



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada. Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: AT1120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VII Número: 1 Artículo no.: 147 Período: 1 de septiembre al 31 de diciembre, 2019.

TÍTULO: Reasentamiento de campesinos de la parte europea de Rusia a Siberia a finales del siglo XIX y principios del XX desde el punto de vista de la Teoría de la Frontera.

AUTORES:

1. Ph.D. Cand. Andrey Ivanovich Baksheev.
2. Ph.D. Cand. Galina Vladimirovna Yurchuk.
3. Ph.D. Cand. Elena Alexandrovna Rukavitsyna.
4. Ph.D. Cand. Mikhail Alexandrovich Petrov.
5. Ph.D. Cand. Liudmila Gennadievna Korol.
6. Ph.D. Dmitry Vladimirovich Rakhinsky.

RESUMEN: El propósito del estudio es analizar la Teoría de la Frontera y su uso en el asentamiento campesino en Siberia después de la abolición de la servidumbre. En el estudio se utilizaron métodos científicos generales y especiales de ciencia histórica. El artículo analiza el concepto de "frontera" en la ciencia histórica extranjera y rusa. Se ha demostrado que el desarrollo de Siberia fue el resultado de un proceso global: desarrollo de nuevas tierras, oposición de cristianos y otras civilizaciones. Se analizó la política de reasentamiento en el imperio ruso en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX - principios del siglo XX. Las cuestiones de política regional en la Rusia prerrevolucionaria se investigaron desde el punto de vista de la Teoría de la Frontera.

PALABRAS CLAVES: teoría de la frontera, Siberia, parte europea de Rusia, política de reasentamiento, los campesinos.

TITLE: Resettlement of peasants from European part of Russia to Siberia in the late XIX – early XX centuries from the standpoint of Frontier Theory.

AUTHORS:

1. Ph.D. Cand. Andrey Ivanovich Baksheev.
2. Ph.D. Cand. Galina Vladimirovna Yurchuk.
3. Ph.D. Cand. Elena Alexandrovna Rukavitsyna.
4. Ph.D. Cand. Mikhail Alexandrovich Petrov.
5. Ph.D. Cand. Lyudmila Gennadevna Korol.
6. Ph.D. Dmitry Vladimirovich Rakhinsky.

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the study is to analyze Frontier Theory and its use in the study of peasant's settlement in Siberia after the abolition of serfdom. Both, general scientific and special methods of historical science were used in the study. The article analyzes the concept of 'frontier' in foreign and Russian historical science. It has been shown that the development of Siberia was the result of a global process – new lands development, opposition of Christian and other civilizations. The analysis of resettlement policy in the Russian Empire in the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries was carried out; the issues of regional policy in pre-revolutionary Russia were investigated from the standpoint of frontier theory.

KEY WORDS: frontier theory, Siberia, European Part of Russia, resettlement policy, the peasants.

INTRODUCTION.

The primary meaning of the word ‘frontier’ corresponds to the era of the development of free land in the West of the United States. In this case, it meant not only geographic feature “one’s own” / “smb. else’s”, “wildness” / “civilization”, but also a certain state of conquest spirit expressed in the motives of “open and free territory”, “pioneering”, conquering nature, fighting with Indian savages (Sobolev and Bobrov, 2011).

After American historian F. J. Turner, in 1893, wrote the article “The significance of the Frontier in American History” (further included as the first chapter of the book *Frontier in American History* (Turner, 2009)), the term ‘frontier’, previously only literary and journalistic one, acquired scientific character – geopolitical and historically sociological. The new concept caused a significant resonance and heightened the interest to the history of little-inhabited areas development in American continent, the role of these processes in the formation of American nation and state; it also gave birth to a separate field of research.

The essence of frontier concept in Turner’s understanding is as follows. The historical development of the United States is determined by their natural environment. The lack of virgin territories in the East, their vast reservoir in the West, and the Americans’ desire for freedom moved the settlement line farther and farther inland. F. J. Turner considered this process in the context of “conflict between barbarism and civilization”, the consequence of which was the development of individualism spirit, formation of American nation and strengthening of democracy.

