The culture and economy of Siberia were meant to develop on this basis.

In fact, the modernization of the North in the 1950s–1970s, which was sanctioned by the authorities, entailed withdrawal of lands of traditional nature management in favor of raw-material enterprises, and the leveling of many areas of traditional subsistence. The practice of “administrative town-formation”, whereby the status of urban settlements was assigned to large rural administrative centers, became widespread; transition to a sedentary lifestyle (initiated already in the 19th century) became irreversible (Krivonogov, 2017; Popov, 2005: 217; and others). The policy of settlement consolidation was accompanied by the organization of boarding schools. Education in such schools has produced generations alienated from ethnic traditions and their indigenous language (Lyarskaya, 2003: 16). This determined the context for the social mobility of indigenous peoples of the northern territories, and facilitated their migration to towns and cities.

In the 1950s–1970s, migrations of the “village-town” pattern became typical for the majority of the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East. Owing to the development of transport infrastructure, towns and cities became easily accessible. They offered a qualitatively different standard of living, and satisfied the growing needs of rural residents (Boiko, 1977: 182). Work-oriented and educational migration gradually became the leading factor in the urbanization of the peoples of Siberia and the Far East. For example, in the Far East, in the course of industrialization, twenty four new towns, including fifteen on Sakhalin Island, appeared from 1940 to 1950, and ten towns appeared from 1960 to 1990 (Vlasov, 2013: 104–105).

V.I. Boiko described the redistribution of the indigenous population in the region, using the example of the town of Amursk in the Khabarovsk Territory. This town was founded in 1958, in connection with the construction of the Amur Pulp and Cardboard Mill. In 1962, it became the district center, in the status of industrial township; and in 1973, acquired the status of town. It was built in the shortest time possible, on the site of the Nanai village of Padali-Vostochnoye. “At that time, the Nanais of this village had a choice: to stay at the construction of a new town or to move to another place. A significant part of them moved to the new, well-equipped village of Omni... However, already in the first five years, every sixth family and almost all young people had moved to Amursk” (Boiko, 1977: 206–207).

Large-scale sociological surveys were carried out in 1968–1987 by the Institute of History, Philology, and Philosophy of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences; these concerned the peoples living in the Lower Amur region; Yakutia; the northern regions of the Baikal-Amur Mainline; and the Chita, Sakhalin, and Kamchatka regions. According to the results of these, and of other similar studies conducted in the 1990s under

the leadership of Boiko, the following conclusions were arrived at. The tactics of state management of social and economic development among the indigenous peoples in the Soviet period was based on the concept of their concentration in large (stationary) rural settlements; the process of transforming villages into urban settlements intensified; from 1959 to 1970, the urban population in most northern regions doubled; youth dominated in the structure of migration from villages to towns; the key factors of urbanization were the increased social and cultural level of the indigenous communities and the growth of the social and economic capacity of the regions; the cellular nature of development preconditioned a limited influence of towns and cities on nearby villages; urbanization did not become a factor in the dispersal of ethnic communities; on the contrary, it often contributed to the intensification of intra-ethnic ties and the growth of ethnic self-awareness (BAM..., 1979; Boiko, 1973, 1977; Boiko, Vasilyev, 1981; Boiko, Popkov, 1987; Vinokurova, 1992; Markhinin, Udalova, 1993; Nivkhi Sakhalina..., 1988; and others).

The third stage of urbanization was associated with a set of ethno-cultural and socio-economic processes in the 1990s. The systemic crisis led to the exodus of population from the Arctic towns and cities of Russia. From 1989 to 2016, dozens of towns and cities in the Russian Arctic lost from 20 to 50 % of their population. Deindustrialization was accompanied by changes in values and in the social and cultural environment, and also by reorganization in the economic structure (Baburin, Zemtsov, 2015: 78; Zamyatina, Pilyasov, 2017: 8). Owing to the cessation of centralized food and fuel supplies, many urban settlements were liquidated, which led to organized redistribution of the population. Some of the indigenous residents from the depopulated settlements were administratively resettled in towns and cities (Kolomiets, 2020: 208). Throughout the 1990s, multidirectional dynamics of absolute and relative indicators of urbanization were typical for many peoples of Siberia and the Far East. For example, there was a sharp decline in the population in industrial cities and towns in the Amur region during that period. The indigenous peoples of the region had a tendency to return to traditional values and technologies against the background of economic recession, degradation of urban infrastructures, and the collapse of the state farming system (Maltseva, 2018: 169).

