

Arctic and North. 2026. No. 62. Pp. 27–39.

Original article

UDC [364.65:332.1:349.3](985)(045)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2026.62.34>

Basic Income as a Measure of Social Support in the Arctic Regions of the Russian Federation: Statement of the Problem

Denis A. Novikov ¹✉, Cand. Sci. (Law), Associate Professor

¹ Saint Petersburg State University, Universitetskaya naberezhnaya, 7–9, Saint Petersburg, Russia

¹ d.novikov@spbu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2727-5357>

Abstract. The Arctic zone of the Russian Federation is one of the most promising resource and logistics regions of the state. A significant challenge to its development is the low population density, which hinders the development of necessary infrastructure and the implementation of such crucial geopolitical projects as the Northern Sea Route. The existing social support system in the Arctic regions appears to be insufficient to retain and attract people to permanent residence in the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation. One of the universal tools for expanding social support in the Arctic regions of Russia could be a universal social payment program, which is essentially similar to the concept of “basic income”. The author examines the successful application of the basic income concept from a socio-demographic point of view in the US state of Alaska, where permanent residents receive annual payments from the Alaska Permanent Fund. The author proposes a mechanism for implementing universal social payments in the Arctic regions of Russia, as well as the legal conditions for receiving such payments. Among the conditions for receiving universal social payments, the author highlights the following: Russian citizenship, permanent residence in the Arctic regions, children attending schools at the place of registration in the Arctic regions, annual medical examinations, participation of unemployed able-bodied citizens in professional retraining programs, and participation of unemployed able-bodied citizens in socially useful activities. The author points out possible grounds for the deprivation of universal social payments, such as the commission of a criminal offense, repeated administrative violations related to the circulation and use of alcohol and drugs.

Keywords: social support, basic income, universal social payment, labor resources, Arctic regions

Introduction

The Arctic regions play a crucial role for modern Russia. The Arctic contains significant reserves of oil, natural gas, nickel, copper, diamonds and other minerals, making it strategically important for Russia’s sustainable development. From the perspective of technological and economic cooperation with Asian countries, the development of the Northern Sea Route through the Arctic is a priority for Russia, as it is intended to serve as a national transport corridor between the world’s major regions.

The Arctic regions are important for Russia from geopolitical, resource, transport, and economic perspectives, necessitating the development of these territories, including in light of their growing demographic potential. Currently, the Arctic regions, which cover 5.5 million km² (30% of the total territory), have a population of only 2.5 million people (1.6% of the total population) ¹. At

* © Novikov D.A., 2026

For citation: Novikov D.A. Basic Income as a Measure of Social Support in the Arctic Regions of the Russian Federation: Statement of the Problem. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North]. 2026; 62: 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2026.62.34>

 This work is licensed under a CC BY-SA License

¹ Ovcharova L.N. Demographic and social landscape of the regions of the Arctic zone: dynamics of key indicators and development reserves. URL: <https://stratpro.hse.ru/social-policy/news/927512655.html> (accessed 28 January 2025).

the same time, as noted in studies, the Arctic regions of Russia are characterized by spatial differentiation of economic activity, and harsh conditions and remoteness hinder their development [1, Baklanov P.Ya., Moshkov A.V., p. 49]; population migration to Russian Arctic regions, deprived of quality living conditions, is of crucial importance for the future development of the Northern Sea Route [2, Shaparov A.E., Sokolova F.K., Magomedov A.K. et al.]; attracting human capital to the Arctic regions of Russia requires significant government participation and the implementation of successful government programs [3, Simonchuk V.D., Nikulina A.Yu.].

In 2020, the Strategy for Developing the Russian Arctic Zone and Ensuring National Security until 2035 was approved by Decree of the President of the Russian Federation ²; in 2021, the Russian Government adopted the state program Socio-Economic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation ³. One of the program's implementation areas is the creation of conditions for the sustainable socio-economic development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation, including by improving the quality of life of residents of the Arctic regions. The program also envisages the creation of additional jobs in the Arctic, which requires attracting labor forces to the Russian Arctic.

Achieving these goals requires the implementation of broad social support measures for residents of Russia's Arctic regions. One such promising measure, which could cover the entire population of the Russian Arctic, attract new specialists and their families from other regions of the Russian Federation, and stimulate the socio-economic development of the Arctic zone, is a *basic income* as a universal social payment that does not depend on a citizen's participation in labor activity. As a scientific theory, the concept of *basic income* presents the following social model: every citizen of the state, regardless of whether they work or not, should be guaranteed a minimum monetary standard that will cover the costs of meeting basic physiological and social needs [4, Novikov D.A., p. 102]. In this study, we will attempt to determine the extent to which the concept of basic income is substantiated, tested, and applicable to implementation in a social support mechanism for residents of Russia's Arctic regions.

