Indigenous Knowledge Under Siege: Epistemic Closure and the Transformation of Scholarship on Indigenous Peoples in Russia

Liubov Sulyandziga

This article examines how the institutional transformation of Indigenous governance in Russia has reshaped the production of scholarly knowledge about Indigenous peoples. Drawing on legal and institutional analysis alongside a corpus study of Russian-language publications on Indigenous rights, self-governance, and state–Indigenous relations published between 2015 and 2026, it finds that scholarship on Indigenous peoples remains quantitatively productive while progressively losing its capacity to function as a space for independent, rights-based, and politically critical inquiry. To explain this transformation, the article introduces the concepts of epistemic capture and epistemic closure. It argues that legal restrictions on international cooperation, the foreign-agent regime, the restructuring of representative institutions, the securitization of research, and the erosion of the independent scholarly community have created a mutually reinforcing system that narrows the range of permissible inquiry without requiring overt censorship. The field therefore remains institutionally active while becoming epistemically closed. What persists is a managed form of academic research on Indigenous peoples operating largely within state-defined categories of sustainable development, cultural preservation, and partnership, while questions concerning political agency, dispossession, and the legitimacy of contemporary governance arrangements become progressively more difficult to investigate. More broadly, the Russian case demonstrates how authoritarian governance can transform academic research not by suppressing knowledge production, but by reorganizing the institutional conditions under which knowledge itself becomes possible. Its long-term consequence is not only the marginalization of Indigenous voices, but the gradual erosion of scholarship's capacity to recognize, describe, and understand the political realities shaping Indigenous life.

Introduction

In December 2025, Russian authorities arrested at least seventeen Indigenous activists from across the Russian North, Siberia, and the Far East on charges related to extremism and terrorism (ADC Memorial, 2025). Among those detained were former leaders, employees, and long-time associates of Indigenous organizations. The arrests constituted one of the largest coordinated actions against Indigenous activists in post-Soviet Russia. Yet the episode generated remarkably little public

Liubov Sulyandziga, PhD, Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, Harvard University

discussion, either domestically or internationally. The silence of state institutions was unsurprising; the more revealing silence came from RAIPON, the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, the country's most prominent Indigenous organization and its officially recognized representative in international forums. Rather than defending those arrested or raising concerns about the implications of the case for Indigenous communities, RAIPON ultimately aligned itself with the state's position (Novyukhov, 2026). For decades, the organization occupied a position that was simultaneously political, institutional, and epistemic. It functioned not only as a representative organization but also as a bridge connecting Indigenous communities, advocacy networks, scholars, and international institutions. When organizations such as RAIPON cease to function as independent intermediaries, the consequences extend beyond political representation. They affect the production of knowledge itself.

The arrests attracted little attention not only from representative institutions but also from the academic field devoted to studying Indigenous Peoples. At the moment when Indigenous activists faced unprecedented political pressure, Russian scholarship on Indigenous peoples remained overwhelmingly focused on legal frameworks, cultural preservation, traditional livelihoods, and administrative support mechanisms. Questions concerning shrinking civic space, political repression, institutional capture, and the changing conditions under which Indigenous organizations operate remained remarkably marginal.

Rather than asking why some of the most consequential developments affecting Indigenous peoples disappear from scholarship precisely when they become most politically significant—a question whose immediate explanation lies in the realities of authoritarian repression—this article turns to a more fundamental question: *Can a scholarly field remain alive while becoming progressively less capable of seeing certain realities?*

The question has acquired particular urgency in the aftermath of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. The war accelerated a broader transformation that had been unfolding for more than a decade. International collaboration became increasingly securitized (Douglass & Chirikov 2022; Cornwall, 2022). Independent Indigenous organizations were liquidated, marginalized, or forced into exile (ADC Memorial, 2025). Scholars working on politically sensitive subjects faced increasing professional and legal risks (Chankseliani & Belkina, 2024). New regulations governing international scientific cooperation, the expansion of foreign-agent and undesirable-organization legislation, and increasing restrictions on access to information collectively reshaped the conditions of knowledge production (Matthews, 2023; Kozmenko, 2025). The cumulative effect has been the narrowing of the intellectual space within which independent research can be conducted, constraining the range of questions scholars can ask, the methods they can employ, and the conclusions they can publicly articulate.

These developments have had especially profound implications for the country's Indigenous academic landscape. Much of the infrastructure supporting research on Indigenous rights emerged through a fragile but productive ecosystem uniting Indigenous organizations, community networks, research institutes, and international partners. These relationships enabled interdisciplinary research, facilitated the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives in scholarly inquiry, and provided institutional space for examining conflicts surrounding rights, governance, land use, and development. Over the past decade, however, this ecosystem has undergone profound change.

The present analysis focuses primarily on scholarship concerning the peoples officially designated as Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation (*korennye malochislennye narody*). This administrative category, which limits recognition to peoples numbering fewer than 50,000 and incorporates criteria concerning traditional livelihoods and territories, does not encompass the full diversity of Indigenous peoples in Russia. Its origins and limitations have been extensively examined in scholarship on Soviet and post-Soviet nationality policies (Slezkine, 1994; Sokolovskii, 2005; Donahoe et al., 2008). The article therefore treats this classification not as an exhaustive definition of Indigeneity, but as a state-produced category whose own epistemic effects—who is made legible, what counts as traditional, and which claims become administratively relevant—must be kept in view. Throughout the analysis, the use of this category is understood as both an object of study and a structuring condition of the knowledge that is produced about it.

A related distinction concerns the meaning of Indigenous scholarship. This article examines Russian-language academic scholarship on Indigenous peoples, rather than Indigenous intellectual traditions or Indigenous-led knowledge production as such. The object of this analysis is therefore the academic production of knowledge on Indigenous peoples within Russian scholarly institutions and publishing networks, with particular attention to the analytical categories, research priorities, and forms of authority through which Indigenous realities are represented.

Within this scope, the article argues that contemporary Russian scholarship on Indigenous peoples increasingly exhibits a condition of epistemic closure. Epistemic closure does not imply the disappearance of scholarship. Nor does it require direct censorship of every politically sensitive topic. Rather, it emerges when the institutional, legal, financial, and relational conditions necessary for critical inquiry are progressively dismantled. Under such conditions, research continues, yet the scope of realities that can be meaningfully investigated gradually contracts. The central analytical question is therefore not whether Indigenous peoples remain visible in academia but how they are made visible, through which analytical categories, and at the expense of which alternative understandings. *Why has Indigenous scholarship in Russia become a site of epistemic closure?*

To answer this question, the article adopts a multi-method approach combining analysis of legal and institutional change with bibliometric and qualitative analysis of academic publications. It traces changes in research priorities across a period marked first by the consolidation of a state-centered model of Indigenous governance and later by the wartime securitization of Russian academic life. This approach allows the article to move beyond the question of what Indigenous scholarship studies to examine how the institutional environment progressively reshapes the boundaries of what can be investigated, debated, and ultimately known. The article therefore has two aims: first, to examine how Indigenous peoples are imagined, studied, and governed within Russian academic discourse; and second, to demonstrate how, under authoritarian conditions, certain forms of knowledge become structurally difficult to produce.

Theoretical Framework: knowledge regimes and decolonial critique

The article situates the transformation of Indigenous scholarship in Russia within broader theoretical debates on power, knowledge, and exclusion. Together, this literature provides a framework for understanding how scholarly knowledge on Indigenous peoples is embedded within broader systems of governance. The article asks how certain forms of Indigenous scholarship

become institutionally rewarded, visible, authoritative and reproducible, while others become marginalized.

Michel Foucault's concept of power–knowledge *(pouvoir-savoir)* nexus provides the starting point. For Foucault, knowledge is never independent of political authority. Knowledge systems are not merely constrained by power but produced within, and productive of, relations of domination (Foucault, 1977). Every society generates its own "regime of truth": a configuration of institutions, discourses, practices, and authorities that determine what can be accepted as true, which forms of expertise are legitimate, and who is authorized to speak. Campbell and Pedersen's concept of knowledge regimes helps explain how this process is institutionally organized. Knowledge regimes consist of the organizational and institutional arrangements through which societies produce policy-relevant knowledge, including universities, research institutes, expert networks, think tanks, funding systems, and policy institutions (Campbell & Pedersen, 2014). In authoritarian contexts, the production of knowledge increasingly becomes organized around state-approved priorities, while knowledge regimes become instruments of hierarchical control rather than independent pluralistic inquiry. Together, these approaches direct attention beyond the content of scholarship itself and toward the institutional conditions under which the boundaries of legitimate knowledge are defined.

Similarly, decolonial and Indigenous scholars have long argued that knowledge production is inseparable from questions of power, authority, and representation. Linda Tuhiwai Smith's critique of research as an imperial project and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's emphasis on the relational and land-based nature of Indigenous knowledge challenge the assumption that dominant institutions occupy a neutral position from which Indigenous realities can be objectively described (Smith, 2012; Simpson, 2017). Instead, they show how research has often functioned as a mechanism through which Indigenous peoples remain obscured within dominant state-centered frameworks of analysis. Aileen Moreton-Robinson further conceptualizes this dynamic through the notion of settler ignorance—the structural inability or unwillingness of dominant institutions to recognize Indigenous sovereignty, authority, and political agency (Moreton-Robinson, 2015). Under such conditions, Indigenous Peoples remain visible within official narratives and academic discourse, yet the political foundations of Indigenous self-determination become difficult to legitimize. Similarly, Madina Tlostanova's work on the coloniality of knowledge is particularly useful in the Russian and post-Soviet context because it reveals a dual dynamic: Russian academia occupies a peripheral position within global knowledge hierarchies while simultaneously functioning as a colonizing center in relation to Indigenous Peoples and minority populations within its own territorial space (Tlostanova, 2015).

Broader debates on epistemic oppression, epistemicide, and epistemic violence deepen this analysis. Kristie Dotson's theory of epistemic oppression shows how exclusion can operate through the structure of knowledge production itself, especially when dominant epistemic systems lack the resources to recognize alternative forms of knowledge (Dotson, 2014). Boaventura de Sousa Santos's concept of epistemicide highlights the destruction or systematic devaluation of alternative ways of knowing (Santos, 2014). Gayatri Spivak's notion of epistemic violence draws attention to the ways dominant systems of representation translate, reinterpret, and ultimately overwrite subaltern realities while claiming to speak on their behalf (Spivak, 1988).

Yet the Russian case reveals a phenomenon that cannot be fully explained by exclusion or epistemic violence alone. The central issue is not only whose knowledge is recognized, but how the conditions necessary for producing alternative forms of knowledge are progressively dismantled. The problem extends beyond representation to the transformation of the epistemic infrastructures of knowledge production. To capture these dynamics, the article introduces the concepts of epistemic capture and epistemic closure. These concepts shift attention from representation and marginalization of Indigenous knowledge alone to the broader infrastructures through which knowledge is validated. Epistemic capture describes the process through which institutions, networks, resources, forms of expertise, and knowledge-producing systems become progressively incorporated into state-defined frameworks. The transformation of Indigenous representative institutions becomes relevant to this process insofar as it changes the relationships through which Indigenous perspectives, community knowledge, and alternative political interpretations enter academic inquiry. Epistemic closure, by contrast, refers to the gradual narrowing of the intellectual field itself. Rather than requiring direct prohibition, closure emerges when the conditions necessary for investigating certain topics are weakened, making some forms of inquiry easier to analyze, publish, and fund, while others become progressively more risky, or analytically unintelligible. Taken together, these concepts provide a framework for understanding how scholarly fields can remain productive and institutionally vibrant while becoming progressively less capable of recognizing and contesting particular dimensions of political reality.

Methodology

This article employs a qualitative research design combining policy analysis, institutional analysis, corpus analysis of academic publications and review of secondary scholarship on Russian research governance. The objective is to examine how changes in the political and institutional environment of post-2022 Russia have reshaped the boundaries of legitimate inquiry and altered what can be publicly debated about Indigenous Peoples in Russia and contributed to processes conceptualized here as epistemic capture and epistemic closure.

