

Modernization Processes as a Factor of Construction and Transformation of the System of Territorial Structures on the Example of the Territory of the South of the Far East

Elena S. Kosheva^a, Galina V. Petruk^b and Yulia S. Lebedinskaya^c
Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, 41 Gogol str., Vladivostok, Russia

Keywords: Territorial Structure, System, Modernization Processes, Reformation, Structural Adjustment, South of the Far East, Transformation.

Abstract: The territorial structure, like any system that consists of elements that are different in their parametric and typological characteristics that determine its integrity, is subject to change. Any intra-structural violation of the functional activity of the elements caused by political, economic, and social processes largely determines the nature and direction of systemic changes in the territorial structure. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the modernization processes of an economic, political and social nature that have an indirect impact on the Far East South territorial structure elements transformation. Within the framework of this goal, the following tasks are solved: the study and correlation of modernization processes occurring in the Southern Far East territory in spatial and temporal dynamics and their impact on construction, and the territorial structures system elements transformation. The authors applied a comprehensive approach to the study of this process, which allows to analyze the territorial structuring elements transformation by studying the modernization processes in the south of the region in spatial and temporal dynamics. As a result of the study, the modernization processes occurring in the Southern part of the Far East in spatial and temporal dynamics are analyzed; three waves of powerful modernization processes are systematized and identified, i.e. the 1905 uprising; the 1917 revolution; the USSR collapse in 1991 and the modern Russia formation; their differences are identified, characterized by the reform conceptual, political, economic and social features, which caused changes in the south of the region territorial structuring system elements in the spot-temporal continuum. The special theoretical methods conceptual application for the study of this problem makes it possible to explain in general the territorial structures system elements transformation patterns in the South of the region.

1 INTRODUCTION

The nodal and linear elements form the territorial structure basis and are an objective indicator of its stability. Consequently, the main reason for the emergence of systemic changes in the territorial structure will be the reorganization. The source of such transformations is the economic growth of the national economy branches, which are the object of producing decisions taken by political authorities in the field of the economy of the Southern region of the Far East. This means that the economic change policy main subjects are political and economic institutions.

A special role in this issue is assigned to the State. It is a leading political management institution that determines the choice of the Primorye political and economic development path. On this territory, depending on the state policy direction of modernization and reorganization (is chosen by the government), the territorial structure nodal and linear elements formation and development was carried out. All system elements structural adjustments, according to V.V. Ratieva, S. Cardina, began from the institutional structure deformation, which was caused by the economic and political forces activities. The main role in this process is assigned to politics, since

^a <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6720-4401>

^b <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1025-3605>

^c <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7573-1372>

the choice of the modernization path, according to A.I. Demidov, took place and began in this area, where not only the political will to change was clearly manifested, but also the modernization changes option choice was made (Ratiyev, 2012). It is political reform actions that trigger the economic, social, and political development mechanisms, ensuring the consistent implementation of reforms in these public life areas. However, the modernization changes did not always take place evenly. Their impact often covered the economic and political spheres. This situation was explained by the exceptional role of the State in Russia. The State modernization began with the institutional structures transformation, the state apparatus, military and industrial power, in order to achieve a high level of political, economic, and technological development, especially in military-technological terms (Koshevaya, Tushkov, 2020).

2 ANALYSIS OF MODERNIZATION PROCESSES IN RUSSIA AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE TERRITORIAL STRUCTURE

In Russia, the reform actions in most cases did not concern the political sphere, except when it was necessary. According to S.A. Lantsov, this area "lagged far behind the changes that took place in other spheres of public life, which caused crises" (Lantsov, 2001). This lag was explained by the fact that the State modernization policy pursued by the government primarily covered the economic sphere, solving the problem of the gap in the economic development level with advanced countries (Lantsov, 2001; Kolganov, 2012). This process was often carried out on the basis of the internal resources usage and was accompanied by new technologies introduction, most of which, according to M.V. Ilyin, V.I. Pantin, A.L. Yanov, E.Yu. Meleshkin, were borrowed (Yanov, 1991). The political modernization process in Russia is called endogenous-exogenous. Its characteristic feature, according to A.A. Achkasov and S.N. Gavrov, was the Western models and development technologies imitation (Achkasov, 2001; Gavrov, 2004). The need to accept the Western countries experience was largely due to the desire to achieve an equal position with more developed countries in a number of priority areas, i.e. military-