The concept of basic income: from utopia to practice

The first outlines of the concept of basic income can be found in the socio-political treatise "Utopia" (1516) [5] by the English philosopher and statesman Thomas More. Using the example of a fictional city-state, he justified the need to implement a minimum material support for citizens as a preventive measure against theft, which people without means of subsistence are forced to commit. Two and a half centuries later, the French mathematician and philosopher Marquis de Condorcet proposed a system of social insurance against the risks of poverty in his work "Sketch

² Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of October 26, 2020 No. 645 "On the Strategy for Developing the Russian Arctic Zone and Ensuring National Security until 2035". URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/45972> (accessed 28 January 2025).

³ Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation of March 30, 2021 No. 484 "On Approval of the State Program of the Russian Federation 'Socio-Economic Development of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation'". URL: http://pravo.gov.ru/proxy/ips/?doc_itself=&backlink=1&nd=602136938&page=1&rdk=0#10 (accessed 28 January 2025).

for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind” (1769) [6]. According to the author, technological progress should make it possible to level economic inequality, at least in terms of access to minimum benefits.

At the end of the 19th century, American researcher Edward Bellamy in his work “Looking Backward” (1888) [7] predicted that in 2000, people would receive a minimum subsistence allowance from the state, which would include food, protection, education and healthcare. French philosopher Charles Fourier in his book “The False Industry” (1836) wrote that the state is obliged to provide each citizen with a minimum income as compensation for the loss of direct access to natural resources [8, Scherer R.]. Fourier’s follower, Belgian lawyer Joseph Charlier, in his study “The Solution of the Social Problem or a Humanitarian Constitution Based on Natural Law and Prior to the Statement of Reasons” (1948) [9], argued that the only way to equalize people’s rights was to introduce a basic income paid quarterly or monthly to everyone, regardless of their need or ability to work. Fourier and Charlier were convinced that the introduction of a basic income should not weaken the motivation to work. According to Fourier, work should be made as attractive as possible, and only then one can be sure that the minimum income received by the poor will not contribute to their parasitism.

These authors present the concept of basic income as an element of an ideal social order, embodying ideas of equality and justice, largely social-utopian. It should be noted that in modern studies, the concept of basic income is sometimes presented in precisely this way. Greek economist Yanis Varoufakis pointed to the need for a universal right to income from capital through the implementation of unconditional payments, which would provide a new understanding of freedom and equality⁴, while Belgian philosophers P. Parijs and Y. Vanderborght consider basic income as a means of achieving human freedom and justify the importance of providing each person with the resources to shape their life according to their own choice [10, Van Parijs P., Vanderborght Y.].

However, the concept of basic income can (and, given scientific methodology, should) be understood more realistically within a pragmatic paradigm. One of the first to describe the potential practical implications of implementing a basic income was the Anglo-American politician and philosopher Thomas Paine, who, in his work “Agrarian Justice” (1797) [11], proposed paying 15 pounds per year to every citizen who had reached the age of 21 and 10 pounds to every citizen over 50 years old. Paine linked the need for such payments to the landlessness of most US citizens, and their financing — to land rent, which landowners would have to pay into a single national fund.

In the 1920s, the British engineer Clifford Douglas proposed a social credit model, essentially similar to the concept of a basic income. In his study “Social Credit” (1924) [12, Douglas C.H.], Douglas developed the idea of social credit: instead of conventional lending, so-called social credit

⁴ Varoufakis Y. The Universal Right to Capital Income. URL: <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/basic-income-funded-by-capital-income-by-yanis-varoufakis-2016-10/> (accessed 28 January 2025).

should perform the function of evenly distributing funds among all members of society. According to Douglas, national dividends should be distributed equally among all citizens in the form of interest-free loans to help bridge the gap between purchasing power and prices, and a new price adjustment mechanism, which Douglas called “just price”, would reduce prices for consumers. This idea was continued by the English economist Joan Robinson, who in her book “The Economics of Imperfect Competition” (1933) [13] put forward the concept of a social dividend, which was viewed as a way to provide the poor with the opportunity to increase their purchasing power. The English socio-economist Robert Theobald, in his study “The Guaranteed Income: Next Step in Economic Evolution?” (1966) [14], also emphasized the need to support consumer demand and proposed the introduction of an “economic floor”, that is, a basic income that all citizens should be provided with.