The analysis draws on four sources of evidence. First, the article examines the evolving legal and regulatory framework governing scientific research, international cooperation, and civil society in Russia. Particular attention is given to measures introduced or expanded after 2022 that affect research funding, international partnerships, access to data, and academic autonomy. The Soviet and early post-Soviet periods provide historical context and serve to contextualize the development of research institutions and Indigenous political participation, but they are not part of the systematic publication comparison. Second, the article examines the institutional landscape through which Indigenous scholarship is produced. This includes Indigenous representative organizations, research institutions, state agencies, and international research networks. Third, the article analyzes a corpus of academic publications addressing Indigenous rights, self-governance, state–Indigenous relations in Russia. Publications were identified through the Russian Scientific Electronic Library (eLIBRARY.RU), the largest bibliographic database of Russian-language scholarly publications and the principal repository for academic journals in the Russian Federation. The database is particularly well suited for examining changes within the academic field itself. The empirical analysis compares two periods, 2015–2020 and 2021–2026, tracing shifts in research questions, analytical terminology, and the framing of Indigenous political agency. The first period captures the consolidation of this institutional order before Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine.

The second encompasses the subsequent acceleration of authoritarian and wartime restrictions. The comparison does not assume that 2021 marked an immediate break in scholarly production, nor does it treat the two periods as representing an autonomous field before and after its capture. Rather, it examines how research priorities, scholarly language, and forms of publication evolved within an already constrained institutional environment. The corpus encompasses publications by Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers, whose contributions are examined in relation to their research content. Fourth, the article draws on secondary academic literature, policy reports, and academic-freedom monitoring initiatives addressing transformations in Russian research governance, international scientific collaboration, and academic mobility. These materials provide broader context for understanding changes affecting the institutional environment of Indigenous scholarship and situate developments in Indigenous studies within wider transformations occurring across the Russian academic sector.

Historical Context: State Ethnography and the Limits of the Post-Soviet Opening

Soviet ethnography: institutional capacity and state authority

The following section provides historical context for the institutional environment in which research on Indigenous peoples developed. It is not intended as a systematic comparison with the 2015–2026 corpus, but as an account of the longer trajectory of state ethnography and the incomplete institutionalization of rights-oriented research after 1991.

Contemporary scholarship on the Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East took shape within the institutional framework of the Soviet state. The field was anchored in a robust school of Soviet ethnography that transformed the study of Indigenous Peoples from a largely descriptive pursuit focused on documenting cultural difference into a comprehensive state-supported scientific discipline (Oktyabrskaya & Romanova, 2020). It possessed a level of institutional density, state-backed funding, empirical capacity and scientific authority that distinguished it from both the fragmented post-Soviet landscape and the more tightly managed scholarship of the 2020s.

Major research institutions—including the country's principal research body, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology named after N.N. Miklukho-Maklay of the Russian Academy of Sciences (the direct successor of the Soviet Institute of Ethnography), Institute for Humanitarian Research and North Indigenous Peoples Problems of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Yakutsk, the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography in Novosibirsk and major regional academic centers in the Russian Far East —were either established or consolidated during this period. These institutions also generated successive generations of specialists, creating professional communities devoted to the study of Indigenous societies. In particular, the Institute for Humanitarian Research and Indigenous Peoples Problems of the North in Yakutsk played a distinctive role in bridging academic research and practical policy development. Led for many years by scholars including Vasiliy Robbek, the institute became one of the few research centers dedicated specifically to Indigenous Peoples, producing research and policy recommendations on Indigenous rights, education, traditional livelihoods, and socio-economic development. The Institute of the Peoples of the North, founded in 1930 and still operating within Herzen State

Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg, remains one of the most important centers for the training of specialists in Indigenous languages, education, and culture.

The Soviet period established many of the legal, institutional, theoretical, linguistic, and administrative foundations upon which Russian Indigenous academia stands today, and also produced a generation of scholarly figures whose knowledge still constitutes the baseline for contemporary research. Through extensive field expeditions (measured not in months but in years), household surveys, linguistic documentation, and ethnographic observation, scholars such as Boris Dolgikh, Ivan Gurvich, and Zoya Sokolova documented Indigenous languages, customary institutions, settlement patterns, oral traditions, and systems of traditional resource use at a scale and depth that has rarely been replicated since (Dolgikh, 1960; Gurvich, 1982; Sokolova, 1983). While ethnographers could not openly challenge the political foundations of the Soviet system, their expertise informed administrative decision-making and, in some cases, contributed to adjustments in economic and development plans (see also Dolgikh's participation in interdepartmental commissions under Gosplan structures).

However, this institutional authority was never autonomous, and was inseparable from a paternalistic model in which non-Indigenous specialists were positioned as interpreters of Indigenous interests. Ethnographic work was carried out within the ideological constraints of Soviet nationality policy and evolutionary understandings of social progress that placed small-numbered peoples as "backward" and in need of state guidance.

The same ethnographic practices that generated detailed empirical knowledge also contributed to the administrative classification of Indigenous peoples according to numerical size and traditional economic activity—criteria that would later be codified in the legal category of "коренные малочисленные народы" (Indigenous small-numbered peoples).[1] Soviet ethnography thus produced both a substantial body of documented knowledge that laid the foundation for subsequent research into the cultural, linguistic, and other less politically contentious dimensions of Indigenous life, and the classificatory frameworks through which Indigenous Peoples were rendered legible to the state as objects of protection, modernization, and control.

The Post-Soviet opening and its institutional limits: the transformation of Indigenous scholarship after 1991

The collapse of the USSR created a brief but significant period of intellectual and political opening that allowed the institutional inheritance of Soviet scholarship to be redirected toward new analytical questions. Soviet empirical traditions were increasingly combined with comparative perspectives drawn from global Indigenous studies, creating the conditions for the emergence of a more critical field. During the 1990s and early 2000s scholars gained the ability to revisit subjects previously considered politically sensitive, including forced sedentarization, boarding school

[1] many of the criteria used to define Indigenous small-numbered peoples traces its origins to classifications developed by ethnographers associated with the Committee of the North during the 1920s (State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, 1996).The Soviet ethnographers established the core markers—limited population size, maintenance of traditional economic activities, and persistence of distinct self-consciousness—that still govern recognition and associated rights today. The numerical threshold of 50,000, still used to distinguish small-numbered peoples from larger peoples, originated in Soviet demographic calculations. Contemporary Russian legislation, including Federal Law No. 82-FZ "On Guarantees of the Rights of Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples of the Russian Federation," largely inherits these conceptual foundations.

systems, industrial displacement, environmental degradation, and the social consequences of resource extraction (Sokolova, 1994; Lyarskaya, 2003).

While scholars gained the right to address topics that had remained silent under Soviet rule, Indigenous Peoples themselves acquired political subjectivity. The emergence of Russian Association of Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East (RAIPON) in 1990 as an independent political force under Indigenous leadership and Indigenous political organization capable of participating directly in public debate became one of the defining developments of the period (IWGIA, 2010; Fondahl, & Poelzer, 2003). For the first time since the Soviet era, Indigenous leaders possessed an institutional platform through which they could articulate collective interests domestically and internationally.

International collaboration expanded rapidly. Russian scholars became increasingly connected to Arctic and global Indigenous networks, introducing concepts of human rights and environmental justice into Russian discourse. As international Indigenous rights norms were entering Russian policy debates, the field broadened beyond cultural documentation to include questions of rights, representation, self-governance, and Indigenous participation in decision-making. Indigenous peoples increasingly appeared not merely as objects of study but as political actors whose claims could shape both scholarly inquiry and public policy. As new forms of interaction emerged between researchers, Indigenous organizations, legal experts, and policy practitioners, ethnographers allied with activists. For a brief moment, scholarship acquired some of the characteristics of a vibrant, critical, and internationally engaged field (Pika et al., 1996; Indigenous Peoples of the World – Living Arctic, 1999; RAIPON, 1997).

The relationship between Indigenous political mobilization and knowledge production was particularly visible in the transnational institutional partnerships that emerged during this period. Through the Institution-Building for Northern Russian Indigenous Peoples Project (INRIPP), implemented in cooperation between the Inuit Circumpolar Council Canada, RAIPON, and Canadian and Russian governmental institutions, Indigenous representatives gained access to international training, institutional exchanges, and comparative expertise in Indigenous governance, land rights, and resource co-management. One important outcome was the establishment in 2001 of the Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North/Russian Indigenous Training Centre (CSIPN/RITC), which subsequently developed educational programmes and analytical publications on Indigenous self-governance, land rights, and participation in decision-making. In 2005, CSIPN joined the University of the Arctic, creating a formal connection between Indigenous-led expertise and an international network of universities and research institutions. These initiatives illustrate how important forms of Indigenous knowledge production, including research-related activities and the development of expertise on Indigenous rights and governance, emerged through collaborative institutions operating partly outside conventional academic structures (World Bank, 2014; University of the Arctic, 2005).

The post-Soviet opening should not, however, be equated with the degree of convergence between Indigenous political mobilization and Indigenous scholarship that emerged in many settler democracies. In Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and increasingly the Nordic countries, political mobilization produced new academic spaces, and those academic spaces in turn strengthened Indigenous movement. As a result, Indigenous advocacy and Indigenous scholarship evolved together, creating mutually reinforcing intellectual and political spaces. In Russia, rather than

converging, Indigenous mobilization and academic knowledge production evolved along largely separate institutional trajectories. Institutions such as CSIPN demonstrated the potential for Indigenous organizations to become active producers of knowledge and to connect Indigenous communities with scholarly networks. Yet these developments did not translate into an autonomous academic infrastructure capable of sustaining Indigenous-led research independently of the organizations and partnerships through which it had emerged. While universities and research institutes remained dominated by ethnographers, legal scholars, and state-centered research traditions, much of the most innovative Indigenous intellectual and political work emerged through Indigenous associations, international networks, policy initiatives, and community-based advocacy. As a result, the post-Soviet period produced an important Indigenous political awakening without generating a consolidated Indigenous studies field with dedicated departments, methodologies, and Indigenous-led research traditions. Then, when civic space narrowed after 2013, Indigenous advocacy institutions came under increasing pressure. Because an autonomous scholarly discipline had never fully consolidated inside universities, there was no strong academic infrastructure capable of carrying those debates forward. The result was a structural divergence that left Indigenous scholarship particularly vulnerable when political conditions deteriorated. Though Post-Soviet transformation remained incomplete, it represented the closest approximation to an independent scholarly tradition on Indigenous Peoples that Russia had experienced.

By the early 2010s, broader processes of political centralization began reshaping Russian civil society, academia, and Indigenous governance. The transformation of RAIPON from an independent advocacy body into a structure closely aligned with state and corporate interests in 2013 became one of the clearest manifestations of this shift (IWGIA, 2013). From that moment, the independent voice of Indigenous Peoples was eliminated, and critical inquiry fell with it. As its autonomy narrowed, so too did one of the principal channels through which alternative Indigenous perspectives entered academic and policy debates. RAIPON's transformation marked a decisive turning point in the progressive dismantling of the institutional foundations necessary to sustain critical scholarship on Indigenous Peoples in Russia. What followed was not merely a return to Soviet-style constraints but a more thorough subordination of knowledge production to immediate political demands.

The transformation of Indigenous scholarship unfolded within a much broader restructuring of Russian education and scientific research. Beginning in the early 2010s, universities experienced increasing administrative centralization, declining institutional autonomy, and growing state oversight (Dubrovskiy, 2025). Increasingly, academic careers became dependent on state priorities and institutional conformity, while the space for independent scholarship narrowed (Douglass & Chirikov 2022; Matveev & Roshchin, 2025). These trends accelerated dramatically following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. International research partnerships with Western institutions were suspended or terminated, while many of the scholars who had built these collaborations were dismissed (Cornwall, 2022; Kozmenko, 2025). Across disciplines, research agendas became progressively evaluated through the lenses of national security and sovereignty.

The history of Indigenous scholarship in Russia is therefore best understood not as a simple progression from repression to freedom or from stagnation to growth. The development of academic research on Indigenous Peoples reveals a persistent tension between substantial

institutional and empirical capacity and limited independence from state-defined research priorities. Soviet ethnography established enduring research infrastructures while contributing to the administrative classification and governance of Indigenous populations. The post-Soviet years briefly allowed this inheritance to be turned toward critical and independent ends, but institutional foundations for autonomous Indigenous studies field remained fragile. By 2015, scholarly knowledge production was already situated within institutions shaped by a long history of state involvement; what followed was not simply a continuation of earlier patterns of state oversight, but a more restrictive and coercive configuration of the relationship between scholarly knowledge, Indigenous politics, and state power.

