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Abstract. The article is devoted to the main stages and results of the process of forming administrative and territorial boundaries on the Kola Peninsula located in the Russian Arctic zone from the 12th to the 20th centuries, during which it became a completely independent entity, with significant natural and human resources, organically integrated into the Russian-wide strategic, economic and socio-cultural space. The authors highlight 4 main stages and the administrative-territorial development of the region: the 1st (12th - 15th centuries) - "cross-borders", meaning that there are no clear boundaries, both external and internal; the 2nd (16th to 17th centuries) - "border" during which the external (state) border was formed; The 3rd (XVIII to early 20th centuries) is a "state" defined as a stage of existence in the form of a region with low administrative status; 4th (1920th to 1930th) "subjective", that finally defined the external and internal borders and the place of the region within Russia.

1. Introduction
The modern administrative boundaries of the Murmansk region look quite obvious and natural, as nature itself has already laid a significant part of their contours, defined by the peninsular form created by the Barents and White Seas. However, in reality, the movement to this borderline naturalness was quite long, taking many, many centuries…

2. Main part
All the same nature of the Kola Peninsula, located in the Far North with its Arctic or close to them climatic conditions, poor for human existence, led to a relatively late appearance and a longer formation here of state and, consequently, administrative elements. Even if we take the point of reference of the 13th century, bearing in mind the appearance here of Novgorod tributes – in particular, the Novgorod First Chronicle mentioned under 1216 among Novgorod residents «Tersky tributeto» the Simun Petrilowitz (Novgorod) [1], who collected tributes from the local population – lopare (Sami), in this case the lag is about 3 centuries (in accordance with the traditional idea of the initial stage of the formation of the Russian state in the 9th century). And Novgorod itself, which already carries a very significant number of elements of statehood, only with a very large degree of conventionality can be called the state in the full sense of the word.

In fact, the entire initial stage of the inclusion of the territory of the Kola Peninsula in the Russian state, apparently, can be defined as a struggle for the establishment of control over this territory in order to exploit its natural resources. This seems to be the case in the early-State entities, which seek...
not so much direct occupation of external territories towards them as to establish control over them, ensuring the pumping of the desired resource from the population. Let us recall, for example, the well-known institute of the population from early Ancient Russian history or the system of tributary relations between the same Russia and the Mongol Tatars. These resources were not so significant, but because of the relatively weak competition from other state entities, they could have been obtained at relatively low cost.

Although the competitors of course were. The emerging Norwegian State (later Danish-Norwegian, Swedish-Norwegian) also tried to control them. The lack of force in some, and the peripheralness of the territory for others provided the balance on which and in accordance with the treaty of 1251 (Runna or Separation Letter, which is true, a number of historians attribute to a different chronological segment, but in any case – to the period of formation and development of Novgorod-Norwegian relations) [2], there was the creation of a very special territorial-political system – a common Norwegian-Novgorod district, including Finnm and Kola North.

However, this speciality is very relative. In the practice of relations between Novgorod land and other state entities, many examples can be found not only of joint lygiving, but also of joint management. Thus, since the beginning of the 15th century, the city of Great Luke was ruled by two tions (the governor) – Novgorod and Lithuanian: «And on the Lukes our tiun, and your other: the court is half». Even when Novgorod declares the undisputed ownership of this territory, the Lithuanian prince, under the treaty of 1471, retains the right to receive a tribute from her: «And what is Rzhew, and the Great Luki and and Holmovskyy pogost... that land Novgorodwithtoande; and then you, the honest king, will not enter the earth, but not to you, and to you, and to the black and black kuna» [3].