In the second decade of the 21st century, amid the rapid acceleration of global capitalism’s problems, British economist G. Standing, in his book “Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen” (2017), offers a renewed understanding of the concept of basic income from a pragmatic perspective. The scholar writes that “in the modern world, wages — that is, the income a person receives in exchange for actual labor activity — are growing, if at all, extremely slowly. Meanwhile, income received through non-labor activity — such as rent, intellectual property, and financial assets — is growing steadily. This disproportion exacerbates the growth of inequality.” [15, Standing G., p. 20] The scholar believes that the introduction of a basic income should change the situation. Among other things, he justifies the need to replace state social programs with a basic income by eliminating them, since the market economic model can no longer afford to support them in view of the increasingly frequent global financial crises. According to G. Standing, a basic income should become a universal tool for providing a minimally adequate living standard for a significant portion of the population who lost their ability to earn a living due to widespread automation and computerization of production.

A predominantly pragmatic approach was taken by the organizers of basic income experiments, which began in the second half of the 20th century. The aim was to find solutions for “adapting the capitalist system to the increasing difficulties of extracting increasing profits, that is, a new form of capitalism transformation (through its optimization, “buying off” workers by paying them a basic income)” [16, Bobkov V.N., Dolgushkin N.K., Odintsova E.V., p. 10]. Such experiments were conducted in Australia, Germany, India, Italy, Canada, Kenya, Namibia, New Zealand, the USA, Finland, South Korea, and other countries. Let us consider the most representative of them.

The first experiment with basic income was conducted by the Australian government in Melbourne from 1972 to 1975. People already receiving social benefits were given an amount equal to 106% of the established poverty level, while others received 50–71% of this level. Canada’s basic income experiment, known as Mincome (short for “minimum income”), was conducted from 1974 to 1979 in Dauphin, Manitoba. During the experiment, initiated by the Canadian government, 30% of Dauphin residents received payments, the amount of which depended on the

family's total income and the employment of its members (the amount of payments decreased proportionally to earnings when employment was found). A similar experiment was conducted in the Canadian province of Ontario from 2016 to 2018. From 1998 to 2001, the New Zealand government launched a program of direct cash payments to all citizens of the country. The payment amounted to 123 NZD per week. The Finnish Social Insurance Institution initiated an experiment in which, from 2017 to 2018, 2,000 unemployed individuals aged 25 to 58 began receiving monthly payments of €560 (by the end of the project, 1,869 participants remained in the experimental group). A similar project to provide basic income to citizens participating in social programs was also underway in Italy during the same period. In African countries, such as Namibia (2008–2009) and Kenya (since 2017), as well as in the Indian state of Madhya Pradesh (2011–2013), basic income is paid in agricultural regions. Recent experiments aimed at studying the impact of basic income on social well-being include projects to pay basic income to small groups of citizens in Germany (2021–2024)⁵, Scotland (since 2022)⁶, and South Korea (2021–2022)⁷.

The results of these experiments on the implementation of basic income show generally positive changes in the social well-being of the test subjects: crime rate and suicide rate decreased, physical and psychological health of the poor improved, poverty rate and mortgage repayment periods decreased, demand for local goods and services increased, and work motivation decreased slightly in favor of increased time for education and fulfilling family responsibilities. Moreover, even a small number of citizens participated in the experiment required significant financial investments. In New Zealand, the tax system had to be changed to finance the project, with income tax increasing from 33% to 39%. The Finnish basic income model increased the government deficit by approximately 5% of GDP. It is noted that a basic income, which can guarantee an acceptable standard of living, is “incredibly expensive”; either the level of the basic income is unacceptably low, or the cost of its provision is unacceptably high [17, Kislitsyna O.A., p. 36].

As we can see, the universal and unconditional implementation of a basic income at the national level is highly problematic while maintaining the traditional social security system and is only possible with its elimination or significant reduction. In fact, the payments made during the experiments were not basic, i.e. their nominal equivalent did not cover the minimum subsistence level. These are additional social support measures. An example of such payments can be seen in Iran, where in 2010 citizens began to receive payments as compensation for the cancellation of food and fuel subsidies. Monthly payments, set at 455 thousand rupees, amounted to 15% of the minimum wage. However, in subsequent years, due to sharply accelerating inflation, they lost about two-thirds of their initial purchasing power [18, Kapelyushnikov R.I., p. 13].

