

HISTORICAL SCIENCES

UDC (341.24+342.1+94+39)(045)

DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2018.30.60

**Russian-Norwegian borderland in the foreign historical literature
in the 20th — beginning of the 21st centuries ***

© Konstantin S. ZAIKOV, Cand. Sci (Hist.)

E-mail: k.zaikov@narfu.ru

Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Arkhangelsk, Russia

Abstract. The article presents a review of foreign research on the history of Russian-Norwegian borderland in 16th — early 20th centuries. The dominance of the empirical positivism and historical nationalism in the history of the Northern frontier delimitation led to the formation of relatively stable and unilateral interpretations of the Russian-Norwegian border in the first half of the 20th century. The state was perceived as an a priori objective phenomenon. That's why historians and legal scholars understood the "border" as a static instrument of political power, ignoring its multipotential phenomena and variety of its subjects. The Scandinavian historiography has developed a historical tradition of perception of the Treaty 1826 on the delimitation of "common districts" as a fair act of institutionalization of borders over the common possession. As a part of this tradition, it may seem that Norwegian territorial claims did not look expansive in relation to Russia. However, for a long time the Scandinavian historians advocated the theory that the Russian Empire, driven by the idea of permanent territorial extensions, had posed a threat to the Norwegian Finmark. So, the delineation of the Northern frontier was a diplomatic deal aimed at creating legitimate barriers to further Russian expansion in Western Europe through the Norwegian Arctic. Thus, the author concludes that from the methodological perspective, the evolution of the Russian-Norwegian borderlands is still not sufficiently developed in foreign historiography and requires closer attention to create high-quality reconstruction of the Russian-Norwegian borderland evolution from the territory with frontlines configuration of political boundaries in the 13th century — the early 19th century to the space with a sealed political boundary in the 20th century.

Keywords: *history, border, frontier, historiography, the Russian-Norwegian relations, the Russian-Norwegian borderland, the Sami.*

Introduction

The definition, control and protection of the state border are the most important functions of the state. It underlines the sovereignty and demonstrates national independence and exclusivity. However, the classical perception of the boundary as a line that forms the limits of territoriality of the border states, did not exist at all periods of human history.

In time of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, in Europe, a frontier line conditionally limited the sovereignty of kingdoms in relation to each other instead of a clear system of borders. Frontiers left the physical borders of the state open to migration and development by other ethnic groups and ruling subjects [1, Paasi A., pp. 19–22].

In 1648, the Westphalian Peace Treaty put an end to the bloody conflicts for the inheritance rights for territories that devastated Europe. A new system of interstate relations was es-

* For citation:

Zaikov K.S. Russian-Norwegian borderland in the foreign historical literature in the 20th — beginning of the 21st centuries. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2018, no. 30, pp. 49–61. DOI: 10.17238/issn2221-2698.2018.30.60

tablished. The principle of “state sovereignty” emerged in international legal practice and introduced a fundamentally different content in the meaning and functions of the border, completing the medieval practice of joint possessions. Because of the agreement, the autonomy of the power was limited to the boundaries of natural and geographical boundaries [2, Minghi J., pp. 36–37]. Clear physical boundaries served an important criterion because they allowed to preserve the state sovereignty from an external threat and to legitimize the state's powers within a single outlined territory.

Since the 16th century, the restriction of the physico-political space of sovereignty led to a rethinking of the relationship of the authorities and their powers to the subsequent consolidation of the state, i.e., it changed the functions of the state from collecting taxes and judicial proceedings to the expansion into the economic, social and cultural spheres of societies [3, Häkli J., p. 11–12]. Nevertheless, the institutionalization of the European borders system as clear, permanently protected lines was completed only in the 19th century.

In the 18th–19th centuries the development of science, the rationalization of government, the growth of the state's knowledge on its own territory, population and resources, the spread of nationalism and the formation of “people's sovereignty” played a key role in creating new forms of territoriality and criteria for demarcating borders [3, Häkli J., pp. 12–13].

Thus, in 19th century, in time of the national consolidation in Europe, the concept of “people's sovereignty” emerged. It was based on the idea of national exclusivity and the right of every nation to its own sovereignty and territory. The transition from dynastic to popular sovereignty marked a significant expansion of the actors, as well as criteria for the delimitation of territories [1, p. 21]. The socio-cultural space of ethnic groups in the neighboring territory played the role of determining factor in the delimitation of the physical landscape. This affected the overall perception of the border as a historically established line dividing the formed socio-cultural boundaries of nation-states.

A short excursion into the history of the perception of the border and the territoriality of the European states shows the apparent multidimensionality of the boundary phenomenon and the complexity of its formation. Often, the problem of delineating political boundaries is the main reason for establishing the first diplomatic relations between states. It plays a key role in the development of their relations and serves a motive for conflicts and closer cooperation. The Russian-Norwegian relations are not an exception to these rules.