The creation of the district led to the establishment of the so-called «dvoedanstvo» double-tribute of the lopare (paying tribute to the 2nd states together). At the same time, the lopari of Inari's pogost in the 16th and 17th centuries turned out to be triple-tribute, paying tribute not only to Russia and Norway (Denmark), but also to Sweden. Such systems are known to international law as condominiums (joint ownership of two or more States of the same territory), although today they are extremely rare in the practice of international relations. The reason for their occurrence, as a rule, is the inability of applicants for sole possession of this territory to succeed and forced, hence, the need to compromise. However, Fedorov P.V. considers such a definition ‘unjust’ because in his opinion in addition to owning a condominium provides for joint management, which in this case is not the case [4]. It seems, however, in determining the essence of the condominium system to speak not so much about management, but about power, which in our case is quite enough and which just ensures the receipt of a tribute with a lopare. As for the preservation of competition within the district, it is inherent in any system of power, even within the same state, let alone a few.

At the same time, it should be noted that the territory, as such, for both «exploiters» was not the main «apple of contention»: only the part of it that was inhabited and ensured the receipt of tribute was important. This becomes particularly evident if we take into account the nomadic nature of Sami life: although the movements had quite traditional ways of summer-winter cycles, in general the boundaries of their residence were very uncertain and did not cover the entire Kola Peninsula.

From the 14th to the 15th centuries there was also a fourth participant in the system of relations: the Russian-Karel Pomor population, gradually mastered the White Sea coast, including the southern part of the Kola Peninsula – the Tersk coast and the settled settlements here: Karelian (Varzugu) and Umb's pogosts. It is from this period that the first rudiments of the administrative-territorial structure – Varzuzhskaya and Umb parish, which were under the general control of the landowner of Dvina land as part of the Great Novgorod – appear.

Thus, the initial «Novgorod» stage is characterized by the overstate status of the region, the uncertainty of state borders, the absence of administrative and territorial borders, the formation of four main subjects of interaction in the Kola Peninsula: the Sami (lopare) and the Pomors, however, most often acting as objects in relation to the other two – the Russian and «Norwegian”states. The definition of «Norwegian» because of the peculiarities of the development of Norwegian statehood is very conditional here, but given that we are considering mainly intra-Russian processes, this seems to be
quite possible to neglect. However, the same applies to the definition of «Russian», which from the point of view of the Kola Peninsula could act as «Novgorod», «Moscow» and «Soviet».

The new stage is undoubtedly connected with the accession of Novgorod and his possessions to Moscow in the 1570s.

Actually, the Moscow Principality even before the entry of these territories directly into its membership claimed to receive them, insisting on the right of Moscow princes to the Dvina land. The first attempts were made at the end the 14th century: in 1397 «the prince of great Basily Dmitrievich sent for Volok on the Dvina boyar of his ... had asked, if the Dvina land sat down for the prince, and from Novgorod would have taken away» they would have received significant benefits. To the prince of the great kiss, Novgorod managed after the campaign to rebel lands to restore the status quo and force Moscow to sign a treaty on the ownership of the Dvina land Novgorod «in the old days» [1].

In contrast to Novgorod's policy, dictated in many ways by trade and craft interests and therefore more inclined to limit themselves to profiting from the possession of territory, the Moscow princes, and then the Moscow state, sought to to establish their possessions and direct political administration. And the state reacted especially acutely to the situations in which other competitors claimed the same land. For Murman, where such a competitor existed in the person of the Norwegians, it meant a transition to a more active phase of confrontation between Moscow and neighboring states for the division of spheres of influence and, ultimately, from the point of view of administrative and territorial division, for the definition of the outer western boundary of the region.

At first glance, the change of the metropolis did little to change Murman's life. The Lopares of Novgorod tributes were replaced by Moscow, and the Russian parishes of tersk coast and did remain in the Dvina land, however, which was also managed by the Moscow governor.

However, if in the «Novgorod time» relations of tributes with the local population of the Kola Peninsula were limited only to obtaining the required resources, now they began to carry out trials for serious crimes (theft, murder) at the lopare (according to the letter of Basil III of 1517 [5]) and for minor offences – in Russian parishes (see, for example, the salary certificates of Grand Duke Ivan Vasilyevich in Keret and Kovda dated February 16 and 20, 1542 [6]). Thus, although everything remains in terms of territorial division, the expansion of the powers of the tributes in relation to the population begins to turn them into administrators, not only with power, but also in fact exercising control of the territory.