Another important idea of F. J. Turner is the “escape valve” doctrine. Availability of virgin land contributed to the solution of social problems. Consequently, in contrast to Europe, the USA managed to avoid acute forms of social contradictions. Frontier has long served as a kind of socio-economic catalyst for the development of the United States and facilitates the development of entrepreneurship and democratic individualism spirit (Turner, 2009). Thus, historically, the continuous border line of

territories developing in 1820-1890, when the state power was relative and the resources were extremely extensive, was considered to be a 'frontier'.

In 1894, F. J. Turner defined the notion of 'frontier' meaning "those remote territories that were poorly populated at different stages of country development and that formed the melting line between savagery and civilization". In 1924, the scientist clarified this definition: "per se, temporary border of an expansive society on the edge of virgin land, ... settlement area that is closest to wild lands, where society and government are uncertain or not organized" (Turner, 1994).

The frontier theory in the original Turner's definition was critically analyzed several times and substantially expanded by other researchers during 1960s – 1990s. (Lattimore, 1962; Webb, 1981; Rieber, 2004). At first, the thesis about the conflict between "barbarism" and "civilization" was revised, as a result, the attention was focused on genocide of native people – the Indians. Subsequently, they turned to the problem of environmental losses in the territory as a result of economic activities of the settlers. Although, in general, none of the critics doubted the dominant role of frontier in the US history, Turner's understanding of the frontier gradually became a notion of the past.

Today, 'frontier' is defined by scientists as an area of intercivilizational, multicultural influence and interaction. Such understanding was primarily proposed by an American historian and orientalist Owen Lattimore (1962), who formulated the concept of frontier as an area of intense interaction between different cultures. Drawing parallel between the frontiers of China, British India and Ancient Rome, the researcher focused on several issues. The first one is the border itself (here the population has a strong sense of their own border identity concerning mutual economy with the inhabitants from the opposite side). The second one is the assimilated previous population, the barbarians living on the inside of the border. The third one is population from the outside of the border, who are familiar with civilization purely superficially, but enjoys its benefits (for example, the contacts of the Scythians and the Greeks in the Northern Black Sea region). The fourth one is a society of "total barbarism".

The settlement of border territory has already resulted in frontier formation, which permanently undergoes changes under the influence of communities on both sides of it (Lattimore, 1962).

In the context of intense fragmentation of historical knowledge and historical science globalization in the period of 1970-1990s the tendency towards comparative studies of world frontiers has strengthened. Historians confirmed that American frontier is not a unique phenomenon, but an episode of global process of “European expansion” (MacKay, 1977; Barfield, 1989; Sahlins, 1990; Power, 1999). It seems that in this context it is worth paying attention to the thesis of “Great Frontier” by Walter Webb (1981). He proposed global historical narrative, disseminating Turner’s thesis onto Western Europe, whole America, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, emphasizing, at the same time, determining influence of peoples from Great Frontier zone on the world economy, literature, science and art.

Furthermore, W. Webb considered frontier to be one of the main factors for society modernization, along with the Renaissance, Reformation and industrial revolution. He proposed boom hypothesis, according to which it was the frontier that provided the resources which enabled the metropolises to ensure their own intensive industrial development, on the one hand, and attracted active and businesslike people to try their luck in the new lands, on the other. Consequently, due to frontiers, economic and axiological basis of modern industrial society were forming. The economic boom lasted as long as frontier excess resources were available. Their lack entailed the First World War (for redistribution of territories and resources) and further cataclysms of the 20th century (Webb, 1981).

Among modern scholars, frontier theory was further developed in the works of A. Rieber (2004). In his opinion, frontier is a transitional zone within which the interaction of several cultures and poly-ethnic structures takes place. Along with this, while studying the history of Eastern Europe, A. Rieber proposed to single the frontier out according to political criterion, basing on the ideas of O. Lattimore and historical reality of the Russian Empire. The researcher notes the phenomenon of dual loyalty of

frontier societies in the territories with interaction of three or more policies: Austrian military border in Croatia, where there were interests of Venice, Hapsburgs and Porta; the Ukraine which was the aim for Poland, Turkey and Russia; the Caucasus (Porta, Iran, Russia); Chinese Turkestan (the Mongols, the Chinese, the Russians) and the Ordos-Liao line (the Manchus, the Chinese, the Russians). A. Rieber (2004) traced how long-lasting political and cultural influences of each of the three political systems affected transformations of autochthonous identity of these frontiers.