Historical introduction to the issue

By the 16th century, the development of the Northern territories and the expansion of the Moscow state and Norway in Union with Denmark had led to the collision of two consolidation centers of the political space and the two socio-cultural communities: Western European, Protestant and Russian, Orthodox. The interest of both states in the expansion of the political space and tax zones led to the first contacts and relations [4, Johnson O.A., pp. 231–236].

By the beginning of the 17th century, the Russian-Norwegian frontier – the frontier in adjacent areas of Eastern Finmark and the Western part of the Kola Peninsula – had decreased significantly and attained the borders in which it existed until 1826. According to Danish legal documents, the frontier was called “common districts” (*fellesdistrikter*); according to the Russian — “*dvoedannie pogosti*” — the territory of three cemeteries/districts between the Sami settlements along rivers Navdemo (Neiden), the Groove (Pasvik) and Pechenga (Pasen). The absence of a common historical terminology in Norway and Russia led to the search for a more universal concept. From the point of view of the location, the common area can be identified unconditional “North” in relation to the centers. So, we proposed the concept of “Northern frontier” as the most acceptable for the common border of Russia — Denmark/Norway, Sweden/Norway in 17th — early 19th centuries.

Despite a certain irritation, the authorities of Norway and Russia mutually recognized the common rights to use the resources of the three districts and collect taxes from the indigenous population. However, the right to economic development of the districts was not strictly regulated. This led to local conflicts caused by the collision of economic interests of Russian and Norwegian industrialists and conflicts between the newly arrived Norwegian Sami and indigenous Russian Sami-Skolts.

The political map of Europe changed after the Napoleonic wars (1805–1814) and the necessary prerequisites for delineating the political boundary between Russia and Sweden-Norway in the Far North were formed. In 1814, following the conclusion of the Swedish-Norwegian Union, Norway was gained wide autonomy. The functions of the Norwegian authorities in the management of their territory had significantly expanded, serving as a catalyst for national consolidation and the pressure of the Norwegian elite on the Swedish leadership in the direction of an early delineation of the three common districts, the availability of which limited the ability to create effective forms of control, management and development of the adjacent territory. At the same time, the alliance between the Russian Empire and the Swedish kingdom against Napoleon's France played a key role in changing the nature of Russian-Swedish relations from confrontation to cooperation. Thus, the positive attitude of the Russian government towards its northern neighbor and the desire of the King of Sweden-Norway, Karl Johan, to solve the problem of the frontier quickly contributed to the success of diplomatic efforts for joint delimitation of the border and the ratification of the border convention on May 2/14, 1826.

The boundary, established in 1826, affected the economic interests of the inhabitants of the Arkhangelsk Province. After the demarcation, a part of the disputed territories – the Nyavdem pogost and the northwestern part of the Pazretsky pogost remained outside Norway. However, the population of the Arkhangelsk Province considered all three settlements Russian land. They argued that the Russian-Norwegian border had already existed, and it was much more northwest than the one established by the convention of 1826. Therefore, immediately after the ratification of the convention, the emergence of a “new frontier” caused its condemnation by the regional

authorities and a broad discussion among the political and scientific elites of the province, actively involved in the evaluation of the treaty and its impact on the further development of the border area. In the 1860s, some well-known researchers of the Russian North — Dolinsky and Sidorov raised the issue of the unfair delineation at a meeting in the Imperial Free Economic Society and initiated a nationwide discussion of the border issue. Participants in these discussions were the Arkhangelsk historians and local folklore specialists of the second half of the 19th — early 20th centuries.

Setting the issue

Almost always hidden or obvious dissatisfaction with the results of differentiation gradually turns into the plane of subsequent scientific, historical and political discussions, accompanied by attempts to correct existing boundaries. The controversy in the assessments of the demarcation of 1826 between Norwegian and Russian scientists does not cease to this day [5, Zaikov K., pp. 1164–1172].

At the beginning of the 21st century, the increased interest in the theme was caused by the dynamics of Russian-Norwegian relations over the past three decades. They were characterized by a variable increase in cooperation and, at the same time, competition in the issue of delimitation in the Barents Sea, which finally culminated in the signing of a treaty on the delimitation of the maritime boundary in 2010. In this regard, the author of the article sets himself the task of studying the foreign historiography of the northern frontier in the 18th — early 20th centuries and determines the current state of the studies on this theme.

Diplomatic and political history of the Russian-Norwegian Borderland

The most complete work on the history of the northern frontier in the 14th–19th centuries is the monograph of the Norwegian historian O.A. Jonsen's "The Political History of Finmark", published in 1923. It is based on a wide range of sources from the central archives of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Russia. The author tried to reconstruct the political history of the border area, and to explain the architecture of the border of 1826 [4].