The process of forming new forms of relations, their natural unresolved and disorder could not but create serious contradictions between the local population and the authorities, the largest of which was the conflict, which resulted in a pogrom on the Tersk coast, carried out by the detachments of Basarga Leontiev in 1568, the so-called «Basargin Righteous» The dvina industrialists of Bachurins, who charged the Varzujans tithing on the right of the ransom, provided to them by the two authorities, sued the residents of varzug for payment of the alleged 450 rubles Debt. As the latter, claiming the fictitiousness of the lawsuit, refused to pay, the Bacurians complained to Tsar Ivan IV, who sent to the Tersk coast a punitive detachment led by Basarga Leontiev.

Both the tribute collectors and the tax farmers were a temporary «administration» that was in controlled lands only by raids and interested not so much in solving the real problems of the local population, but in obtaining maximum benefits, which, in fact, gave rise to conflicts. quasi-administrative structures very often became church structures, and first of all – monasteries.

The monasteries that came to Murman in the 16th century, both those that emerged directly on Kola land (Kandalakshsky and Pechengsky) and operated from other, mainly North Russian, territories (Solovetsky, Kirillo-Belozersky, Antoniev-Sisky, Trinity-Sergiev, etc.) began active economic expansion, concentrating in their hands significant fishing grounds, and with them gaining control of the locals. became the basis of the formation of the administrative system of government, enshrining its status in various royal certificates (complained, unconvicted, etc.) provided by the state.

At the same time, the missionary activities of the Kandalaksh and Pecheng monasteries to carry out the Orthodox Christianization of the local pagan population created the prerequisites for greater
involvement in the orbit of the influence of the Russian administration of the lopares who lived in the Kola Peninsula.

And here the «internal» administrative task, it would seem, intersects with the «external», state, or rather, – interstate problem, which is more clearly formed at the junction of borders and interests of Russia, Sweden and Norway (Denmark). Russian Murman; though, based on the most far-reaching intentions of the neighbors, whether Murman will be Russian at all.

It seems that the Swedish attempts to establish control over the Kola Peninsula were satisfied with the situation: as a rule, they were based on the notions of the weakening of the Russian state and, accordingly, the possibility of using this the weakness for the territory currently uncontrolled, which was carried out in the context of wars and conflicts with Russia (1589-1593, 1611, 1701) and was carried out mainly by armed means.

Noticeably more long-term, strategic and persistent towards Murman was the policy of the Danish-Norwegian state. Danes rarely used military tools to achieve the goal and sent them not so much to the territory of the Kola Peninsula and its inhabitants, as to Dutch and British merchant ships, located in the coastal waters of the Barents Sea (1582, 1621-1623). The residents of Murman were more likely to have used the means of show of force, as it was in 1599, when King Christian IV, having personally arrived with a squadron of ships in The City of Cola, to invite the locals to accept Danish citizenship, but was refused.

They were more active in applying peaceful diplomatic steps: embassy exchange (Danish embassies in Moscow Ulfeldt J. 1578, Matzen St. and Schwaben J. 1597-1598, Brock E., Bryske K. and Salingen S. 1601-1602, the Russian Embassy in Copenhagen Rzhevsky I. and Dmitriev P. in 1601, etc.), border conventions (to which, however, did not come that Danish, then Russian envoys), diplomatic correspondence [7], seeking to achieve results by giving the counterpart the opportunity to obtain certain benefits in the event of a transaction: dynastic marriage (unfulfilled projects of dynastic marriages between the brother of King Christian IV Duke Hans and Princess Ksenia Borisovna Godunova in 1602 and already the son of the Danish king Waldemar Christian and the eldest daughter of Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich Irina), offer of military or diplomatic assistance (for example, in the instruction of the Danish King Christian IV to the ambassadors to Russia Skeel O. and Gyldenstjerne K. in March 1614, it was mentioned about the possibility to deliver to Russia and to maintain there for a year a regiment of 2000 people [7]), payment of ransom (so, according to Christian IV's instructions to the ambassadors of Brock E., Bryske K. and Salingen S. 31 August 1601, if the king refused to give up Lapland, they had to offer 50,000 thalers for it as compensation for the other property built by the church [7]), willingness to go on some concessions (refuse, for example, the requirement of transfer of the whole of Lapland) etc. n.