⁵ Citizens' Basic Income replaces basic income benefits. URL: <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-en/news/citizens-basic-income-2126300> (accessed 28 January 2025).

⁶ Minimum Income Guarantee Expert Group: interim report. URL: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/minimum-income-guarantee-expert-group-interim-report/pages/4/> (accessed 28 January 2025).

⁷ Do South Koreans want a universal basic income? URL: <https://mondediplo.com/2022/02/05korea-box> (accessed 28 January 2025).

Thus, the concept of a basic income, initially utopian construct of social thinkers, has also come to be seen as a viable replacement or supplement to the traditional model of social support. Experiments with basic income payments have revealed significant practical challenges to its implementation, primarily related to economic factors (the lack of funds to cover all citizens with payments, as well as their low size, which excludes the characteristic of being basic). However, the impact on the social well-being of citizens receiving basic income as an additional social support measure is generally characterized as positive.

Basic income in the Arctic region of the United States (the example of Alaska)

For Russian Arctic regions, it is most relevant to consider the experience of regional payments in the Arctic region of the United States — the state of Alaska. Some researchers classify these payments as a basic income [19, Zelleke A.; 20, Berman M.; 21, Hoynes H., Rothstein J.; 22, Feinberg R., Kuehn D.].

The Alaska Statehood Act of 1958 granted the new state hundreds of thousands of acres of land previously owned by the US federal government, and the Alaska Constitution mandated the use and development of the state's natural resources for the maximum benefit of its people. The lands chosen by the state included vast oil reserves. In the mid-1970s, oil production began at Prudhoe Bay, the largest oil field in the United States, located on the northern slope of Alaska. Revenues from production, property taxes, and income taxes began flowing into the state budget. These revenues were supplemented by royalties (ownership fees) to the state, as the field was located on state lands acquired from the federal government when Alaska became the 49th state.

However, after the state government quickly spent nearly \$900 million that had been allocated to the budget, Alaska's legislature became concerned, firstly, about the rational expenditure of the funds received, and secondly, that heavy dependence on oil revenues during the boom would lead to an undesirable shortfall in funds during the downturn [19, Zelleke A., p. 143].

The solution to the problem was formalized in the form of an amendment to the state constitution, which established the Alaska Permanent Fund (APF). According to the amendment, introduced in 1976, "not less than twenty-five per cent of all mineral lease payments, royalties, proceeds from the sale of royalties, federal mineral revenue sharing payments, and state bonuses shall be placed in a permanent fund, the principal amount of which shall be used only for those income-producing investments designated by law as eligible for investment in the permanent fund. All proceeds from the permanent fund shall be deposited in the general fund unless otherwise provided by law" (Alaska Constitutional Amendment, Article 9, Section 15)⁸. Thus, this amendment required that the fund receives at least 25% of the royalties collected from the sale of all natural resources owned by the state, that the fund invests only in income-producing assets, and that only the fund's revenues, not its principal, could be spent. In addition to the royalty de-

⁸ The Constitution of the State of Alaska. The Constitution of the State of Alaska was adopted by the Alaska Constitutional Convention on February 5, 1956. URL: <https://ltgov.alaska.gov/information/alaskas-constitution/> (accessed 28 January 2025).

ductions provided by the Constitution, the fund is replenished through legislative appropriations. Each year, funds are contributed to the fund to offset the impact of inflation on the real value of the fund (based on the purchase price rather than the current market value of the assets).

As noted by P. O'Brien and D. Olson, the general purpose of the fund was to diversify Alaska's revenue streams by investing a larger portion of royalties; to ensure that a portion of current revenues would be preserved for future residents; and to limit the discretionary spending of state government officials [23, O'Brien P., Olson D., p. 144]. However, the ultimate purpose of the fund was not clearly defined. The general purpose of the fund as a savings account to prevent all oil revenues from being spent as they are received was agreed upon. The question of what the savings would ultimately be spent on was hardly discussed or agreed upon⁹. In 1980, the Alaska Legislature created the Permanent Securities Corporation to manage the fund, whose assets were invested in a diversified investment portfolio designed to maximize returns rather than invest in Alaska's development.

In 1982, the Alaska Legislature approved the Permanent Fund Dividend Act, which established an annual payment to state residents. The payment is administered by a special department within the state government — the Dividend Division of the Department of Revenue.