Structuring of epistemic closure in Indigenous scholarship

The concepts of epistemic capture and epistemic closure become analytically meaningful only when connected to the concrete mechanisms through which they operate. Epistemic capture represents the intermediate stage between political control and epistemic closure. It is produced through a cumulative interaction of legal restrictions, institutional capture, relational isolation, and the erosion of the epistemic community itself. These mechanisms operate at different levels of the knowledge-production system, yet they reinforce one another in ways that progressively narrow the range of subjects researchers can safely investigate and the types of evidence they can access without professional or legal risk. Epistemic closure emerges when this process advances far enough that alternative forms of inquiry become increasingly difficult to imagine, pursue, and sustain.

Legal-securitization mechanisms

The first mechanism operates through the securitization of research itself. Since the early 2010s—and with particular intensity after 2022—the Russian state has constructed an extensive legal architecture regulating international cooperation, foreign funding, and politically sensitive forms of inquiry, successfully transforming the conditions under which Indigenous research can be conducted.

The Foreign Agent Law and the Undesirable Organizations Law have been central to this process. The Foreign Agent Law, first adopted in 2012 and continuously expanded thereafter, subjects any organization or individual receiving broadly defined forms of foreign support while engaging in activities interpreted as "political"—a category expansive enough to encompass research on rights implementation, land governance, extractive impacts, or self-determination—to extensive reporting requirements, public labeling obligations, and heightened state scrutiny (Federal Law No. 121-FZ, 2012). Any Indigenous organization or scholar maintaining regular contact with international networks, risks designation. The 2015 Undesirable Organizations Law compounds the pressure by criminalizing cooperation with designated foreign entities (Federal Law No. 129-FZ, 2015). Indigenous organizations, environmental groups, human-rights networks, academic exchange programs, and foreign universities increasingly become legally risky partners. These developments were significantly reinforced by Government Decree No. 1894 of 27 November 2025, which introduced mandatory coordination with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the Federal Security Service for scientific activities involving foreign participation

in designated areas of scientific activity (Government Decree No. 1894, 2025).[2] By transforming international scientific cooperation into a matter of security clearance, the decree converted what had previously been recommendatory notification procedures into a compulsory system of prior restraint with security-service veto power.[3] Together the laws have progressively dismantled the funding, partnership, and comparative infrastructures that once sustained rights-based critical analysis, comparative Indigenous research, fieldwork, and international scholarly exchange.

The laws do not simply slow international collaboration—they render it structurally precarious for any inquiry that touches the prohibited or heavily securitized domains and subject to layers of uncertainty, delay, and political review. Universities and research institutes pre-vet international cooperation, while researchers avoid projects that may trigger institutional scrutiny. Works involving Indigenous governance, extractive conflicts, or comparative Indigenous rights increasingly face obstacles at the proposal stage before research can even begin. For scholars operating from exile or within transnational research networks, the decree widens an already existing divide. It isolates Russian-based colleagues who might otherwise maintain critical dialogue, while reinforcing the structural advantage of captured institutions that have already aligned with state priorities. Independent and exile voices become increasingly framed as external actors, while state-approved representatives retain privileged access to international platforms.

Since 2022, the Russian government has also progressively reduced public access to a wide range of environmental, industrial, economic, and demographic data, while expanding the classification of information deemed sensitive for reasons of national security (Moscow Times, 2025). The result is not only a reduction in transparency but a narrowing of the empirical evidence upon which independent scholarship can be built.

The combined effect is a triple barrier: funding channels are closed by one set of laws, collaborative channels are closed by another, while growing controls over access important data erode the empirical foundations of independent research. As a result, Indigenous inquiry becomes increasingly difficult to defend. At the same time, these measures also protect the state's monopoly on the authoritative representation of Indigenous realities, ensuring that knowledge produced on small-numbered peoples and their territories serves the structures of administrative control.

Institutional capture and policy reorientation

While legal mechanisms make certain research legally risky, institutional mechanisms operate through the removal of autonomous institutions responsible for representing Indigenous interests, defining policy priorities, and producing authoritative knowledge.

The transformation of RAIPON provides one of the clearest illustrations of this process. During the 1990s and early 2000s, the organization functioned as an important representative organization

[2] The procedure imposes a mandatory 60-day review period; Under the rules approved by the decree, subjects of scientific activity must lodge information in the unified state information system. The Ministry transmits it to the FSB within five calendar days; the FSB then has sixty calendar days to decide on approval or refusal, after which the Ministry has another five days to register the outcome. Decisions, once granted, cover the entire duration of the scientific work. When foreign persons or entities are later brought into an ongoing project, fresh proposals for amendment must again traverse the same pipeline.

[3] The measure builds directly upon the February 2019 directive from the Russian Ministry of Science and Higher Education orders that first normalized the demand for prior notification of foreign meetings, post-meeting reports "certified by round seal," and restrictions on the technical means foreigners might employ inside Russian institutes. These were originally deemed "non-mandatory recommendations."

capable of articulating Indigenous concerns within both domestic and international arenas (IWGIA, 2010). The political crisis surrounding the organization in 2013 and its subsequent incorporation into state-led governance frameworks, transformed RAIPON from an independent platform for Indigenous political advocacy into an institution of managed representation (IWGIA, 2012, 2013; Cultural Survival, 2012; Arctida, 2024). The loss of RAIPON's independence did not simply change the organization's political orientation; it altered the epistemic infrastructure through which Indigenous realities became visible. Prior to 2013, RAIPON together with CSIPN functioned as intermediaries that connected researchers with community networks, facilitated access to localized information on land conflicts and rights implementation, and co-produced or commissioned analytical materials that circulated between advocacy and academic settings. After the reorganization of RAIPON and the closure or designation of independent organizations, these channels narrowed. Researchers lost regular access to interlocutors who were willing and able to speak about implementation failures, contested land use, or the political constraints on participation. In their place, state-aligned representative structures and corporate-supported initiatives offered more limited and filtered forms of engagement. The result was not only the disappearance of certain topics from the literature, but a contraction of the empirical and relational resources through which those topics could be investigated, narrowing the kinds of research that could be undertaken in partnership with the organization, the perspectives that could be amplified, and the voices that could enter academic and policy discussions.

The capture of representation was accompanied by a broader reorientation of policy discourse. This process is particularly visible in the activities of the Federal Agency for Nationalities Affairs (FADN), the primary federal coordinator for policy toward Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East. While legal mechanisms restrict independent inquiry, FADN increasingly fills the resulting space with a carefully curated discourse. This reorientation is reflected in the 2025 Concept of Sustainable Development of Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples until 2036. Developed by FADN in cooperation with RAIPON and the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Concept replaces the more detailed and rights-oriented structure of the 2009 framework with what officials describe as a "new approach": the unification of efforts by public authorities and civil society institutions within a broader language of partnership, development, and cultural preservation. Participation rights are narrowed, international Indigenous rights frameworks are subordinated to domestic legislation, and Indigenous self-definition is increasingly embedded within a state-defined framework.[4] The document further integrates references to "traditional Russian spiritual and moral values" and state cultural policy, subordinating Indigenous self-definition to a centralized ideological framework (Concept of Sustainable Development of Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples until 2036, 2025).

The same tendency is visible in state-supported research initiatives. Large-scale expeditions organized through federal universities and the Russian Academy of Sciences prioritize the

[4] The 2009 framework contained 10 detailed principles and set one integrated goal supported by seven specific, measurable tasks across three phased timelines with clear intermediate benchmarks. In contrast, the 2025 Concept reduces principles to six generalized statements, replaces tasks with six broad goals lacking any quantitative targets or timelines, eliminates phased implementation, and provides only vague qualitative indicators (e.g., "improvement of quality of life," "satisfaction with measures"). It subordinates international human rights standards by stating that rights are "defined by legislation of the Russian Federation" (para. 35(a)); participation rights are narrowed to decisions on resource development only, removing the earlier language of "necessity" and excluding areas such as education, healthcare, and cultural policy.

documentation of language, culture, folklore, and traditional ways of life. Projects such as "Чистая Арктика — Восток-77" ("Clean Arctic - East-77") and "Россия-360" ("Russia-360") are framed as the largest scientific efforts in the North, engaging Indigenous participants "in full accordance with the ethnological school founded by Nikolai Nikolaevich Miklukho-Maclay," while Indigenous participants themselves "recognize the necessity of a scientific approach to preserving their culture, traditional economy, and languages" (NazAccent, 2024, 2026). Parallel official statements from FADN declare the Russian model of relations with Indigenous peoples "one of the most effective and humane in the world," crediting the state with creating the legal, economic, and infrastructural base for cultural preservation, while positioning Indigenous Peoples as an integral part of Russia's multi-national unity (NazAccent, 2024, 2026).

Relational isolation and the collapse of knowledge networks

A third mechanism operates through the fragmentation of the transnational networks that historically sustained Indigenous academia. Since Indigenous rights scholarship is an inherently comparative field, its development has depended upon international conferences, academic exchange, collaborative fieldwork, transnational funding arrangements, and participation in broader research networks. These connections enabled Russian Indigenous experiences to be analyzed alongside those of Sámi, Inuit, First Nations, and other Indigenous Peoples, identifying alternative institutional arrangements, evaluating governance outcomes while providing access to alternative conceptual frameworks and research methodologies.

Since 2022, academic sanctions, visa restrictions, institutional self-censorship, security concerns surrounding foreign contacts have contributed to the rapid contraction of international research ties. Participation in major global research programs was suspended, cooperation agreements with foreign institutions were frozen, and growing legal and administrative scrutiny of foreign contacts increased the costs of cross-border research. At least 53 Russian scientific and educational organizations (including 17 universities such as MIPT/PhysTech, Bauman Moscow State Technical University, and others) were placed on Western sanctions lists (T-Invariant, 2026). International collaborations involving Russian researchers fell by approximately 34 percent, publications in international journals declined by nearly 20 percent, and conference papers with Russian-affiliated authors dropped by roughly 40 percent in 2022 alone (Kozmenko et al., 2025; Matthews, 2023).

Russian scholars working on Indigenous and Arctic topics largely vanished from major international venues such as the Arctic Council-related events and other circumpolar forums that had long connected Russian experiences to broader global Indigenous rights debates. The effective exclusion of Russian institutions from the University of the Arctic is particularly significant. For decades, the University of the Arctic served as one of the principal platforms connecting Russian scholars and experts with Arctic research communities through collaborative research, academic mobility, educational programs, governance initiatives, and joint knowledge production (University of the Arctic, 2022). The collapse of these connections removed one of the most important channels through which comparative perspectives entered Russian Indigenous scholarship. Traditional knowledge holders, already reduced in many projects to informants rather than co-producers of knowledge, find even that limited role further constrained. For Indigenous studies this has meant the effective closure of comparative work precisely at the moment when many of the challenges confronting Indigenous communities—resource extraction, climate change, militarization, and territorial governance—require transnational perspectives. The result has been

described as "Iron Curtain 2.0" in Arctic science, with significant gaps in shared data, access to circumpolar funding and expertise, and comparative analysis (Cornwall, 2022).

Erosion of the epistemic community

Epistemic closure is reinforced not only through institutions and regulations but also through the gradual disappearance of the people capable of sustaining critical inquiry and producing alternative forms of knowledge. This erosion is starkly illustrated by a substantial post-2022 outflow of scholars and researchers, particularly from the social sciences and humanities (Dubrovskiy, 2025). Motivated by political repression, foreign-agent designations, the criminalization of dissent, and growing restrictions on academic freedom, many researchers have left the country or withdrawn from politically sensitive fields (Matveev & Roshchin, 2025). At the same time, arrests and prosecutions of academics on charges related to treason, foreign contacts, or public criticism of state policies have intensified the climate of fear surrounding independent inquiry (Talanova, 2023). Together, these developments have depleted the community capable of producing critical scholarship while encouraging self-censorship among those who remain.[5] The generation of Soviet-trained "scholar-titans" that once anchored the field became politically constrained or increasingly limited to non-confrontational scholarship. Researchers who remain within Russia face a narrowing set of options: adapt their work to the new political environment and retreat into descriptive documentation that poses no challenge to administrative power, withdraw from public engagement, or cease functioning altogether.

