

New Security Challenges Programme

Project Title: A New Russian Heartland?

Professor Michael Bradshaw, Department of Geography,
The University of Leicester.

Email: mjb41@le.ac.uk

Introduction:

The primary aim of this project is to assess the impact of Russia's recent economic and demographic crises upon the effective occupation of its national territory. A secondary aim is to use that analysis to identify actual and potential threats to Russia's internal cohesion and external relations. The central hypothesis is that the Soviet period, for economic, ideological and strategic reasons, witnessed an expansion of the 'effective national territory' with the boundaries of the then Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR). After Hooson (1966: 342), the 'effective national territory' is: 'that major part of the country which consistently produces a surplus in relation to its population and which, by implication, is therefore supporting the country in a real sense.' During the late Soviet period, state policy promoted the economic development and settlement of peripheral regions of the RSFSR, most notably the 'North' and Siberia and the Far East. At the same time, emphasis upon heavy industry and the 'Military-Industrial Complex (VPK in Russian)' resulted in the concentration of economic activity in a small number of industrial regions (concentrated in the Moscow and Leningrad regions and parts of the Volga and Urals regions). The net result was an economic geography, population distribution and a settlement system that supported the goals and logic of the Soviet State. Now that the Soviet system has gone the Russian Federation is experiencing an adjustment to its 'effective national territory' that potentially raises new security challenges, both internally and externally.

Transitional recession: The introduction of market principles has brought an entirely different logic and this is resulting in a restructuring of Russia's economy. While there is agreement among economists as to the causes of the so-called 'transitional recession,' associated with this restructuring, there is disagreement as to its extent and implications for Russia's economic and political future. Nevertheless, it seems that Russia probably experienced a decline of 30-35% in its GDP between 1991 and 1998 (Aslund 2002, 118). Unfortunately, trying to assess the current level of GDP is equally contentious, not only is the contribution of the 'underground economy' underestimated, but by concentrating on the decline of the rustbelt, official statistics are failing to capture the growth of Russia's new service economy. The common sense view is that Russia experienced a significant fall in production during the 1990s, but most of that lost production was uncompetitive (value-subtracting); at the same time, the extent of the post 1998 (Russian Economic Crisis) recovery may also be underestimated for the reasons mentioned above. But there is also a growing consensus that the recent recovery, based as it is on high oil prices, is not sustainable unless there is greater real investment outside the energy sector. Whatever, the exact macroeconomic situation, it is now apparent, after more than a decade of transformation, that processes of 'spatial adjustment' are reworking the economic and population geography of Russia and that has significant consequences for the future

territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. It is in this context that President Putin, in his first major policy move after getting elected in spring 2000, introduced a system of seven presidential regions (based on the districts of the Interior Ministry's Interior Troops) and seven president representatives (five of whom were generals) in an attempt to counter the centrifugal forces that had promoted Russia's economic and political fragmentation during the Yeltsin period. However, the kinds of 'spatial adjustments' discussed above are more fundamental, in other words they transcend the whims of individuals governors and the policy makers in the Kremlin, and pose a challenge to the efficacy of the Russian State and influence Russia's role in the global economy and its political status.

Economic restructuring and demographic crisis: Deindustrialisation has led to dramatic declines in the output of the VPK and associated sectors of the economy. At the same time the internationalisation of the economy has favoured the resource-exporting sectors (particularly oil), while economic liberalisation has promoted the growth of the consumer (particularly foodstuffs) and service sectors that were badly neglected in the Soviet period. The increasing reliance upon income from the resource sector in a relatively small number of regions is causing tensions within Russia's fiscal federal structure (particularly the dominance of Moscow city). Concurrently, against a national backdrop of population decline, there has also been a substantial amount of internal migration. In fact the level of migration is more than initially expected and not necessarily in response to regional economic performance (Heleniak 2001). Were it not for a return migration stream from the other post-Soviet Republics, Russia's population would have declined by a further 3 million, rather than the 5.1 million experienced during the past decade (in 2002 Russia's population was estimated at 143.6 million compared to 148.7 million in 1992. By the Russian Government's own projections, the population is expected to decline by 11.5 million to 134 million in 2015, the excess of deaths over births will be 12.8 million and migration will only add 1.3 million. There is now growing concern that Russia will have to rely on a migrant workforce if it is to increase its level of economic development. These national figures hide substantial regional variation. In simple terms, there has been a relative 'emptying out' of the northern and eastern regions of Russia. Between 1989 and 2001 the regions that comprise the 'North' (which accounts for 70 % of Russia's territory) lost 12 % of its population. The most extreme cases were Magadan and Chukotka (both in the Far East) that lost 43 and 61 % of their population respectively. Many more people would leave these regions, but are unable to do so. At the same time, due to excessive rates of mortality, there are large parts of European Russia experiencing substantial population declines. Furthermore, many of Russia's federal subjects are extremely large and exhibit substantial economic and demographic variation within them that threatens their economic and political stability.

