

, , . -
 -
 . -
 - ()
)
 - ,
 , . -
 - ,
 - 1 ,
 ()
 :
 ,
 , .
 , .
 , :
 , -
 , -

1 : . .
 :
 : .-2016.- 4 (51);
 :
 // : , , .-2016.- 4.

1968 . . .).

(. . .) 2 , 1964 .,

« , » (face-to-face, F2F),

[19].

(proximity),

3.

[20]).

1930-

4.

[5].

[12].

[11].

[16].

(. 1).

3

.-2017.- 3.

4

// .-1930.- 41.- .427.

, , , .
 -
 , -
 -
 . ,
 -
 ,
 « - » ,
 -
 ,
 -
 .
 -
 -
 « » -
 -
 ,
 -
 ()
 -
 . ,
 -
 .
 -
 ,
 -
 , , ,
 -
 ,
 -
 - ()
 -
 (,)
 ,
 -
 .
 «
 -
 » ,
 -
 ,
 -

. . . , . . .
 ,
 6.
 - ,
 .
 , - ,
 .
 - ,
 - ,
 (. . . ,
),
 - , -
 .
 -
 « »
 , .
 .
 ,
 ,
 ,
 .
 - - ,
 .

6 .:
 / ; - ., 2011.

, -
 « » -
 « », -
 (.2).

2

<p>,</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>,</p>	<p>(governing the commons) [4].</p> <p>[8]–c</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>,</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>–</p> <p>:</p> <p>«Norut» (Northern Research Institute)</p>

,	-
	-
/	- () «
	» - , () , () , (« »). ,
	-) () , (, ,) . . .
,	- (, , - , - ; « » - 250-300 140 - « »). , , , (, , .)

,	-
,	- : (, - ,)
-	- : - ; « »; ó - ;
	- : . - ,
-	- () « ». ()
	- - ,
	- : - « ».

:

[13].

» - - « ? -
1. « -
» , -
, , . , -
2. . -
, , -
, -
- , -
3. . -
: « » - -
. -
, , , -
, -
.

4. , , -

: -

, , -

, -

, « » -

. , -

, , :

, .

5. -

, .

, -

6. , , -

, -

, -

, -

, , -

7. , -

-

Ы -

.

« » -

.

, , -

, -

, , -

.

-
3. . . . -
 4. : - : , 2013. -
 - . - : ; , 2011. - 447 .
 5. . . . - : , 1961. - 302 .
 6. . - : - , 2011. - 384 .
 7. . - 2014. - 3. - . 8-24. //
 8. . . ? - : , 2004. - 360 .
 9. *Arctic Human Development Report: Regional Processes and Global Linkages* / Ed. by J.N. Larsen, G. Fondahl. – Copenhagen: TemaNord; Norden, 2014. – 500 p.
 10. *Ardener E.* «Remote areas»: some theoretical considerations // *The Voice of Prophecy and Other Essays* / Ed. by E. Ardener. – London; New York: Berghahn Books, 2007. – P. 211–223.
 11. *Berman M.* Remoteness and Mobility: Transportation Routes, Technologies, and Sustainability in Arctic Communities / Working Paper. – 2013.
 12. *Hamelin L.E.* Canadian Nordicity: It's Your North, Too. – Montreal: Harvest House, 1979. – 392 p.
 13. *Handbook of Regional Science* / Ed. by M. Fischer, P. Nijkamp. – Berlin: Springer, 2014. – Vol. 1–3.
 14. *Herrschell T.* Regionalization and marginalization: bridging old and new divisions in regional governance // *Regional Development in Northern Europe: Peripherality, Marginality and Border Issues.* – Routledge, 2012. – P. 30–48.
 15. *Huskey L.* Limits to growth: remote regions, remote institutions // *The Annals of Regional Science, Western Regional Science Association.* – 2006. – Vol. 40 (1). – P. 147–155.
 16. *Huskey L., Morehouse T.A.* Development in remote regions: What do we know? // *Arctic.* – 1992. – No. 45 (2). – P. 128–137.
 17. *Iammarino S., McCann Ph.* Multinationals and Economic Geography: Location, Technology and Innovation. – Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, Mass.: Edward Elgar, 2013. – 479 p.
 18. *Phelps N.A., Aienza M., Arias M.* Encore for the enclave: The changing nature of the industry enclave with illustrations from the mining industry in Chile // *Economic Geography.* – 2015. – Vol. 91, No. 2. – P. 119–146.
 19. *Storper M., Venables A.J.* Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy // *Journal of Economic Geography.* – 2003. – Vol. 4, No. 4 (4). – P. 351–370.
 20. *Torre A., Ségolène D.* Land use and soils disposal: From competition to territorial governance (examples from land use conflicts in the greater Paris region) // *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems.* – 2013. – Sept. – P. 1–12.

(119991, -1, 1, -mail:
nadezam@yandex.ru).

(117997, -7, 7, e-mail: pelyasov@mail.ru).