Ethnic dynamics correlated with reforms of local self-governance, which began in 2003, when rural and urban settlements were reorganized. A new type of municipality—the urban district—appeared. This again changed the nature of urbanization among the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East (see *Table*). In the 1990s–2000s, the process of urbanization among the indigenous peoples living in the zone of resource (oil and gas) development (the Khanty, Mansi, and Nenets)

Dynamics of urbanization indicators among the indigenous

People	1926			1939			1959			1970		
	Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population	
		persons	%		persons	%		persons	%		persons	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Aleuts	353	15	4.3	421	85	20.2	441	99	22.5
Altaians	40,600	1089	2.7	47,867	4244	8.9	45,270	4805	10.6	55,812	8229	14.7
Buryats	237,501	2491	1.1	224,719	20,741	9.2	252,959	42,801	16.9	314,671	77,264	24.6
Dolgans	656	0	0	4877	621	12.7
Itelmens	4217	116	2.8	1109	154	13.9	1301	304	23.4
Kamchadals
Kereks
Ket people	1428	49	3.4	1019	50	4.9	1182	135	11.4
Koryaks	7439	4	0.1	7354	70	1.0	6287	438	7.0	7487	1578	21.1
Kumandins	6335	8	0.1
Mansi	5754	12	0.2	6315	199	3.2	6449	702	10.9	7710	2011	26.1
Nanais	5860	37	0.6	8526	240	2.8	8026	1223	15.2	10,005	2596	26.0
Nganasans	748	50	6.7	953	178	18.7
Nedigals	683	0	0	537	129	24.0
Nenets	15,462	87	0.5	24,791	872	3.5	23,007	1912	8.3	28,705	3853	13.4
Nivkhs	4076	8	0.2	3902	76	2.0	3717	607	16.3	4420	1499	33.9
Orochis	647	2	0.3	782	252	32.2	1089	455	41.8
Selkups	1630	0	0	2613	114	4.4	3768	371	9.9	4282	637	14.9
Soyots	229	0	0
Taz people
Siberian Tatars	96,135**	28,206	29.3
Telengits	3415	0	0
Teleuts	1898	7	0.4
Tofalars	2829	7	0.3	586	19	3.2	620	90	14.5
Tubalars	12	0	0
Tuvans	100,145	8988	9.0	139,388	23,879	17.1
Tozhu Tuvans
Udege people	1357	0	0	1743	40	2.3	1444	202	14.0	1469	279	19.0
Uilta people	162	0	0
Ulchis	723	0	0	2055	246	12.0	2448	391	16.0
Khakasses	45,608	492	1.1	52,771	6669	12.6	56,584	10,738	19.0	66,725	17,142	25.7
Khanty	22,306	141	0.6	18,468	553	3.0	19,410	1788	9.2	21,138	3238	15.3
Chelkans
Chuvans	705	3	0.4
Chukchi	12,332	10	0.1	13,835	158	1.1	11,727	957	8.2	13,597	2404	17.7
Chulyms
Shors	12,601	83	0.7	16,265	1813	11.2	15,274	6455	42.3	16,494	8430	51.1

population of Siberia and the Far East (1926–2010)*

1979			1989			2002			2010		
Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population		Total population, persons	including urban population	
	persons	%		persons	%		persons	%		persons	%
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
546	195	35.7	702	267	30.0	540	172	31.9	482	155	32.2
60,015	10,928	18.2	70,777	13,630	19.3	67,239	13,897	20.7	67,380	16,027	23.8
352,646	122,775	34.8	421,380	178,337	42.3	445,175	194,562	43.7	461,389	217,134	47.1
5053	742	14.7	6945	1572	22.6	7261	1334	18.4	7885	1840	23.3
1370	394	28.8	2481	956	38.5	3180	1194	37.6	3193	1245	39.0
...	2293	1297	56.6	1927	566	29.4
...	8	4	50.0	4	4	100
1122	206	18.4	1113	219	19.7	1494	406	27.2	1219	317	26.0
7879	2223	28.2	9242	2778	30.1	8743	2765	31.6	7953	2917	36.7
...	3114	1704	54.7	2892	1400	48.4
7563	2721	36.0	8474	3934	46.4	11,432	5919	51.8	12,269	7028	57.3
10,516	3880	36.9	12,023	4783	39.8	12,160	3702	30.4	12,003	3518	29.3
867	98	11.3	1278	360	28.2	834	165	19.8	862	315	36.5
504	158	31.4	622	250	40.2	567	164	28.9	513	155	30.2
29,894	4564	15.3	34,665	6193	17.9	41,302	7844	19.0	44,640	9543	21.4
4397	2077	47.2	4673	2383	51.0	5162	2483	48.1	4652	2374	51.0
1198	694	57.9	915	444	48.5	686	338	49.3	596	287	48.2
3565	703	19.7	3612	934	25.9	4249	786	18.5	3649	773	21.2
...	2769	252	9.1	3608	255	7.1
...	276	110	39.9	274	114	41.6
...	9611	4271	44.4	6779	1133	16.7
...	2399	115	4.8	3712	300	8.1
...	2650	1142	43.1	2643	1198	45.3
763	161	21.1	731	104	14.2	837	138	16.5	762	98	12.9
...	1565	150	9.6	1965	357	18.2
166,082	37,327	22.5	206,629	65,983	31.9	243,442	107,850	44.3	263,934	129,035	48.9
...	4442	7	0.2	1858	4	0.2
1551	416	26.8	2011	775	38.5	1657	425	25.7	1496	375	25.1
...	190	159	83.7	346	201	58.1	295	177	60.0
2552	711	27.9	3233	923	28.6	2913	564	19.4	2765	589	21.3
70,776	24,850	35.1	80,328	34,736	43.2	75,622	32,743	43.3	72,959	31,572	43.3
20,934	4832	23.1	22,521	6828	30.3	28,678	9924	34.6	30,943	11,879	38.4
...	855	135	15.8	1181	231	19.6
...	1511	834	55.2	1087	366	33.7	1002	396	39.5
14,000	2015	14.4	15,184	2176	14.3	15,767	3402	21.6	15,908	3808	23.9
...	656	54	8.2	355	26	7.3
16,033	10,626	66.3	16,652	12,293	73.8	13,975	9939	71.1	12,888	9353	72.6