The erosion of human capital is compounded by the dismantling of independent Indigenous civil-society structures that historically served as vital intermediaries between critical research and community engagement. The dissolution of CSIPN in November 2019 following a Ministry of Justice demand affected more than an advocacy organization: it removed the Russian legal structure of an institution that had facilitated the circulation of Indigenous expertise across community, academic, and international networks (Cultural Survival, 2019). The International Indigenous Fund for Development and Solidarity "Batani" was designated an "undesirable organization" and liquidated in Russia (OVD-Info, 2025). The Aborigen Forum network of Indigenous experts and activists from 14 regions was labeled an "extremist organization" in July 2024 and later added to the list of terrorist organizations (ADC Memorial, 2025).[6]

At the same time, replacement institutions have emerged. Structures such as the School of Indigenous Diplomacy and the Arctic development center Project Office for Arctic Development (PORA) increasingly occupy spaces once associated with independent Indigenous expertise. A joint initiative of FADN, Moscow State Institute of International Relations and RAIPON and supported by major extractive corporations, including Nornickel, School of Indigenous Diplomacy is a mechanism for training Indigenous representatives for international engagement, and illustrates the growing integration of Indigenous representation into state-managed frameworks (Arctida, 2025). Similar dynamics are visible in the activities of PORA, an organization established in 2017

[5] Estimates indicate that between several hundred and over 2,500 Russian scholars and researchers left the country following the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, with computer science, humanities, and social sciences particularly affected. Top institutions such as the Higher School of Economics recorded at least 160 departures, while St. Petersburg State University and the Skolkovo Institute also saw significant losses. Motivations included fear of prosecution for "discrediting the armed forces," foreign-agent designations, and the criminalization of dissent.

[6] The designation has been used to justify arrests, including that of Indigenous climate leader and human rights defender Daria Egereva, whose charges explicitly reference her association with both Aborigen Forum and CSIPN

that presents itself as an independent analytical center but maintains close institutional and financial ties with both FADN and Nornickel (PORA, n.d.). Through expert evaluations, PORA consistently supports development-oriented and partnership-based approaches to Indigenous issues including ethnological assessments framed as "scientific expertise" that serve primarily to demonstrate the compatibility of industrial projects with traditional ways of life, and legitimize these projects in Indigenous territories. Supported by state agencies, major corporations, or both, these organizations contribute to the expansion of a state- and corporate-connected ecosystem of policy expertise operating alongside established academic institutions. Their significance lies in the authority they acquire to produce expert assessments, define policy priorities, and frame Indigenous issues through approaches compatible with state governance and extractive development.

The consequences extend beyond the loss of individual researchers. The cumulative effect is the weakening of entire communities of interpretation. Independent scholars, Indigenous activists, community leaders, and policy experts have historically played an important role in connecting academic research with Indigenous political realities. As these actors leave the country, lose institutional support, or become marginalized within public debate, alternative interpretations become increasingly difficult to sustain. The absence of any dedicated university faculty or department focused on Indigenous law—only scattered elective courses exist—further illustrates the institutional thinning of the epistemic community capable of training new generations in critical, rights-based approaches.

The mechanisms described above operate through different institutional pathways. Restrictions on international collaboration, research funding, and academic governance directly affect the conditions under which scholars conduct research. The restructuring of Indigenous organizations and representative institutions has a more indirect relationship to academic production, affecting access to community perspectives, collaborative networks, and alternative sources of political knowledge. The publication corpus provides evidence of changes in scholarly discourse, while the institutional analysis identifies the political and organizational conditions within which those changes occurred. Considered together, they support an interpretation of increasing epistemic closure.

Explaining epistemic capture

Taken separately, none of these mechanisms fully explains the transformation of Indigenous scholarship in Russia. Legal restrictions constrain collaboration; institutional capture narrows the range of legitimate analytical frameworks; relational isolation severs comparative perspectives; and the erosion of human capital removes many of the scholars, activists, and organizations capable to produce alternative interpretations. Together, however, these measures create a knowledge regime characterized by the isolation of critical inquiry from the transnational resources, partnerships, and epistemic communities that once sustained it. Over time, the boundaries of legitimate inquiry come to mirror the boundaries of politically acceptable discourse.

Epistemic capture does not necessarily require the elimination of formal academic autonomy. Instead, the transformation occurs at a deeper level: in state-approved categories, priorities, and problem definitions through which Indigenous realities become knowable. Once the knowledge-producing infrastructures are dismantled or captured, certain questions—those that link historical dispossession to contemporary extractive governance, that treat traditional knowledge as a

sovereign rather than supplementary epistemology, or that examine the mechanisms of representational capture itself—cease to be viable objects of domestic scholarship. The result is not necessarily ideological conformity. Rather, certain forms of knowledge become systematically privileged over others.

While these restrictions do not fall evenly across scientific fields, Indigenous research is structurally exposed because the field occupies the precise intersection of domains the contemporary securitized state increasingly treats as sensitive: land and resource governance, territorial rights, extractive development, political representation, historical memory, and international cooperation. As a result, the distinction between academic inquiry and political activity becomes increasingly difficult to maintain.

Authoritarian governance does not require the disappearance of Indigenous issues from public life. On the contrary, their continued visibility helps sustain official claims of effective and inclusive governance. The objective is therefore to relocate Indigenous peoples into institutional frameworks that remain politically manageable and discourage the emergence of political self-consciousness. Epistemic capture therefore operates through careful selective incorporation rather than exclusion. Indigenous issues remain visible through promoted state-backed initiatives while public and scholarly spaces in which Indigenous narratives might be connected to collective agency are progressively foreclosed. It also operates through the reorganization of incentives: it reshapes what is funded, what is publishable, what is professionally rewarding, and what appears analytically legitimate. The result is Indigenous research that simultaneously erases the political content of Indigenous narratives and prevents the emergence of Indigenous political subjectivity.

Quantitative trends in Indigenous rights scholarship, 2015–2026

The analysis proceeds by comparing two distinct phases in the evolution of Indigenous scholarship. The corpus of academic publications addressing Indigenous rights, self-governance, and state–Indigenous relations in Russia was divided into two periods: 2015–2020 and 2021–2026. The first period captures the consolidation of governance framework that emerged following the incorporation of Indigenous issues into state-led development agendas. The second period encompasses the accelerated securitization of Russian political and academic life associated with the wartime period.

The analysis begins after 2015, when restructuring of RAIPON and the consolidation of a new state-centered framework of Indigenous governance had already produced a new institutional equilibrium. Rather than comparing the relatively open post-Soviet period with the post-2022 wartime environment—a contrast whose broad contours are already well established—the article examines how knowledge production functioned within an institutional order that had already been reconfigured by the post-2013 consolidation of state-centered Indigenous governance, and how wartime securitization further accelerated processes of epistemic closure.

A comparison with the pre-2015 period nevertheless remains an important task for future research. The 1990s and early 2000s constituted a distinct phase in the evolution of Indigenous scholarship in Russia, shaped by different political opportunities, institutional configurations, and a fundamentally different intellectual and political environment. A systematic comparison between the pre- and post-restructuring periods would therefore provide valuable insight into the longer-

term evolution of Indigenous knowledge production in Russia but falls beyond the scope of the present article.

Dataset and quantitative overview

Contrary to expectations, the post-2021 period did not produce a regression in scholarly output on Indigenous issues. Between 2015 and 2020, the dataset contains 385 books, journal articles, dissertations, conference papers, and research reports addressing Indigenous rights, self-governance, and state–Indigenous relations. Between 2021 and 2026, this number increased modestly to 422 publications. The findings challenge a common assumption that increasing political restrictions necessarily lead to a decline in academic output. Contrary, the composition of output has changed: conference papers increased from 129 publications in 2015–2020 to 258 in 2021–2026, effectively doubling between the two periods examined. At the same time, state-funded research reports, grants, and commissioned studies declined from 56 items in 2015–2020 to only 20 in 2021–2026.

The production of Indigenous-related scholarship has therefore not collapsed; in quantitative terms, the field remains active and productive. However, the growth occurred primarily through conference papers, forums, and other short-form publications, rather than through monographs, theoretical interventions, or long-term empirical studies. This suggests a transformation in the organizational structure of knowledge production rather than an expansion of research capacity. The field increasingly relies on lower-investment forms of scholarly communication, while long-term research reports, commissioned studies, and other forms of sustained research activity have declined. The central question is therefore not whether knowledge production has increased, but what kinds of research have become possible and institutionally supported—and which forms of inquiry have gradually disappeared from view and, critically, what has come to replace them.

Thematic findings

From rights to administration

The largest thematic cluster in both periods concerns domestic legal frameworks on Indigenous peoples. Across both corpora, publications repeatedly examine constitutional recognition, legal definitions, and mechanisms of legal protection. Much of the literature focuses on the implementation of key federal laws governing Indigenous peoples, particularly Federal Laws No. 82-FZ, 49-FZ, and 104-FZ, alongside Article 69 of the Russian Constitution (Federal Law No. 82-FZ on guarantees of the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation; Federal Law No. 104-FZ on general principles of organizing communities of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation; Federal Law No. 49-FZ on territories of traditional nature use of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation; Constitution of the Russian Federation, 1993).

Publications from 2015–2020 more frequently adopt a critical-analytical stance while treating state–Indigenous relations as a site of ongoing structural shortfall. Scholars examined legislative shortcomings, weak enforcement, limited participation, legal contradiction, and the tension between constitutional guarantees and practical outcomes. Critical legal scholarship (e.g. Kryazhkov, 2010, 2016, 2018; Turaev, 2018) remained prominent. Rights functioned as the normative benchmark against which state performance was evaluated. Comparative references to

Canada, Norway, and international standards appeared regularly (e.g. Grigorevskii, 2016, 2017; Larichev, 2019; Bocharikova, 2020). By contrast, in the later corpus Indigenous rights become increasingly embedded within frameworks of administration and policy management (e.g. Zadorin, 2026; Lipina, 2025). Indigenous Peoples appear less frequently as political communities exercising collective rights or pursuing self-determination and more often as legal categories requiring effective regulation, support measures, and institutional coordination.

Discussions of self-governance undergo a similar transformation. Earlier works explored institutional capacity, comparative models, and the gap between legal guarantees and practice (e.g. Kryazhkov, 2018; Zadorin, 2015; Turaev, 2018). While the 2015–2020 corpus retained greater capacity to name and analyze this gap, the 2021–2026 literature largely operates within it, producing work that overwhelmingly presents self-governance as a mechanism that must operate strictly within existing federal and regional legal-administrative frameworks. As a result, self-governance is transformed from a potential site of Indigenous agency into an instrument of state-managed inclusion. The overwhelming majority of publications more often adopt a descriptive or constructive tone, reiterating existing legal frameworks rather than evaluating their operation on the ground. The dominant register seeks optimisation or "partnership" solutions inside the current architecture rather than naming its structural limitations. Genuine contestation over the terms of participation or the limits of state authority has become rare. Comparative international perspectives decline noticeably.

The same tendency is evident in studies of courts, ombudsmen, advocacy mechanisms, and institutions of protection. Earlier scholarship examined judicial practice, including Constitutional Court cases, concerning traditional hunting, fishing, and land-use disputes (e.g. Anisimov & Gryaznova, 2020; Burnasheva, 2017; Filippova & Multanov, 2017; Grib & Gryaznova, 2015; Martynov & Serdyukov, 2015; Grigoriev, 2018). Today most publications assume that the protection system is fundamentally functional; very few ask whether these institutions themselves have become politically constrained or whether their capacity to defend Indigenous interests has changed over time. While the 2015–2020 corpus contained works that examined the practical limits of Indigenous activism and political space necessary to protect Indigenous rights against state and corporate power, in the later corpus these developments largely disappear from the literature or survive only as passing references.

From conflict to partnership

A second transformation concerns the treatment of land rights, traditional nature use, and extractive development. Questions of resource governance, traditional territories, reindeer herding, fishing, hunting, compensation, and industrial expansion appear throughout both periods. Historically, this has been one of the few areas in which conflicts between Indigenous communities and extractive development have remained visible. The 2015–2020 corpus contained a modest but visible strand of scholarship that documented rights violations and the inadequacy of existing protective mechanisms (e.g., Novikova, 2018; Tulaeva & Tysiachniouk, 2017; Khyshiktuev, 2018; Erokhina, 2017; Anisimov & Arzamastsev, 2017). While rarely radical, these studies nevertheless kept questions of environmental harm, inadequate consultation, and unequal power relations firmly on the scholarly agenda. By contrast, in the later corpus, these tensions are largely neutralized (e.g. Rumyantsev, 2025; Alekseeva, 2024; Stepanova et al. 2024). The analytical focus consequently shifts from conflict and dispossession toward compatibility and proper regulation. Extractive

development is no longer analyzed as a site of competing political claims but instead as a governance challenge requiring improved regulatory mechanisms and stakeholder coordination. Questions of territorial authority, asymmetrical power relations, inequalities, long-term social consequences and structural conflicts over land use become less prominent. In their place appear discussions of corporate social responsibility, state-supported initiatives, compensation frameworks, and mechanisms for balancing interests (e.g. Nazarova & Sleptsov, 2022; Grenaderova, 2026).