Considering the Norwegian-Novgorod treaty of 1326 the starting point for the political status of Finmark and the Murmansk coast of the Kola Peninsula, O.A. Jonsen admitted the absence of political boundaries in the Far North in the 14th — first half of the 16th centuries. Instead of political boundaries, there were only borders of the general fiscal jurisdiction of Norway, Sweden and Russia. These zones were much larger than the territory of the "common districts" of the 17th–19th centuries. The author believed that the desire of states to set up clear boundaries led to the consolidation of governance and colonization, which became the main factors in the gradual reduction of cross-zones in the 16th–18th centuries. Jonsen O.A. referred the emergence of the conditional political and ethno-cultural borders of Norway and Russia that passed through the territory of the "common districts" — the three settlements of the orthodox Sami (Skolt) — Njåvdàn (the Norwegian Neiden, the Russian Nyavdem Pogost), Báhcaveadji (The Norwegian Pasvig, the Russian

Pazrecki Pogost), Beahcan (the Norwegian Peisen, Russian Pechenga Pogost) in the Southern Varanger — to the end of the 16th century [4, p. 84, 195–210].

Norwegian scholar first revealed the growth of fishing activity of Norwegian Sami on the territory of the common districts and transition from fishing to settler colonization, observed since the second half of the 18th century [4, pp. 203–215]. This caused discontent among the indigenous population — the Russian Sami — and was reflected in the growth of commercial conflicts. This accelerated the setup of the “districts” issue in the early 19th century. Johnson O.A. made an accurate historical reconstruction of the Russian Skolt Sami boundaries, comparing the protocol by major P. Schnitler and Norwegian and Swedish maps of the 18th — beginning of 20th century [4, pp. 195–200, 211–215]. The reconstruction of the siits borders was supplemented by anthropologist V. Tanner and Russian historian M.G. Kuchinsky [6, Tanner V.; 7, Kuchinsky M.G.].

Jonsen O.A. noticed that the Norwegian regional authorities of the 17th century considered Russian fishing activity near the Norwegian coasts as a possible threat to the security of Eastern Finmark. This predetermined the aspirations of the Finmark officials to the delimitation of the districts and their subsequent attempts to organize diplomatic negotiations with the Russian Empire at the end of the century [4, pp. 217–225]. The O.A. Johnson’s idea on the impact of the growing Pomor fisheries on the delimitation issue was refined by T. Christiansen and reflected in the publications of Y.P. Nielsen and E. Niemi [8, Christiansen, pp. 26–52; 9, Niemi, pp. 387–415; 10, Nielsen J.P., Zaikov K., pp. 67–86].

The undoubted merit of the scholar is the introduction of many sources into scientific circulation: documents of the Storting committees and the Finance Department, responsible for the boundary projects and the protocols of the Galiamin — Spork Delimitation Commission 1825 and the Galiamin - Meilander Demarcation Commission 1826 [4, app.].

Despite the rich source material, in methodological terms, O. A. Johnson’s study was written in the era of empirical positivism and therefore it has significant shortcomings. The author perceived the state as an objective and ideologically static historical subject. The main feature of its territorial policy was the desire for territorial expansion and the acquisition of clear borders of sovereignty [4, pp. 284–258]. This approach to the public policy has led to a significant distortion of the local and regional actors’ roles in the spatial standardization of Norway and Russia and exaggerated perception of the border state policy. The facts, related to the administrative and economic activity of Russian citizens and officials on the territory of the districts, O.A. Johnson saw hidden motives of the Russian government. Thus, the scholar explains the growth of taxation, attempts to map the disputed area and expansion of fishing activity of Pomors by territorial expansion of Russia in the North-West [4, pp. 210–211, 219–222, 231–235]. Therefore, O.A. Johnson considered the aspirations of the Norwegian Finmark authorities to territorial surveying in the late 18th century to be a response to the hidden Russian expansion from the East [4, pp. 233–234]. This position is expressed by the governors of Finmark Fjellstedt and Sommerfeldt. However, the author ignored the subjective nature of the sources and considered these judgments as an objective,

credible fact. Moreover, he extrapolated them to explain the local interactions with Russia in 18th — early 19th century [4, pp. 221–225, 233–235].

The reconstruction of the socio-economic and political space of districts made by O.A Johnson is based on the 18th century governors' reports and P. Schnitler's Protocol. The scholar concluded that in economic terms, two West districts — Nademski and Petrecki were fully integrated into East Finmark [4, pp. 214–215, 228–230]. Jonson O.A. was sure that the economic factor had been decisive in considering these districts Norwegian, when delimitating the territory [4, p. 257]. This interpretation of social and economic processes could be also found in modern Norwegian historiography: A. Lund, S. Vikan, and A. Andresen [11; 12; 13; 14]. At the same time, it should be noted that O.A. Johnson, working on the reconstruction of the history of the Borderlands, was not able to correlate Norwegian sources with their Russian counterparts. Therefore, we assume that its interpretation has significant distortions of the real historical situation.