A. Kappeler suggested to consider frontier phenomenon in four perspectives: as geographical frontier between different natural zones; as social frontier between different lifestyles and value systems of different peoples, especially between settled people and nomads or hunters; as military frontier; as religious and cultural frontier. According to this scheme, A. Kappeler (2003) distinguished military frontier, frontier of intensive exploitation (natural resources), frontier of settlements.

At present, the approach to the history of Russia based on 'frontier' concept is especially popular among Siberian scientists. Series of publications "Frontier in the History of Siberia and North America in the 17th – 20th centuries: general and peculiar issues" (2001-2003), historiographic works, concrete historical studies are worth noting; for example, Ph.D. thesis of Krasnoyarsk historian O.S. Khromyh (2008) "Russian colonization of Siberia of the last third of the XVI – the first third of the XVII century in the light of frontier theory" showed three-stage frontier concept – external, internal and internal civilizational in the context of socio-spatial analysis. It concerns external frontier as emergence of contact zones between alien and native population; internal – as the process of new territory entering the state, the content of which is interaction and interference of various cultural and economic types and ethnic groups.

Finally, in the conditions of internal civilizational frontier, a new community is formed and institutionalized on the basis of various types of interaction. It is of fundamental importance that the above

mentioned three stages of frontier in Siberia did not occur sequentially, but simultaneously, although there were regional differences.

The complexity and ambiguity of social and economic dimension of frontier is shown by established nature of Siberian economy proved by Russian historians, where market relations were next to archaic ones. By the way, such phenomenon was also typical for American frontier (Rezun and Shilovsky, 2005).

Let us note that both domestic and foreign scientists pay much attention to regional frontier component. It is explained by the fact that the new paradigms of modern international relations essence also defined new ideological contexts of such concepts as 'space' and 'time' in the postmodern era, as well as processes of globalization and integration, intercultural communications, transnationalism, and a number of new interrelations of domestic and foreign policy. The importance of frontier theory in the study of modern geopolitical processes is growing. This is especially evident in regional geopolitical dimensions.

Thus, frontier theory for the whole period of its existence, from the end of the XIX century till present day, has undergone many additions and changes, nevertheless, it still remains essential and relevant among academic historians mainly because of such changes.

The aim of our study is to analyze frontier theory and its use in study of the peasants' colonization of Siberia after the abolition of serfdom in 1861.

The hypothesis of the study is as follows: cognitive value of frontier theory is very high when studying the development of Siberia, which is the territory of frontier.

According to the results of the study, it is possible to conclude that the aim set in the article was achieved.

DEVELOPMENT.

Research methods.

The basis of the present work are the principles of historicism and objectivity.

The following works were selected as the main sources: works by A. M. Anfimov (1961) and M.A. Davydov (2011), devoted to the issues of land management in the Russian Empire; researches by M. K. Churkin (2006), D. N. Belyanin (2011a;b), who analyzed the resettlement policy in Russia in the second half of the XIX - early XX centuries; researches by I. L. Dameshek (2002) and A.V. Remnev (1997), who covered the issues of regional policy of pre-revolutionary Russia in details.

Both general scientific and special methods of historical science were used in the study. Depending on the tasks set, comparative historical, statistical, problematic and chronological, logical, and other methods were used. Interdisciplinary approach allowed to use a wide range of methods from other sciences; from sociology and demography, in particular.

Such combination provided a comprehensive study of the problem set and obtaining valid research results.

Results and discussion.

Siberia, as a territory of the Russian Empire, has always occupied a special place. In our opinion, Siberia became its constituent in the middle of the 15th century, when Moscow tsar, who became military strong, began to take the lands from former Golden Horde.