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Evenks	38,805	151	0.4	29,666	1576	5.3	24,710	3272	13.2	25,149	3846	15.3
Evens	2044	0	0	9698	166	1.7	9121	571	6.3	12,029	2036	16.9
Enets
Eskimos	1293	11	0.9	1118	331	29.6
Yukagirs	443	4	0.9	442	86	19.5	615	208	33.8
Yakuts	240,709	5288	2.2	242,080	16,892	7.0	236,655	40,408	17.1	296,244	62,372	21.0

*After (Perepisi naseleniya... (s.a.)).

**After (Kondratieva, Batueva, 2013: 195).

remained progressive. The beginning of urbanization among the indigenous communities in northwestern Siberia was associated with organizing the Yamal-Nenets and Ostyak-Vogul (since 1940, the Khanty-Mansi) ethnic okrugs in 1930, which in 1977 and 1978, respectively, acquired the status of autonomous okrugs. The center of the Yamal-Nenets Okrug was the village of Obdorsk (founded in 1595 as Fort Obdorsk), transformed into the village of Salekhard and receiving the status of town in 1938. The capital of the Ostyak-Vogul Okrug was a newly built town that was renamed as Khanty-Mansiysk in 1940.

In the 1920s–1940s, urbanization among the indigenous population of the region was slow. The discovery of oil in 1953 gave a powerful impetus to this process. The strategy for the exploitation of oil-deposits entailed intense development of urban settlements and towns. By the early 1990s, there were sixteen towns and cities in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug–Yugra (by the late 2000s, 40 urban settlements together with townships), and eight towns and cities in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (by the late 2000s, twelve). During the oil boom, the urban population increased many times: by the early 2000s, it exceeded 80 % in Yamal and 90 % in Yugra (Popov, 2005: 238). From 1959 to 2010, the number of urban residents increased more than ten times among the Mansi, five times among the Khanty, and six times among the Nenets people (see *Table*).

During the 1990s–2000s, some peoples of Siberia showed stable rates of urbanization, others a noticeable decrease. Changes in indicators were caused by ethnic and political processes. Several ordinances shaped the normative aspects of life among the indigenous peoples. These were the laws “On Guarantees of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation” of 1999 and “On General Principles of Organizing Communities of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation” of 2000; and also orders of the Government of the Russian Federation “On the Approval of the List of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation” of 2006 and “On the Approval of the List of Places of Traditional

Residence and Traditional Economic Activities Among the Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation, and List of Types of Traditional Economic Activities of the Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation” of 2009. The connection between social and economic preferences, and the fact of traditional settlement of indigenous peoples, indicated in the legislation, led to dynamic changes in the number of urban residents in these peoples’ composition.

Thus, the emergence of towns in the 17th–18th centuries in Siberia during its accession to the Russian state marked the beginning of the first stage of urbanization among its indigenous inhabitants. The key role in this process was played by the state policy of paternalism. The processes of social transformation fostered by administrative and proselytizing practices were prerequisites for urbanization, which continued to develop at accelerated pace during the Soviet period. At that time, urbanization was associated with the emergence of ethnic administrative structures, where the stratum of urban dwellers from the indigenous peoples was rapidly growing. The second stage of urbanization, which began in the 1950s–1960s, was large-scale; it was associated with the industrialization of the east of the Soviet Union. The set of ethnic and cultural, as well as social and economic, transformations in Siberia in the 1990s determined the direction of urbanization among the indigenous peoples at the third stage.

Scale, features, and results of urbanization

The determining factors in urbanization processes among the peoples of Siberia were programs for the social and economic development of different aboriginal communities, supported by the state. The pace and extent of urbanization initially varied. According to the 1926 Census, their level of urbanization was extremely low. The results of the 1939 survey showed that the leaders of urbanization were the Khakasses (12.6 % of the total population) and the Shors (11.2 %). In 1959, Shors (42.3 %), Orochis (32.2 %),

Table (end)

14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
27,294	5864	21.5	30,163	6272	20.8	35,527	8576	24.1	38,396	10,141	26.4
12,523	2246	17.9	17,199	4369	25.4	19,071	6116	32.1	21,830	7929	36.3
...	209	90	43.1	237	51	21.5	227	57	25.1
1510	333	22.1	1719	399	23.2	1750	557	31.8	1738	628	36.1
835	255	30.5	1142	437	38.3	1509	685	45.4	1603	740	46.2
328,018	82,898	25.3	381,922	106,727	28.0	443,852	157,825	35.6	478,085	193,251	40.4