In the chronological approach to the stage of differentiation, the researcher mentions the problems of Russia from territorial delimitation in the late XVIII and early XIX centuries but does not try to explain their reasons [4, pp. 235–236]. The main factor of territorial land surveying, Johnson believes personal factor and change in the geopolitical picture of the Northern European at the end of the Napoleonic wars.

Strategic partnership of Russia with Sweden 1812 with the strong friendship of the Russian Emperor Alexander I with the crown Prince, later king Karl Johan, those two components that, as I thought scientist were the main reasons for the consent of the Emperor with the Swedish proposals for the delimitation of districts, despite resistance from Arkhangelsk Governor S. I. Minitage [4, p. 236–239, 258]. These findings are reflected in the works of A. Lunde, S. Wikan, A. Andresen, E. Niemi, J.P. Nielsen and M. Lähteenmäki [11; 12; 13; 9; 15, 10; 16]. Identical conclusions were made by the Russian researchers V. Roginsky, B. B. Cristman and A. S. Casian [17; 18; 19; 20].

Diplomatic history of the Russian-Norwegian demarcation 1823-1826 was partly studied in the monograph of the Swedish researcher C.F. Palmstierna, dedicated to the premises of the November Act of 1855. The historian tried to trace the influence of the delimitation of common districts on the foreign policy tension in the 1850s. and to determine the impact of a large policy on the negotiation. Although the author did not find any facts confirming the influence of big politics on diplomatic negotiations or the delimitation effect, he first introduced a wide range of diplomatic sources. First, these were the documents of the Swedish — Norwegian Foreign Ministry and a part of the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Empire [21, Palmstierna C.F.].

Palmstierna C.F. believed that the reason for the delimitation was the conflicts between the Sami and Norway's aspirations to establish a border [21, Palmstierna C.F., pp. 223–226]. Analyzing the correspondence of the Swedish envoys with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom, the researcher reconstructs the process of diplomatic negotiations.

Focusing on the central historical figures, he significantly reduced the influence of regional and local actors on the negotiations, limiting it to the Arkhangelsk — St. Petersburg, on the one hand, and Christiania — Stockholm, on the other hand [21, Palmstierna C.F., pp. 223–235]. According to Palmstierna C.F., the main opponent of the delimitation of the border and the initiator of the resistance is the governor of Arkhangelsk, S.I. Minitsky, who, in his reports and personal conversation with the head of the Russian Foreign K.V. Nesselrode, insisted on the old border and systematically rejected projects of delimitation of the Norwegian side [21, Palmstierna C.F., pp. 226–228, 230–231].

In contrast to the opinion of Russian historiographers, Palmstierna C.F. believed that the position of the Russian central authorities with respect to the Norwegian proposals of 1823 and 1824, was not homogeneous and benevolent [21, pp. 223–227]. After analyzing the dispatches of the Swedish envoys, Palmstierna C.F. concluded that the head of the Russian Foreign K.V. Nesselrode supported S.I. Ministry's initiatives [21, pp. 226–227]. The foreign policy of Alexander I and Nicholas I, aimed at maintaining good-neighborliness with the Kingdom, as well as the diplomatic professionalism of the Swedish — Norway envoys, who skillfully defended the interests of the Kingdom with no regard to the Russian counterarguments [21, p. 235]. The historian emphasized that it was the Swedish diplomat N.F. Palmstierna defended the Norwegian demarcation projects when the king's position was unstable at critical moments of the summer 1824 and the spring 1825–26 [21, pp. 227–233]. In the spring 1826, Karl Johan intended to accept the delimitation plan, proposed by Nicholas I. The plan significantly reduced the boundary line of the Galiamin-Spork project. The hesitation of Alexander I and Nicholas I was explained by the skeptical attitude of emperors towards the value of the disputed space and the arrest of Lieutenant-Colonel V.E. Galiamin. In December 1825 — January 1826, he was under investigation on charges for participation in the December insurrection 1825.

Writing about the contradictions of center and regions of the Russian Empire in the decision-making process, C. F. Palmstierna did not analyze and did not compare the views of Stockholm and Christiania. The idea of a consolidated position of the Kingdom in defending the interests of the inhabitants of Northern Norway had been formed. This view is in many ways contrary to the classical dichotomy of the center — periphery and, in addition, it is not confirmed by a detailed comparison of the delimitation projects of the Norwegian and Swedish sides.

