

URBAN RUSSIA AND GLOBALIZATION: PROBLEMS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Anokhin Anatoliy ALEXANDROVICH
Zhitin Dmitry VIKTOROVICH
Lachininsky Stanislav SERGEEVICH

Urbanization implies enhancement of the role of urban centers in the social life and constitutes a dynamic polystructural process underlying improvement of living conditions of the population. Urbanization manifested to the fullest extent in the second half of the 20th century when the global urban population rate increased from 29% (1950) to 50% (2000); today this rate continues to increase primarily due to emerging markets. In developed markets urbanization has reached its final phase, and, therefore, eliminated the need for development of new urban centers or significant increase in the population of the existing ones. A special focus is made on the development of comfortable urban environment through deployment of advanced urban planning technologies and IT progress. Urban advancement in this case primarily means improvement of living conditions and access to social and cultural values. In the US this is interpreted as the “right to the city”, i.e. the right to access urban culture.

A different situation prevails in the emerging markets with the domination of agricultural or agro-industrial economy and a low degree of urbanization. In these economies development of advanced utility and social facilities and creation of new jobs for the oncoming generation are regarded as priority issues. Notwithstanding the conventional nature of classification of economies into advanced and emerging, since transitional economies exist, it is worth noting that each economy has developed its own urban settlement patterns, functional structure and population density due to its historical, geographical and socio-economic background. This is entirely true for the Russian Federation. At the same time, the common tendencies that are observed in many countries to a greater or lesser degree are also visible. At the current stage of urbanization dynamic, diversified and polystructural systems of metropolitan settlement have been growing around major agglomerations that form vast sub-urbanized areas.

In the globalized world where all economies and regions are interrelated new competitive environment and risks emerge. Non-recurring and operational cost reduction of the costs of suppliers of goods and services is achieved through territorial concentration of industrial production, service sector and utility and public infrastructure. This factor leads to the development of compact settlement formats, nuclei and urbanized areas of social and business activity. Business globalization leads to formation of these poles of business activity that to a considerable extent determine regional economic development. According to the World Bank’s “Reshaping Economic Geography” report [1], the economic landscape of advanced economies is neither smooth nor linear, with the highest economic density concentrated around bigger cities. In this context stand out especially clearly the major international urban centers of global economy that are closely interrelated and constitute the top tier in the global urban settlement hierarchy. According to the authors of this report, the development priority are cities that either have transformed into major agglomerations or have all relevant prerequisites for such transformation in the near term. The authors believe

that this may bring the national economy to an advanced level, which will be beneficial for household wealth both in urban areas and in remote regions due to transfer of social welfare subsidies. However, social welfare assistance rather suppresses economic growth than promotes it. Investment and skill concentration around urban centers of business and social activity entails stagnation of minor towns and remote areas. Therefore, asynchrony and spatial disparity in the level socio-economic development of global and national regions are inevitable.

Globalization generates new opportunities for asset upgrading, communication improvement, international trade enhancement and international skill migration; however, all these are accompanied by new challenges, especially for the markets that are susceptible to fluctuations of global market prices on core export commodities and services. Globalization alters the nature and quality of competition. In addition to traditional competition for markets, raw material and fuel resources, competition for the right to preserve the national socio-cultural systems, environmental safety and life quality increases. As an objective process consisting of various economic, demographic, social and ethnic components, globalization has a rather controversial manifestation at a regional level. This process promotes domination of advanced markets, leaving to emerging markets the role of raw material and cheap skill supplier. This is another confirmation of the statement that global economy can be classified into “central”, “semi-peripheral” and “peripheral” segments. However, a similar pattern of territorial economic organization also exists in the markets that are traditionally referred to as “catching-up”. Can this controversy be eliminated? It replicates continuously, leading to disparity in life conditions between larger agglomerations and smaller towns, between urbanized territories and rural areas. P. Krugman made an important observation in his article “Space: last boundary” [2] about the fact that economists ignore spatial regularities in their studies. The economic effect achieved through agglomeration settlement may lead to significant losses in the long term due to underfinancing of peripheral regions. Eventually asymmetrical settlement patterns where economic and social problems may enhance form. Another statement made in the aforementioned report is worth noting: “elevating space and place from mere under-currents in policy to a major focus” [p. 2]. Rational organization of regional economic space, its saturation with production and social infrastructure, population density and transport accessibility, i.e. economic and geographic factors, determine the investment opportunities of an urban area. The global cities included in P. Taylor’s list generally have an outstanding geo-economic position [3]. Moscow is one of them, being Russia’s major agglomeration extending virtually over the entire Moscow region which is a suburbanized area with its nuclei and sub-nuclei and a significant investment and career opportunities.