Eskimos (29.6 %), and Aleuts (20.2 %) moved to towns and cities; in 1970, it was the Shors (51.1 %), Orochis (41.8 %), Nivkhs (33.9 %), and Yukaghirs (33.8 %); in 1979 these were Shors (66.3 %), Orochis (57.9 %), and Nivkhs (47.2 %), and in 1989 it was the Uilta people (83.7 %), Shors (73.8 %), Chuvans (55.2 %), Nivkhs (51.0 %), and Orochis (48.5 %). However, the 1970 Census showed the reversibility of the process of urbanization among the indigenous population. The number of urban Eskimos decreased from 29.6 % in 1959 to 27.5 % in 1970, and to 22.1 % in 1979; that of the Nganasans decreased from 18.7 % in 1970 to 11.3 % in 1979; of the Chukchi from 17.7 % in 1970 to 14.3 % in 1989; of the Yukaghirs from 33.8 % in 1970 to 30.5 % in 1979; of the Evenki 21.5 % from in 1979 to 20.8 % in 1989; and of the Tofalars from 21.1 % in 1979 to 14.2 % in 1989.

Highly urbanized (according to formal criteria) peoples in 2010 were the Kamchadals (56.6 % in 2002 and 29.4 % in 2010), Kereks (100 % in 2010), and Kumandins (54.7 % in 2002 and 48.4 % in 2010). A high level of urbanization was maintained by the Nivkhs (51.0 %), Mansi (57.3 %), Uilta people (60.0 %), and Shors (72.6 %).

In the 1990s–2000s, deurbanization was observed in two dozen autochthonous communities, including the Kamchadals, Siberian Tatars, and Uilta people; the decrease in the share of the urban population was over 20 %. At the same time, the change in relative indicators did not always correlate with the absolute data.

The Khakasses in the intercensal period of 1926–1939 and 1970–1979, as well as the Itelmens (and possibly Kamchadals, Chuvans, and Enets) in 1959–1970 and 1979–1989 and the Udege in 1939–1959 and 1979–1989, experienced two waves of rapid urbanization. The Nganasans went through three such waves: in 1959–1970, 1979–1989, and 2002–2010. Among the Orochis and Shors, the first wave was larger; it occurred in 1939–1959, while the second, weaker wave was in 1970–1979.

Relatively long intensive urbanization in 1939–1979 was typical for a number of peoples living in the Amur region: the Nanais, Nivkhs, Orochis, and Negidals (until

1959). The rest of the peoples manifested a short but intense growth of urban population: in 1939–1959, among the Eskimos; in 1959–1970, among the Koryaks, Tofalars, Evens, and Yukaghirs; in 1959–1979, among the Mansi; in 1970–1979, among the Aleuts and Ulchis; in 1989–2002, among the Tuvans and probably Chelkans; and in 2002–2010, among the Tubalars. The most active period of migration to towns and cities among the Kumandins occurred in 1959–1979 (Nikolaev, Nazarov, 2021: 151).

Steady, gradual urbanization was typical of numerous peoples, such as Altaians, Buryats, and Yakuts, as well as such peoples as Dolgans, Kets, Nenets, Selkups, Teleuts, Khanty, Chukchi, and Evenks, who received the status of indigenous minorities in 2000 (see *Table*).

A low level of urbanization throughout the 20th century remained among the Soyots, Siberian Tatars, Telengits, Tofalars, Tubalars, Chelkans, and Chulymys, as well as Tozhu Tuvans, who had the lowest indicator (0.2 %). Their territories of traditional residence were not of interest for extracting natural resources and were located far from industrial facilities.

The analysis of statistical data for Siberia and the Far East has shown that the leaders of urbanization by 1989 were the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug (91.0 % of urban residents from the total population), Kemerovo Region (87.3 %), Sakhalin Region (82.3 %), Magadan Region (80.5 %), Kamchatka Region (81.5 %), Irkutsk Region (80.5 %), and Khabarovsk Territory (78.4 %). Local industrialization in Magadan and Kamchatka regions was not accompanied by high rates of urbanization among the Evens, Koryaks, and Itelmens. Assessment of dynamics manifested by the number of urban residents in relation to the total population is not the only criterion of urbanization, since quantitative indicators do not correspond to qualitative features of urban population among the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East (Pivovarov, 2010: 230–235).

