

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
 GIF (Australia) = 0.564
 JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
 PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
 ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
 SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
 PIF (India) = 1.940
 IBI (India) = 4.260
 OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2024 Issue: 02 Volume: 130

Published: 13.02.2024 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Olesya Anatolyevna Golubeva
 Don State Technical University
 Ph.D., Associate Professor

Valentina Vladimirovna Pushkareva
 Don State Technical University
 master's degree
 Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Artur Aleksandrovich Blagorodov
 Institute of Service Sector and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
 master's degree

Vladimir Timofeevich Prokhorov
 Institute of Service Sector and Entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
 Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor
 Shakhty, Russia

Galina Yurievna Volkova
 LLC TsPOSN «Ortomoda»
 Doctor of Economics, Professor
 Moscow, Russia

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL TRANSFORMATION OF URBAN REGIMES FOR COMFORTABLE LIVING IN THE REGIONS OF THE RUSSIAN AZ RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Abstract: *In this article, the authors analyzed the principles and patterns of mutual influence of socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment and urban regimes in the Russian Federation. Clarence Stone's concept of urban regimes was used as a theoretical framework. Based on the author's system of criteria of social significance, six projects for transforming the urban environment in four cities were selected and analyzed: Okhta Center and Tuchkov Buyan in St. Petersburg, Zaryadye Park and the development of fields belonging to the Timiryazev Academy in Moscow, a temple St. Catherine in Yekaterinburg and concreting the embankments of the river. Vologda in Vologda. If the initial phase of all projects took place in the realities of local urban growth regimes with the predominance of the interests of established coalitions of business and government, then the subsequent increase in the role of public activism in all projects and a change in goal setting under its influence led to the fact that during the implementation of projects there was a change in local urban regimes. It is shown that in five cases studied, during the implementation of projects, there was a transition of local urban regimes from "growth" to "progressive", and in one - from "growth" to a greater extent towards the "status quo" regime. The general principles and patterns of mutual influence of socially significant transformation projects and urban regimes in the Russian Federation are identified and described: competitive public interaction of all types of actors; change or relocation of the project as a spatial method of resolving the conflict; the prevailing shift from realizing the interests of government and business to the benefit of society; involving paternalistic instruments as a way to achieve consensus. Such conditions for the mutual influence of socially significant projects and urban regimes can develop at a certain period in any large Russian city, then we can expect results of spatial transformation similar to those*

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

described. The results of the study clearly demonstrate the beginning of the process of local transformation of the dominant urban regimes in the Russian Federation.

Key words: urban regimes, urban political regimes, transformation of the urban environment, socially significant projects, use of urban space.

Language: English

Citation: Golubeva, O. A., Pushkareva, V. V., Blagorodov, A. A., Prokhorov, V. T., & Volkova, G. Yu. (2024). On the importance of local transformation of urban regimes for comfortable living in the regions of the Russian AZ Russian Federation. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 02 (130), 85-98.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-02-130-10> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2024.02.130.10>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction

UDC 338.44:303.24.

With the collapse of the USSR in the early 1990s. The process of transformation of the world order established after the Second World War began. The dominant vector was the destruction of the system of international relations, based on the documents of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences and which laid down the functional principles of international law and the functioning of international political institutions, including the UN and the Security Council. At the same time, as part of the “outlining” of the problem field of research, it is important to emphasize that the destruction of the Yalta-Potsdam system is a concrete manifestation of the transformation of the Westphalian (European) model of world order, the principles of which functioned for almost four centuries. We must agree with G. Kissinger, who defined the Westphalian system “as a “framework” of interstate and international order, covering various civilizations and regions, since the Europeans, expanding the borders of their possessions, imposed their own ideas about international relations everywhere.”

As V.V. noted in his Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation in February 2023. Putin, “all the years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the West did not abandon its attempts to set fire to the post-Soviet states and, most importantly, to finally finish off Russia as the largest surviving part of our historical state space.” Currently, the tragic consequences of the “geopolitical catastrophe” associated with the ousting (economic, sociocultural, political and legal, etc.) of the Russian Federation from the former republics of the Soviet state have fully emerged, producing a number of conflicts that have not been resolved for several decades.