Traditionally the Russian Federation is regarded an economy with a high degree of urbanization. This approach is supported by the share of urban population in the national total: 74.2% as at 01.01.2014. [4]. Urbanization of this country evolved at an accelerated pace. Thus, from 1959 to 1988 the urban population increased from 61.6 million (52%) to 108.0 million (73.5%). Most of the increase is associated with cities with population over 100 thousand inhabitants. The growth rate of cities with population over 500 thousand inhabitants was particularly high. By the time of the 1989 population census, Russia had 12 cities with population in excess of 1 million people [5]. These features must be complemented with the following:

- consistently high growth of the number of cities and towns; immediately after World

War II 335 out of the 1038 cities that existed in 1989 were developed;

- uneven extension of settlements: 43% of the cities were located in the following economic macro regions: Central Russia, North Caucasus and the Volga region;

- the key role of industry in the urbanization process: employment in service industry remained at a low level, and in many cases just one or two enterprises constituted the entire production potential of minor towns.

- the role of mining industry in urban origin and development: numerous towns, especially in the northern and eastern regions of Russia, were built near mineral deposits.

The 1990s were marked by a decline in both urban and overall national population. Between 1991 and 2006, the urban population declined by 4.7 million people. Urban development also slowed down during this period. Only in the recent 5 years a tendency to urban population growth and increase in the number of large cities was recorded. As of 01.01.2013, Russia had 15 cities with population over 1 million people (against 12), 21 cities with population from 500 to 999.9 thousand people, 130 cities with population from 100 to 400.9 thousand people and 934 with population under 100 thousand. [6] Nevertheless, only cities with population over 500 thousand inhabitants belonged to multi-functional advanced agglomerations. They developed as large urban hubs where diverse relations intersected and evidenced the existence of an extensive area of economic and social influence.

In the context of continuing economic crisis, Russia formally meets the criteria of high urbanization, i.e. urban population rate. However, this averaged indicator (72.9%) does not reflect the significant differences between the nature and structure of regional settlement patterns. In seven sub-federal regions (republics), i.e. Altay, Dagestan, Ingushetia, Kalmukia, Karachay-Cherkessia, Tuva and Chechnya, the share of urban population is below 50%: Only two of these regions are located in the Eastern part, whereas the rest are located in the Western part, in North-Caucasus area. All of these regions are quite small and their economies are based on production of primary commodities.

In ten federal regions the urbanization rate ranges from 50 to 60%. Conventionally they may be associated with medium globalization rate group. This group includes such republics as Adygea, Buryatia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Tyva and Chuvashia, such territories as Altay, Krasnodar and Stavropol, and such regions as Orenburg and Tambov. Only two cities in this category have population below 500 thousand people, i.e. Krasnodar and Orenburg.

The rest of the regions belong to a large category with either high or very high urban population density. However, the conditions and reasons of accelerated urbanization in territories with different degree of economic territorial development will not be the same. In the first place, these are the most advanced regions with diversified structure, where high population density was achieved through economic advantages of agglomeration of various industrial production and service sectors. Primarily, these are regions with million-strong cities: Moscow, St. Petersburg, Ekaterinburg, Nizhny Novgorod, Samara, Chelyabinsk, etc.