From politics to culture

A third pattern concerns the concentration of research in the least politically contentious areas of Indigenous scholarship: cultural, historical, and welfare-oriented themes. Historical studies, language preservation, folklore, traditional knowledge, educational initiatives, and cultural heritage account for a substantial and expanding share of the contemporary literature. Within these historical narratives, the Soviet state is frequently portrayed as an organizer, educator, modernizer, and provider. Questions of assimilation, control, and colonial governance receive comparatively less attention. Similarly, cultural rights are studied without directly confronting questions of political representation, institutional autonomy, or shrinking civic space. As a result, culture increasingly functions as a safe language through which Indigenous issues remain visible while their political dimensions recede. A comparable shift is evident within welfare-oriented literature addressing education, healthcare, employment, social support, and demographic challenges. Here, Indigenous Peoples appear primarily as recipients of state programs and beneficiaries of administrative support rather than as collective political actors capable of shaping or challenging governance outcomes. Taken together, these literatures progressively recast Indigenous Peoples from political subjects into cultural communities and administrative populations (e.g. Kudashkin, 2024; Chursina, 2021).

Security as an organizing logic

One of the most significant —and perhaps least surprising—developments in the later corpus concerns the growing prominence of security-related discourse. Although publications explicitly devoted to national security constitute a relatively small thematic cluster, security increasingly provides the conceptual framework through which Indigenous issues are interpreted across multiple fields. Concepts such as sovereignty, resilience, strategic development, resource independence, Arctic competitiveness, and technological autonomy appear with increasing frequency. Titles increasingly frame Indigenous rights, traditional activities, and even cultural preservation as matters of "национальная безопасность" (national security) and state sovereignty. The corpus shows a marked normalization of "accelerated development" as an unquestioned premise, and the subordination of Indigenous claims to a higher-order state interest. Security therefore functions less as a separate topic than as an organizing logic shaping how Indigenous governance is conceptualized (e.g. Mirolyubova, 2022; Gorelikov, 2023).

The Arctic–Indigenous nexus

This transformation is particularly visible in the growing integration of Indigenous issues into Arctic governance and development frameworks. While Indigenous Peoples and Arctic themes were closely linked in earlier scholarship, the nature of that relationship changes over time. Earlier scholarship more often treated Indigenous rights as relatively autonomous questions or situated

them within constitutional and international legal frameworks. In the later period, these same issues increasingly gain visibility through their incorporation into broader discussions of Russia's Arctic policy, Arctic industrial development, Arctic modernization, Arctic governance, strategic resources, national priorities, and strategic planning (e.g. Gladun & Zadotin, 2023; Grenaderova, 2026; Rumyantsev, 2025; Stepanova et al., 2024; Golova & Vorotnikov, 2023; Gavrilova, 2025; Shlakina, 2024).

Between 2015 and 2020, the Arctic was commonly conceptualized as a homeland, governance space, and lived environment with Indigenous Peoples remaining central to how the Arctic is imagined. After 2021, the Arctic is no longer analyzed primarily through Indigenous communities and their territories, and increasingly appears as a strategic region, resource base, logistics corridor, and geopolitical frontier. The Arctic–Indigenous nexus therefore functions less as an expansion of analytical attention and more as a process of thematic incorporation through which Indigenous issues are increasingly aligned with state geopolitical and economic objectives.

Regional persistence and the retreat of international perspectives

Regional case studies remain a consistent feature of Indigenous scholarship across both periods. Researchers continue to examine Indigenous governance, traditional livelihoods, and policy implementation in Yakutia, Chukotka, Khanty-Mansiysk, the Komi Republic, Altai, Primorye, while regional journals occasionally document local governance failures and implementation challenges (Romanova, 2023; Arkanova, 2022; Grenaderova, 2026). However, as these studies are increasingly situated within federal Arctic strategies, national development priorities, and administrative governance frameworks, questions of unequal power relations, contested authority, or alternative political futures become rare. Similarly, the international dimension of Indigenous scholarship shows further retreat over time. Earlier publications more frequently engaged with international Indigenous rights standards, including the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), International Labour Organization's Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention No. 169, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and comparative models from other Arctic states (Kryazhkov & Garipov, 2019 Arkhipova et al., 2018; Yakovlev, 2017). While comparative analysis often served as a benchmark against which Russian policies and institutions could be evaluated, after 2021 references to international standards become less frequent. Equally striking is the near absence of Indigenous voices from exile, transnational Indigenous networks, or international advocacy processes. The result is an increasingly isolated scholarly field that remains regionally grounded but becomes progressively disconnected from the international conversations through which Indigenous rights, self-governance, and representation are debated elsewhere.

Language as evidence of epistemic capture

These transformations are reflected not only in topics but also in language used to frame Indigenous issues. Earlier publications more readily used terms such as права (rights), защита прав (protection of rights), участие (participation), самоуправление (self-government), соуправление (co-management), проблемы (problems), пробелы в реализации (implementation gaps), конфликты (conflicts), нарушения (violations), механизмы защиты прав (advocacy mechanisms) (e.g. Novikova, 2015, 2018; Kryazhkov, 2014, 2018; Grigorevskii, 2016). The tone was predominantly analytical and diagnostic. Titles frequently highlighted contradictions between legal guarantees and their implementation through formulations such as «мертворожденные

законы» (stillborn laws), «намерения и реальность» (intentions and reality) and «проблемы и решения» (problems and solutions), while the analysis often called for stronger legal protections and more effective implementation (e.g. Kryazhkov, 2014, 2018; Zhuravel, 2016).

The later corpus increasingly adopts a different vocabulary. Rights language does not disappear, but it is increasingly supplemented—or in some cases displaced—by concepts such as партнерство (partnership), адаптация (adaptation), обеспечение (ensuring), государственная поддержка (state support), регулирование (regulation), эффективность (efficiency), alongside expressions such as "баланс интересов" (balancing of interests), "аспекты национальной безопасности" (national security dimensions), арктическое развитие и участие коренных народов (Arctic development and Indigenous participation) (e.g. Ilina, 2023; Gorelikov, 2022; Bogdanova et al., 2022; Nazarova & Sleptsov, 2022). " Effective model" (эффективная модель) and "multi-national unity" (многонациональное единство) rhetoric also becomes more prominent. The tone becomes increasingly descriptive and policy-oriented. Similar tendencies are evident in titles emphasizing corporate social responsibility, state support measures, sustainable development, adaptation, and balancing interests. Although critical edges persist in some legal analyses, the literature remains noticeably less confrontational. Works continue to document Indigenous peoples, but increasingly through categories that privilege administration over politics, management over contestation, and regulation over representation.

Changing questions, changing answers

The difference between the two corpora is also evident in the questions scholars no longer ask—and in the answers they no longer offer. In the 2015–2020 corpus, the dominant questions are often rights-oriented. The earlier corpus repeatedly asked why rights protections fail, why implementation gaps persist, how Indigenous participation can be strengthened, how extractive projects violate the rights of Indigenous communities to traditional nature use and a healthy environment, how Russian practices compare to international standards, how consultation mechanisms can function more effectively, and how conflicts between Indigenous communities, state institutions, and extractive industries can be managed. (e.g. Khyshiktuev, 2018; Kryazhkov, 2010, 2014, 2019; Chebotarev & Gladun, 2015)

The later corpus largely abandons diagnostic questions. Instead, scholars ask how partnership mechanisms can be strengthened, how Indigenous communities can be integrated into existing governance structures, how participation can be managed while development proceeds, and how existing legal and policy frameworks can be optimised for "sustainable development" and "partnership." (e.g. Rumyantsev, 2025; Stepanova et al., 2024; Zadorin et al., 2026; Lipina et al., 2025; Bogdanova et al., 2022; Ilina, 2023; Gorelikov, 2022).

The answers change accordingly. Earlier studies often pointed toward institutional reform, stronger rights protections, and closer alignment with international standards. Comparative studies frequently highlighted deficiencies in the Russian system by reference to more robust Indigenous governance arrangements elsewhere. By contrast, the 2021–2026 corpus rarely questions the institutional architecture itself. Instead, problems are recast as technical or managerial challenges to be addressed within existing political and legal arrangements. The recommended solutions emphasize more effective partnership mechanisms, better organisation of ethnological expertise, better implementation of sustainable development programmes, and smoother integration of

Indigenous communities into established governance and economic partnerships (e.g. Rumyantsev, 2025; Gorelikov, 2022; Bogdanova et al., 2022; Nazarova & Sleptsov, 2022).

One of the clearest indicators of the narrowing of permissible inquiry is that the shift is observable not only across topics but within the work of the same scholars over time—a transformation subtle enough to be easily overlooked. Earlier publications more directly examined implementation failures, structural contradictions, power imbalances, and the limits of existing legal and institutional frameworks. In the later corpus, many of those same authors increasingly shift toward technical refinement, accommodative and workable compromises within existing structures (Kryazhkov, 2023; Novikova, 2023). The contraction of critical space is therefore not confined to marginal or precarious voices but extends to the centre of the field itself. Even among its most prominent scholars, the shift from diagnostic and critical inquiry toward policy-oriented analysis reflects the changing institutional environment within which Indigenous knowledge is circulated.

Explaining epistemic closure

The comparative analysis of publications reveals a transformation that extends beyond individual topics, authors, or publication trends. At first glance, the two periods appear similar. Across both corpora, the dominant themes remain legal status, constitutional guarantees, traditional nature use, cultural preservation, and state policy. References to Indigenous rights continue to occupy a prominent place in scholarly discourse, while federal legislation, constitutional protections, and mechanisms of legal support remain among the most frequently discussed topics. Yet, beneath the apparent continuity lies a significant reorientation of scholarly attention. Discussions of self-government, FPIC, international law, political participation, institutional autonomy, and Indigenous diplomacy become less visible, while securitization, further containment of self-governance claims, neutralization of extractive conflicts, and the displacement of contemporary critique into safer cultural and historical terrain become increasingly prominent. Critical and reflexive interventions—once present, if marginal—have become exceptional. Scholars increasingly retreat to periods and themes where documentation is abundant and political risk is lower, rather than generating empirically grounded analysis of contemporary governance failures.

This transformation can be understood as a movement from a field concerned with evaluating the realization of rights to a field increasingly concerned with administering Indigenous difference within existing structures of governance. The 2015–2020 corpus, while already legal-regulatory in orientation, still retained space for critical, rights-based, and comparatively international inquiry with grounded analysis; even when framed through legal perspectives, Indigenous peoples appear as actors capable of participation, negotiation, and resistance. The underlying assumption was that rights exist, that they matter, and that institutions should adapt to ensure their implementation. After 2022, rights are no longer consistently the starting point of analysis. The conceptual relationship is subtly reversed. Development and state priorities are no longer expected to adapt to rights; instead, rights are increasingly expected to adapt to development.

The literature does not become uniformly more ideological or overtly repressive. Rather, political disagreement is translated into administrative language. Conflict becomes legal uncertainty. Opposition becomes stakeholder engagement. Contestation becomes balancing interests. Structural inequalities become implementation challenges. The vocabulary of rights largely survives, but the range of political realities that can be publicly analyzed narrows considerably. The most consequential transformation therefore extends beyond the language of scholarship to the

boundaries of permissible inquiry. Indigenous Peoples remain visible, yet their political agency becomes progressively less so. It becomes structurally more difficult to name capture, coercion, or the systematic sidelining of independent voices. Indigenous Peoples continue to appear in the literature but increasingly as objects of policy intervention rather than subjects of political action.