However, neither military nor diplomatic means changed the position of the Russian state, which considers, in the words of Tsar Ivan IV, Kolu and Pecheng «our ancestral eternal gout lands» [8]. The Russian government's response to the Danish ambassadors on the Lapland question of March 17, 1598, is almost identical: «The Lop land is an ancestral but in earthly fiefdom of the tsar's majesty to the Great Novgorod with Dvinsky landh; and on that land the monastery of Pechenga and parish many and Kola parish, and Kandalaksha, and Varzuga, and other parishes stand for many years... And to your sovereign to the Norwegian land, the Lopland has not been old, and the former Danish kings never in those parishes and in the ancient in the Pechenga monastery did not enter, neither the great-grandfather, nor grandfather Christianus king's nous about that was not sought» [7].

It is impossible not to admit that, while the claims of the Swedes and Danes were usually extended to the entire Kola Peninsula, which was actually controlled by the Russian State (some Danish projects envisaged the transfer of Denmark to the northern or western part of Murman, while maintaining the southern or eastern – behind Russia), the Russian authorities in relation to the territories of their neighbors showed sufficient restraint: when determining the border, it proposed to carry it out along the line close to the modern, without affecting the modern Norwegian possessions.

However, in 1598, in a letter to the Danish ambassadors it was stated that the Lop land is a direct frontier with the Norwegian land of the River Yovgay, from the sovereign of our Kola sharpness more
than a thousand miles; and for the Jvgay river the dans of our tsar and the great prince Boris Fedorovich all over Russia go for tributes” [7], thus offering to draw the border far beyond the actual existing border in the territory of the Norwegian-Danish Finnmark. The Russians themselves claimed a large part of the Norwegian territory behind the Navdemo River and that Godunov’s statement was intended only to “show the firmness and intransigence of the new tsar in the border disputes”. [9]

In the end, the rigidity of the diplomatic position of the Russian state and the successful struggle of the inhabitants of the Kola Peninsula against armed incursions, which showed their ability to prevent the military capture of Murman, led to the consolidation of the virtually established status quo with regard to the western border, both in interstate relations, as well as in the views of their political elites. Accordingly, the territorial dispute has lost its relevance: since the 17th century, the Lapland issue has almost forever disappeared from the agenda of relations between Denmark and Russia. Russia was satisfied with the status quo, and Denmark, which entered the Thirty Years' War, simply did not have the strength to continue trying to resolve the issue of the “northern territories”.

Around the same time, the general district was terminated: the passage to East Lapland of the Danish dani collector in December 1611 was the last. Attempts of the Danes to continue collecting tributes were made until the early 1630s, but had no success.

Simultaneously with the informal resolution of the border dispute, which defined the western border of Murman, and in many ways, just in this regard, the administrative system of management of the Kola region is being formed. Its appearance is rightly associated with the creation of the Kola sharp as the administrative center of the Kola county and the establishment of the post of Kola governors, which were, in general, quite reactive. The first Kola governor, Averyk Ivanovich Palitsin, was sent here with a squad of shooters in response to the caper actions of the Danish military squadron off the coast of the Kola Peninsula in relation to The British and Dutch merchant ships.

Therefore, initially the functions of the governor were mainly external – military and diplomatic – character: the leadership of the military garrison (Palicin A.I.), the construction of the Kola sharp (M.S. Defendants) and its defense against enemy attacks (Zagryzhsky V.F.), organizing border congresses (Salmanov I.S.), informing local Danish authorities about changes in the internal and external policy of the Russian state and negotiations with Norwegian officials (Yartsov A.G., Vasilchikov G.B., Blagovo S.F.), pass (or refusal to pass) Danish dani collectors to the territory of East Lapland (Tolstoy A.S.) and others.