We should also mention the issue of exchange of territories that arose in the 1840s. Palmstierna C.F. believed that the reason for the Russian proposals to exchange the so-called “Finnish ledge” (Finskekilen) on Norwegian land in Southern Varanger was the attempt of the Emperor to pacify the Finnish Parliament, demanding access to sea fisheries for the Finnish Sami [21, p. 277]. Russian researchers M. Borodkin and V.V. Pokhlebin believed that this proposal was caused by Nicholas I's revanchism and his awareness of the injustice of the border Convention against Russian Sami [22, pp. 313–314; 23]. Arkhangelsk historian B.B. Cristman's results are even more sophisticated. His hypothesis is that this proposal was the result of prudent foreign policy manoeu-

vre of the Emperor, who intended to expand borders in 1841 by conciliating Sweden in 1826 [19, Cristman B.B., pp. 59–60, pp. 98–99]. Sources that prove these assumptions were not listed by the Russian researchers. Palmstierna's C. F. interpretation remains generally accepted in the Scandinavian historiography of the Russian-Norwegian diplomatic history of the delineation according to A. Lund, S. Wikan, A. Andresen, E. Niemi, L. Ryvarden, M. Lähteenmäki [11; 12; 13; 14; 9; 24; 16].

The subsequent synthesis of the borderland history with constructivist approach was made by a Professor from the University of Tromsø Einar Niemi. Using secondary sources, the researcher described the evolution of the frontier in the context of the national security policy with the help of the dichotomy "center — periphery" [9]. Attaching a classical scheme, the author concluded that, at the local level, the attitude to Russia was characterized by good-neighborliness and but by xenophobia in the center (Christiania and Stockholm).

Niemi E., on the one hand, related the Finmark authorities' aspirations to the border issue with the increased economic interests of Norwegian citizens and desire to colonize the South Varanger, where the common districts are. On the other hand, the scholar linked the delimitation with the Swedish — Norwegian Central authorities and the doctrine of the Russian threat. Contradiction of differentiation factors in the center and periphery of Sweden — Norway, according to Professor E. Niemi, explains the contradictory nature of the fishing rules for the border population of Norway and Russia, established by the articles of the Convention 1826 [9, pp. 69–71].

Studying the consolidation of the Norwegian state in the border region in the second half of the 19th — early 20th centuries, E. Niemi concluded that the concept of the Russian threat in combination with the ideology of building a nation-state pushed the excessive politicization of the Sami crafts. They had become associated with part of a Russian expansionist plan. This fear seemed to be confirmed for Norwegian officials, by the fact of domination immigrant non-Norwegian ethnic element (Finns, Finnish and Russian Sami) in the ethno-cultural landscape of the Norwegian frontier. This largely predetermined the actions of the regional and Central authorities of the Kingdom, active policy of Norway and the colonization of the Southern Varanger in the second half of the XIX century. This policy implied a wide range of measures aimed at assimilation of the Sami population, isolation of the Finnish immigrant majority and reduction of external migration flows [25, Eriksen K.E., Niemi E., pp. 28–95]. According to the scholar, further attempts to restrict Pomor and Sami crafts in the early 20th century were the Norwegian reaction to the revisionist sentiments of the Russian public, who wanted to revise the Convention of 1826 [25, pp. 104–105]. It is important to note, building this concept, E. Niemi focused on documents about the dispute with Finnish Sami. In his monograph "The Finnish Threat", he considered the politicization of Russian Sami fisheries of the mid-19th century insufficiently. This omission was noticed by A. Andresen, who analyzed Norwegian documents and wrote that the politicization of Russian Sami fisheries in the Norwegian press and the administration of the Borderlands were significantly politicized in relation to the Finnish Sami fisheries [13, pp. 70–73]. The author argued that, the politici-

zation of the Russian Sami fisheries was significantly different from an identical process in relation to the Finnish Sami [14, pp. 210–211; 13, pp. 73–75, pp. 83–84].

E. Niemi considers the shaping the cultural borders of Norway through the construction of Church facilities in the border area one of the elements of the Norwegian border policy in the second half of the 19th — early 20th centuries. The researcher also believed that the use of cultural and religious space to ensure security and prevent territorial expansion was caused by the influence of Russia, which “traditionally” used objects of religious cult to expand its political limits [26, pp. 153–155].