Researchers of lifestyle, which implies a set of sustainably reproducible patterns of behavior, distinguish different types of urbanization. The analysis of the authors' field evidence and published materials has

shown that transition to the category of urban residents in many aboriginal communities was not accompanied by changes in their life values, especially at the initial stages of urbanization. According to historians, a number of Siberian towns (especially in the first half of the 20th century) could not properly be called towns because of the low levels of industry, transport, and social and cultural infrastructure. The processes that took place in the east of the USSR in the first half of the 20th century, especially during the periods of forced industrialization, corresponded mostly to the model of quasi-urbanization (Efimova, 2014: 9; Isupov, 2013). For the indigenous inhabitants of Siberia, acquisition of the status of urban residents often resulted from a change in the status of settlements, when villages turned into towns. The nearest towns became the centers attracting rural indigenous population. Migrations were mostly limited to the region of traditional residence; only in the second generation might it go beyond (Nikolaev, 2018: 143). Most often, former villagers settled in the suburbs or on the outskirts of towns or cities; their traditional settlements they used as summer residences. After acquiring stationary housing in cities, towns, or townships, they regarded it as a place of temporary residence, and continued to maintain a traditional economy, which determined their way of life and basic forms of employment. These trends remained relevant in the late 20th to early 21st century (Volzhanina, 2009: 355–357; Lyarskaya, 2016: 63; Pivneva, 2018: 110–113; Povoroznyuk, 2011: 108; and others).

Analysis of the stratum of “new urban residents” of Siberia, based on field evidence of the authors’ and research data in various regions, makes it possible to draw some conclusions concerning sophisticated social differentiation in the aboriginal population: absence of strict division between the groups of rural residents who preserve their traditional way of life, population of villages not engaged in traditional economy, and urban residents. The lack of a clear urban self-awareness among the representatives of indigenous peoples is associated with the accelerated pace of urbanization, the actual (intra-ethnic) system of social and economic ties oriented at kindred and ethno-local communities, and an orientation to the values of traditional culture, which is considered to be the basis for consolidation and self-preservation among the indigenous peoples of Siberia (Lyarskaya, 2016; Oktyabrskaya, Samushkina, Nikolaev, 2021; Pivneva, 2018).

Data on education and sources of livelihood are important indicators of urbanization processes among the indigenous population of Siberia. Already in the 1970s–1980s, scholars had drawn attention to the number of unemployed persons among urban residents who were the representatives of indigenous peoples. For example, “among the Evenks of the Baikal-Amur Mainline in 1976 and in Chita Region in 1982, over 14 % of the employable

population was not engaged in public production” (Boiko, Popkov, 1987: 102).

According to the 2010 Census, low rates of labor activity were typical of the Tofalars—18.8 % of the total number, Tuvans—22.3 %, Nganasans—22.8 %, Negidals and Uilta people—24.0 %. Auxiliary farming remained an important help for 15.8 % of Tofalars, 9.9 % of Telengits, 9.1 % of Teleuts and Chulymys, and 8.7 % of Tubalars. The Telengits (51.0 %), Nganasans (46.6 %), Negidals (44.7 %), Ulchi people (42.3 %), Ket people (41.6 %), and Enets (41.3 %) relied mostly on state aid, while Tofalars (37.5 %), Soyots (37.4 %), Mansi (36.2 %), Tuvans (36.0 %), and Dolgans (35.8 %) counted mostly on the help of relatives, alimony, etc. These data make it possible to conclude that not all indigenous peoples had been successfully integrated into the urban environment, even with high quantitative parameters. The quality indicator of urbanization is the level of education and social mobility. For instance, according to the 2010 Census, 100 % of the Uilta people with higher education and 55.5 % with secondary education lived in an urban environment; these indicators were 86.8 % and 72.6 % for the Shors, and 79.4 % and 53.2 % for the Mansi. A similar situation was typical for poorly urbanized peoples, for example, for the Soyots (13.2 % and 5.2 %), Telengits (17.1 % and 5.8 %), and Chelkans (39.2 % and 12.7 %). Improvement of the educational system and professional training, and modernization of social structures generally determine the prospects for urbanization of the indigenous peoples of Siberia.

The tendencies of deurbanization in their environment reflect the priorities of the state policy of Russia to protect the rights and traditional ways of life for the peoples of the North. Benefits for the representatives of indigenous minorities of the North living in places of traditional nature management and engaged in traditional economic activities are provided for by the Tax, Forestry, Water, and Land Codes of the Russian Federation.

Several federal, and numerous regional, target-oriented programs have been implemented in the Russian Federation over the past fifteen years. These provide for actualization of traditional types and forms of life as a condition for the sustainable social and economic development of the indigenous peoples of the North. This strategy was systematically formulated in the 2009 Concept for Sustainable Development of the Indigenous Minorities of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation (Rasporyazheniye..., 2009). Paternalism and support for authentic cultures have retained their importance as priorities in building a dialog between the state and the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East in the early 21st century.

Modernization standards were outlined in the strategies for social and economic development of the Siberian regions. For example, the law “On the Strategy of Social

and Economic Development of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) Until 2032, with the Target Vision Until 2050”, adopted in 2018 (amended on June 18, 2020), announced the creation of the conditions for fostering the key value of the state—people. This presupposes the achievement of a high standard of living, the organization of effective territorial management, and the development of competitive sectors of a non-resource-based export-oriented economy, while maintaining cultural diversity and strengthening the civic identity and unity of the peoples living in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) (Zakon..., 2018).

Reliance upon traditions in identifying the prospects for modernization determines specific features of urbanization processes among the peoples of Siberia and the Far East for the coming decades.