The phenomenon of this conquest was manifested in the fact that the Orthodox power occupied the territory of Siberian Khanate, a significant part of recently powerful Islamic empire (Kappeler, 2004). However, the period of its development was the longest in comparison with other lands that were parts of the Russian state, both because of natural and geographical features of the region, remoteness from the capital, lack of roads, cold climate and due to the late understanding by the authorities Siberia importance in political and economic field in the scale of empire. Intensive colonization of this region

in the XIX century began under pressure of external factors rather than internal ones, when as a result of new geopolitical situation developed after Russia's defeat in the Crimean War, the interest in Siberia increased by winning states and mainly by Great Britain. It also increased due to the interest in this land by the Japanese, Chinese and Koreans, whose attacks were becoming more frequent (Alekshev et al., 2004). In such situation peasant's settlement was to strengthen military-political presence of Russia, that was much easier to accomplish after the elimination of serfdom and personal liberation of the peasants than before 1861.

The main factor of peasants' mass migration to the East was acute social problem, provoked by extensive way of economic activity in the country. Being entangled by bondage ransom payments, exorbitant taxes and labour rents, Russian peasants suffered mostly from lack of land and landlessness. Land rent from landowners could increase the profitability of farms. However, they soon refused to lease it for labour rents and turned peasants to monetary form of rent, which became impossible for most farmers. As far as the cost of land was growing, its payment was increasing too, and as a result, it quickly spread and completely supplanted labour rent in most Russian governments (Anfimov, 1961).

Post-reform demographic situation, that resulted in high natural increase, especially among the peasants, led to the increase in rural population, and accelerated growth of family members led to the fragmentation of farms that, due to the slow growth of market relations, could not provide proper welfare of their families (Bakshev, 2016).

The reduction of household plots size was also connected with the predominance of individual farming way among the peasantry and with the tradition of inheriting the land through its division. On average, in governments the hideland per census soul was rapidly decreasing.

A form of homestead landowning, typical, for example, for Little Russian peasants, made them more mobile compared to communal facilitated migration. There was also low productivity of soil, that was typical, first of all, for the governments of non-black-soil zone. That is why migration movement in the late 1880s spread first of all to the Little Russian governments, and then to Kuban and uyezds (districts) of the central Russian governments.

Local manufacturing industry and crafts, where the peasantry could work at least temporarily and somehow could improve their material wealth were also weakly developing. At the end of the 19th century, thousands and thousands of free villagers were looking for work on the side – in towns, at plants and factories, and during seasonal part-time work, increasing a huge army of unemployed people. In addition, the statistics showed deterioration of peasants' situation, as far as their debts in payments for various taxes and loans increased and could reach 20% of annual income in individual farms, which also indicated their difficulties (Churkin, 2006).

Social tension was also worsened by crop failures, threat of hunger, malnutrition and diseases, that made peasants look for new lands. Thousands of families, having no sufficient means of livelihood, spontaneously moved to unknown lands and became immigrants.

An important factor for migration was Russian mentality of peasants, who were originally tied to the land and considered it the only source of wealth and abundance. They did not acquire habits of doing other kind of work, and therefore did not see their own benefit in taking part in industrial development and continued traditionally to prefer agriculture. They were frightened by stuffy town atmosphere with a different way of life and incomprehensible production. Russian peasants were traditionally bound to “the old days” and were very religious. Moreover, weak urbanization of the majority of Russian towns could not offer them enough working places (Baksheev, 2015).

Lack of education and political indifference of peasants was accompanied by naivety, provoked by rumors of the unlimited wealth of Siberia; its virgin lands, that could be cheaply bought; rivers overflowing with fish; and pastures with thick and lush grass for livestock.

Intensive resettlement to Siberia began in the 1880s, but the first migration flow to Siberia was not so numerous. The next period was characterized by fast pace. So, during 1894-1900, 97% of total number of migrants left for Asiatic Russia, Siberia. The government made intervention in the organization of resettlement more active, forming its districts: Turgai-Ural, Tobolsk, Akmola, Semipalatinsk, Tomsk, Yeniseisk, Primorsk and Semirechensk, dividing them to smaller areas.