New Security Challenges

While there is a substantial literature on Russia's macroeconomic performance and a growing literature on its demographic problems, there has been relatively little research into the geographical dimensions of the current situation and possible trends for the future (see Bradshaw and Treyvish 2000 for a review of the literature on regional economic change in Russia and Treyvish and Artobolevskiy 2001 for a collection of work by Russian Geographers). It is this research gap that the current proposal addresses. There has been very little research that has delimited the exact geographical expression of Russia's economic transformation and demographic crises and then assessed its implications for Russia's internal security and external relations, at the regional, federal district and national level. Instead, there has been a tendency to focus on the development of regional 'economic and foreign policies' amongst Russia's federal subjects and the challenge

posed by them to Moscow's economic reform programme and foreign policy making. In the context of a recent re-centralisation of authority, most recently research has focused on the effectiveness of the presidential districts and their representatives (i.e. Petrov 2003). The findings of this project will contribute to a more fundamental understanding of the new security challenges that face Russia as a consequence of the collapse of the Soviet Union. Challenges that potentially threaten its internal cohesion and territorial integrity influence its relations with its near neighbours and its role in the international system. Cohesion in both a political and economic sense, political in terms of centre-region relations and the effective control of sovereign territory and economic in the sense of a territorial configuration of the factors of production that can enable and support sustained economic recovery in Russia. Such cohesion is essential in terms of Russia's ambitions for WTO and OECD membership and its status within G8. This initial project assesses the situation Russia-wide. It is based on extensive analysis of statistical data (including the results of the 2002 Russian Census) and secondary sources and, while the project is self-contained, it is intended to lay foundations for a more intensive second phase case-study project examining those regions that pose the greatest threats (outside the tragic situation in Chechnya) to Russia's territorial integrity and international standing. In addition, the findings of the project might contribute the other programme projects dealing with Russia and her neighbours.

The example of the Russian Far East: The current situation in the Russian Far East is illustrative of the relationship between economics, geography and international relations (Bradshaw 2001; Thornton and Zeigler 2002). The Soviet Far East was a major beneficiary of the Soviet system. Its strategic role as a garrison on the Sino-Soviet border and as a base for Soviet power projection into the Pacific meant that it was highly militarised and its economy was oriented towards the needs of the VPK. There can be no doubting that the Soviet system generated a level of economic activity and settlement above and beyond that which might have been generated by a market-type democracy (Kontorovich 2000). This counterfactual statement is supported by the impact that the collapse of the Soviet system has had upon the region. The transitional recession has been deepest and longest in the Russian Far East and it has experienced the highest levels of out-migration. For politicians and planners in Moscow and the Far East, the region is fast becoming a major security concern (Menon and Ziegler 2002). These fears are based on the simple fact that there are now only 7 million people living in the Russian Far East, down from 8 million in 1991, 5 million in the southern regions along the Chinese border, while there are 102 million in the three neighbouring Chinese provinces (Heleniak 2001, 546). Regional leaders have used this demographic imbalance, and misinformation on the level of Chinese migrants, to stir up concern about a Chinese take over of the region. At present, the Chinese migrants seem more interested in trade than settlement. Nevertheless, there is a perception that the emptying of Far East is a security challenge. During a 2001 visit to the region, President Putin suggested that return migrants from the CIS should be encouraged to settle in the Far East. The various schemes currently being discussed to develop the resources of Siberia and the Far East by building transcontinental pipelines to export oil and gas to China, Japan and beyond are reminiscent of the Soviet strategy that saw the construction of the ill-fated Baykal-Amur Mainline (BAM) railway; but they also echo sentiments about the effective occupation of peripheral regions and the need for Russia to increase its economic presence in northeast Asia, a concern that takes on new currency given tensions on the Korean Peninsula. It is also noteworthy that Russia's membership of APEC was initially opposed because its economic power was not sufficiently located in the 'Asian' regions of the country.