Secondly, high population density (over 90%) is recorded in the regions with mining, forestry and fishing-based economies, i.e. primarily urban type communities with mineral resource specialization. This category includes Kamchatka, Magadan and Murmansk regions, Khanty-Mansiysk and Yamalo-Nenets autonomous districts and a number of others. Thirdly, the relatively high urbanization is partly accounted for by significant reduction of rural population. A similar phenomenon was recorded in the old industrial areas with varied

labor-intensive processing industries, e.g.: Novgorod, Pskov ad Smolensk.

Finally, another group exists that includes regions where urbanization was not limited to a single large city, primarily a regional (republican) capital, but was also based on the growth of secondary and tertiary, in terms of population density, industrial centers. In these regions urban settlements are distributed more evenly throughout the territory, which eliminates the controversies between the central and peripheral areas. Relatively balanced regional urban settlement patterns are typical for the European part of Russia. Among such regions are Vladimir, Ivanovo and Tula regions. In the Asian part, the specimen is Kemerovo region with relatively high population and industrial density at the national scale. A similar population pattern is recorded in Irkutsk region, despite with certain reservations (existence of poorly developed areas).

Thus, manifestation of local differences is not limited to population and ratio between urban and rural population. The structural and functional specifics of population settlement patterns play an important role for an insight into the relations between urban settlements and the environment. Primarily such specifics manifests in the ratio between urban settlements of different dimensions and economic purpose, the nature of their distribution and concentration rate. As we noted earlier, only multi-functional agglomerations constitute advanced urban settlements. In Russia there 36 such agglomerations, including 15 with population in excess of 15 million people (see Table 1).

| | Number of cities | | Population, thousand people | |
|--|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| | 1989 | 2013 | 1989 | 2013 |
| Total cities | 1037 | 1097 | 94450 | 98793 |
| including population, thousand people: | | | | |
| ≤ 3 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 23 |
| 3 – 4.9 | 17 | 29 | 73 | 119 |
| 5 – 9.9 | 82 | 131 | 629 | 1031 |
| 10 – 19.9 | 243 | 250 | 3611 | 3665 |
| 20 – 49.9 | 360 | 359 | 11595 | 11505 |
| 50 – 99.9 | 163 | 150 | 11169 | 10509 |
| 100 – 499.9 | 131 | 130 | 28162 | 27284 |
| 500 – 999.9 | 22 | 21 | 14040 | 12627 |
| ≥ 1 million | 12 | 15 | 25159 | 32086 |

Table 1. Distribution of Russia Cities by Population.

Local distribution within this category of cities is rather unique. In the Far East just 2 cities (Vladivostok and Khabarovsk) fall into this category, yet they are hardly able to exercise any more or less notable influence on the economic situation of this vast region. In the Siberian Federal district, there are six cities (Barnaul Irkutsk, Kemerovo, Novokuznetsk, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, Omsk and Tomsk) that also make a localized impact on the environment, similarly to the other cases. In the Urals there exist 3 cities of this category: Ekaterinburg, Tyumen and Chelyabinsk. In the Volga region, despite its smaller territory, there

are 12 of such cities. In the Southern district there are 3 such cities, in the North-Western - 1, and 5 in the Central region. Thus, most of the cities with population equal to or more than 500 thousand people are concentrated in the developed Western area. The Volga region draws attention due to its favorable economic and geographic location at the intersection of transport routes. Most large cities are concentrated here. Therefore, urbanization as a factor affecting the environmental situation manifests differently at the local and inter-regional level. Its importance reaches the maximum in the Center, Volga region and Urals. Yet it should be taken into consideration that Russia will face a population decline accompanied by vital space reduction. A slump was recorded in the population of Polar districts, while migration from the Far East and from peripheral areas towards the center is still going on. Among the eleven economic macro regions of Russia only one (Northern Caucasus) will retain its positive dynamics by 2025. At the level of federal regions “concentration” of population around transport arteries and major cities may be expected.