The doctrine of the “end of history” acted as an explanatory paradigm for the final victory after the collapse of the USSR of the liberal-democratic model of global peace, which presupposes the further development of national states, their regional associations and unions according to Western models of the “leading” countries of the world, led by the United States, which do not provide for alternative vision and implementation own interests, priorities, goals. Unfortunately, it is worth recognizing that in

the process of forming the new post-Soviet Russian statehood, “our country tried to enter and partially entered into the Western system of reference points and coordinates,” where the collective West develops and dictates the rules, imposing “parallel international law” on other countries.

From our point of view, one of the first attempts to reject the “unipolar world” on the part of Russia was demonstrated by E.M. Primakov, who turned the plane over the Atlantic as a sign of NATO's UN-sanctioned military actions led by the United States in Yugoslavia. Speech in 2007 by the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin at the Munich Conference laid the foundations for a foreign and domestic policy that defends Russia's right to economic, political, spiritual, and military sovereignty and rejects the existence of a “unipolar world.”

The events that followed, including the reunification of Crimea and Sevastopol with Russia, the implementation of sanctions policies with the dominance of Russophobic ideology on the part of unfriendly countries, the achievement of the goals of the Northern Military District to denazify Ukraine and ensure the safety of life of residents of the Lugansk and Donetsk people's republics, Zaporozhye and Kherson regions, “provoked”, on the one hand, the process of consolidation of Russian citizens, increasing the level of trust in government institutions, primarily the President of the Russian Federation. On the other hand, they deepened ideological and value diversification within social groups and identified factors that reproduce the “split” between individual representatives of the elite and the majority of civil society.

Thus, within the framework of political science, the need to understand the conditions and factors of transformation of the modern system of international relations in the context of analyzing possible scenario approaches to the development of Russian society and the state as an integral part of the world community has become urgent. An absolute priority is the analysis of the main directions of Russian foreign policy, the possibility of cooperation with friendly countries, regional and global organizations, which would make it possible to implement the project of institutionalizing a multipolar world as a community of equal sovereign states and their associations.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

In recent years, in Russian cities, the importance of large projects in the field of transformation of the urban environment has sharply increased, which for various reasons become “signature” for society, “image” for business and authorities at various levels, for the cities and regions in which they are implemented, and even at the international level - for Russia as a whole. It is enough to mention resonant (with different signs and for different audiences), even at the international level, examples of projects for placing the Gazprom tower in St. Petersburg, projects for transforming the space of Vladivostok or Sochi.

At the same time, with the development of business institutions, civil society and in the context of reforming the political system, the interests of the main actors of urban and social development in general are changing actively and not always unidirectionally, such projects are increasingly becoming an arena of conflict interactions between them, in which not only are they identified, but also the conflicting interests of the parties involved are resolved: society, business and government.

It is important that it is precisely such arenas, namely

firstly, they are as public and socially significant as possible;

secondly, they find themselves “fixed” for a long time in material space and, consequently, in the public consciousness;

thirdly, new effective tools for resolving conflict or conflict-free interactions of all participating actors in cities are developed and tested at them, concentrated in time and space.

The patterns and effectiveness of this kind of interaction between the main urban actors (bearers of special interests) are analyzed by the so-called theory (or concept) of urban regimes. Clarence Stone's classic definition describes an urban regime as “a set of arrangements or relationships (formal and informal) realized in the action of actors forming a coalition through which the community is governed.” An urban regime is formed when intersecting interests in urban space begin to emerge in the interaction of actors.

It is worth mentioning that in Russian literature, Stone's English-language term “urban regime” is translated differently by researchers; the concepts of “urban regime” or “urban political regime” are encountered, which are not differentiated in Stone's concept. However, in our opinion, the term “urban regime” has a broader interpretation and more accurately describes the relationships and interactions - not only political, but also economic, socio-cultural - that are formed in the city. The creation of coalitions and regime changes can also be caused by non-political reasons and may involve more than just political processes. In this regard, for the purposes of this work, aimed at analyzing a wide range of actions

of urban actors in terms of impact on urban space, we use the term “urban regime”.

The topic of using the theory of urban regimes to analyze the processes of transformation of urban space in Russia (including in comparison with foreign practices) is not new. Today, there is a wealth of sociological research on urban social practices, social activism and participation. In the literature we will also find a large number of studies analyzing the effects of megaprojects. Among geographical studies, there are a number of works devoted to the problems of the image of geographical space, meta-geography and the integration of these ideas in the systems of natural and social geographical sciences.