DOI: 10.15372/REG20170301

Region: Economics & Sociology, 2017, No. 3 (95), p. 3–30

N.Yu. Zamyatina, A.N. Pelyasov

A NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY AREA OF STUDY: ARCTIC REGIONAL SCIENCE

The article proves the expediency of shaping Arctic regional science as a new interdisciplinary area of study. The existing realities of the economic development in the Arctic territories cannot always be explained through the economic mainstream theories designed for high-density areas within the temperate zone. What looks like a rare anomaly for the temperate zone, pushed back to the research periphery, becomes the norm in the Arctic and can no longer be ignored. The fundamental specific feature of the Arctic regional science phenomenon is that it deals with an extremely dynamic, ultimately non-stationary, and economically enclave object, pulsating in space and time with a giant amplitude, remote from the main developed centers, and dominated not by competition forces but by monopolies of different types and sizes. The transformation of the original conceptual blocks established by the «mother science» regionalistics is so great in the Arctic and takes us so far away from the initial theoretical notions that it should be reasonable to talk of a radical paradigm shift rather than gradually drive the former ideas to the

conditions of the polar regions. It is the first way, according to the article, which will provide the maximum explanatory power to the developed hypotheses and concepts and will ensure their successful integration with the unique realities of the Arctic.

Keywords: Arctic regional science; economic mainstream; market failures; Arctic remoteness

References

1. *Golovnev, A.V.* (2009). *Antropologiya dvizheniya (drevnosti Severnoy Evrazii)* [Anthropology of Movement (Antiquities of the North Eurasia)]. Yekaterinburg: UrB RAS Publ., Volot Publ., 496.
2. *Kosmachev, K.P.* (1974). *Pionernoe osvoenie taygi. Ekonomiko-geograficheskie problemy* [Pioneer Development of the Taiga. Economic and Geographical Problems]. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., Siberian Department, 144.
3. *Noeva, L.I.* (2013). *Razvitie korporativnoy sotsialnoy otvetstvennosti v severnykh regionakh Rossii. Avtoref. diss. ... kand. ekon. nauk* [Developing corporate social responsibility in the northern regions of Russia. Author's abstract for the Candidate of Economic Sciences Thesis]. Moscow, RANEPa Publ.
4. *Ostrom, E.* (2011). *Upravlyaya obshchim. Evolyutsiya institutov kolektivnoy deyatel'nosti* [Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action]. Moscow, Irsen Publ., Mysl Publ., 447.
5. *Slavin, S.V.* (1961). *Promyshlennoe i transportnoe osvoenie Severa SSSR* [Industrial and Transport Development of the Soviet North]. Moscow, Economizdat Publ., 302.
6. *Reinert, E.* (2011). *Kak bogatye strany stali bogatymi, i pochemu bednye strany ostayutsya bednymi* [How Rich Countries Got Rich... and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor]. Moscow, NRU HSE Publ., 384.
7. *Humphrey, C.* (2014). *Izmenenie znachimosti udalennosti v sovremennoy Rossii* [The changing significance of remoteness in contemporary Russia]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* [Ethnographic Review], 3, 8–24.
8. *Hickel, W.J.* (2004). *Problemy obshchestvennoy sobstvennosti. Model Alyaski – vozmozhnosti dlya Rossii?* [Problems of Public Ownership. Model of Alaska – Opportunities for Russia?]. Moscow, Progress Publ., 360.
9. *Larsen, J.N. & G. Fondahl* (Eds.). (2014). *Arctic Human Development Report: Regional Processes and Global Linkages*. Copenhagen, TemaNord. Norden, 500.
10. *Ardener, E.* (Ed.). (2007). *«Remote areas»: some theoretical considerations. The Voice of Prophecy and Other Essays*. London, New York, Berghahn Books, 211–223.
11. *Berman, M.* (2013). *Remoteness and Mobility: Transportation Routes, Technologies, and Sustainability in Arctic Communities*. Working paper.

-
12. *Hamelin, L.E.* (1979). Canadian Nordicity: It's Your North, Too. Montreal, Harvest House, 392.
 13. *Fischer, M. & P. Nijkamp* (Eds.). (2014). Handbook of Regional Science. Vol.1-3. Berlin, Springer.
 14. *Herrschell, T.* (2012). Regionalization and marginalization: bridging old and new divisions in regional governance. Regional Development in Northern Europe. Peripherality, Marginality and Border Issues. Routledge, 30–48.
 15. *Huskey, L.* (2006). Limits to growth: remote regions, remote institutions. The Annals of Regional Science, Western Regional Science Association, 40 (1), 147–155.
 16. *Huskey, L. & T.A. Morehouse.* (1992). Development in remote regions: What do we know? Arctic, 45 (2), 128–137.
 17. *Iammarino, S. & P. McCann.* (2013). Multinationals and Economic Geography. Location, Technology and Innovation. Cheltenham, UK & Northampton, Mass., Edward Elgar, 479.
 18. *Phelps, N.A., M. Atienza & M. Arias.* (2015). Encore for the enclave: The changing nature of the industry enclave with illustrations from the mining industry in Chile. Economic Geography, Vol. 91, No. 2, 119–146.
 19. *Storper, M. & A.J. Venables.* (2003). Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy. Journal of Economic Geography, Vol. 4, No. 4 (4), 351–370.
 20. *Torre, A. & D. Ségolène.* (2013). Land use and soils disposal: From competition to territorial governance (examples from land use conflicts in the greater Paris region). Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems. September, 1–12.

Information about the authors

Zamyatina, Nadezhda Yurievna (Moscow, Russia) – Candidate of Sciences (Geography), Leading Researcher of the Faculty of Geography at Lomonosov Moscow State University (1, Leninskie Gory, Official Municipal Post No. 1, Moscow, 119991, Russia, e-mail: nadezam@yandex.ru).

Pelyasov, Aleksandr Nikolaevich (Moscow, Russia) – Doctor of Sciences (Geography), Professor, Head of the Center for Northern and Arctic Economies, Council for the Study of Productive Forces (7, Vavilov st., Official Municipal Post No. 7, Moscow, 117997, Russia, e-mail: pelyasov@mail.ru).

29.05.2017 .

©, 2017