technological, scientific, economic, and political, the implementation of which for a long time determined the Russian development path, characterized as inorganic modernization. The transformations were not completed and had a cyclical pattern, which was characterized by the reforms and counter-reforms alternation. Such a model of cyclical or wave-like development in Russia is analyzed in scientific studies (Pantin and Lapkin; 2011; Pantin and Lapkin, 2005; Kolganov, 2012; Pain, 2008; Klyamkin, 2011). The meaning of such development was most fully revealed and expressed by A.L. Yadov: "Short phases of modernization activity with long prostration periods" (Yanov, 1991).

The modernization processes taking place in various spheres of public life brought the systemic changes deformations in the territorial structure. Its restructuring was accompanied by the territorial structure key elements development. Their economic growth was due to the State policy, i.e. due to the modernization of the military-technological, economy production sector and those industries that were directly related to the increase in the country's defense capability (Gudkov, 2012).

Russia pursues the inorganic modernization path that led to some reforms incompleteness and the other reforms subsequent introduction. (Kara-Muza, 1999). Such development was uneven on the Russian territory. It was explained by regional differences in economic, socio-political, and technological development. In this regard, the modernization multi-level regional results in various spheres of public life led to territorial contradictions, which largely determined the modernization direction and pace. Transformations in some areas of public life were successful, while in others they ended in gradation and destabilization, which only proved the uneven modernization process in Russia.

3 ANALYSIS OF MODERNIZATION PROCESSES OF TERRITORIAL STRUCTURING OF THE SOUTH OF THE FAR EAST

Complex and incomplete reform processes were called the modernization "revolutions" because these processes were forced. In total, there were three waves of powerful revolutionary modernization in Russia, i.e. the uprising in 1905; the revolution in

1917; the collapse of the USSR in 1991 and the modern Russia formation. It perfectly demonstrates the modernization changes impact on the construction and transformation of the territorial structures system in the South of the Far East.

A rather difficult economic and social situation developed in Russia at the beginning of the XX century. It was caused by the economic crisis of 1900-1904 beginning and the Russian-Japanese war of 1904-1905, which was the reason for the launch of the first wave of a revolutionary nature modernization. It dates 1905-1907 and is characterized by the beginning of social, economic and political upheavals. A powerful impulse to its development, according to A. Kolganov, was the extraordinary circumstances, i.e. the gap in economic development with advanced countries, the military defeats, the increase in geopolitical threats (Kolganov, 2012). The military failures and the production sectors tension related to the country defense capability became the direct reason for the modernization. In this regard, the Russian government has attempted to implement the industrial modernization and the agrarian reform. The industrial reforms implementation provided a significant industrial recovery, with the highest growth rates in metallurgy, mechanical engineering and mining. Such a leap of industries contributed to the systemic changes beginning within the territorial structure nodal elements. Their development was accompanied by the territorial structure entire integrity reorganization. At the same time, the change in the areal elements partially took place. It was carried out through the transport lines and settlements construction, since there was an unresolved land issue. Consequently, the industry growth did not contribute to the agrarian question resolution. All attempts taken by S.Yu. Witte were doomed to failure within the autocratic political system framework.

In general, the first wave of modernization in the period from 1900 to 1906 took place unevenly, it was affected only by the economic sphere and industries related to the country defense capability. In the South of the Far East, the industrial production development contributed to the beginning of systemic changes in the territorial structure nodal elements, the functional activity of which was disrupted by epy political actions of a mass nature, i.e. the political unrest, demonstrations. During the period of their operation, the territorial structure did not develop, its functional activity was insignificant, factories worked intermittently, the infrastructure traffic was minimal, which allowed the author to conclude that the system was stagnating.