Gradually, however, the functions of the governor are beginning to expand, increasingly including the resolution of issues of traditional internal civil governance: the resolution of conflicts between different groups of the population of the province, the judicial process, enforcement law enforcement, control of the collection of taxes and the execution of state duties, implementation of the orders of the center, etc.

This leads to the fact that in the sphere of their attention is not only the streletsy garrison of Kola, but also the growing part of the inhabitants of the Kola Peninsula, pomors and lopares, which, in turn, creates a new hotbed of tension: conflicts in relations with the “administrators” of the previous period – monasteries, the permission of which is forced to take over the central government.

However, for quite a long time the old administrative division of the territory of the region is preserved, within which, although the Kola county includes most of the peninsula (Kolu, Kandalaksha, Poria lip, as well as Kereth and Kovda), the Tersky coast is still remains in the Dvina County.

The resolution of the territorial dispute with neighbouring states and the formation of the foundations of the administrative system of governance on Murman can be seen as the main achievements of the 2nd stage. Both happened by the middle of the 17th century, but the central government did not immediately realize the changed role of the region: despite the fact that the 2nd half of the 17th century quite demonstrates the decline of the state's attention to the Kola region, its administrative and territorial status up to the beginning of the 18th century remains unchanged.

Thus, the 2nd, «Moscow» stage is characterized by the formation of the state status of the region as exclusively Russian, significantly increased certainty of the state border and the folding of relatively
clear administrative and territorial boundaries on the Kola Peninsula, divided between two entities of administrative administration.

The next stage, opening by the inclusion of the territory of the region (Kola County, as well as the Varzuzh and Umba districts of Dvinsky county) in the Archangel (from 1796 – Archangel) province on December 18, 1708, meant the final and natural loss of the province subjectivity, already quite programmed by the development of events in the preceding stage.

The center of decision-making was not the central government, as it was before, but the provincial authorities of Arkhangelsk, for whom, moreover, this territory looked like a distant and uninteresting periphery.

In general, this period could be similar to the once common point of view regarding the Middle Ages to define as the «dark ages» of the Kola region from an administrative-territorial point of view. Extremely revealing in this regard, the Decree of December 2, 1858, which abolished Kola County with the transfer, its territory to Kem County, and the receipt of the city of Kola as a «state.»

However, even in these «dark ages» some events are found, significant not so much in themselves, as promising for the development of future processes. This is, first of all, the consolidation of the mainterritoria of the Kola Peninsula within the Framework of Kola County in 1784 (when, in 1784, the Varzesh and Umb parishes were incorporated into the county, and most of North Karelia went to Kem County), meaning, regardless of the real intentions of the authorities, the formation of the region as a complete administrative and territorial unit, and the holding of an official border with Norway in 1826.

Some prerequisites for the future «Revival» can be found in the late 19th century, when in 1883 the Kola county was restored (from 1899 – Alexandrovsky), leaving, however, in the Kem county of Kovdskaya and Kandalaksh parish.

The First World War and the Second Russian Revolution of 1917-1921, albeit not immediately, created the prerequisites for Murman’s return to his subjectivity, but at a new level.

The role that Murman began to play thanks to the construction of the Murmansk Railway in ensuring Russia’s connection with its allies during World War I, the dramatic increase in the population, mostly young and active, created favorable conditions for the perception of the region as entitled to a higher level of self-reliance. This led to the formal, but the allocation of the Murmansk region as an independent unit on April 22, 1918, including in the se I Alexandrovsk Kemsky counties. However, the events of the civil war did not allow to develop this initiative and on September 15, 1918, the independence of Murman, who was part of the anti-Bolshevik Northern region, was eliminated. True, on February 2, 1920, as part of the Northern region of Kemsky, Alexandrovsky counties and part of the Olonets province, the Murmansk province was formed, but it managed to survive only 2 weeks.