Academic context: previous research

This project builds on previous research funded by the ESRC and a current Leverhulme Research Fellowship. It also links to recent and on-going research by an international network of scholars working on the regional dimensions of Russia's transformation (for example, see: Held and Aldis 2003; Kivenen and Pynnöniemi 2002; and Ross 2002). In the mid-1990s the ESRC funded two projects that involved the current applicant: *Understanding Patterns of Regional Economic Change in Russia* (with Professor Philip Hanson and assessed as Outstanding) and *The Russian Far East: Resource Frontier for the Pacific Century* (part of the Asia-Pacific Programme and assessed as Good). Both projects resulted in the publication of edited collections (Hanson and Bradshaw 2000 and Bradshaw 2001). As its title suggests, the first project sought to examine the pattern of regional economic change in Russia and involved both Russia-wide analysis and case study research. The project concluded that, despite the best efforts of the regional elites (both political and economic), the pattern of regional economic change in Russia was now following the logic of a market economy. The second project focused on attempts by the Russian Far East to increase economic interaction with the Asia-Pacific region to compensate for the loss of domestic markets and financial support from Moscow. The project showed how the difficult investment environment in the region thwarted most of the projects involving foreign investors. The 1997 Asian Economic Crisis dampened demand for the region's resource exports. The one exception was the Sakhalin offshore oil and gas projects and these have remained the focus of on-going research by the applicant (Bradshaw 2003). Both these project provide a solid foundation for the current application. Some of the datasets developed for the regional patterns project are currently being updated as part of a Leverhulme Research Fellowship project on Russia's new economic geography. Thus, the current project builds on a substantial amount of previous work and enable the material collected so far be organised, supplemented and presented in such a way as to produce an innovative analysis of Russia's effective occupation of its national territory and the new security challenges presented by the current situation.

Theoretical context: the heritage of Mackinder and Hooson

The issues and contexts discussed above paint a very broad picture and, perhaps, suggest an overly ambitious project for an ESRC small grant. While the aims of the research project are broad and relate to big issues, the research design presented below is focused and is grounded in a specific intellectual heritage, namely the Heartland theory of Britain's most eminent political geographer Sir Halford Mackinder (1962) and the later re-working of some of his ideas by David Hooson (1964; 1966). Put simply, Mackinder held that the Eurasian landmass held certain natural strategic advantages for its occupant in any potential struggle between land power and sea power. However, those advantages could only be achieved through an alliance between the heartland state and one of the surrounding maritime powers (at the time he was most concerned about an alliance between Russia and Germany); hence his famous dictum: 'Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland; who rules the Heartland commands the World-Island; who rules the World-Island commands the World (Mackinder 1962: 150). Writing in 1943 about the Soviet Union's occupation of the Heartland, but before the Red Army's defeat of Germany on the Eastern Front, he stated: "The Heartland is the greatest fortress on earth. For the first time in history it is manned by a garrison sufficient both in number and quality (Mackinder 1962: 273). Mackinder's writings were not only influential at home, but in Nazi Germany; they also informed the post-war strategy of containment and the thinking of some realist geopolitical thinkers such as Colin Gray. The purpose of this project is NOT to reassess the current validity of Mackinder's ideas; they simply form the intellectual

heritage for the current reassessment of Russia's 'effective national territory'. The origins of the current project lie most directly in the work of the geographer David Hooson.

A New Soviet Heartland: In the early 1960s David Hooson published a series of articles, a research monograph (Hooson 1964) and a substantial regional systematic geography of the Soviet Union (Hooson 1966) that developed a framework for considering the dynamics of the Soviet Union's economic geography. In the preface to his 1964 volume *A New Soviet Heartland?* he made the aims of his research clear:

"The aim of this book is to train a searchlight on those parts of the Soviet "Eastern regions" which are of vital importance to the country's strength. The zone which emerges from this analysis is an elongated one stretching from the middle reaches of the river Volga to Lake Baykal. Though containing only one-fourth of the Soviet population at present, its cities have grown much faster in recent decades than those in other parts of the U.S.S.R. In addition, it now appears to contain most of the accessible reserves of the energy and raw materials upon which the growth of Soviet industrial, military, and political power in the world ultimately depends (Hooson 1964: 3-4).