Extraordinary circumstances in 1917 were the reason for the development of the modernization shocks during the second wave in Russia, according to A. Kolganov (Kolganov, 2012). According to A. Averin, its characteristic feature is the halfway modernization undertaken by the government. And these measures were not enough to realize the necessary transformations in the war and socio-economic and political crises conditions (Averin, 2012). Many researchers associate the events of 1917 with the modernization crisis, the forms and dynamics of their implementation were caused by protracted military difficulties, which were a powerful impulse for military-technological transformations in the economy branches sphere.

This kind of halfway modernization was accompanied by the production reorganization in a military manner, actions of this nature led to the reduction of consumer-oriented direction, which contributed to the beginning of the economic (food) crisis (1915-1916), which had significantly worsened by 1917. A. Stolypin attempted to correct the situation by reforming the agrarian, administrative system. In the face of the authorities unwillingness to give up the autocracy foundations these attempts were useless. Thus, the revolutionary movement led to the downtime of many industrial and agricultural industries (Alimov and Zhokhov, 1979), ensuring the frame structure degradation. By this time, it was a stable structure consisting of the territorial structure nodal elements: Blagoveshchensk, Khabarovsk, Ussuriysk, Vladivostok, which performed the structure forming and organizing functions in relation to the adjacent territory, and the territorial structure geostrategic linear elements connecting them: the Amur and Ussuriysk highways. The weak but stable support framework created by the government in the South of the Far East did not last long. Its destruction, as the author believes, began with the territorial structure nodal elements. Their functional activity was disrupted by the widespread re-equipment of production sectors in a military manner, which provoked a food crisis. The nodal elements stagnation contributed to the beginning of the systemic changes process in the linear and areal elements of the territorial structure. It was accompanied by a decrease in their functional activity. All these systemic changes in the territorial structure had a significant impact on the frame structure restructuring in the South of the region. Weak, but stable, it underwent a strong change during the civil war, which, according to G.M. Lappo, could affect the end of the autocratic political system and the empire collapse (Lappo, 2009).

In general, the second wave of modernization took place unevenly in Russia. It was united with the first wave by the fact that it, like the previous one, was aimed at transforming only the economic and priority industries spheres. Such a trend was the cause of systemic changes in the territorial structure nodal elements and the territory structuredness as a whole. The system did not develop, but functioned in a stagnant mode.

The further modernization process took place already in Soviet Russia, where the government clearly defined the main modernization areas, covering only those areas of activity that are closely related to the industrial, high-tech industries and military technologies development. One direction of reforms, in the absence of political changes, led to an economic crisis. The authorities unsuccessful attempts to overcome the crisis by partially reforming the political system led to the fall of the economy redistributive system and, as a result, to a political crisis (Shaptalov, 2003; Baranov, Lyubashits, Mamychev, Kuchina, Shestopal, 2017). These extraordinary circumstances were the reason for the beginning of the new modernization wave of a revolutionary nature, according to A. Kolganov (Kolganov, 2012). The prerequisites for its development were the governmental narrowly targeted modernization efforts:

1. the war communism policy (1917-1920);
2. the new economic policy (1921-1927);
3. the policy of forced industrialization and collectivization (Stalin's Great Turning Point and terror) (1920-1932);
4. the governmental and socio-political development of the "Thaw" era (1950-1960).
5. the socio-economic policy of the "Stagnation" era (1965-1984);
6. Perestroika (1985-1991):
 - the collapsed planned economic and political systems dismantling; the formation of new relations in the socio-economic and political spheres (1993-1998);
 - the restoration of Russian statehood and country economic recovery (1998-2008);
 - the integration policy in the Asia-Pacific region (2008-2012) (Bogaturov, 2004; Mosyakov, 2003).

These transformations are characterized by the incompleteness and regular changeability, due to the specific features of Soviet Russia, the internal and external circumstances that determined the modernization conditions, pace and dynamics in the country.

The ongoing transformations accompanied the territorial structure nodal elements development. Among them there was an evolutionary growth caused by an increase in the number of functions performed. Their formation was associated with the linear elements construction and improvement. The full-scale development of the territorial structure supporting elements, especially the proto-nodes unlimited formation, contributed to the territorial structure areal elements formation, the evolutionary growth of which was associated with the huge territorial spaces involvement in the economic activity. Thus, on the basis of the territorial structure elements widespread development, the process of systemic changes in the territorial structure was carried out, and the extensive frame structure formation in the South of the region was ensured.