The specifics of urbanization in Russia consist in the concentration of the larger part of urban population in medium and large cities, including localities with population above 50 thousand people. According to the latest census conducted in 2010, among 1100 cities of the Russian Federation only 320 (13%) may be classified as medium and large, while they account for 77% of the total urban population (57% of national total). It is this category of cities that determines the regional socio-economic development to the largest extent.

An analysis of the nature of urban population settlement and dynamics in the recent decades should take into account the geographic diversity of socio-economic and demographic processes in the Russian Federation. This also refers to urbanization processes that influence the dynamics of urban population and ratios between cities of various sizes.

According to the 2010 census, the majority of the 320 cities with population over 50 thousand people, i.e. 70 cities (22%) are located in the Central economic district, including 38 cities in Moscow region [7]. This region also hosts 12 out of the 73 (16%) of the cities classified in Russia as “large” (from 250 thousand to 1 million inhabitants) and “major” (over 1 million inhabitants) (*see Table 2*). Apart from Moscow region where 39 of such cities are concentrated, most of them are located in the Urals (49) and Northern Caucasus (49).

The highest population density in medium and large cities is recorded in the Central and North Western macro regions due to Russia’s largest urban agglomerations - Moscow and St. Petersburg. Relatively high concentration of population within a limited number of urban settlements (from 1 to 3) exists in several Far Eastern areas (Kamchatka and Khabarovsk districts, Magadan region), Siberia (Novosibirsk, Tomsk and Omsk regions) and the Volga regions (Samara and Ulyanovsk regions). In 65 out of 81 Russian regions over 40% of population is concentrated in 1-3 cities or towns.

Traditionally a high rate of urbanization and urban population concentration is typical for the Arctic zone and regions in the Russian Federation (Murmansk region, Yamalo-Nenets autonomous district, Magadan region, Kamchatka, northern areas of Krasnoyarsk region and Yakutia). This situation is explained by traditional concentration of agriculture around the major mineral resource deposits in these regions.

| macro region | Population, thousand people | Urbanization rate, % | Ratio of residents of cities with population above 50 thousand people, % | Number of urban settlements with population above 50 thousand people | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | Total | including: | | | | |
| | | | | | Below 50 thousand | 50-99 thousand | 100-249 thousand | 250-999 thousand | over 1000 thousand |
| North-Western | 8,846 | 86.6 | 71.2 | 139 | 127 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Northern | 4,770 | 77.8 | 48.2 | 149 | 137 | 5 | 2 | 5 | - |
| Central | 31,167 | 85.4 | 69.0 | 506 | 436 | 35 | 23 | 11 | 1 |
| Central Black Earth Region | 7,260 | 63.7 | 44.7 | 125 | 112 | 6 | 2 | 5 | - |
| Volga-Vyatka | 7,435 | 77.8 | 50.3 | 195 | 179 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Volga | 16,113 | 74.3 | 59.9 | 225 | 194 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 3 |
| Northern Caucasus | 19,373 | 54.2 | 48.2 | 167 | 118 | 24 | 17 | 7 | 1 |
| Ural | 18,947 | 72.3 | 56.8 | 234 | 185 | 28 | 11 | 7 | 3 |
| Western Siberia | 14,476 | 73.2 | 54.0 | 185 | 154 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 2 |
| Eastern Siberia | 8,176 | 72.3 | 50.3 | 229 | 208 | 11 | 6 | 4 | - |
| Far East | 6,293 | 74.8 | 49.5 | 232 | 216 | 6 | 6 | 4 | - |
| Total Russian Federation | 142,856 | 73.7 | 56.7 | 2386 | 2066 | 156 | 91 | 61 | 12 |

Table 2. Distribution of Urban Population across Economic Macro Regions of the Russian Federation, 2010.