Hooson used six criteria to assess the extent and dynamics of the Soviet Union's effective national territory. These criteria were: 1. the scale of contribution to the national economy as a whole; 2. rate of population (especially city) growth; 3. relative importance of *accessible* resources; 4. economic specialization; 5. a certain community of association; and 6. ethnic considerations where they actually loom large in the distinctiveness of a region. On the basis of analysis of these criteria, Hooson identified three broad regions: *the established European Core*; *the expanding Volga-Baykal zone*; and *the marginal zones*. Volga-Baykal zone was subjected to more detailed analysis and was further subdivided into three zone: the Volga-Ural, the Ural-Ob and Central Siberia. Unfortunately, in keeping with the times, there is no discussion of methodology and limited analysis of quantitative data; nevertheless, he concluded: "...whatever superior locational assets in terms of the modern economy may be attributed, and rightly, to the Ukraine and Moscow region, there are a number of compelling reasons--ideological, nationalistic and strategic, but also economic--which make it more than likely that we will be witnessing for some time a steady easterly drift of industrial population along the trail blazed by its agricultural forerunners less than a lifetime ago" (Hooson 1964: 126). Hooson's analysis captured the beginnings of the construction of a series of hydroelectric power stations on the Angara-Yenisey river system that became the basis for energy intensive industrial complexes (aluminium smelters, pulp & paper and chemicals); but he did not foresee the scale of the crash development of the West Siberian Oil and Gas Complex nor the construction of the BAM railway. Thus, the period from the mid-1960s to the end of the 1980s saw a re-enforcement of this easterly drift. In the late Soviet period the expansion of this resource-based economy provided the economic underpinnings of East-West détente and masked the failings of the domestic economy. Now, a decade after to the collapse of the Soviet Union, those same industries and regions are providing the exports that are financing Russia's apparent economic recovery. At present, oil and gas make up over two-fifths of Russia's exports; adding metals exports put the figure at more than half, counting oil products it goes up to 63% (*The Economist*, February 8th, 2003, 43). However, while the distribution of resource production may remain unchanged and highly concentrated, there is ample evidence that the eastward drift in population has been reversed and that the geography of Russia's new economy represents a return to the established European Core. This begs the question, what will the geography of Russia's new heartland be in 10-20 years time and how will that geography contribute to Russia's internal cohesion and its

place in the global economic and political system? This project revisits Hooson's analysis to address these questions.

Research Design and Data Availability

Obviously, one cannot simply take a research design produced 40 years ago to study the Soviet Union and apply it to contemporary Russia. What follows is a reinterpretation of Hooson's original criteria based on information that is known to be available. In each instance the analysis is of change between the 1989-91 and the 2001-02 period, as well as an assessment of the situation in 2001-02. Data will be stored in electronic format and mapped (using MS Excel and Access and ArcGIS).

1. *Scale of contribution to the national economy*: there are a number of quantitative measures that can be used to measure the relative contribution of individual regions to the national economy; however, for obvious reasons, there are a limited number of indicators that provide continuity between the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. Indicators such as share of industrial production and economically active population are relatively easy to reconcile, but measures such as net material product (a Soviet era concept) and gross regional product (a contemporary measure) are not. Equally, the recent data on Russia's fiscal federal structure and the notion of 'donor regions' were simply not a consideration in the Soviet system. Nevertheless, a combination of indicators can provide a clear indication of the relative 'weight' of individual regions in the Russian economy and the extent to which the geography of such contributions has changed.
2. *Rate of population (especially city) growth*: Here there is no shortage of information. There is a wealth of demographic data available for the 89 federal subjects (the so-called Oblast level) and the larger cities. However, this project proposes to use the results of the 1989 Soviet Census and the 2002 Russian Census to map population change at the raion (district) level (see Appendix 2). There are 1864 raions and 1098 cities in Russia's sub-oblast administrative structure. Mapping at this scale will strip away the often-false impression given by oblast-level representations. It will enable analysis of the internal cohesion of individual federal subjects and provide unique insight into Russia's population geography. Computer mapping will also be used to represent patterns of city growth or decline and techniques such as rank-size will be applied at an assessment of the urban hierarchy (such techniques are in vogue in the field of geographical economics).
3. *Relative importance of accessible resources*: There is no shortage of information on the regional distribution of the production of major resource sectors, such as coal, oil and gas, timber, pulp and paper. However, Soviet era data on non-ferrous metals production and diamonds are harder to come by. Nevertheless, there are specialist industry publications (such as the US Bureau of Mines reports) that enable one to put together a comprehensive picture of the geography of resource production. Contemporary information can also be obtained from the web sites and annual reports of Russia's new resource companies, such as Noril'sk Nickel, Siberian Aluminium and Ilim Pulp.
4. *Economic specialization*: Again, there is no shortage of data on the official economy and the more 'traditional' sectors of economic activity. Simple descriptive statistics, such as location quotients, can be used to measure and map the level of economic specialization. However, there is a problem with the non-reporting of the 'underground

economy' and the service sector. There is a growing literature on these issues and it will be possible to supplement with the official statistics with 'new economy' indicators such as financial service activities, mobile phone networks and usage and the development of the Internet. Such analysis will provide new insight into Russia's new economic geography.