The real restoration of the status of the region as one of the subjects began only during the Soviet Era with the transformation of the Alexandrov district of the Arkhangelsk province into the Murmansk province with a center in Murmansk in accordance with the decree of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee from June 13, 1921. [10] This was the result of the gradual formation of a new view of the Kola Arctic by the Soviet leadership, in which it begins to be seen as an important source of resources needed to strengthen the economic foundation Soviet Russia.

However, it was still a very narrow view of the region, in which Murman, thanks to the presence of transport communications (Murmansk Railway and The Murmansk port) and relative proximity to the neighboring countries could become a supplier of much-needed goods to rebuild the war-torn country.

The Soviet leadership, as well as the local leaders of Murman, the territory of the Kola Peninsula and its population were relatively weak. First, local leaders were usually not local at all, but sent from the central government and viewed their stay there as temporary, almost as an exile; and secondly, those rich natural resources possessed by the Kola region still weren’t fully discovered. Therefore, the Soviet state, more concerned about the settlement of relations with Finland than about the wishes of the local population, easily abandoned, for example, the Pecheneg region. The borders of the
Murmansk province and its southern region remained isolated, as the Kandalaksha district became part of Karelia.

From this point of view, the decision to include the Murmansk province as a district of the Leningrad region in 1927 and, accordingly, the drop in Murman's administrative status seems quite logical. However, paradoxically, the loss of the local apparatus of self-control, in fact, had more than a beneficial effect on the processes taking place in the development of the Kola region. It not only contributed to a significant inflow of funds for its development, but also brought the northern suburbs closer to the center, and although this also meant strengthening of its administrative supervision, at the same time there was a strengthening of the local apparatus qualified officials, economic leaders, scientists, specialists who were coming from Leningrad to work in Murmansk.

3. Main part

All this allowed in the course of industrialization, collectivization and cultural transformation by the end of the 1930s on the Kola Peninsula to create a powerful heavy industry, to reconstruct maritime and rail transport, and to create a reliable energy base. This transformation of the Kola North into an economically developed region of the country became a natural prerequisite for changing its administrative status – on May 28, 1938, the Murmansk region was formed with a center in Murmansk, while from the Karelian ACSR to its the train was handed over to the Kandalaksha district.

External factors in relation to the region also played a significant role in this process: the military-political – the creation of a large naval operational-strategic association here – the Northern Fleet; and geo-economic – Murmansk began to be considered as the starting point of the Northern Sea Route ("gateway to the Arctic"). This forced the central government to perceive the province as a strategically important object, which was later quite confirmed during The Second World War, when Murmansk became one of the most important communication points of the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition. This process was undoubtedly mutual: the central authority's awareness of Murman's importance was a prerequisite for turning it into a base of the Northern Fleet, and determining its role the construction of the largest northern transport artery; in turn, the successful implementation of the tasks assigned to the region cemented its role as a strategically important region.

Thus, by the end of the 1930s, the Murmansk region was formed as a natural administrative-territorial entity, as a completely independent entity with significant natural resources, significant human potential, organically fitting into the russian-wide strategic, economic and socio-cultural space. Changes in territorial boundaries occurred, of course, and later: especially significant changes in this respect occurred as a result of the Soviet-Finnland and The Great Patriotic Wars, which pushed the border of the region in the western direction (the territory of the modern Kovdor and Pechenga districts). However, these changes have not changed the main thing: the awareness of the region as a holistic administrative-territorial structure, a strategically important subject in the system of organizing the interaction of central and local authorities.

In turn, this was the result of a long process of administrative-territorial development during the four main stages, which could be very conventionally defined as the 1st (12th – 15th centuries) – «cross-border» (or «limitless»), 2nd (16th – 17th centuries), «border» 3rd (18th – early 20th centuries) – «state» and «20th – 20th century) «subjective.»
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