The implementation of the State modernization policy (the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 1661. 2008, Decree of the Government dated March 19, 2002, the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation 1661-p.) from 2008 to 2012 on infrastructure and transport development, the formation of cross-border cooperation with the countries of the Asia-Pacific region contributed to the active development and the geopolitical significance territorial structure linear elements creation in the East-West, North-South direction. Their growth was accompanied by the region frame structure expansion beyond the Russian State border, to the foreign territory.

In total, the modernization carried out by the government from 1998 to 2012 did not completely solve the economic and political problems, the Russian economy still remained dependent on raw materials. Its rise from 2000 to 2008 was the result of the energy exports price policy. According to E.A. Pain, it is possible to overcome the dependence on raw materials if the majority of products in Russia will be from the intelligent manufacturing, i.e. on the basis of resource-substituting and information technologies (Pain, 2008). According to V.L. Inozemtsev (Inozemtsev, 2000), these technologies should become the basis for Russia's transition from a raw material economy to the post-industrial economy development.

In general, the third wave of modernization took place unevenly in Russia. It was consolidated with the first and second waves by the fact that it, like the previous ones, was aimed at transforming the economic sphere only and those industries that were directly related to the country defense capability. The economic growth of industrial military-technological, high-tech industries from 1920 to 1985, on the one

hand, contributed to the beginning of systemic changes in the territorial structure due to the territorial structure nodal elements reorganization and the proto-nodes unlimited formation. Their widespread appearance not only contributed to the broadwise South of the Far East frame structure development, but also significantly "weighed it down". On the other hand, the industry intensive development, especially the mining enterprises growth, led Russia to the path of resource-intensive development, which ended in an economic crisis. The State transformative attempts to withdraw from this crisis from 1985 to 1991 resulted in the administrative-command and political systems collapse, and the collapse of the State.

At the same time, the third wave of modernization has significant differences, which were most clearly manifested in Russia from 2008 to 2012. The following are among them:

- oil and gas industries development, instead of defense industries;

- the role of the structure-forming function in the territorial structure formation was assumed by the territorial structure linear elements. Here, the construction was the impulse for the nodal elements creation. This territorial space organization model is called linear-nuclear, in which the territorial structuring source is not the proto-nodes, but the transport lines.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The three waves of revolutionary modernizations in Russia analysis has shown that the extraordinary circumstances serve as a powerful impulse for modernization, according to A. Kolganov (Kolganov, 2012). Each new wave of modernization in Russia was associated with the need to reduce the gap in the development level with advanced countries, to increase the State defense capability, especially in the period of military defeats and the growing geopolitical threat elimination. This narrowly targeted orientation of modernizations gave a certain degree of incompleteness and fragmentation, characterized by an alternation of reforms and counter-reforms, which is due to the specific Russian features, its external and internal circumstances, which largely determine the modernization pace and dynamics.

In the unidirectional, incomplete modernization implementation by the State, which has a narrow target orientation, in the territorial structuring development in the South of the Far East, a natural trend is clearly traced. It is characterized by the dependence of the territorial system development on

the State policy modernization cycles. At the same time, the territorial structure nodal elements have a pulsating dynamics, while the system itself has a stagnant development. Their pulsation is manifested on the basis of the industries development, and the unlimited, ubiquitous appearance of proto-nodes, which sufficiently weigh down and expand the frame structure in breadth on Southern territory of the region.

In general, the modernization processes contribute to both the territorial structure elements evolutionary growth, their development, stagnation, degradation, and the formation of a branched, weak, but sufficiently stable frame structure. It is the territorial structures system elements transformation that most clearly demonstrates the process of modernization changes in the South of the Far East.