5. *Regionalism: (A certain community of historic association):* This criterion is somewhat harder to tie down and does not readily lend itself to simple quantitative indicators. It is interpreted as a sense of regionalism or regional identity. Neither is held to be particularly strong in the Soviet period, but are of increasing importance in contemporary Russia. The creation of regional economic association and the emergence of regional lobbies with the State Duma (Parliament) and Federation Council (Upper House) are indicators of growing regional sentiment. Equally, the regional response to President Putin's reforms provides another indicator of regionalism, especially as the presidential districts cut across the long-standing system of economic regions and the regional economic associations. The literature suggests that electoral data provide some indicator of attitudes towards Moscow and the development of regional political identities. There is no shortage of electoral data for both presidential and parliamentary elections at the national scale and for presidential and gubernatorial elections at the regional scale. There is also a literature in English and Russian that has analysed these issues. Furthermore, there will be parliamentary elections in late 2003 and presidential elections in spring 2004, providing an ideal opportunity to judge regional sentiment.
6. *Ethnic considerations:* The ethnic dimension was given limited attention in Hooson's original analysis; however, since the collapse of the Soviet Union they have taken on new significance. Russia's current federal structure includes 21 ethnic republics and the 1989 census identified 26 major ethnic groups. While Russian's are by far the dominant group, 81.3% in 1989, there is a complex ethnic geography that has been enlivened by the contemporary processes of democratisation and federalisation (the creation of a true working federation). Some republics and ethnic groups are more vociferous than others and issues of ethnic identity cut across issues of regionalism. Again, there is a literature on these issues that can enable a qualitative assessment of this criterion. At the same time, the 2002 census will contain data on regional composition, but such data are always contentious and will need to be treated with caution.

As a result of previous and on-going research, much of the data described above is readily available to the applicant and some of it is already in electronic format and has been mapped. The preliminary results of the 2002 census are expected in April 2003, with more detailed results by November 2003 (now February 2004). The project Research Associate will organise the data, assess the literature (in Russian and English) and examine the dynamics of the various criteria. The involvement of three leading Russian geographers provides ready access to the Russian language material on the issues discussed above. The original contribution of this project is in the organisation, analysis and presentation of information on Russia's regions to make an expert assessment of risks to Russia's cohesion, in both a political and economic sense, and the security challenges that those risk present.

Data analysis and presentation

There is already a substantial amount of research that ranks Russia's regions by various criteria. The most durable of these is Ekspert Magazine's 'Regional Rankings' that produce

an assessment of 'investment risk' and 'investment potential'. In such exercises, all of the criteria are reduced to a quantitative measure and overall assessment made. Such analyses are focused on where individual regions stand and not on how they all fit together to influence the national situation. The current project has a specific purpose, to assess the changing geography of Russia's 'effective national territory'. It will generate both quantitative and qualitative data, the latter based on a review of the relevant literature. It is possible to reduce each of the six criteria to a single number for each region, which is then totalled to produce a measure of contribution to 'effective national territory'. Equally, a series of variables could be subjected to cluster and factor analysis to arrive at a typology based a statistical association. However, such an approach would loose the richness and complexity of the various criteria. A Geographical Information System (which contains a database that can store qualitative and qualitative data) is the centrepiece of the data analysis and presentation phase. The entry, organisation and cartographic presentation of quantitative data are fairly straightforward and the GIS will enable the interrelationship between quantitative measures to be assessed. In addition, qualitative information relating to issues such as regionalism and ethnicity can be included as expert judgements based on analysis of the specialist literature. Thus, the GIS will contain a profile, of both qualitative and quantitative information, on each region that ultimately provides a justification for its placement in a regionalisation scheme that relates to the concept of 'effective national territory'. By using district level data and assessing the literature relating to each region, it will also be possible to reach a judgement on its internal cohesion. This is particularly important in Russia's border regions, but also in some of the more peripheral internal regions that face significant social and economic problems. Thus, the GIS will be able to identify and map regions that pose particular types of problem in terms of security challenges. For example, a border region that has been the recipient of migrants and refugees, but that is itself economically depressed and unable to cope with the influx of population. The GIS represents a new way of analysing and presenting data on Russia's territorial cohesion and once developed could be maintained as a tool for academic researchers, policy makers and commercial interests.