Migration Board under the Ministry of the Inner Affairs (1896-1905), a special state structure aimed to regulate and coordinate migration, was created and sent special directives to the governors. It pointed out that all local state institutions were to contribute in every way for successful “process of resettlement” in order to weaken “... agrarian movement among the rural population of European Russia by resettling population surplus to the Asian outskirts of the empire” (Belyanin, 2011).

The construction of Transsib (1891-1916), which linked the European part of the Russian Empire with the Far East, significantly influenced the pace of resettlement, pushing the sea transport and cartage back, which was previously used by immigrants.

The quantity and the pace of migration makes it possible to single out another stage in the development of Siberian lands, so-called Stolypin period, which began after 1906 and had a special mass character. This stage was characterized by a change in social composition of the peasantry, as it included the poorest part who not waiting for state subsidies, actively tried to leave for the east of Russia. There were no such fertile lands for them as for their predecessors, and they were mainly forced to develop worse land areas in more distant places. No wonder in one of the agitations of 1909 it was indicated that such people should get rid of the resettlement idea (Baksheev et al., 2018).

Calculations of the number of resettlement movements in state and local statistics of the initial period were practically not conducted, and researchers can count only on digital data, starting from 1896, when the official centralized registration of migrants was established. So, in 1859-1870 only 129.2 thousand people migrated to Siberia and the Far East. Major part of people migrated to Siberia in the period 1905-1914, and mainly from 1908. Most researchers indicate 2.5 million people in calculations of immigrants' number to the Urals before World War I (Davydov, 2011).

The spontaneity of peasant's trip to the East broke previous legislative norms, in particular, the rules of 1843, and the situation of 1861 as well. It was the latter that deprived landowner peasants of the right, especially in the first years, to go to new lands with a punishment of up to three months of imprisonment for self-willed resettlement. This forced the authorities to start developing new legislation. The most significant was the decree of June 13, 1889 "On voluntary resettlement of rural inhabitants and bourgeois to state lands", to Tobolsk and Tomsk governments, Semirechensk, Ak-mola and Semipalatinsk regions to be more exact. According to this law, peasants could resettle only with the permission from the Ministry of Inner Affairs and state institutions, which determined the availability of free plots and compared them with the requests of immigrants that were forwarded to the governors.

It is important to note that the land was granted for permanent use, and it was indicated in the relevant land act, which also had information on its limits and the payment procedure for its use. The plots were not taken back and were not a subject to exorbitant fees. For the first three years, the peasants were completely exempted from state taxation and rental payments. The next three years only half of the established amount was to be paid. Furthermore, immigrants were given a delay for the military service for three years. Migrants could get one-time interest-free loan for the purchase of food and seeds (Dameschek, 2002).

This law was constantly supplemented with instructions by Migration Board, which clarified and directed peasant flows coordinating train operation, setting time for trains separately for each government, separating regions into six categories. The main criterion was natural characteristics associated with the beginning of flood, navigation on the Irtysh and the Ob, etc.

Mainly, the resettlement took place in February, March and April for people to arrive at the place of settlement at the beginning of spring; in October, November and December, the flow of immigrants decreased. Later, the departure dates were strictly regulated: from March 10 to July 20. The instructions had detailed information on the documents that the peasants needed to get benefits from the state (Dorofeev, 2007).

In order to regulate migration flows, local state structures were established – government and district land use planning commissions, which, in accordance with the Law of June 6, 1904 and the approved by the Emperor Nikolai II Regulations of Ministers Council of March 10, 1906 got the right to send representatives and foot-messengers for choosing lands at the Urals. They were given certain privileges for travelling. Those who wanted to resettle were to register, every four families presented a foot-messenger who chose the land for the settlement, keeping in mind the fact that the land was given to each family member. Foot-messengers were chosen from wealthy families because of significant travel expenses, as the trip lasted at least two months. The authorities also tried to regulate the pace of resettlement with their help either granting them benefits or depriving them (Shilovsky, 2006).