Researchers J.P. Nielsen and T. Christiansen continued to develop the theme of the Russian threat in the history of the Russian-Norwegian borderland. Professor J.P. Nielsen concluded that the Russian threat was not related to the real Russian policy towards Norway. This doctrine was only an asymmetric perception of Russian politics in Norwegian interpretation, i.e. the myth, the system of belief that Norway needs to accelerate its own consolidation. At the same time, this myth proved to be suitable for Sweden and the UK and their political interests [27, Nielsen J.P., pp. 75–94; 15, pp. 13–14]. The most important J.P. Nielsen’s contribution to the development of the borderland history is the assumption about the possible reason for the long removal of Russia from the border issue — the different views of the elites of both countries about their own territory. An essential characteristic of these differences is the liberal attitude of the Russian authorities to open frontier zones, unacceptable for a small nation-state, which aspired to get clear and hermetically sealed boundaries [28, Nielsen J.P., pp.241–246; 15, pp. 10–13].

Professor T. Christiansen reviewed the reports of Professor Erickson (1772), the governors Feldstedt (1776) and Sommerfield (1789) and journals of the naval expeditions of the Norwegian fleet (1816–1818). The researcher concluded that the Russian threat as a belief system was widespread not only among the elite of the United States, but also among the population of Eastern Finmark [8]. The researcher insists that this myth was considered not just an ideological construct of the elites, but a product of the daily experience in trade relations between the border population of Norway and Russia. It is the growth of the Russian commercial expansion in the second half of the 18th century. According to T. Christiansen, this pushed Norwegian officials to consolidate in the North [8, pp. 29, 36–37]. Unlike the O.A. Jonsen, the modern researcher stressed that the commercial expansion of the Pomors was a spontaneous uncontrolled process not related to the policy of the Russian authorities [8, p. 44].

Sami people in the history of the Russian-Norwegian borderland

It is necessary to admit the writings devoted to the local space on the border and its indigenous population. This theme was developed in the framework of Scandinavian historiography. The main issues were the legal status of the siits of the Skolt Sami people, the nature of the state policy towards the indigenous population, the impact of the border convention and the Russian-Norwegian relations on the Sami transboundary fisheries.

Regarding the legal status of the siits, the historian of law S. Tonnesen, the anthropologist W. Tanner, the historians A. Andresen and S. Wikan agree that the Skolt Sami collectives considered the borderlands and their resources as their private property [6; 29; 14; 12]. In this context, S. Tonnesen and A. Andresen compared the policies of Norway and Russia towards Skolt Sami collectives. They concluded that Russia recognized the mono-legal right of Skolt Sami to the resources of the siits, while Norway aspired territorial expansion without integrating the traditional rights of the Sami into the Norwegian legal system [29, pp. 114–122; 14, pp. 28–31]. This, stressed A. Andresen, was the main distinguishing feature of the territorial policies of Norway and Russia, which influenced the delimitation process [14, pp. 49–50]. The authors believed that Russia recognized the territory of the pogosts as private property of Skolt Sami. Without any documentary evidence, A. Andresen suggested that this could be based on Russia's legal practice, which included the traditional norms of the peoples of the empire in the legal dimension of the state [14, p. 41]. Such reflections look speculative. Nevertheless, the author's conclusion about the significance of territorial — legal practice of Russia and Norway in relation to the Skolt Sami and their political self-identification is obvious in our view.

The most important consequence of the delimitation, according to A. Andresen, was the deformation of the Nyavdem and Pazrets pogosts [13, pp. 44–45, pp. 165–169]. The negative result of the delimitation for Skolt Sami, according to the author, was the consequence of Alexander I's unsuccessful attempt, to balance between the interests of the Pomors and the indigenous population of the borderland and to maintain friendship with Karl Johan [13, pp. 32–33, p. 44]. At the same time, the author noted that in the long historical perspective, the Sami did not feel the restrictive measures of the convention. After studying the trade conflicts of the 1850-90s and comparing them with the concept of E. Niemi, the researcher identified a link with the current security policy. The fear of a possible Russian expansion made the central and regional authorities tolerant in relation to the Russian Sami trades [13, pp. 60–87].

The modern Norwegian historiography has some uncertainty when assessing the nature of the administrative jurisdiction of Norway and Russia over the disputed area. The identical documents of the 18th century trade disputes made the researchers A. Andresen and S. Wikan come to the opposite conclusions. A. Andresen argued that the siits were under double jurisdiction, while the Finnish historian S. Wikan believed that the jurisdiction over the siits was exclusively Russian, and Norway only tried to expand its judicial jurisdiction with the aim of strengthening their territorial claims in the region [14; 12, p. 39].

The main drawback of the research on local space has become an excessive interest in the analysis of the central state in the process of territorialization of the border area. The indigenous population in the works of W. Tanner, A. Andresen, and S. Wikan looks like a historical object and a victim of state policy. Focusing on the analysis of socio-economic effects of the convention, scholars left outside the scope of research questions about the influence of the Sami on the territorialization of the border space and the formation of spatial images. We believe that the answers

could qualitatively improve the existing interpretations of the territorial policies of Norway and Russia in the border area.