Outputs and dissemination: The aim is to produce a variety of outputs, instead if the rather traditional project book. Firstly, because of the lead time associated with such publication, compared to electronic media; secondly, because as a Phase 1 project within the ESRC's New Security Challenges programme it is important to have demonstrable output by the end of the project in September 2004; and thirdly, to insure the dissemination of the results of the project to as wide a range of different audiences as possible.

1. **A Geographical Information System on Russia's Regions:** As described above, this is a tangible output in itself. It dataset can be made available over the web or on CD or DVD (subject to any copyright issues) and its cartographic output can be published on the web as pdf files for use by other researchers.
2. **A Series of Working Papers:** A series of papers will be published in English on the project's web site, including the two reports commissioned from Russian geographers. A bibliography of materials consulted will also be made available.
3. **Conference session on 'Eurasia Revisited' at Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers) Annual Meetings in Glasgow (in August 2004):** A special session on this theme to include a paper on 'Hooson's New Soviet Heartland Revisited'.

4. **Academic journal articles:** One focusing on a re-evaluation of Hooson's New Soviet Heartland in a theme issue (related to RGS-IBG Conference session) of *Eurasian Geography and Economics* and one in an Area Studies journal (*Europe-Asia Studies*) focusing on Russia's regions and new security challenges.
5. **Briefing Paper for the RIIA Russia and Eurasia Programme:** This will present the findings of the project to a non-academic audience, more specifically policy-makers and the business community. It will be made available in pdf format on the programme's web site.
6. **Seminar at Chatham House:** Again, with the RIIA Russia and Eurasia Programme, a daylong seminar will be held in early September 2004 to present the initial findings of the project to interested parties. The seminar would involve two invited specialists from the US. This will be a high profile event promoting the project and the wider ESRC programme and would be open to programme participants.

Appendix 1: References

- Aslund A (2002) *Building Capitalism: The Transformation of the Former Soviet Bloc*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bradshaw M J (2003) "Sakhalin oblast: sectoral globalisation." In Held, G P and Aldis A (eds.) *Russian Regions and Regionalism: Strength through weakness*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 141-163.
- Bradshaw M J (2001) *The Russian Far East and Pacific Asia: Unfulfilled Potential*. Richmond: Curzon Press.
- Bradshaw M and Treyvish A (2000) "Russia's regions in the 'triple transition'." In Hanson P and Bradshaw M (eds.) *Regional Economic Change in Russia*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 17-42.
- Gaddy, C and Hill F (2002) 'Putin's Agenda, America's Choice.'" *Brookings Policy Brief*, No. 99, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Hanson P and Bradshaw M (2000) *Regional Economic Change in Russia*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Held, G P and Aldis A (eds.) (2003) *Russian Regions and Regionalism: Strength through weakness*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Heleniak T (2001) "Migration and Restructuring in Post-Soviet Russia", *Demokratizatsiya*, 9 (4): 531-49.
- Kivinen M and Pynnöniemi K (eds) (2002) *Beyond the Garden Ring: Dimensions of Russian Regionalism*. Helsinki: Kikimore Publications, Series B: 25.
- Kontorovich V (2000) "Can Russia resettle the Far East?" *Post-Communist Economies*, 12 (3): 365-84.

- Makarychev, A (2000) "Foreign Policies of Sub-national Units-The case of the Russian Regions." In Godzimirski J M (ed.) *New and Old Actors in Russian Foreign Policy, Conference Proceedings*. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 121-52.
- Menon R and Ziegler C E (2002) "The Balance of Power and U.S. Foreign Policy Interests in the Russian Far East." In Thornton J and Ziegler C E (eds.) *Russia's Far East: A Region at Risk*. Seattle: The National Bureau of Asian Research and Washington University Press, 35-56.
- Nicholson M (1999) *Towards a Russia of the Regions*, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelphi Paper 330.
- Petrov N (2003) "Federal Reform, two and half years on", *Jamestown Foundation: Russia & Eurasia Review*, 2 (1): 1-4.
- Ross C (2002) *Regional politics in Russia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Thornton J and Ziegler C E (2002) *Russia's Far East: A Region at Risk*. Seattle: The National Bureau of Asian Research and Washington University Press.
- Treyvish, A and Artobolevskiy S (2002) *Regionalizatsiya v pazvitii Rossii: geograficheskiye protsessy i problemy* (Regionalisation and problems in Russia: geographical processes and problems). Moscow: URSS.