The main conditions for receiving the payment are:

- the applicant must be a resident of Alaska for at least one calendar year prior to applying for the payment (green card holders and refugees are also eligible [24, Jones D., Marinescu I., p. 317]. Military personnel and students retain eligibility for the payment even if they were temporarily absent from the state);
- the obligation to submit a written intention to remain in Alaska for an indefinite period. For minor children, who are also eligible for the payment, such intention, as well as the application for the payment, must be submitted by parents or guardians;
- the applicant must not have been convicted of any criminal offences during the year preceding the application. The applicant must also not be incarcerated or serving a sentence for a criminal offence.

Each adult and child receives a separate annual payment, typically in September or October via direct deposit. Payments are subject to federal taxes, but not to Alaska state taxes. The payment amount depends on the Alaska Permanent Fund's revenues for the previous year and is approved by state law. The payment amount has varied over the years. The first annual dividend paid in 1982 was \$1,000, the second was \$386. Subsequently, the payment amount increased

⁹ Goldsmith S. The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend: An Experiment in Wealth Distribution: Report at the Ninth Congress of Basic Income European Network [BIEN] Geneva, Switzerland September 12-14, 2002. Geneva: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 2002. URL: <https://webapps.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/download/docs/gold.pdf> (accessed 28 January 2025).

nominally, reaching almost \$3,000 in 2020. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the payment amount decreased, reaching \$1,702 in 2024¹⁰.

It should be noted that the payment to Alaska residents is not fully universal, unconditional, or basic. Firstly, not all Alaska residents are eligible for the payment, only those who have had permanent residence in the state for a year. Secondly, a condition that disqualifies a state resident from receiving the payment is the imposition of criminal sanctions against the state resident during the year preceding the application. Employment or other income does not affect eligibility for the payment. Thirdly, as L. Kueng writes, the amount of the payment throughout its implementation has not been large enough to cover the basic needs of Alaska residents¹¹. However, the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend Program compensates for a significant portion of the cost of living for medium-sized and large families, reducing the risk of losses for potential entrepreneurs [22, Feinberg R., Kuehn D., p. 609].

The implementation of annual payments to Alaska residents over 42 years has led to positive socio-demographic results: the birth rate increased and the intervals between births decreased, especially among women in the 20–44 age group [25, Yonzan N., Timilsina L., Kelly I.]; reproductive inequality decreased, especially among socio-economically disadvantaged groups of the population, without affecting the abortion rate [26, Cowan S., Douds K., p. 1021]; poverty rate among rural indigenous families and the elderly decreased by 20–40% [27, Berman M., p. 138]; crime rate decreased [28, Dorsett R., p. 195]; the number of small businesses and self-employed increased [22, Feinberg R., Kuehn D., p. 618]. It should also be noted that Alaska's population has increased by 242 thousand people since 1982 (from 499 thousand to 741 thousand people)¹².

Thus, dividends in the form of annual payments from the Alaska Permanent Fund can be attributed to measures of additional social support for permanent residents of the region, which is provided by the state's resource revenues. This payment, made to residents of the state of Alaska, is a good illustration of the pragmatic understanding of the concept of basic income as a rent payment from the use and extraction of natural resources. Considering the significant value and prospects of the Arctic regions of Russia in terms of resources, as well as the need to improve socio-demographic indicators, the use of such a mechanism for redistributing income from mineral extraction and the development of the Northern Sea Route to the population seems to be the most appropriate solution.

Mechanism for implementation of basic income in Russia's Arctic regions

The existing social support mechanism in Russia's Arctic regions is comprehensive, covering various categories of individuals working and living in these regions, and provides a system of so-

¹⁰ Permanent Fund Dividend. Tax Information 2024. URL: <https://pfd.alaska.gov/payments/tax-information> (accessed 28 January 2025).

¹¹ Kueng L. Explaining Consumption Excess Sensitivity with Near-Rationality: Evidence from Large Predetermined Payments. Working Paper 21772, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2015. URL: https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w21772/w21772.pdf (accessed 28 January 2025).

¹² Alaska Population Estimates. Population and Components of Change, 1945 to 2024. URL: <https://live.laborstats.alaska.gov/data-pages/alaska-population-estimates> (accessed 28 January 2025).

cial and labor guarantees and benefits established by Russian Federation law. These guarantees and benefits are aimed at compensating for living and working in challenging climatic conditions, as well as providing social protection, including for the indigenous populations of Russia's Arctic regions.

The following groups of basic guarantees and benefits applicable in the Arctic regions of Russia can be identified.