In the domestic literature, there are studies that interpret the coalitions of business and government in the regions that existed in the 2000s as “growth regimes.” E. V. Tykanova and A. M. Khokhlova note that they are formed on the basis of a tactical compromise between the interests of the authorities and large construction business. Such “growth machines” (coalitions of government and business) suppress other actors, deprive them of their voice, and society is forced to look for ways to consolidate with various political groups, parties, and urban protection organizations in order to influence the situation. O. Bychkova and V. Gelman demonstrate the diversity of urban regimes and their periodic dynamics, which may vary depending on the amount of political and economic resources. A change in these proportions, combined with a change in the role of actors, can affect the implementation of certain socially significant projects. At the same time, researchers note that Russian urban regimes are quite complex for obvious identification. According to A. Papadopoulos, the urban regime can also be local, since certain urban areas often have their own system of interactions between actors, which may differ from the citywide management system. Therefore, the authors use the theory of urban regimes using local cases as examples.

This study focuses only on urban transformation projects that have public significance. The concept of social significance has many interpretations. For example, from an economic point of view, a project that mitigates or solves problems of a social nature is socially significant. On the other hand, A.F. Ageeva believes that socially significant projects are, first of all, those projects whose implementation results have a significant impact on the socio-economic conditions of development, as well as priority projects that cannot be implemented without government support. According to M. N. Koroleva and M. A. Chernova, projects become significant when the authorities begin to listen to the public. One way or another, social significance arises in cases of active participation of actors in the project of transformation of the urban environment, especially the authorities and society.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

From the point of view of influence on the urban environment, socially significant projects can exist in various forms. The most common today is redevelopment, which involves changing the functional purpose, as a result of which the object acquires qualitatively new properties that are more flexible to the current economic situation. Also closely related to the social significance of the concept is “renovation” - the renewal of territories through the redevelopment of abandoned areas with the possibility of reassessing the role and function of an important part of the city, “revitalization” - the revitalization of an area or object that is no longer functioning, “megaproject”, under which in the literature more often This generally means any projects with increased costs. We leave out the term “urban conflict” (a clash of opposing interests, goals, views, ideologies between individuals, social groups, classes), although in most cases many socially significant projects will intersect with many urban conflicts. Any of these cases (most often redevelopment accompanied by a conflict-clash of actors) can come into the focus of our attention if it influences the formation of a new image of the city and significantly shapes its face in public space.

In relation to the stated subject, the next key element of the theoretical basis of the study, in combination with the theory of urban regimes, is the theory of urban transformation. More specific aspects of such research lie: in terms of analysis of the transformation of urban practices, redevelopment studies - in the field of theories of geo-urbanism; in the field of studying urban conflicts - in political conflictology in the field of coalition formation - in the sociology of social movements; in the field of studying their interaction - in the sociology and jurisprudence of the city. In relation to the case of post-socialist transformation that is relevant to us, L. Sikora and S. Buzarovsky prove that three different types of transformation in a post-socialist city have different natures and should be considered separately. These are institutional transformation, transformation of social practices and transformation in the morphology of urban space. They argue that while the first transformation (which includes economic and political institutions) has largely ended, the other two are still ongoing in post-Soviet cities.

According to this interpretation, large socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment in Russian cities precisely reflect the interaction of generally changed socialist institutional actors and actively changing social practices regarding the transformation of the morphology of urban space. For example, the unrealized construction of the Okhta Center led the city administration to the idea of limiting the height of buildings under construction in the center and semi-periphery of St. Petersburg, and the unrealized concept of building the complex of the Supreme Court of the Russian

Federation on Tuchkovy Buyan aggravated the issue of the fundamental need to transfer federal authorities to St. Petersburg.

Finally, speaking about the special place of a socially significant project for transforming the urban environment, it is important to note that it can form an image, identity, a new image of the city in the public consciousness. The reputation and prestige of city authorities and the idea of city politics in the public consciousness may depend on it. In our study, the assessment of social significance is carried out by assessing the interest of actors, the participation of senior officials of the state and corporations, the reaction of the media, and the multiplicity of concepts for the development of the urban environment.