Perhaps the strongest evidence emerging from the corpus is not that the field went silent, but that it became selectively silent—precisely on the questions where power, repression, and Indigenous political agency intersect. The later corpus contains virtually no sustained examination of the restructuring of Indigenous agency, the narrowing of civic space, the effects of foreign-agent legislation, the criminalization of activism, the securitization of governance, wartime mobilization, extremism legislation, or the changing conditions under which Indigenous organizations operate. These are arguably some of the most important developments affecting Indigenous Peoples in Russia over the last decade. Yet they are almost entirely absent from academic literature. The result is a growing body of scholarship that can describe institutional architecture in detail while remaining largely disconnected from the lived realities of communities on the ground.

A related manifestation of this transformation concerns the institutional logic through which Indigenous narrative is now understood: constitutional and legal rights exist, institutions (courts, universities, consultative bodies, ethnological expertise procedures) exist to implement them, protection is therefore presumed to follow. The literature catalogues the existence of mechanisms for accounting for the opinion of Indigenous Peoples, procedures for ethnological expertise, or programs for cultural preservation while remaining largely silent on whether these mechanisms retain any meaningful independence or capacity to deliver the protection they are formally charged with providing. Once the formal architecture is described, the question of whether these institutions retain meaningful independence or operate under conditions of political, financial, or administrative capture is rarely posed. This stands in contrast to the 2015–2020 corpus, where the presence of institutions was not automatically equated with their protective capacity. By focusing on the existence of institutions rather than their changing capacities, it allows the production of scholarship to continue precisely when the institutional foundations of Indigenous participation and representation are undergoing profound transformation.

The patterns identified in the corpus cannot be explained by publication trends alone. Their significance becomes clear only when they are read alongside the broader transformation of the legal, institutional, and political environment within which knowledge is produced. Legal protection itself increasingly becomes a mechanism of governance. Policy and institutional frameworks reinforce the foreclosure at the level of permissible content. Together these measures render international engagement legally and practically unsustainable for any scholar or institution that cannot guarantee political safety. The result is a closed epistemic loop: evidence bases disappear, funding evaporates, topics are policed at the proposal stage, traditional knowledge is extracted rather than centered, and international validation or solidarity is blocked. What remains is a managed simulation of Indigenous scholarship: descriptive, partnership-oriented, stripped of its comparative rights-based dimensions, and safely contained within state-defined categories of cultural preservation.

This outcome also distinguishes the Russian case from existing discussions of epistemic injustice, epistemic violence, and epistemic oppression which have largely focused on the exclusion of marginalized knowers from dominant systems of knowledge production. The Russian case points

to a more advanced—or perhaps more terminal—condition: the transformation of academic research on Indigenous Peoples from a field beginning to develop the capacity to interrogate power into one compelled to reproduce it. What survives is the field that can no longer name the colonial character of contemporary extractivism or the mechanisms through which Indigenous voices are constrained, filtered, and represented in global governance. This constitutes the systematic foreclosure of the analytical and relational space required for academic research on Indigenous Peoples to function as a site of truth-telling rather than legitimation.

The evidence therefore supports the argument advanced in this article: under contemporary authoritarian conditions, knowledge production does not have to be prohibited in order to be controlled. Russia does not need to ban Indigenous studies. It is sufficient to reorganize the institutional environment in which scholarship operates. Epistemic closure thus describes not the end of Indigenous scholarship, but the narrowing of its political horizon. Viewed through this lens, the transformation of scholarship on Indigenous Peoples represents more than an intellectual shift within a specialized field of study, but the progressive collapse of its capacity to function as a site of independent, rights-based, and politically critical inquiry. Taken together, the empirical findings and the legal and institutional analysis demonstrate that the central question is no longer simply what contemporary scholarship says about Indigenous Peoples, but what contemporary political conditions allow scholarship to see.

Conclusion: The disappearance of the capacity to know

The Russian case is ultimately a story of stolen opportunity. The Soviet ethnographic tradition, despite its ideological constraints, generated empirical knowledge that could, under different political conditions, have served as a foundation for stronger claims to self-determination and territorial rights. Its successor has not dismantled this inheritance so much as hollowed out its critical and empirical capacities. The result is a profound irony: the Soviet school remains visible in the volume of historical scholarship it continues to produce, yet the capacity to extend or contest its own categories in the present has not emerged. The brief post-Soviet opening was never translated into a stable academic infrastructure capable of sustaining Indigenous-led knowledge production over the long term.

Today, academic research on Indigenous Peoples is more productive than at any previous point in its history while operating within a progressively narrower space for independent inquiry. The constraints are more diffuse, more punitive in their unpredictability, and reinforced by the criminalization of international collaboration and the closure of independent funding channels. Rather than signaling greater Indigenous empowerment, the expansion of scholarship increasingly mirrors the incorporation of Indigenous issues into state-led governance, development, and security agendas. The most significant finding of this study is therefore not the emergence of new themes but the growing divergence between what is happening and what is being studied. The result is not necessarily the production of inaccurate knowledge. Rather, it is a narrowing of the range of realities that scholarship is able—or willing—to describe. The field continues to produce knowledge within analytical boundaries that separate formal rights from lived realities, institutions from their functions, and participation from political power. What is disappearing is Indigenous political reality from scholarship, together with the field's capacity to connect law, governance, and representation to authoritarian rule. The absence of critical research should not be interpreted as an absence of critical realities. The repression of Indigenous activists, the capture of representative

institutions, and the dismantling of the independent scholarly community continue to define contemporary Indigenous politics in Russia. The resulting gap—between the formal existence of academia and its actual capacity, between form and function, between official narrative and ground reality—has become one of the structuring features of how Indigenous Peoples are imagined, studied, and governed within Russian academic discourse. It is also one of the clearest indicators that what is taking place is not the adaptation of Indigenous scholarship, but its structural containment.

This article has conceptualized that transformation as epistemic closure. It does not refer to the absence of scholars or data. It describes the cumulative reorganization of the knowledge regime that increasingly privileges administrative, developmental, and security-oriented forms of knowledge. Universities, funding structures, expert networks, conferences, RAIPON, FADN, Arctic programs now reward certain questions, methods, and forms of expertise while rendering others not merely risky but structurally impossible to produce. This is not a neutral evolution in research priorities. It reflects a deliberate narrowing of the epistemic space available to scholars and the construction of a knowledge regime that secures the state's monopoly on authoritative knowledge about Indigenous territories and peoples. From this perspective, epistemic closure is not an accidental byproduct of authoritarian consolidation or wartime measures. It is the predictable outcome of more than a decade of legal restrictions, institutional restructuring, and political interventions.

At its deepest level, these transformations alter not only scholarship but also the political foundations of Indigenous sovereignty. As independent institutions, research networks, and representative organizations are progressively captured or marginalized, Indigenous governance becomes increasingly organized as a state project rather than an expression of autonomous political life. The struggle over Indigenous knowledge thus becomes inseparable from the struggle over Indigenous self-determination.

In most modern societies, intellectuals have historically formed the social group most inclined toward independent judgment. Their critical distance, methodological independence, and the capacity to interrogate power have positioned them as a critical counterweight to official narratives and natural interlocutors of authority. In the Russian context, the mechanisms of epistemic closure have operated with notable precision against precisely this stratum. Through the progressive elimination of infrastructures required for independent inquiry, the state has substantially eroded the capacity of the scholarly community to perform its conventional critical function.

The findings also raise a broader historical question that extends beyond the scope of this article. The post-Soviet opening created new possibilities for Indigenous political mobilization, international scholarly exchange, and the development of critical approaches to Indigenous rights and governance. Yet, its intellectual trajectory was interrupted before it could consolidate its own institutions, methodologies, and critical traditions. Rather than advancing toward an autonomous scholarly tradition, the field was repeatedly pushed back to the earliest stages of its development. The case therefore raises a broader question for future research: did an autonomous field of Indigenous studies in Russia ever have the opportunity to fully mature, or were the institutional conditions necessary for its development dismantled before such a tradition could take root?

Scholarship on Indigenous Peoples, at its most fundamental level, is not merely a means of documenting Indigenous Peoples. It carries the transformative potential to reveal, challenge, and

reimagine existing relations of power. When the conditions required for independent inquiry vanish, the field does not simply change. It gradually loses its capacity to recognize and understand power, repression, and domination itself. Ultimately, the erosion of Indigenous political space and the erosion of the scholarly capacity to understand that space become mutually reinforcing processes, until what disappears is not only Indigenous political autonomy but also the ability to analyze its loss.

These findings also carry broader implications for Indigenous scholarship. Quantitative growth, institutional continuity, and continued participation in official forums should not be mistaken for evidence of intellectual vitality, institutional resilience, or academic legitimacy. Under authoritarian conditions, the central analytical challenge is not simply to document institutional behavior, but to understand how changing structures of power reshape the range of strategies that remain politically possible, under what conditions, and at what cost.

References

ADC Memorial. (2025, December 20). Freedom to Daria Egereva and all Indigenous activists – victims of political repression, discrimination, and colonial suppression of Indigenous peoples. https://adcmemorial.org

Alekseeva, N. A. (2024). Sootnoshenie interesov lits, kotorym predostavliaetsia "Arkticheskii gektar", i korennykh malochislennykh narodov [Correlation of interests of persons who are granted the "Arctic hectare" and Indigenous small-numbered peoples]. Pravovye voprosy nedvizhimosti, 3, 9–11.

Anisimov, A. P., & Arzamastsev, A. S. (2017). O nekotorykh problemakh realizatsii kontseptsii ustoichivogo razvitiia na territoriiakh traditsionnogo prirodopol'zovaniia [On some problems of implementing the concept of sustainable development on territories of traditional nature use]. Agrarnoe i zemel'noe pravo, 12(156), 37–44.

Anisimov, V. F., & Gryaznova, A. A. (2020). Zashchita advokatom prav zhitelei iz chisla korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, prozhivaiushchikh na territorii Khanty-Mansiiskogo avtonomnogo okruga – Yugry [Defense by a lawyer of the rights of residents from among the Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North living in the territory of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra]. Yuridicheskii mir, 4, 29–33.

Arctida. (2024,). RAIPON in the hands of United Russia and business representatives. Arctida.io. https://arctida.io/projects/oni-rabotayut-na-blago-verhushki

Arctida. (2025) AN OIL SECTOR BUREAUCRAT. Arctida.io.

Arkanova, A. I. (2022). Osobennosti zashchity prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa v sovremennykh usloviyakh na primere Khanty-Mansiyskogo avtonomnogo okruga – Yugry [Features of protecting the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North in modern conditions using the example of the Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug – Yugra]. Sovremennaya shkola Rossii. Voprosy modernizatsii, 5-1(42), 8–9.

Arkhipova, M. P., Barabanskaya, L. A., & Petrova, A. A. (2018). Implementatsiya Konventsii MOT №169 v pravovoy sisteme RF [Implementation of ILO Convention No. 169 in the legal

system of the Russian Federation]. Vestnik Severo-Vostochnogo federal'nogo universiteta im. M.K. Ammosova. Seriya: Istoriya. Politologiya. Pravo, 2(10), 54–57.

Arumova, E. S. (2019). Vzaimodeistvie gosudarstva i biznesa s korennymi malochislennymi narodami Severa pri promyshlennom osvoenii Arkticheskoi zony [Interaction of the state and business with Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North during industrial development of the Arctic zone]. Tendentsii razvitiia nauki i obrazovaniia, 56-14, 57–60.

Bocharnikova, A. V. (2020). Osobo okhraniaemye prirodnye territorii i korennye narody: Sposoby resheniia konfliktov v sravnenii mezhdu Britanskoi Kolumbiei (Kanada) i Primorskim kraem (Rossiia) [Specially protected natural territories and Indigenous peoples: Methods of conflict resolution in comparison between British Columbia (Canada) and Primorsky Krai (Russia)]. Biosfera, 12(1–2), 45–52.

Bogdanova, E. N., Voronina, L. V., Ivanova, M. V., & Romanenko, T. M. (2022). Vzaimodeistvie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa s organami vlasti v kontekste aktorno-setevogo podkhoda: Adaptatsiia k global'nym vyzovam [Interaction of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North with authorities in the context of the actor-network approach: Adaptation to global challenges]. Korporativnoe upravlenie i innovatsionnoe razvitie ekonomiki Severa: Vestnik Nauchno-issledovatel'skogo tsentra korporativnogo prava, upravleniia i venchurnogo investirovaniia Syktyvkarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2(4), 420–430.