- Guarantees and benefits for those working in the Arctic regions of Russia (increased northern allowances and regional coefficients, additional leave, a one-time benefit upon conclusion of an employment contract for the employee and each member of his family arriving with him, paid leave for settling in a new location, compensation for travel expenses to and from the place of rest once every two years, compensation for relocation expenses, transportation of luggage and family members, reimbursement of travel expenses to the place of work and back for shift workers, as well as their provision of housing and meals during their shift, a shortened work week for women, special guarantees in the field of labor protection related to climatic conditions, limitation of tax deductions from severance pay, preferential retirement procedures).
- Guarantees and benefits for residents of the Arctic regions of Russia (preservation of the traditional way of life and economic activities of indigenous peoples, the "Arctic Mortgage" and "Arctic Hectare" programs, housing subsidies in other regions, free trips for children to Russian resorts and travel from their place of residence to the resort and back, free travel to medical facilities or compensation for its cost).

These guarantees and benefits for workers and residents of Russia's Arctic regions are targeted and provided on specific legal grounds.

Improving the demographic situation and social well-being in the Arctic regions of the Russian Federation requires additional social support measures. Following the example of the state of Alaska, such measure could be a basic income — a universal social payment (USP) program for all residents of the Arctic regions. It should be noted that, according to Russian scholars, the concept of basic income is gaining practical significance in Russia due to the urgent need to reduce income inequality and provide additional social support to the population [29, Bobkov V.N., Zolotov A.V., Odintsova E.V., p. 44]. Studies conducted in Russia have demonstrated the country's readiness to introduce transitional forms of basic income associated with mitigating (overcoming) the problem of poverty and ensuring a minimum standard of living for vulnerable groups of the population [30, Odintsova E.V., Chernykh E.A., Chashchina T.V., p. 29].

It would be reasonable to launch the USP program in several pilot regions (e.g., the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug, Chukotka, Murmansk Oblast) with subsequent expansion to the entire Arctic zone of the Russian Federation. Financial support for this payment should be provided through the creation of a special fund (the Arctic Development Fund), which will be formed from revenues from mineral extraction (oil, gas, and rare metals) in Russia's Arctic regions. Part of

the profits of companies operating in the Arctic could also be directed to this fund. Additional funding is possible from the federal budget and through co-financing from regional budgets to support the USP program, especially in its initial stages.

It is advisable to link the amount of the universal social benefit to the subsistence minimum for an adult, which is subject to annual indexation taking into account inflation and the cost of living in the Arctic regions of Russia. Following the example of the state of Alaska, the USP could be paid annually and represent the sum of the monthly subsistence minimum multiplied by the number of months. The USP should be excluded from the taxation system.

The conditions for receiving the universal social payment are as follows:

- Citizenship of the Russian Federation;
- Permanent residence in Russia's Arctic regions. Payments should be provided only to those who have permanently resided in the Arctic regions for at least a certain period (e.g., two years). Recipients of the universal social payment must be registered as residents in one of the Russia's Arctic regions and undergo quarterly verification of their actual residence at their registered place of residence. Recipients, who move from one Arctic region to another, as well as students and military personnel stationed in other regions for duty or training but permanently registered in Russia's Arctic regions, cannot be excluded from the universal social payment program;
- Education of children in schools at their place of registration in the Arctic regions of Russia. If a child is studying in another region for objective reasons (for example, the lack of a specialized school in the Arctic), payments may be retained upon provision of supporting documents;
- Annual medical examination. Recipients of the USP must undergo an annual medical examination at local medical facilities. This ensures public health monitoring and disease prevention in the Arctic regions of Russia. However, for residents of remote settlements without medical facilities, alternative measures (for example, mobile medical teams) may be provided;
- Participation in professional retraining programs. Unemployed recipients of the USP must participate in professional retraining programs offered by the employment service with the aim of reducing unemployment and improving the skills of the population. This requirement may not apply to pensioners and individuals with disabilities;
- Participation in socially beneficial activities. Unemployed recipients of the USP must participate (e.g., 40 hours per year) in community service activities (e.g., volunteer programs or community service events). This condition may not apply to pensioners, individuals with disabilities, and other categories unable to participate in such activities.

Recipients are required to provide documents confirming they have met the USP eligibility requirements (e.g., school certificates, medical reports) one month prior to the next annual

payment. Failure to meet any of these requirements disqualifies them from receiving the USP for the calendar year.

Furthermore, USP payment is excluded if the recipient commits a criminal offense. Resumption of payments is possible only after the criminal record is expunged or expunged. Payments are also terminated in the event of repeated administrative offenses related to the sale and use of alcohol and drugs (e.g., appearing in public places while intoxicated, driving while intoxicated, or using drugs without a doctor's prescription). If a recipient of the universal social payment is undergoing treatment for alcohol or drug addiction, payments may be temporarily suspended, but not terminated.