Socially significant projects change the essential content of the urban environment - during the transformation, the essence of urban phenomena is not just modified, but replaced with fundamentally new ones. Therefore, generalizing and supplementing the above approaches and definitions, by socially significant we mean those projects of transformation of the urban environment that have the maximum impact on changing and consolidating a new image of the city in the public consciousness, change the essential content of the urban environment, significantly correct the current public discourse and urban population.

The authors see the main goal of the study in determining the principles and patterns of mutual influence of socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment and urban regimes in the Russian Federation. A feature of the proposed study, in contrast to existing ones, is the focus on the aspect of the social significance of urban spatial transformation practices for urban development. The authors' task was to offer a new look at the mechanisms of transformation of urban space, without in any way claiming to cover the problem completely, as well as to identify the entire possible range of interactions under study.

Main part

The selection of key socially significant transformation projects in Russian cities was carried out on the basis of the author's methodology using the developments of E. V. Tykanova, A. M. Khokhlova.

As a hypothesis formulated on the basis of the mentioned developments and tested in the study, the authors identified the three most significant groups of criteria for assessing their mutual influence with urban regimes of the social significance of urban environment transformation projects, namely:

- 1) spatial (environmental) - defining projects in relation to the urban environment;
- 2) resonance and participation of actors - describing the parameters of social significance, distinguishing the projects under study from the entire set of projects;

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

3) transformational - classifying projects as transforming the urban environment.

The proposed groups of criteria describe all three aspects of the complex phenomenon being studied. In each aggregated group, one or more criteria are additionally identified that determine the social significance of the project for transforming the urban environment.

1. Spatial (environmental) criteria. This group consists of two criteria.

Criterion 1.1. A large territory redevelopment project localized in the city. Only redevelopment projects of certain urban areas are subject to consideration, that is, those associated with the emergence of new urban functions in the territories. Projects affecting only individual urban objects or newly developed territories (receiving a certain urban function for the first time) were not included in the consideration.

Criterion 1.2. Location in a socially significant location for the city. Deepening criterion 1.1, the authors focus on the fact that the city itself can be divided into locations that secure the status of the city and secondary ones. Socially significant locations, as a rule, include central, historical, publicly accessible and visited places, aesthetically or symbolically significant places. To evaluate the criterion, the authors use the “center-periphery” model already described and adapted for urban space.

2. Criteria for resonance and participation of actors. This group includes three criteria.

Criterion 2.1. The clash of interests of three main actors in space and reflection in all three public discourses - government, business and society. If at least one of the actors has no interest in the project, it will not be perceived as socially significant. It is the presence of this criterion that removes from the focus of our consideration federal megaprojects of urban transformation, such as the preparation of Sochi for the 2014 Olympics or Vladivostok for the APEC summit in 2012. As a rule, those projects that cause direct clashes of interests of all three actors have a complex public response — conflicts over the use of urban space.

In this case, socially significant transformation projects attract more spontaneous attention to the project from the outside, do not allow it to be resolved by the realization of the interests of one specific actor, and locally influence changes in the urban regime. In the study, we focused on those projects that were changed under the influence of social activism, since it is in these cases that the interaction of actors most clearly allows us to determine the existing urban regime.

Criterion 2.2. Participation of all levels of state and municipal authorities in public discourse. The most conflict-ridden transformation projects for actors

do not allow the conflict to be resolved within the framework of the usual intra-city system of interaction “city government - city business - city communities”. As a rule, in such cases, public significance becomes so great that it requires the involvement of external echelons of power in the discourse - in special cases, even the highest officials of the state. The existence of this type of decision-making refers to the concept of so-called paternalistic urbanism, which is very characteristic of Russia. In the present study, the authors use cases that fit the parameters of this concept.

Criterion 2.3. Significant resonance for the image of the city in public discourse, media and online media. The increased attention to the transformation project is largely due to the increase in the number of publications in the media, the level of media in which discussions are taking place, and the number of public events that form information occasions related to the possible implementation of the project.

3. Transformation criteria. The last group consists of three criteria.

Criterion 3.1. The process of changing the functional purpose of a spatial object in the process of redevelopment. If a new business center appears on the site of a business center, and a more landscaped green area appears on the site of an old park, then such a project cannot radically transform the image of urban space. It is important that the transformation project changes the essential content of the urban environment, significantly modifies the characteristics and image of the city, and gives actors the opportunity to obtain new spatial functionality.