The recent decades were accompanied by significant changes in the development of Russia's major and medium cities. Since 1992, death rate exceeded the birth rate for the first time in the post-war period and natural population decline that is still going on began. At the same time, the population of major and medium cities virtually did not change.

We analyzed the time-space dynamics of Russia's urban population at the end of the 20th and in early 21st century on the data about 304 cities with population over 50 thousand people in 2010.¹ With the deduction of Moscow whose population over the past twenty years increased by over 2.6 million people from the list of the surveyed cities, the total population of medium and major Russian cities remained the same from 1989 through 2010.

However, within the analyzed category of Russian urban settlements some significant changes took place in the reported period. Just 19% of Russia's medium and major cities maintained their population in 2010 at the level of late 1980s. In 45% of the cities the population declined by over 3%. In 56 cities of this category, the population declined by 10-20%, and in 20 cities - by over 20%. In 36 cities of the category in question, the population increased by over 3% from 1989 to 2010. At the same time, in 36 cities the population increased by 10-20%, and in 39 cities - by over 20%.

Such diverse population dynamics of medium and major Russian cities provides grounds for stratification of urban settlements into several groups that differ significantly from each other in their development patterns. The first group includes the cities whose population increase by over 10% in the inter-census period. Such settlements primarily include the cities located in the Northern Caucasus (24), Moscow region (16) and Western

¹ In total there are 320 such cities. Our analysis did not include the cities with no population statistics available for 1989 and the cities whose statistics is incomparable with 2010 situation due to administrative and territorial reforms.

Siberia (8). The factors of fast urban growth in the Northern Caucasus include: positive natural population growth and high inbound migration rate [9]. Urbanization processes are not over in the Northern Caucasus yet - almost half of the population still lives in rural areas with redundant labor resources, a factor that leads to outward migration of rural population to the booming cities of the region, including Krasnodar, Stavropol, Makhachkala, Novorossiysk, Sochi, etc.

To a lesser degree this situation is recorded in the Volga-Ural region republics, i.e. Tatarstan and Bashkortostan. Although the population of the capitals of these republics, Kazan and Ufa, virtually did not change in the reported period, in 9 out of 21 medium and large cities of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan the population increased by over 10% in the course of 20 years. Internal migration and immigration are the main factor of growth of the population of Moscow and urban units of Moscow and Tyumen region. In case of Moscow and its satellites, the population growth is accounted by the gravitational effect of a major metropolitan agglomeration, which is typical for emerging industrial economies.

The notable growth of population in Tyumen cities is associated with exploration of oil and gas fields in Western Siberia. Similar to the metropolitan region, Tyumen attracts migration with high wages and low unemployment. The category of Russian cities with the highest population growth rates also includes the capitals of Siberian republics - Yakutsk, Kyzyl, Gorno-Altaysk and Ulan-Ude. These cities do not attract migration from other Russian regions. In the past two decades these cities consolidated the local ethnic groups featuring a high natural population growth rate. The second category of cities comprises settlements with population growth within 3-10% range. In total there 36 such cities located in all economic zones of the Russian Federation. No spatial relationship in the distribution of the cities of this category has been identified. In the period under consideration most of these cities featured a natural population decline, yet due to location in economically favorable zones, they eventually have a positive migration balance (*see Table 3*). It is worth noting that in the 1990s and first decade of the 21st century positive natural population growth was recorded only in the Northern Caucasus republics and in Siberia, including Tyumen region. In all other Russian regions death rates exceeded birth rates, so the population growth could be based only on immigration.

The third category includes the cities whose population in the period under consideration remained virtually the same. Over 40% of such cities are regional and republican administrative centers of the Russian Federation. They constitute the settlement framework and play a regulatory role for their areas. The specific of the cities within this category consists in "concentration" of population from the neighboring areas. Thus, from 1989 to 2010 the following increase in the ratio of the population of local administrative centers was recorded: Karelia - from 31 to 41%; Komi - from 18 to 26%; Kirov region - from 28 to 35%; Pskov region - from 24 to 30%; Ryazan' region - from 38 to 46% [10-11].