During Stolypin agrarian reform, the resettlement policy became clearer, more organized and directed. It was proposed to organize tenders for certain areas in Siberia, only after which the immigrant could go and take the purchased land. In order to prepare peasants for resettlement, to acquaint them with new conditions of management, Migration Board began publishing thousands of copies of relevant literature. In particular, in 1907; 130,000 books were printed with 400,000 explanations. The

state did not skimp on promises in case of legal resettlement. It was to provide preferential transportation of migrants, reduce the railway fee for their luggage and pets, arrange quick settlement and land allotment, withdraw arrears, land debts for five years, give interest-free loans to each family up to 165 rubles.

The description of one of the most promising, the Yenisei government, with its mild climate and black soil giving big crops is interesting in particular. The government promised that the migrants could sell large quantities of the bread to the workers of gold mines and factories that was in high need at all the time. However, life realities did not correspond to the propaganda appeals. Indeed, those immigrants who had certificates for allotted land could receive travel and luggage benefits, but those who did not have documents were deprived of them. However, all of them, equally suffered from unsanitary conditions in trains, caused by duration of the trip, large number of people in one place without basic living conditions (Belyanin, 2011).

Besides, peasants could not always take advantage of the benefits, they were often late, because they did not have enough time to sell the property before the deadline, in such case they move without permission and actually robbed themselves, because they neither had any preferential certificates for the trip, nor loans to acquire household, nor allocated plots for them. Moreover, immigrants often changed settlement place on their way, violating the requirements of travel documents. The peasants who did not leave at the appointed time, and family members, who for some reason were not included in the preferential certificates, also became unauthorized migrants. Statistics noted that compared with 1895-1896 the number of unauthorized migrants increased significantly and by 1908 in some governments they accounted for more than half of the newcomers. In the Turgai region, in particular, such migrants accounted 80%, and in Semipalatinsk – even 90% (Khramkov, 2014).

Since the beginning of the XX century, new tasks on migration movement began to appear in the government of the empire, which, apart from colonization, had another goal. “A new point of view on colonization issue in Siberia is not to make evicting working people from their homeland, but to settle the outskirts with Russian people as the main task of resettlement policy” (Remnev, 1997). Thus, the task of resettlement was not in the fight against dubious land shortages but was the problem of whether to make Russia a great country or not.

Colonization has become an important component of imperial politics, while the peasants were to become effective conductors of the idea of “united and indivisible Russia”. The idea was to combine Siberia colonization and its russification and to strengthen, in such a way, military-political presence in this strategically important region of Russia. The imperial center chose a rather peculiar and at the same time reliable method of self-defense, opposing it to leaders and ideologists of Siberian regional idea with its separatist sentiments, which began to gain weight and was widely spread in the region after the Siberians realized their own economic and cultural identity (Baksheev et al., 2019).

The state refused from the role of passive observer and subordinated the resettlement to imperial development and strengthening of the suburbs, stimulating and regulating it legislatively, paying much attention to Orthodoxy and “Russianness”.

CONCLUSIONS.

The results of the analysis of migration processes in Siberia in the late XIX – early XX centuries showed that, undoubtedly, Siberia in the era of imperial modernization of this period is a vivid example of a frontier.

The use of conceptual approaches of frontier theory makes it possible to broaden the understanding of the subject and the object of historical regionalism, taking into account the fact that the current stage of regionalology historical development attracts the attention of historians primarily from the point of view of formation of new methodological approaches and the search for ways to integrate a