Bondarenko, D. V., Nasonkin, V. V., & Babanova, V. M. (2025). Malochislennye korennye narody i gosudarstvo: Tendentsii i perspektivy vzaimootnoshenii [Small-numbered Indigenous peoples and the state: Trends and prospects of relations]. Probely v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve, 18(3), 78–90.

Bromley, Y. V. (1983). Essays on the theory of ethnos. Nauka.

Burnasheva, S. M. (2017). Rol' organov konstitutsionnoi (ustavnoi) iustitsii v sfere zashchity prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa [The role of bodies of constitutional (statutory) justice in the sphere of protection of the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North]. In Teoreticheskie aspekty iurisprudentsii i voprosy pravoprimeneniia: Sbornik statei po materialam VI mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii (pp. 83–88).

Campbell, J. L., & Pedersen, O. K. (2014). The national origins of policy ideas: Knowledge regimes in the United States, France, Germany, and Denmark. Princeton University Press.

Chankseliani, M., & Belkina, E. (2024). Academic exodus from Russia: Unraveling the crisis. Oxford Review of Education. Advance online publication.

Chebotarev, G. N., & Gladun, E. F. (2015). Soupravlenie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa arkticheskimi territoriiami v period ikh promyshlennogo osvoeniia [Co-management of Arctic territories by Indigenous small-numbered peoples during their industrial development]. Pravo i gosudarstvo: teoriia i praktika, 11(227), 198–200.

Chursina, A. S. (2021). Kul'turno-prosvetitel'naia rabota sredi korennogo naseleniia Eniseiskogo Severa v 1920–1930-e gg. [Cultural and educational work among the Indigenous population of the Yenisei North in the 1920s–1930s]. Agrarnoe i zemel'noe pravo, 1(193), 7–10.

Cornwall, W. (2022, March 4). 'It looks like Iron Curtain 2.' Arctic research with Russia curtailed after Ukraine invasion. Science. https://www.science.org/content/article/it-looks-iron-curtain-2-arctic-research-russia-curtailed-after-ukraine-invasion

Cultural Survival. (2012, December 9). RAIPON's suspension: Just or just opportune?

Cultural Survival. (2019, November 14). Cultural Survival stands in solidarity with the Indigenous Peoples of Russia. https://www.culturalsurvival.org

Donahoe, B., Habeck, J. O., Halemba, A., & Sántha, I. (2008). Size and place in the construction of indigeneity in the Russian Federation. *Current Anthropology, 49*(6), 993–1020.

Dolgikh, B. O. (1960). Rodovoi i plemennoi sostav narodov Sibiri v XVII veke [Clan and tribal composition of the peoples of Siberia in the 17th century]. Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Dotson, K. (2014). Conceptualizing epistemic oppression. Social Epistemology, 28(2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2013.782585

Douglass, J. A., & Chirikov, I. (2022). Russian universities during and after Putin. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://www.press.jhu.edu/newsroom/russian-universities-during-and-after-putin

Dubrovskiy, D. (2025). The slow-motion collapse of Russian higher education. OVD-Info. https://ovd.info/en/2025/05/21/slow-motion-collapse-russian-higher-education

Erokhina, E. A. (2018). Коренные malochislennye narody i dobyvaiushchie kompanii na Obskom Severe: Sotrudnichestvo ili konflikt? [Indigenous small-numbered peoples and extractive companies in the Ob North: Cooperation or conflict?]. EKO, 5(527), 81–92.

European Commission. (2022, March 3). Statement on research and innovation cooperation with Russia. https://ec.europa.eu

Expert Center "Project Office for the Development of the Arctic" (PORA). (2025). Nornickel invests billions in Arctic development. https://porarctic.ru/en/news/nornickel-to-invest-billions-into-development-in-arctic/

Expert Center "Project Office for the Development of the Arctic" (PORA). (n.d.). About the project. https://porarctic.ru/ru/about/

Fastovich, G. G., & Chensky, A. O. (2018). Uchastie gosudarstvennogo mekhanizma v zashchite interesov korennykh malochislennykh narodov Krainego Severa… [Participation of the state mechanism in protecting the interests of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Far North…]. Agrarnoe i zemel'noe pravo, 1(157), 4–6.

Filippova, N. A. (2015). Institut upolnomochennogo po pravam korennykh narodov v severnykh regionakh Rossii [The institute of the ombudsman for the rights of Indigenous peoples in the northern regions of Russia]. Severnyi region: nauka, obrazovanie, kul'tura, 2-1(32), 95–99.

Filippova, N. A. (2017). Predstavitel'stvo korennykh malochislennykh narodov v Rossii: Novelly federal'nogo i regional'nogo zakonodatel'stva [Representation of Indigenous small-

numbered peoples in Russia: Novelties of federal and regional legislation]. Vestnik Surgutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 3(17), 77–80.

Fondahl, G., & Poelzer, G. (2003). Aboriginal land rights in Russia at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Polar Record, 39(2), 111–122.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. Pantheon Books.

Gavrilova, E. D. (2025). O perspektivakh razvitiia arkticheskikh territorii RF [On the prospects for the development of the Arctic territories of the Russian Federation]. Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal gumanitarnykh i estestvennykh nauk, 5-2(104), 140–144. https://doi.org/10.24412/2500-1000-2025-5-2-140-144

General Prosecutor's Office of the Russian Federation. (2025). Deiatel'nost' amerikanskoi nepravitel'stvennoi organizatsii International Indigenous Fund for Development and Solidarity Batani priznana nezhelatel'noi v Rossii [The activities of the American non-governmental organization International Indigenous Fund for Development and Solidarity Batani have been recognized as undesirable in Russia]. https://epp.genproc.gov.ru

Gladun, E. F., Zadorin, M. Yu., & Gorbunova, A. I. (2023). Regional'nye praktiki zashchity prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossiiskoi Arktiki [Regional practices of protecting the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Arctic]. Voprosy gosudarstvennogo i munitsipal'nogo upravleniia, 3, 122–154.

Golenok, S. G., & Grigorevskii, V. A. (2019). Poriadok ucheta mneniia korennykh malochislennykh narodov pri predostavlenii uchastkov nedr v pol'zovanie: Pravovaia neopredelennost' normativnogo regulirovaniia i ee preodolenie [The procedure for taking into account the opinion of Indigenous small-numbered peoples when granting subsoil plots for use: Legal uncertainty of normative regulation and its overcoming]. In Aktual'nye problemy ekonomiki i prava: Sbornik trudov. Kirov.

Golova, V. D., & Vorotnikov, A. M. (2023). ESG-podkhod k ustoichivomu razvitiiu korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa sokhranit ekologiiu Arktiki [ESG approach to the sustainable development of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North will preserve the ecology of the Arctic]. Zhurnal estestvennonauchnykh issledovanii, 8(1), 2–9.

Gorelikov, A. I. (2022). Pravovoe regulirovanie v oblasti zashchity prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Dal'nego Vostoka kak faktor natsional'noi bezopasnosti (pervaia polovina XIX – XX v.) [Legal regulation in the field of protection of the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Far East as a factor of national security (first half of the 19th – 20th centuries)]. Obshchestvo: filosofiia, istoriia, kul'tura, 5(97), 133–136.

Grenaderova, M. V. (2026). Sotsial'no-ekologicheskoe vospriiatie promyshlennogo osvoeniia korennym soobshchestvom: Rezul'taty etnologicheskikh ekspertiz v Neriungrinskom raione Respubliki Sakha (Yakutiya) [Socio-ecological perception of industrial development by the Indigenous community: Results of ethnological expertise in the Neryungri district of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)]. Teoriia i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiia, 1(213), 86–92.

Grib, V. V., & Gryaznova, A. A. (2020). Rol' advokatury v zashchite prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, prozhivaiushchikh na territorii Khanty-Mansiiskogo avtonomnogo okruga – Yugry [The role of the bar in protecting the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North living in the territory of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra]. Advokatskaia praktika, 2, 3–10.

Grigorevskii, V. A. (2016). Mezhdunarodno-pravovoe regulirovanie prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov na uchastie v upravlenii delami gosudarstva [International legal regulation of the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples to participate in the management of state affairs]. StudArctic Forum, 4(4), 27–30.

Grigorevskii, V. A. (2016). Mezhdunarodno-pravovoe regulirovanie prav na vnutrennee samoupravlenie korennykh malochislennykh narodov [International legal regulation of the rights to internal self-government of Indigenous small-numbered peoples]. StudArctic Forum, 3(3), 36–41.

Grigoriev, S. A. (2018). Vlast' i korennye narody v Aziatskoi Arktike: Predposylki vozniknoveniia i formirovanie aborigennykh dvizhenii v regione [Power and Indigenous peoples in the Asian Arctic: Prerequisites for the emergence and formation of aboriginal movements in the region]. Severo-Vostochnyi gumanitarnyi vestnik, 4(25), 33–38.

Gurvich, I. S. (1982). Etnicheskaia istoriia Severo-Vostoka Sibiri [Ethnic history of the North-East of Siberia]. Nauka.

Ilina, O. Y. (2023). Obespechenie sotsial'nogo partnerstva s korennymi malochislennymi narodami Severa kak konstitutsionnaia obiazannost' gosudarstva pri priniatii reshenii v oblasti okhrany i ratsional'nogo ispol'zovaniia prirodnykh resursov [Ensuring social partnership with Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North as a constitutional duty of the state when making decisions in the field of protection and rational use of natural resources]. Evraziiskii iuridicheskii zhurnal, 12(187), 146–147.

Indigenous Peoples of the World – Living Arctic. (1999) [Мир коренных народов – Живая Арктика], (1). Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON).

International Labour Organization. (1989). Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). International Labour Organization.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. (2012). The Russian government shuts down the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON).

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. (2013). The Indigenous World 2013. IWGIA.

Ivanova, N. I. (2017). Razvitie institutov priamoi demokratii na mestnom urovne v mestakh prozhivaniia korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa Rossii [Development of institutions of direct democracy at the local level in places of residence of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North of Russia]. Vestnik Saratovskoi gosudarstvennoi iuridicheskoi akademii, 4(117), 60–64.

Khyshiktuev, O. V. (2018). Prava evenkov narusheny? [Are the rights of the Evenks violated?]. Advances in Law Studies, 6(1), 111–119.

KMNS.ru. (2023). Ofitsial'nyi reliz ekspeditsii [Official release of the expedition]. https://kmns.ru/exp77/

Kozmenko, S., et al. (2025). Sanctions against the Russian science: Current results so far. VoxUkraine. https://voxukraine.org

Kryazhkov, V. A. (2014). Pravovye problemy korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa v fokuse vnimaniya OON i Soveta Federatsii Federal'nogo Sobraniya RF [Legal problems of the Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North in the focus of attention of the UN and the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation]. In Mir korennykh malochislennykh narodov. Al'manakh (pp. 14–17).

Kryazhkov, V. A. (2016). Pravo korennykh malochislennykh narodov na traditsionnoe prirodopol'zovanie (na primere okhoty) [The right of Indigenous small-numbered peoples to traditional nature use (using the example of hunting)]. Gosudarstvo i pravo, 11, 32–42.

Kryazhkov, V. A. (2018). Konstitutsiia Rossiiskoi Federatsii o pravakh korennykh malochislennykh narodov: Namereniia i real'nost' [The Constitution of the Russian Federation on the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples: Intentions and reality]. Gosudarstvo i pravo, 12, 71–82.

Kryazhkov, V. A. (2019). Delo o traditsionnoi okhote, ili pervyi opyt zashchity prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov v Konstitutsionnom Sude Rossii [The case of traditional hunting, or the first experience of defending the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples in the Constitutional Court of Russia]. Sravnitel'noe konstitutsionnoe obozrenie, 4(131).

Kryazhkov, V. A. (2023). Federal'noe zakonodatel'stvo o korennykh malochislennykh narodakh Severa, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka Rossii: novelly poslednikh let [Federal legislation on the Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of Russia: Novelties of recent years]. Gosudarstvo i pravo, (4), 72–83.

Kryazhkov, V. A., & Garipov, R. Sh. (2019). Konventsiia MOT 169 i rossiiskoe zakonodatel'stvo o korennykh malochislennykh narodakh [ILO Convention 169 and Russian legislation on Indigenous small-numbered peoples]. Gosudarstvo i pravo, 9, 52–64.