Concentration of population in the major local cities has also been recorded in Mariy-El and Udmurtia, Altay, Astrakhan, Vladimir, Voronezh, Kursk, Novosibirsk and a number of other Russian regions. Compensation of natural population decline with immigration from peripheral areas of the respective federal regions led to the so-called demographic stagnation, i.e. the situation when the population remains virtually at the same level for quite an extensive period of time. This phenomenon can be explain by the fact that during the period under consideration, in the context of internal public investment decrease, the federal and regional government focused on the major cities and regional administrative

centers. Regional businesses in their development and, accordingly, creation of new jobs, are also oriented on the leading markets with high buying capacity.

| Economic zone | Population Change, % (1989=100) | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | Decline | | | Change | Growth | | | |
| | ≥20 | 10 -20 | 3 -10 | ≤ 3% | 3 -10 | 10 -20 | ≥20 | |
| | <i>Category</i> | | | | | | | |
| | V | IV | | III | II | I | | |
| Northern | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| North-Western | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Central | 1 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 68 |
| Central Black Earth Region | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 13 |
| Volga-Vyatka | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Northern Caucasus | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 46 |
| Volga | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 29 |
| Ural | 1 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 45 |
| Western Siberia | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 29 |
| Eastern Siberia | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 19 |
| Far East | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Total | 20 | 56 | 60 | 57 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 304 |

Table 3. The Number of Medium and Large Cities of the Russian Federation with Population Change between 1989 and 2010.

Almost as many as 45% of Russia’s medium and large cities in the past 20 years recorded a population decline. In 60 localities the population declined by 3-10%, and in 56 - by 10-20% with reference to 1989. Most of these localities that belong to category IV are located in the Center of European Russia and in the Urals. Generally these are minor provincial towns that suffered a lot from the economic crisis that burst out in the 1990s. However, this category contains important industrial machinery engineering centers that have received a post-Soviet industrialization impetus (Samara, Perm, Saratov, Tula, Penza, etc.) that turned out to be uncompetitive in the modern market economy.

However, the most dramatic aftermath of the transformation of centrally planned economy into market economy affected 20 medium and large Russian cities that belong to category V under our classification. The population of all the cities within this group declined by over 20% between 1989 and 2010. Most of them are located in adverse climatic conditions and are remote from the major economic hubs. Closure of the core local enterprises and a considerable drop in the living standards entailed mass-scale outward migration from such communities. Thus, within two decades the population of such local centers as Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Murmansk and Magadan declined by over 33%, and Vorkuta and Norilsk - almost by 50%.

The changes in the population of medium and large Russian cities in between 1990 and 2010 were the result of population of reallocation among various regions, both nationwide and intra-regionally. The differences in the dynamic of the population of medium and large cities were primarily based on the vectors and intensity of migration flow and, to a lesser degree, natural population growth rates.

The changes in the population of most Russian medium and large cities were driven by transformation of their economic structure. The cities and towns with traditional industrial orientation (primarily machinery engineering) turned out to be more vulnerable in the new free market environment. Closure of ineffective enterprises and a drop in the living standards entailed outward migration that was accompanied by a negative natural population growth. On the other hand, exploration of high-yield oil and gas fields, skill redundancy, investment opportunities and capital concentration (in the metropolitan area) led to the growth of population of some other Russian cities [12].

Polarization of urban development that took place in the recent decades permits identification of several categories among medium and large Russian cities. Each of these groups has its own geographic localization. The cities and towns that recorded a significant population growth in the past decades are located in the Northern Caucasus, Central Black Earth region, oil-producing areas of Western Siberia and some national republics of Volga-Ural region (Tatarstan and Bashkortostan) and Siberia (Tyva, Buryatia, Yakutia and Altay).