Conclusions

On the basis of the above analysis, three stages of urbanization of the indigenous peoples of Siberia and the Far East can be distinguished: before the mid 20th century, the 1950s–1980s, and from the 1990s till nowadays. It should be acknowledged that the leading factor of urbanization was the policy of paternalism pursued by the state throughout the entire 20th century. Administrative-political and socio-economic transformations in the regions of Siberia predetermined the ethnic and cultural rapprochement of the indigenous population and the newcomers, and also systemic transformations of aboriginal communities, with changes in their life-support systems and their movement to cities and towns. The industrial development of Siberia—development of energy resources, industrialization, and the building of transport infrastructure—was crucial in accelerating urbanization by the late 20th century. The opportunities for preserving traditions under conditions of active modernization have determined the current projects of the indigenous peoples of Siberia for the coming decades. Strategic planning in this area has become possible with active participation of the Russian state.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Project No. 20-111-50364.

References

Baburin V.L., Zemtsov S.P. 2015
Evolutsiya sistemy gorodskikh poseleniy i dinamika prirodnikh i sotsialno-ekonomicheskikh protsessov v rossiyskoy Arktike. *Regionalniye issledovaniya*, No. 4: 76–83.

- Bakhrushin S.V., Petrov A.I. et al. 1929**
Goroda. In *Sibirskaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya*, vol. I. Novosibirsk: Sib. krayev. izd., pp. 702–724.
- BAM i narody Severa. 1979**
Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Bogoyavlensky D.D. 2012**
Perepis 2010: Etnicheskiy srez. *Demoskop*, No. 531/532. URL: <http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/2012/0531/tema02.php> (Accessed May 18, 2021).
- Boiko V.I. 1973**
Opyt sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya problem razvitiya narodov Nizhnego Amura. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Boiko V.I. 1977**
Sotsialnoye razvitiye narodov Nizhnego Amura. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Boiko V.I. 1988**
Sotsialno-ekonomicheskoye razvitiye narodnostey Severa. Programma koordinatsii issledovaniy. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Boiko V.I., Popkov Y.V. 1987**
Razvitiye otnosheniya k trudu u narodnostey Severa pri sotsializme. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Boiko V.I., Vasilyev N.V. 1981**
Sotsialno-professionalnaya mobilnost evenkov i evenov Yakutii. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Budina O.R., Shmeleva M.N. 1977**
Etnograficheskoye izucheniye goroda v SSSR. *Sovetskaya etnographiya*, No. 6: 23–34.
- Dekret VTsIK, SNK RSFSR ot 02.02.1925 “Ob utverzhdenii polozheniya o Komitete sodeistviya narodnostyam severnykh okrain pri Prezidiume Vserossiyskogo Tsentralnogo Ispolnitelnogo Komiteta”. (s.a.)**
URL: http://www.libussr.ru/doc_ussr/ussr_2342.htm (Accessed May 18, 2021).
- Dobrova-Yadrintseva L. et al. 1931**
Komitet sodeistviya malyh narodnostyam Severa pri Prezidiume VTsIK. In *Sibirskaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya*. Novosibirsk: OGIZ, Zap.-Sib. otd., pp. 865–872.
- Dolgikh B.O. 2005**
O polozhenii malykh narodov Severa i o meropriyatiyakh po podyemu ikh khozyaistva, kultury i uluchsheniya byta. In *Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza: Narody Severa Rossii. 1959–1962 gody*. Moscow: IEA RAN, pp. 155–180.
- Efimova E.A. 2014**
Regionalniye aspekty urbanizatsii v Rossii. *Regionalnaya ekonomika: Teoriya i praktika*, vol. 12 (43): 2–12.
- Gorod i derevnya v Yevropeiskoy Rossii: Sto let peremen: Pamyati V.P. Semenova-Tyan-Shanskogo. 2001**
G.M. Lappo, D.N. Lukhmanov, T.G. Nefedova, P.M. Polyan, R.A. Popov, S.G. Safronov, A. Titkov, A.I. Treivish. Moscow: Obyedinen. gum. izd.
- Goroda Sibiri (epokha feodalizma i kapitalizma). 1978**
Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Istoriya Buryatii. 2011**
In 3 vols. Vol. II: 17 – nachalo 20 v. Ulan-Ude: Izd. BNC SO RAN.
- Isupov V.A. 2013**
Kvaziurbanizatsiya v stalinskoy strategii modernizatsii Sibiri: Vtoraya polovina 1920-kh–1930-ye gg. In *Regionalniye aspekty tsivilizatsionnogo razvitiya rossiyskogo obshchestva v 20*

stoletii: Problemy industrializatsii i urbanizatsii. Novosibirsk: Parallel, pp. 238–245.

Isupov V.A. 2018

Urbanizatsiya Zapadnoy Sibiri: Vzgl'yad istorika. *EKO*, No. 7: 7–22.

Kolbina E.O., Naiden S.N. 2013

Evolutsiya protsessov urbanizatsii na Dalnem Vostoke Rossii. *Prostranstvennaya ekonomika*, No. 4: 44–69.