REFERENCES

- Achkasov, A.A. (2001). Rossiya kak razrushayushcheyesya traditsionnoye obshchestvo. *Polis*, 3: 84.
- Alimov, Yu.P., Zhokhov, V.P. (1979). Analiz effektivnosti razmeshcheniya proizvoditel'nykh sil Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka. Moskva. *Finansy*, pp. 36; 38; 39; 53.
- Averin, A. (2012). Sushchnost' i zadachi modernizatsii. URL: <http://www.lawinrussia.ru/modernizatsiya-rossii-uroki-istorii-i-sovremennye-zadachi>
- Baranov, P., Lyubashits, V., Mamychev, A., Kuchina, Y., Shestopal, S. (2017). Dynamics of governmental organization of the society: Evolutionary state-legal forms and modern development trends. *Man in India*, 97: 543-550.
- Bogaturov, A. (2004). Rossiyskiy dal'niy Vostok v novykh geoprostranstvennykh izmereniyakh Vostochnoy Yevrazii. *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya*, 10: 93.
- Gavrov, S.N. (2004). Modernizatsiya vo imya imperii. Sotsiokul'turnyye aspekty modernizatsionnykh protsessov v Rossii, 38 – 72. URL: http://lit.lib.ru/g/gavrow_s_n/indexdate.shtml
- Gudkov, L.D. (2012). Osobennosti modernizatsii v Rossii i kharakter russkoy etnonatsional'noy identichnosti. URL: http://www.demoscope.ru/weekly/knigi/konfer/konfer_025.html
- Inozemtsev, V.L. (2000). Predely «dogonyayushchego» razvitiya. Moskva. *Nauka*, pp. 66,71-76.
- Kara-Muza, A. (1999). Kak vozmozhna Rossiya? Moskva, P. 41.
- Klyamkin, I. (2011). Problemy modernizatsii v Rossii. URL: <http://www.invur.ru/index.php?page=news&id=28931>
- Kolganov, A. (2012). Tri modernizatsii v Rossii i nashe vremya. URL: http://www.zlev.ru/69_64.htm
- Koshevaya, E.S., Tushkov, A.A. (2020). Conceptual approaches to territorial structuring studies of a region.

- Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*, 139: 159-168.
- Lantsov, S.A. (2001). Rossiyskiy istoricheskiy opyt v svete kontseptsiy politicheskoy modernizatsii. *Polis*, 3: 93 – 101.
- Lappo, G.M. (2009). Territorial'naya struktura Rossii v nachale XXI veka. URL: geo.1september.ru/2002/33/4.htm
- Mosyakov, D. (2003). Rossiya – ATR: khoroshiye otnosheniya s dostoinymi partnerami. Nekotoryye aspekty Rossiyskoy politiki v Aziatsko-Tikhookeanskom regione. *Aziya i Afrika segodnya*, 10: 14.
- Pain, E.A. (2008). Istoricheskiy «beg po krugu». *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost'*, 4: 5 – 20.
- Pantin, V.I., Lapkin V.V. (2005). Ritmy mezhdunarodnogo razvitiya kak faktor politicheskoy modernizatsii Rossii. *Polis*, 3: 57.
- Pantin, V.I., Lapkin, V.V. (2011). Volny politicheskoy modernizatsii v istorii Rossii. URL: <http://ss.xsp.ru/st/003/>
- Pravitel'stvennoye postanovleniye ot 19 marta 2002 № 169 «*Ekonomicheskoye i sotsial'noye razvitiye Dal'nego Vostoka i Zabaykal'ya na 1996 - 2005 i do 2010 goda*».
- Rasporyazheniye Pravitel'stva RF 1661-r. Ob utverzhenii Kontseptsii federal'noy tselevoy programmy «*Ekonomicheskoye i sotsial'noye razvitiye korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka do 2015 goda*». URL: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/902073548>
- Rasporyazheniye pravitel'stva RF № 1661. 2008. URL: <http://www.ebiblioteka.ru/browse/doc/13013219>
- Ratiyev, V.V. (2012). Institutsionalizatsiya i osobennosti funktsionirovaniya informatsionnykh protsessov v rossiyskom obshchestve. *Avtoreferat*. URL: http://dibase.ru/article/26072010_ratievvv/2
- Shaptalov, B.N. (2003). Rossiya v poiskakh effektivnosti. Moskva. *Nauka*, pp. 241-242.
- Yanov, A.L. (1991). Odisseyaya russkoy avtokratii. *Perspektiva*, 3: 78.