To implement the USP program, it is necessary to create a unified database of recipients, which will be integrated with other government systems (the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, and Gosuslugi) to prevent excessive use; regularly publish reports on the distribution of funds and the use of the Arctic Development Fund; and include local community representatives in the fund's supervisory boards.

Implementing the universal social payment program as an effective mechanism for redistributing funds received from Arctic mineral extraction and the development of the Northern Sea Route could become a powerful tool for social support for those living and working in Russia's Arctic regions and stimulating the development of these territories. It will also lay the foundation for creating conditions for the retention of the population, including young people and families with children. It will contribute to improving the standard of living of the population and reducing the outflow of population from the Arctic; it will encourage socially significant behavior (education, health, work); and it will reduce the level of crime, alcoholism, and drug abuse among the population.

It is important to note that the USP program is intended not to replace, but rather to complement existing targeted social support measures in Russia's Arctic regions. The universal nature of this payment will create a new incentive to attract and retain specialists and their families in Russia's Arctic regions without affecting other socio-economic and legal guarantees. This approach should confirm the social orientation of the Russian state and demonstrate that basic income can be used not only "to replace existing systems of state social guarantees and targeted social support, but also to shift the costs of education and healthcare onto citizens" [31, Bobkov V.N., p. 21].

Conclusion

Basic income, initially a utopian idea, has come to be seen as a possible alternative or supplement to traditional social support measures. However, experiments with its implementation have revealed practical difficulties associated with economic constraints: a lack of funds for payments to all citizens and their small size, which prevents them from being considered truly basic. Nevertheless, the impact of such payments on the well-being of citizens is assessed positively.

An example of the successful application of such a model is the annual payments from the Alaska Permanent Fund, which residents of the region receive from revenues from natural resource extraction. For Russia, especially for the resource-rich Arctic regions, the implementation of a similar mechanism could become an effective tool for social support. Such payments could contribute to the retention of the population, including young people and families, improve living standards, reduce the outflow of people from these areas, and also stimulate socially significant behavior (education, health, work) and reduce the level of crime and addiction [32, Wijngaarde I., Vinanchiarachi J., Readman J., p. 112]. Overall, the introduction of a basic income in the form of a universal social payment could be an important step in the development of Russia's Arctic regions and the improvement of their socio-demographic indicators.

The fundamental aspects of the universal social payment program and the legal conditions for receiving such a payment highlighted in the study require further discussion and interdisciplinary substantiation in academic circles.

References

1. Baklanov P.Ya., Moshkov A.V. Spatial Differentiation of the Economic Structure of the Russian Regions of the Arctic Zone. *R-Economy*. 2015; 1: 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.15826/RECON.2015.1.005>
2. Shaparov A.E., Sokolova F.K., Magomedov A.K., Bhagwat J.V. Population Migration in the Supporting Regions of the Russian Arctic to Improve International Competitiveness of the Northern Sea Route. *Polar Record*. 2022; 58 (4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247421000711>
3. Simonchuk V.D., Nikulina A.Yu. Norway's Experience in Attracting Human Resources to the Arctic Region. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. 2020; 554: 012006. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/554/1/012006>
4. Novikov D.A. The Concept of an Universal Basic Income in Research Discourse: Implications for Labor and Social Law. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*. 2022; 9 (2): 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.13187/zhmnp.2022.9.95>
5. More T. *Utopia*. Moscow, Nauka Publ.; 1978. 416 p. (In Russ.)
6. Condorcet J.A.N.C. *Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique des Progres de L'Esprit Humain, Suive de Reflexions Sur L'Esclavage des Negres*. Paris, Massonetfils; 1822.
7. Bellamy E. *Looking Backward, 2000–1887*. Oxford, Oxford University Press; 2007. 256 p.
8. Scherer R. Industry, Labor, and Joy. Quick Graftings on the False Industry. *Charles Fourier*. 2017; 28: 7–15.
9. Charlier J. *Solution du Probleme Social ou Constitution Humanitaire, Baseesur la Loinaturelleetprecedee de L'Expose de Motifs*. Bruxelles, ImprGreuse; 1848. 100 p.
10. Van Parijs P., Vanderborght Y. *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press; 2017. 400 p.
11. Paine T. Agrarian Justice. In: *The Origins of Universal Grants*. London, Palgrave Macmillan; 2004. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230522824_1
12. Douglas C.H. *Social Credit*. London, Isha Books; 2013. 51 p.
13. Robinson J. *The Economics of Imperfect Competition*. London, Palgrave Macmillan; 1969. 352 p.
14. Theobald R. *The Guaranteed Income: Next Step in Economic Evolution?* New York, Anchor; 1967. 237 p.
15. Standing G. *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen*. London, Pelican; 2017. 320 p.
16. Bobkov V.N., Dolgushkin N.K., Odintsova Y.V. Universal Basic Income: Reflections on the Possible Impact on Improving the Living Standards and Quality of Life and the Sustainability of Society. *Living Standard of the Population in the Regions of Russia*. 2019; 15 (3): 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.24411/1999-9836-2019-10069>