Kudashkin, V. A. (2024). Sovetskaia nauka i reshenie problem korennykh malochislennykh narodov RSFSR (1985–1991) [Soviet science and solving the problems of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the RSFSR (1985–1991)]. Problemy sotsial'no-ekonomicheskogo razvitiia Sibiri, 1(55), 97–101.

Larichev, A. A. (2019). Mekhanizm upravleniia i samoupravleniia v reshenii mestnykh voprosov na subarkticheskikh territoriiakh: Opyt Kanady i ego primenimost' v rossiiskikh usloviiakh [The mechanism of management and self-government in resolving local issues in sub-Arctic territories: The experience of Canada and its applicability in Russian conditions]. In Aktual'nye problemy ekonomiki i prava: Sbornik trudov (pp. 139–145). Kirov.

Levin, M. G., & Cheboksarov, N. N. (1955). Historical and ethnographic regions and economic-cultural types. Sovetskaya Etnografiya, 4, 3–17.

Lipina, S. A., et al. (2025). Sravnitel'nyi analiz strategii razvitiia Arkticheskoi zony Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Soglasovanie federal'nykh i regional'nykh prioritetov v sfere prirodopol'zovaniia i ekologicheskoi bezopasnosti [Comparative analysis of strategies for the development of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation: Coordination of federal and regional priorities in the field of nature management and environmental safety]. Okhrana okruzhaiushchei sredy i zapovednoe delo, 6(4), 185–198.

Lyarskaya, E. V. (2003). Severnye internaty i transformatsiya traditsionnoy kul'tury (na primere nentsev Yamala) [Northern boarding schools and the transformation of traditional culture (on the example of the Nenets of Yamal)] [Unpublished candidate's dissertation abstract]. European University at St. Petersburg.

Martynov, M. Yu., & Serdyukov, D. V. (2020). Rol' obshchestvennykh organizatsii v zashchite prav korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa (po materialam ekspertnogo oprosa v KhMAO – Yugre) [The role of public organizations in protecting the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North (based on expert survey materials in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug – Yugra)]. Voprosy etnopolitiki, 4, 41–56.

Matthews, D. (2023, November 14). News in depth: Russian researchers disappear from academic conferences. Science|Business. https://sciencebusiness.net

Matveev, I., & Roshchin, E. (2025). Insights from Russia on academic freedom during war. Academe. https://www.aaup.org/academe/issues/winter-2025/insights-russia-academic-freedom-during-war

Mirolyubova, S. Yu. (2022). Geneticheskii pasport, geneticheskii profil' naseleniia i genofond narodov v sfere obespecheniia natsional'noi bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii [Genetic passport, genetic profile of the population and gene pool of peoples in the sphere of ensuring the national security of the Russian Federation]. Vestnik Surgutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2(36), 70–80.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015). The white possessive: Property, power, and Indigenous sovereignty. University of Minnesota Press.

NazAccent. (2024). Uchenye v 2025 godu izuchat iazyk, kul'turu i byt korennykh narodov Severa i Dal'nego Vostoka [Scientists in 2025 will study the language, culture and life of the Indigenous peoples of the North and Far East]. https://nazaccent.ru

NazAccent. (2026). FADN RF: Rossiiskaia model' vzaimootnoshenii s korennymi narodami – odna iz samykh effektivnykh v mire [FADN RF: The Russian model of relations with Indigenous peoples is one of the most effective in the world]. https://nazaccent.ru

Nazarova, N. N., & Sleptsov, A. N. (2022). Korporativnaia sotsial'naia otvetstvennost' nedropol'zovatelei kak uslovie ustoichivogo razvitiia Arktiki [Corporate social responsibility of subsoil users as a condition for the sustainable development of the Arctic]. Arktika XXI vek. Gumanitarnye nauki.

Novikova, N. I. (2014). Okhotniki i neftyaniki: Issledovanie po yuridicheskoy antropologii [Hunters and oil workers: A study in legal anthropology]. Nauka.

Novikova, N. I. (2015). Neft', gaz, korennye narody: Kto napishhet pravila? [Oil, gas, Indigenous peoples: Who will write the rules?]. Zakony Rossii: opyt, analiz, praktika, 7, 39–44.

Novikova, N. I. (2018). Uchastie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Rossii v priniatii reshenii [Participation of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of Russia in decision-making]. Vestnik Rossiiskoi natsii, 5(63), 9–21.

Novikova, N. I. (2023). Nothing about us without us: How an anthropologist can keep his place. Herald of Anthropology (Vestnik Antropologii), 1, 7–18.

Novikova, N. I., & Wilson, E. (2015). Korporativnaia sotsial'naia otvetstvennost': Transformatsiia poniatiia na Zapade i znachimost' dlia korennykh narodov Rossii [Corporate social responsibility: Transformation of the concept in the West and its significance for the Indigenous peoples of Russia]. Ural'skii istoricheskii vestnik, 2(47), 108–117.

Novyukhov, A. V. (2026). Statement of the President of the Association of Indigenous Small-Numbered Peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation A.V. Novyukhov [Заявление Президента Ассоциации коренных малочисленных народов Севера, Сибири и Дальнего Востока Российской Федерации А.В. Новьюхова] (on behalf of the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North). https://raipon.info/press-tsentr/meropriyatiya/zayavlenie-prezidenta-assotsiatsii-korennykh-malochislennykh-narodov-severa-sibiri-i-dalnego-vostoka/

Oktyabrskaya, I. V., & Romanova, E. N. (2020). Severovedenie v istorii rossiiskoi etnografii: Ot opisaniia narodov k konstruirovaniiu etnichnosti [Northern studies in the history of Russian ethnography: From the description of peoples to the construction of ethnicity]. Severo-Vostochnyi gumanitarnyi vestnik, 3(32), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.25693/SVGV.2020.32.3.001

Perevalova, E. V., & Kisser, T. S. (2022). Korennye narody Taimyra: "Pravo zhit' na svoei zemle" [Indigenous peoples of Taimyr: "The right to live on their own land"].

Pika, A., Dahl, J., & Larsen, I. (Eds.). (1996). Anxious North: Indigenous peoples in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. Selected documents, letters, and articles [Тревожный Север: Коренные народы в советской и постсоветской России. Избранные документы, письма и статьи] (IWGIA Document No. 82). International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Romanova, E. V. (2023). Sub"ektivnaya otsenka naseleniem Arkticheskoy zony Respubliki Sakha (Yakutiya) mer gosudarstvennoy podderzhki [Subjective assessment by the population of the Arctic zone of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) of state support measures]. Obshchestvo: sotsiologiya, psikhologiya, pedagogika, 4(108), 75–81.

Rumyantsev, F. P. (2025). Perspektivy i osobennosti osvoeniia territorii po "Zakonu ob arkticheskom gektare" [Prospects and features of the development of territories under the "Arctic Hectare Law"]. Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo, 1, 145–152.

Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North. (1997). Доклад о положении коренных малочисленных народов Севера в Российской Федерации [Report on the situation of the Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North in the Russian Federation]. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (1999). Federal Law No. 82-FZ of April 30, 1999, on guarantees of the rights of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (2000). Federal Law No. 104-FZ of July 20, 2000, on general principles of organizing communities of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (2001). Federal Law No. 49-FZ of May 7, 2001, on territories of traditional nature use of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (2012). Federal Law No. 121-FZ of July 20, 2012, on amendments to certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation regarding the regulation of activities of non-commercial organizations performing the functions of a foreign agent. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (2015). Federal Law No. 129-FZ of May 23, 2015, on amendments to certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation. Moscow.

Russian Federation. (2025). Concept of sustainable development of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East of the Russian Federation until 2036. Federal Agency for Nationalities Affairs (FADN).

Russian Federation. (2025). Government Decree No. 1894 on approval of rules governing international scientific cooperation and coordination with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and the Federal Security Service. Government of the Russian Federation.

Santos, B. de S. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide. Routledge.

Shlakina, E. R. (2024). Rol' korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa v razvitii Arktiki: Pravovaia perspektiva [The role of Indigenous small-numbered peoples of the North in the development of the Arctic: A legal perspective]. Okeanskii menedzhment, 1(24), 46–50.

Simpson, L. B. (2017). As we have always done: Indigenous freedom through radical resistance. University of Minnesota Press.

Slezkine, Y. (1994). Arctic mirrors: Russia and the small peoples of the North. Cornell University Press.

Smith, L. T. (2021). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples (3rd ed.). Zed Books.

Sokolova, Z. P. (1983). Sotsial'naia organizatsiia khantov i mansi [Social organization of the Khanty and Mansi]. Nauka.

Sokolova, Z. P. (1994). Narody Severa Rossii v usloviyakh ekonomicheskoy reformy i demokraticheskikh preobrazovaniy [Peoples of the North of Russia under conditions of economic reform and democratic transformations]. Otechestvennaya istoriya, (3), 180–190.

Sokolovski, S. V. (2005). *Identity politics and indigeneity construction in the Russian Census 2002* (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Working Papers No. 77). Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.

State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. (1996, December 15). Stenograms of the discussion of draft federal law No. 94700302-1 "Fundamentals of the legal status of indigenous small-numbered peoples of Russia" (Session No. 64) [Стенограммы обсуждения законопроекта № 94700302-1 «Основы правового статуса коренных малочисленных народов России» (Заседание № 64)].

Stepanova, V. V., Sivobrova, I. A., & Yakusheva, U. E. (2024). Sotsial'nye tsennosti v ESG-transformatsii dobyvaiushchikh kompanii v Arktike i na severnykh territoriiakh [Social values in the ESG transformation of extractive companies in the Arctic and northern territories]. Vektory blagopoluchiia: ekonomika i sotsium, 52(4), 50–62.

T-Invariant. (2025–2026). Khroniki presledovaniia uchenykh [Chronicles of the persecution of scientists]. https://t-invariant.org

Talanova, D. (2023, August 19). The great Russian brain drain. Novaya Gazeta Europe. https://novayagazeta.eu/en/articles/2023/08/19/the-great-russian-brain-drain-en

Tlostanova, M. (2015). Can the post-Soviet think? On coloniality of knowledge, external imperial and double colonial difference. Intersections. 1. 10.17356/ieejsp.v1i2.38.

Tulaeva, S. A., & Tysiachniouk, M. S. (2017). Mezhdu neft'iu i oleniami: O raspredelenii blag mezhdu neftianikami i korennymi narodami v rossiiskoi Arktike i Subarktike [Between oil and reindeer: On the distribution of benefits between oil workers and Indigenous peoples in the Russian Arctic and Subarctic]. Ekonomicheskaia sotsiologiia, 18(3), 70–96.

Turaev, V. A. (2018). Samoopredelenie i samoupravlenie korennykh malochislennykh narodov Dal'nego Vostoka: Ot nadezhd k real'nosti [Self-determination and self-government of the Indigenous peoples of the Far East: From hopes to reality]. Izvestiia Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriia: Geoarkheologiia. Etnologiia. Antropologiia, 23, 164–185.

United Nations. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. United Nations.

University of the Arctic. (2022, April). UArctic actions on Ukraine. https://www.uarctic.org/news/2022/4/uarctic-actions-on-ukraine/

University of the Arctic. (n.d.). Russian membership paused. https://www.uarctic.org/members/member-profiles/russia/

Yakovlev, I. V. (2017). Sravnitel'nyy analiz sotsial'nykh programm dlya malochislennykh narodov Severa Yakutii i Kanady [Comparative analysis of social programs for the small-numbered peoples of the North of Yakutia and Canada]. In Molodoy issledovatel': vyzovy i perspektivy: sbornik statey po materialam XXXIII mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii.

Zadorin, M. Y. (2015). Konstitutsionnoe pravo korennykh malochislennykh narodov na razvitie [Constitutional right of Indigenous small-numbered peoples to development] [Candidate of Legal Sciences dissertation, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia]. Moscow.

Zadorin, M. Y., Saveliev, I. V., & Levit, L. V. (2026). Strategiia gosudarstvennoi natsional'noi politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii na period do 2036 goda: Obshchaia kharakteristika i tselevye orientiry [Strategy of the state national policy of the Russian Federation for the period until 2036: General characteristics and target guidelines]. Arktika 2035: aktual'nye voprosy, problemy, resheniia, S1.

Zhuravel, V. P. (2016). Prava korennykh narodov Rossiiskoi Arktiki: Problemy i resheniia [Rights of Indigenous peoples of the Russian Arctic: Problems and solutions]. Arktika i Sever, 4, 66–70.