civilizational system and regional science. In this regard, history shows that Siberia is the edge of solid frontier, and the use of appropriate approaches makes it possible to correct already established ideas even with a sufficient degree of study of the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Alekseev, V.V., Alekseeva, E.V., Zubkov, K.I., Coastal, I.V. (2004). Aziatskay Rossiya v geopoliticheskoy i tsivilizatsionnoy dinamike XVI-XX veka [Asian Russia in geopolitical and civilizational dynamics of XVI – XX centuries]. Science, Moscow, 600.
2. Anfimov, A.M. (1961). Zemel'naya аренда v Rossii v nachale XX v. [Land lease in Russia at the beginning of XX century]. Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Moscow, 184.
3. Baksheev, A.I. (2015). Sotsialno-psikhologicheskoe myshlenie sibirskogo krest'yanstva v period NEPa [Socio-psychological thinking of Siberian peasantry in the period of NEP]. *Historical and socio-educational thought*, 7(8), 11–13.
4. Baksheev, A.I. (2016). “Colonial Dependence” of Siberia in the 19th century – the first quarter of the 20th century. *Modern science: actual problems of theory and practice*, 1, 9-13.
5. Baksheev, A.I., Filimonov, V.V., and Nozdrin, D.A. (2018). Politika pereseleniya krest'yanstva iz regionov evropeyskoy chasti SSSR v Sibir v 20-kh gg. XX v. [The policy of peasantry resettlement from the regions of European part of the USSR to Siberia in 20-s. of XX century]. *Ethnosocide and interethnic culture*, 12, 40–48.
6. Baksheev, A.I., Filimonov, V.V., and Rakhinsky, D.V. (2019). Diskurs sibirskoy suverenizatsii: ot oblastnichestva k sovremennoy modernizatsii territorialnogo ustroystva [Discourse of Siberian sovereignty: from regionalism to modern modernization of territorial structure]. *Social – Political Sciences*, 1, 66–70.
7. Barfield, Th. (1989). *The Perilous Frontier. Nomadic Empires and China*, Oxford, 255.

8. Belyanin, D.N. (2011a). Protivorechiya v realizatsii pereselencheskoy politiki v Sibiri na rubezhe XIX-XX vv. [Contradictions in implementation of resettlement policy in Siberia at the turn of XIX – XX centuries]. *Humanities in Siberia*, 1, 27–30.
9. Belyanin, D.N. (2011b). Pereselenie krest'yan v Sibir' v gody Stolypinskoy agrarnoy reformy [Peasants resettlement to Siberia during Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Russian history*, 1, 86–95.
10. Churkin, M. K. (2006). Pereselenie krest'yan chernozyomnogo tsentra Evropeiskoy Rossii v Zapadnyu Sibir' vo vtoroy polovine XIX – nachale XX vv.: determiniruyushchie faktory migratsionnoy mobil'nosti i adaptatsii [The resettlement of peasants from the black-earth center of European Russia to Western Siberia in the second half of XIX - early XX centuries: determining factors of migration mobility and adaptation]. Publishing house OmGPU, Omsk, 376.
11. Dameschek, I.L. (2002). Sibir' v sisteme imperskogo regionalisma (komparativnoe issledovanie ukrainnoy politiki Rossii v pervoy polovine XIX v. [Siberia in the system of imperial regionalism (comparative study of Russian outskirts policy in the first half of XIX century)]. Ottisk, Irkutsk, 389.
12. Davydov, M.A. (2011). Statistika zemleustroystva v khode Stolypinskoy agrarnoy reformy [Land management statistics in the course of Stolypin agrarian reform]. *Russian history*, 1, 56–72.
13. Dorofeev, M.V. (2007). Zemel'naya reforma v Sibiri 1896-1916 gg. (aspekty vzaimootnosheniy vlasti i krest'yanstva) [Land reform in Siberia 1896–1916 (aspects of relationship between the government and the peasantry)]. *TSU Bulletin*, 303, 69–73.
14. Frontir v istorii Sibiri i severnoy Ameriki v XVII-XX vv.: obshchee i osobennoe [Frontier in the history of Siberia and North America in XVII-XX centuries: general and peculiar issues]. (2001–2003). Novosibirsk, 1–3.
15. Kappeler, A. (2003). Yuzhniy i vostochniy frontier Rossii v XVI-XVIII vv. [The southern and eastern frontier of Russia in XVI-XVIII centuries]. *Ab Imperio*, 1, 47–64.