17. Kislitsyna O.A. Introduction of the Unconditional Basic Income System: What Do Russians Think about It? Who Is for, Who Is against? *The Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. 2019; 3: 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.24411/2073-6487-2019-10030>
18. Kapeliushnikov R.I. Universal Basic Income: Does It Have a Future? *Voprosy Ekonomiki*. 2020; 8: 95–127. <https://doi.org/10.32609/0042-8736-2020-8-95-127>
19. Zelleke A. Basic Income and the Alaska Model: Limits of the Resource Dividend Model for the Implementation of an Unconditional Basic Income. In: *Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend. Exploring the Basic Income Guarantee*. Ed. by K. Widerquist, M.W. Howard. New York, Palgrave Macmillan; 2012: 141–155. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137015020_10
20. Berman M. Resource Rents, Universal Basic Income, and Poverty among Alaska's Indigenous Peoples. *World Development*. 2018; 106: 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2018.01.014>
21. Hoynes H., Rothstein J. Universal Basic Income in the United States and Advanced Countries. *Annual Review of Economics*. 2019; 11: 929–958. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030237>
22. Feinberg R., Kuehn D. Does a Guaranteed Basic Income Encourage Entrepreneurship? Evidence from Alaska. *Review of Industrial Organization*. 2020; 57: 607–626. <https://doi.org/10.17606/A4RX-HP30>
23. O'Brien P., Olson D. The Alaska Permanent Fund and Dividend Distribution Program. *Public Finance Quarterly*. 1990; 18 (2): 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109114219001800201>
24. Jones D., Marinescu I. The Labor Market Impacts of Universal and Permanent Cash Transfers: Evidence from the Alaska Permanent Fund. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*. 2022; 14 (2): 315–340. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20190299>
25. Yonzan N., Timilsina L., Kelly I. Economic Incentives Surrounding Fertility: Evidence from Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend. *Economics & Human Biology*. 2024; 52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2023.101334>
26. Cowan S., Douds K. Examining the Effects of a Universal Cash Transfer on Fertility. *Social Forces*. 2022; 101 (2): 1003–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soac013>
27. Berman M. A Rising Tide that Lifts All Boats: Long-Term Effects of the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend on Poverty. *Poverty & Public Policy*. 2024; 16: 126–145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pop4.398>
28. Dorsett R. A Bayesian Structural Time Series Analysis of the Effect of Basic Income on Crime: Evidence from the Alaska Permanent Fund. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*. 2020; 184: 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12619>
29. Bobkov V.N., Zolotov A.V., Odintsova E.V. Transitional Forms of Universal Basic Income as a Real Prospect for Russia. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*. 2021; 14 (4): 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.15838/esc.2021.4.76.2>
30. Odintsova E.V., Chernykh E.A., Chashchina T.V. Practical Aspects of the Introduction of an Unconditional Basic Income and Its Impact on Employment: Assessments of Experts and Target Categories of the Population. *Labour and Social Relations Journal*. 2022; 33 (5): 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.20410/2073-7815-2022-33-5-19-36>
31. Bobkov V.N. The Basic Income Paradigm and Its Impact on Human Development Opportunities. *Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*. 2023; 14 (4): 18–37. <https://doi.org/10.19181/vis.2023.14.4.2>
32. Wijngaarde I., Vinanchiarachi J., Readman J. Universal Basic Income (UBI) for Reducing Inequalities and Increasing Socio-Economic Inclusion: A Proposal for a New Sustained Policy Perspective. In: *Crime Prevention and Justice in 2030*. Ed. by H. Kury, S. Redo. Springer, Cham.; 2021: 107–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56227-4_6

*The article was submitted 28.01.2025; approved after reviewing 08.02.2025;
accepted for publication 28.02.2025*

The author declares no conflicts of interests