The largest population decline affected the Northern European Russia (Muransk and Arkhangelsk regions, Komi Republic), Siberia (Irkutsk region, Krasnoyarsky and Zabaikalsky districts, Kemerovo region), Far East and mono-profile industrial communities of in the Urals (Sverdlovsk region, Perm district) and some areas in the central Russia (Ivanovo, Tula and Nizhny Novgorod regions).

A special focus must be made on the metropolitan region.² It fully reflected the spatial tendencies of polarized development Russian population. On the one hand, the population of Moscow and its satellites increased rapidly between 1990 and 2010. On the other hand, at the same time industrial communities located in the periphery of Moscow region faced depopulation.

An analysis of the dynamics of the population of Russian cities at the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st centuries suggests that the vector and intensity of these changes are just indicators of the underlying essential differences in the life standards of the population of various national regions. It is the life standard that attracts migration to a specific town for permanent residence and is the driving factor of its successful development. Furthermore, an analysis of the relationship between the degree of urban and regional economic development and migration appeal of such communities and regions will permit a more substantiated approach to demographic reallocation patterns and forecasting the potential changes in the key socio-demographic indicators

² Moscow and Moscow region.

REFERENCES

- World development report. Reshaping Economic Geography. World Bank. 2009
- Кругман П. Пространство: последний рубеж // Пространственная экономика, №5, 2004. (Krugman P. Space: Last boundary // Spatial Economics, #5, 2004).
- Анохин А.А., Лачининский С.С. Эволюция идей и содержания геоэкономических исследований // Известия Русского географического общества, Том 146, №2, 2014 - с. 66-76 (Anokhin A.A., Lachininsky S.S. Evolution of ideas and geoeconomic studies // Russian Geographic Society Bulletin, Vol. 146, #2, 2014 - p. 66-76).
- Официальный сайт Росстата (Official web site of Russian Committee for Statistics) - http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/population/
- Городские поселения РСФСР по данным Всесоюзной переписи населения 1989 года. М., 1991. - 269 с. (1989 National Census data on urban communities of the RSFSR. M., 1991. -269 p.).
- Российский статистический ежегодник. 2013: Стат. сб./Росстат. - М., 2013 - 717 с. (Russian Statistics Yearbook. 2013: Stat. compendium/Rosstat. - M., 2013 - 713 p.)
- Всероссийская перепись населения, 2010. Том 1. Численность и размещение населения (Russian census, 2010. Vol. 1. Population size and distribution).www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612htm. – (дата обращения (accessed) 26.05.2014).
- Всероссийская перепись населения, 2010. Том 1. Численность и размещение населения. (Russian census, 2010. Vol 1. Population size and distribution). – www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612htm. – (дата обращения (accessed) 26.05.2014).
- Житин Д.В. «Территориальные особенности локализации миграционных потоков в Российской Федерации», Известия Русского географического общества. 2011. Т. 143. Вып. 3. С. 16 - 317, с. 19. (Zhitin D.V. Geographic specifics of migration flow vectors in the Russian Federation, Russian Geographic Society Bulletin. 2011. Vol. 143. Issue 3. P. 16-317, P. 19).
- Всероссийская перепись населения, 2010. Том 1. Численность и размещение населения (Russian census, 2010. Vol. 1. Population size and distribution).www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/perepis_itogi1612htm. – (дата обращения (accessed) 26.05.2014).
- Городские поселения РСФСР. по данным Всесоюзной переписи населения 1989 года. - М., 1991 - 270 с. 1989 National Census data on urban communities of the RSFSR. - M., 1991. 270 p.
- Anokhin A., Kuznetsov S., Lachinonskii S. A Spatial Study of Geo-Economic Risk Exposure of Russia's Arctic Mono-Towns with Commodity Export-Based Economy // Journal of Geography and Geology. – 2014. – Vol. 6, № 1.