In this context, an interesting article was written by the Japanese-British historian Maria Ishizuki. Its emphasis is on analyzing the roles of various actors in the Russian-Norwegian and Finnish-Norwegian negotiations 1825–1852. [30, Ishizuka M.]. The researcher noted that the regional actors occupied a central place in the design of the border images and the formulation of policies [30, pp. 95–96], which is at variance with the generally accepted in historiography descending model of the relationship between the center and the region.

Conclusion

Summarizing the review of the foreign scientific literature on the history of the Northern Frontier, we can note that in the Norwegian historiography the “region — state” dichotomy in the perception of the border area and the indigenous population is leveled. The extrapolation of the classical “center — periphery” scheme looks synthetic against the backdrop of the apparent contradiction of facts, pointed out by T. Christiansen. In the context of reconstruction of the social and economic system of siits of the Skolt Sami, both Scandinavian and Russian historiographies are dominated by the one-sidedness of sources and spatial fragmentation. Both works of S. Wikan and A. Andresen are devoted to the two of the three siits in the disputed areas. The system of their relations with Norway and Russia was analyzed with the use of the Norwegian sources. This significantly reduces the historical reliability of the reconstructions made by the authors and strengthens the need for a qualitative reconstruction of the Northern Frontier history with the analyze of sources from the archives of all countries, involved in the formation of political and socio-cultural borders in the Far North of Europe (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Russia).

Acknowledgments and financing

The study was carried out at the expense of a grant from the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 17-78-10198 “Political and ethno-cultural boundaries of the Russian Arctic: from conceptualization to reconstruction of the process of spatial socialization”).

References

1. Paasi A. Mapping the Backgrounds, Contexts and Contests. *B/ordering Space*. Ed. by H. Van Houtum, O. Kramsch, W. Zierhofer. Aldershot, 2005, pp. 19–22.
2. Minghi J. Changing Geographies of Scale and Hierarchy in European Borderlands. *Boundaries and Place, European Borderlands in Geographical Context*. Ed. by D.H. Kaplan, J. Häkli. Oxford, 2002, pp. 36–37.
3. Häkli J. Borders in the political geography of knowledge. *The Dividing line: borders and national peripheries*. Ed. by L-F. Landgren, M. Häyrynen. Helsinki, 1997, pp. 11–12.
4. Johnsen O.A. Finmarkens politiske historie, aktnæssing fremstillet. *Skrifter utgitt av Det norske videnskapsakademi i Oslo, II, Hist. fil. Klasse*. Kristiania, Jacob Debwad Publ., 1922. 357 s.
5. Zaikov K. The history of the Northern frontier delimitation (1822–1826) in the light of the Russian and European historiography: the interpretation and perceptual problems. *Bylye Gody*, 2016, no. 42(4), pp. 1164–1172.