16. Kappeler, A. (2004). *Formirovanie Rossiyskoy imperii v XV – nachale XVII veka: nasledstvo Rusi, Vizantii i Ordy* [Formation of the Russian Empire in XV- early XVIII century: the inheritance of Russia, Byzantium and the Horde]. *Russian Empire in a comparative perspective*, Moscow, 95–96.
17. Khromykh, A.S. (2008). *Russkaya kolonizatsiya Sibiri posledney treti XVI- pervoy chetverti XVII veka v svete teorii frontira* [Russian colonization of Siberia of the last third of the XVI – the first third of the XVII century in the light of frontier theory]. PhD Thesis, Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V. P. Astafyev, Tomsk, 270.
18. Khramkov, A.A. (2014). *Ocherki istorii krest'yanstva Sibiri nachala XX vv.* [Essays on history of the peasantry in Siberia at the beginning of XX century]. Publishing house Alt. University, Barnaul, 328.
19. Lattimore, O. (1962). *Studies in Frontier History. Collected Papers 1928–1958*. Oxford University Press, London.
20. MacKay, A. (1977). *Spain in the Middle Ages: From Frontier to Empire, 1000-1500*, MacMillan Publishing Company, 288.
21. Rezun, D.Ya., and Shilovsky, M.V. (2005). *Sibir', konets XVI – nachalo XX v.: frontier v kontekste etnosotsialnykh i etnokulturnykh protsessov* [Siberia, the end of XVI - te beginning of XX century: frontier in context of ethnosocial and ethnocultural processes]. Sova, Novosibirsk, 193.
22. Power, D. (1999). Introduction: Frontiers: Terms, Concepts, and Historians of Medieval and Early Modern Europe, in: D. Power and N. Standen (eds.), *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, Macmillan Press, London, 1–31.
23. Remnev, A. (1997). *Samoderzhavie i Sibir'*. *Administrativnaya politika vtoroy poloviny XIX – nachala XX vv.* [Autocracy and Siberia. Administrative policy of the second half of XIX - early XX centuries], OGU, Omsk, 253.

24. Rieber, A. (2004). “Menyayuschiesya kontseptsii i konstruksii frontira: sravnitelno-istoricheskiy podkhod [Changing Concepts and Constructions of Frontier: Comparative Historical Approach]”, in: I. Gerasimov, et al. (Eds.), *A New Imperial History of the Post-Soviet territory*. Center for Nationalism and Empire Studies, Kazan, 180–200.
25. Sahlins, P. (1990). *Natural Frontiers Revisited: France’s Boundaries since the Seventeenth Century*. *American Historical Review*, 95(5), 1423-1451.
26. Shilovsky, M.V. (2006). *Agrarnaya reforma P.A. Stolypina i Sibir’ [Agrarian Reform by P.A. Stolypin and Siberia]*. *Humanities in Siberia*, 2, 3–6.
27. Sobolev, T.N., and Bobrov, D.S. (2011). *Sovremennaya rossiyskaya istoriografiya kontseptsii frontira [Modern Russian historiography of frontier concept]*. *News of Altai State University*, 4, 189–193.
28. Turner, F.J. (2009). *Frontier in American history*. Trans. from English. All the World Publishing House, Moscow, 304.
29. Turner, F.J. (1994). *The Significance of the Frontier in American History and Other Essays*. With Commentary by John Mack Faragher, Henry Holt & Company, New York.
30. Webb, W.P. (1981). *The Great Plains*. Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 525.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Andrey Ivanovich Baksheev. Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences and Humanities, Krasnoyarsk State Medical University named after Professor V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky, Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, Russia. Email: baksh-ai@yandex.ru

2. Galina Vladimirovna Yurchuk. Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Latin and Foreign Languages, Dean of the Department of Foreign Students, Krasnoyarsk State Medical University named after Professor V.F. Voyno-Yasenetsky, Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, Russia.

3. Elena Alexandrovna Rukavitsyna. Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor, Department of Advertising and Social and Cultural Activities, Humanitarian Institute, Siberian Federal University, Russia.

4. Mikhail Alexandrovich Petrov. Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy of the Humanities Institute, Siberian Federal University, Russia.

5. Liudmila Gennadievna Korol. Candidate of Biological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Psychology and Pedagogy of the Institute of Social Engineering, Reshetnev Siberian State University of Science and Technology, Russia.

6. Dmitry Vladimirovich Rakhinsky. Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Department of Civil Law and Law Institute Process, Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University, Russia.

RECIBIDO: 12 de agosto del 2019.

APROBADO: 27 de agosto 2019