Kolomiets O.P. 2020

Osobennosti sovremennykh migratsionnykh protsessov na Krainem Severo-Vostoke Rossii (Chukotskiy variant). *Vlast i upravleniye na Vostoke Rossii*, No. 4: 207–214.

Kondratieva V.V., Batueva I.B. 2013

Chislennost i rasseleniye tatar na territorii Buryatii. *Vestnik Chelyabinskoy gosudarstvennoy akademii kul'tury i iskusstv*, No. 3: 194–197.

Korusenko S.N., Tomilov N.A. 2011

Tatary Sibiri v 18 – nachale 20 v.: Rasseleniye, chislennost i sotsialnaya struktura. *Vestnik arkheologii, antropologii i etnografii*, No. 2: 177–185.

Krionogov V.P. 2017

Vliyaniye urbanizatsii na etnicheskiye protsessy korennykh narodov Sredney Sibiri. In *Spetsifika etnicheskikh migratsionnykh protsessov na territorii Tsentralnoy Sibiri v 20–21 vekakh: Opyt i perspektivy*. Krasnoyarsk: Izd. Sib. Federal. Univ., pp. 31–33.

Kultura narodnostey Severa: Traditsii i sovremennost. 1986

V.I. Boiko (ed.). Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Lyarskaya E.V. 2003

Severniye internaty i transformatsiya traditsionnoy kul'tury (na primere nentsev Yamala): Cand. Sc. (History) Dissertation. St. Petersburg.

Lyarskaya E.V. 2016

“Komu-to tozhe nado i v gorode zhit...”: Nekotoriye osobennosti transformatsii sotsialnoy struktury nentsev Yamala. *Etnograficheskoye obozreniye*, No. 1: 54–70.

Maltseva O.V. 2018

Nanaitsy v promyshlennom raione Priamurya: Model osvoeniya prostranstva i poisk identichnosti. *Etnograficheskoye obozreniye*, No. 1: 161–177.

Markhinin V.V., Udalova I.V. 1993

Etnos v situatsii vybora budushchego: Po materialam sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya obraza zhizni khandov, nentsev, mansi Nizhnevartovskogo rayona Khanty-Mansiyskogo avtonomnogo okruga. Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Nagnibeda V.Y. 1917

Tomskaya guberniya: Statisticheskiy ocherk. Tomsk: [Tip. V.M. Perelman].

Nechaev M.G. 2014

Deyatel'nost Pravoslavnogo missionerskogo obshchestva na Urale. *Istoricheskiye, filosofskiy, politicheskiye i yuridicheskiye nauki, kulturologiya i iskusstvovedeniye. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, No. 2, pt. II: 140–144.

Nikolaev V.V. 2009

Khristianizatsiya koren'nogo naseleniya predgoriy Severnogo Altaya. *Mirovozzreniye naseleniya Yuzhnoy Sibiri i Tsentralnoy Azii v istoricheskoy retrospektive*, No. 3: 213–223.

Nikolaev V.V. 2018

Migratsiya kumandintsev iz sela v gorod v nachale 21 veka. *Vestnik Novosibirkosoy gosudarstvennoy universiteta*. Ser.: Istoriya, filologiya, vol. 17 (3): 142–147.

Nikolaev V.V., Nazarov I.I. 2021

Urbanizatsiya koren'nogo naseleniya Altaya v 20–nachale 21 veka (na primere kumandintsev goroda Biyska). *Vestnik Novosibirkosoy gosudarstvennoy universiteta*. Ser.: Istoriya, filologiya, vol. 20 (3): 149–162.

Nivkhi Sakhalina: Sovremennoye sotsialno-ekonomicheskoye razvitiye. 1988

V.I. Boiko (ed.). Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Oktyabrskaya I.V., Samushkina E.V., Nikolaev V.V. 2021

Korenniye malochislenniye narody v sovremennom etnopoliticheskom prostranstve Respubliki Altai. *Uralskiy istoricheskii vestnik*, No. 2: 101–109.

Palikova T.V. 2010

Goroda Zabaikaliya vtoroy poloviny 19 – nachala 20 v.: Sotsialnoye, ekonomicheskoye, kulturnoye razvitiye. Ulan-Ude: Buryat. Gos. Univ.

Perepisi naseleniya Rossiyskoy imperii, SSSR, 15 novykh nezavisimyykh gosudarstv. (s.a.)

Demoskop. URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/census_types.php?ct=6 (Accessed December 5, 2020).

Perspektivy i riski razvitiya chelovecheskogo potentsiala v Sibiri. 2014

V.V. Kuleshov (ed.). Novosibirsk: Izd. SO RAN.

Petrov P.P. 1990

Goroda Yakutii 1861–1917 gg. Yakutsk: Yakut. kn. izd.

Pivneva E.A. 2017

Severniy gorod kak etnograficheskoye pole: Poisk novykh izmereniy. In *Pole kak zhizn: K 60-letiyu Severnoy ekspeditsii IEA RAN*. Moscow, St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, pp. 225–239.