6. Tanner V. *Antropogeografiska studier inom Petsamo-området. I. Skolt-Lapparna*. Helsingfors, 1929. 518 s.
7. Kuchinskii M.G. *Sami Kol'skogo uezda v XVI–XVIII vekakh. Model' sotsial'noi struktury* [The Sami of the Kola district in the XVI–XVII centuries. Model of social structure]. Alta, 2008. 294 p. (In Russ.)
8. Kristiansen T. «Russkie gubiat nas; Oni lishayut nas sredstv k propitaniyu...»: Russko-norvezhskie otnosheniya na Krainem Severe do 1820 ["The Russians are ruining us; They deprive us of the means to subsistence ...": Russian-Norwegian relations before 1820]. *Russkii sbornik* [Russian Anthology]. Ed. by O.R. Airapetov, M. Iovanovich, M.A. Kolerov, B. Menning, P. Cheisti. Moscow, 2010, pp. 26–52. (In Russ.)
9. Niemi E. Etnisitet, nasjonalitet og grenseforhold i det nordligste Skandinavia fram til vår tid. *Grenser og grannelag i Nordens historie*. Red. S. Imsen. Oslo, 2005, ss. 387–415.
10. Nielsen J.P., Zaikov K. Norway's Hard and Soft Borders towards Russia. *Imagined, Negotiated, Remembered. Constructing European Borders and Borderlands*. Ed. by K. Katajala, M. Lähteenmäki. Münster, 2012, pp. 67–86.
11. Lunde A. *Sør Varanger Historie Med bidrag av Povl Simonsen og Ørnulv Vorren*. Vadsø, Sør-Varanger kommune, 1979. 887 s.
12. Wikan S. *Grensebygda Neiden. Møte mellom folkegrupper og kampen om ressursene*. Svanvik, 1995. 473 s.
13. Andresen A. *Sii'daen som forsvant. Østsamene i Pasvik etter den norsk-russisk grensetrekningen i 1826*. Kirkenes, Sør-Varanger Museum, 1989. 192 s.
14. Andresen A. Russiske Østsamers Rettigheter i Norge 1826–1925. Myndighetspolitikk og Rettighetsproblematikk. *Hovedoppgave i Historie*. Tromsø, 1983. 150 s.
15. Nielsen J.P. Some Reflections on the Norwegian-Russian Border and the Evolution of State Border in General. *Russia-Norway. Physical and Symbolic Borders*. Ed. by T.N. Jackson, J.P. Nielsen. Moscow, 2005, pp. 7–16.
16. Lähteenmäki M. *The peoples of Lapland. Boundary demarcation and interaction in the North Callote from 1808 to 1889*. Helsinki, 2006. 335 p.
17. Roginsky V.V. The 1826 Delimitation Convention between Norway and Russia: A Diplomatic Challenge. *Russia — Norway. Physical and Symbolic Borders*. Ed. by T.N. Jackson, J.P. Nielsen. Moscow, 2005, pp. 162–168.
18. Roginskiy V.V. Konventsia 1826 g. o razgranichenii mezhdru Norvegiy i Rossiey kak diplomaticheskaya problema [1826 Convention on Border Delimitation Between Norway and Russia as a Diplomatic issue]. *Vestnik "Barents-tsentra" MGPU*, 2008, no. 7, pp. 25–30.
19. Kristoman B.B. *Istoriya nauchno-promyslovogo osvoeniya Evropeiskogo Severa v kontekste politicheskikh interesov Rossiiskoi Imperii v XIX — nachale XX vv.: dis. ... kand. ist. nauk* [The history of scientific and commercial development of the European North in the context of political interests of the Russian Empire in the XIX – early XX centuries: Cand. Sci. (Hist.) diss.]. Arkhangelsk, Pomor State University Publ., 2003.
20. Kasiyan A.S. Laplandskii vopros v rossiisko-norvezhskikh otnosheniyakh: razgranichenie 1826 g. i ego posledstviya v nachale XX v. [The Lapland issue in Russian-Norwegian relations: the demarcation of 1826 and its consequences at the beginning of the 20th century]. *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya na Severe Evropy i Barentsev region: istoriya i istoriografiya: sbornik nauchnykh statei* [International relations in the North of Europe and the Barents Region: history and historical literature]. Ed. by Yu.P. Bardileva. Murmansk, 2008, pp. 141–149. (In Russ.)
21. Palmstierna C.F. *Sverige, Ryssland och England 1833–1855. Krig November traktaens Förutsättningar*. Stockholm, 1932. 408 s.
22. Borodkin M. *Istoriya Finlyandii. Vremya Imperatora Nikolaya I* [History of Finland. Time of the Emperor Nicholas I]. Saint Petersburg, 1915. 716 p. (In Russ.)
23. Pokhlebin V. Rossiya pervoi priznala norvezhskuyu nezavisimost' [Russia was the first to recognize Norwegian independence]. *Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'* [International affairs], 1997, no. 5, pp. 48–61.
24. Ryvarden L., Lauritsen P.R. *Norges grense: fra Grisebåen til Barentshavet*. Oslo, Cappelen, 2005. 255 s.
25. Eriksen K.E., Niemi E. *Den finske fare: Sikkerhetsproblemer og minoritetspolitikk i nord 1860–1940*. Oslo, 1983. 470 s.

26. Niemi E. Kirka som grensefestning: kirkebygging, religiøs spenning og grensesikring i Finmark 1850–1940. *Forpost mot øst: fra Vardø og Finmarks historie 1307–2007: rapport fra det XXXII nord-norske historieseminar, Vardø 21–23 september 2007*. Ed. by R.R. Balsvik, J.P. Nielsen. Stamsund, 2008, pp. 153–166.
27. Nielsen J.P. The Russia of the Tsar and North Norway. "The Russian danger" Revisited. *Acta Borealia*, 2002, no. 1, pp. 75–92.
28. Nielsen J.P. Norwegian Images of Russia and the Russians. *Rossiia i Zapad. Istoricheskii opyt XIX–XX vekov* [Russia and the West. Historical experience of the XIX–XX centuries]. Ed. by M.A. Lipkin. Moscow, 2008, pp. 241–246.
29. Tønnesen S. *Retten til jorden i Finnmark: rettsreglene om den såkaldte «statens umatrikkulerte grunn»: en undersøkelse med særlig sikt på samenes rettigheter*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1979. 414 s.
30. Ishizuka M. Norwegian-Russian Borderland in Transition: Spatial Perception among Norwegian Elites in 1826–1852. *Russia — Norway. Physical and Symbolic Borders*. Ed. by T.N. Jackson, J.P. Nielsen. Moscow, 2005, pp. 95–104.