Pivneva E.A. 2018

“No diskomfort my vse-taki oshchushchayem”: Obskiye ugry v protsessakh sotsiokulturnoy adaptatsii k usloviyam goroda. *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoy antropologii*, No. 21: 104–129.

Pivovarov Y.L. 2010

Urbanizatsiya Rossii v 20 veke: Idealy i realnost. In *Geografiya mirovogo razvitiya*. Moscow: Tov. nauch. izd. KMK, pp. 228–239.

Popov R.A. 2005

Urbanizirovannost regionov Rossii vo vtoroy polovine 20 veka. In *Rossiya i eye regiony v 20 veke: Territoriya – rasselenie – migratsii*. Moscow: Obyedinen. gum. izd., pp. 215–244.

Postanovleniye TsK KPSS i SM SSSR ot 16.03.1957 g.

No. 300 “O merakh po dalneishemu razvitiyu ekonomiki i kul'tury narodnostey Severa”. 1957

URL: <https://docs.cntd.ru/document/765714380> (Accessed May 18, 2021).

Povoroznyuk O.A. 2011

Zabaikalskiye evenki: Sotsialno-ekonomicheskoye i kulturnoye transformatsii v 20–21 vekakh. Moscow: IEA RAN.

Programma koordinatsii issledovaniy “Vzaimodeistviye nauchno-tekhnicheskogo i sotsialnogo progressa: Obshcheye i osobennoye (gumanitarniy aspekt)”. 1987

V.I. Boiko (ed.). Novosibirsk: [s.n.].

Rasporyazheniye Pravitelstva RF ot 4.02.2009 g.

No. 132-p ob utverzhdenii “Kontseptsii ustoychivogo razvitiya korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dalnego Vostoka Rossiyskoy Federatsii”. 2009

URL: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/902142304?marker=6540IN> (Accessed May 24, 2021).

- “Resursnoye proklyatiye” i sotsialnaya ekspertiza v postsovetsoy Sibir: Antropologicheskiye perspektivy. 2019**
Moscow: Demos.
- Rossiyskaya Arktika: Korenniye narody i promyshlennoye osvoyeniye. 2016**
Moscow, St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya.
- Skobelev S.G. 1999**
Korenniye narody Sibiri: Opyt upravleniya v Rossiyskoy imperii i SSSR (17–20 vv.). *Sibirskaya zaimka*. URL: <https://zaimka.ru/skobelev-governance/> (Accessed May 5, 2021).
- Slezkin Y.L. 2008**
Arkticheskiye zerkala Rossii i maliye narody Severa. Moscow: Novoye lit. obozr.
- Sovremennyye etnicheskiye protsessy v SSSR. 1977**
Moscow: Nauka.
- Staroverov V.I. 2010**
Urbanizatsiya. In *Sotsiologicheskiy slovar*, G.V. Osipov, L.N. Moskvichev (eds.). Moscow: Norma: Infra-M, pp. 538–539.
- Stas I.N. 2017**
Etnichnost v protsesse urbanizatsii Rossii: Sovremennaya istoriografiya problemy. In *Problemy i perspektivy sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo i etnokulturnogo razvitiya korenykh malochislennykh narodov Severa*. Khanty-Mansiysk: Format, pp. 246–256.
- Stas I.N. 2020**
Issledovaniya gorodskikh identichnostey v istoricheskoy urbanistike Sibiri. *Quaestio Rossica*, vol. 8 (5): 1807–1821.
- Stepanov V.V. 2008**
Rossiyskiy opyt etnicheskoy statistiki korenykh malochislennykh narodov Severa. *Demoskop*, No. 319/320. URL: <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2008/0319/analit03.php> (Accessed May 18, 2021).
- Urbanizatsiya i malochislenniye narody Severa Respubliki Sakha (Yakutiya). 2001**
R.I. Donskoy (ed.). Yakutsk: Inst. Problem Malochislennykh Narodov Severa SO RAN.
- Vinokurova U.A. 1992**
Tsennostniye orientatsii yakutov v usloviyakh urbanizatsii. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Vlasov S.A. 2013**
Stanovleniye i razvitiye gorodov na Dalnem Vostoke Rossii vo vtoroy polovine 20 v. *Oikumena. Regionovedcheskiye issledovaniya*, No. 2: 103–111.
- Volzhanina E.A. 2009**
Sovremennyye etnosotsialniye protsessy sredi nentsev Yamala v usloviyakh promyshlennogo osvoyeniya. *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury*, No. 3: 355–358.
- Zakon Respubliki Sakha (Yakutiya) ot 19.12.2018 g. 2017-3 No. 45-VI “O Strategii sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo razvitiya Respubliki Sakha (Yakutiya) do 2032 g. s tselevym videniyem do 2050 g.” (s izmeneniyami na 18.06.2020 g.). 2018**
URL: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/550299670> (Accessed May 24, 2021).
- Zamyatina N.Y., Pilyasov A.N. 2017**
Novoye mezhdistsiplinarnoye nauchnoye napravleniye: Arkticheskaya regionalnaya nauka. *Region: Ekonomika i Sotsiologiya*, No. 3: 3–30.

Received July 5, 2021.