Criterion 3.2. Change of project concept during implementation. The authors believe that the most significant examples of environmental transformation projects are those that, due to circumstances, do not find a final result for a long time, even in the event of intervention by higher authorities. Such projects are capable of forming an assessment of the quality of urban environment management both in the country and abroad; they have very complex positive and negative connotations among different actors. As a rule, change/adaptation of a project (as well as its transfer described below) in such cases occurs in the process of conflict communication between actors, which is perhaps the most significant indicator for assessing changes in urban regimes. In the present study, each change in concept marks the beginning of a new phase of the project.

Criterion 3.3. Transferring the implementation of the transformation project to a new location during the revision of the project. Of particular social significance are such projects, the functions of which are implemented in a new place as a result of a clash of interests of actors in the same space. The spatial relocation of the project can reduce the negative background associated with the previous location, and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

there may also be a drop in social significance due to the loss of the previous conflict location and a general decrease in tension in the relationships between the actors.

As a result of selecting possible cases for consideration based on the described criteria, it turned out that there are many regional projects in Russia that fall under criteria 2.1 and 2.3. Suffice it to recall the conflicts surrounding the construction of alluvial territories in St. Petersburg, the development of the Nagatinskaya floodplain in Moscow, and the reconstruction project for the 1000th anniversary of

Kazan. However, there were not so many projects in which there would have been any intervention from the federal level (criterion 2.2), which influenced a change in the concept of transformation or the transfer of project implementation to another location (criteria 3.2 and 3.3).

It was the criterion of intervention by federal authorities, together with the criterion of a radical change in concept, that turned out to be the decisive cut-off criterion. Based on the methodology described above, we identified only six such large cases (shown in Table 1).

Table 1. Socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment and public discourse

Project	City	Public discourse
Okhta Center	Saint Petersburg	"Economics - Preservation of Cultural Heritage"
Zaryadye Park	Moscow	"Government infrastructure - green areas in the center"
Church of St. Catherine	Ekaterinburg	"Temples - parks"
"Tuchkov brawler"	Saint Petersburg	"Expensive development with power functions - green areas in the center"
Concreting of river embankments Vologda	Vologda	"Landscaping - preserving greenery"
Construction of the fields of the Timiryazev Academy in Moscow	Moscow	"Redevelopment is a science"

Let's take a closer look at them.

1. The first selected project is the unrealized project for the construction of the Okhta Center complex (Gazprom City) in the center of St. Petersburg, which led to the collapse of the previous model of urban urban planning policy. This conflict was the result of a significant gap in the understanding of urban development between the authorities, business and society. The state company Gazprom, as the initiator of construction, obviously pursued the goal of consolidating its special economic role through architectural and spatial methods of symbolic politics, while public organizations were guided by cultural and aesthetic ideas about the preservation of the historical and cultural landscape. Their interests did not coincide at all. Even if we assume that the goals of the actors were convincingly argued on both sides, the lack of normal public discussion was the decisive critical factor that led to the largest eco-cultural conflict of recent years. The situation began to be resolved after the World Heritage Committee at UNESCO, under the influence of urban protection protests, asked Russia to develop and conduct an examination of alternative projects for the Okhta Center. The cancellation of construction took place under the influence of President D. A. Medvedev, who stated that the decision to build the Okhta Center was the construction project of the Church of St. Catherine in the park on Oktyabrskaya Square in Yekaterinburg;

landscape and architectural planning on Tuchkovy Buyan in the center of St. Petersburg, etc. This material has not been summarized and published before. The authors evaluate the relevance of using these materials and supplement them with new data and new cases.

In the article, public discourse is the author's evaluative category based on the study of the above-mentioned cases.

The Center should be accepted after completion of legal processes and consultations with UNESCO. The subsequent transfer of the administrative building of Gazprom to the periphery of the city, to Lakhta, became an important stage in the "braking" of the "growth machine" regime that had developed by the 2000s in St. Petersburg. The story of the construction of the Okhta Center became the subject of public discussion and an echo of the perception of innovation not only in St. Petersburg, but also in other regions.

2. Zaryadye Park is a huge area in the very heart of Moscow, east of Red Square. The idea of implementing a park in this space greatly influenced the urban image of Moscow, both in Russia and abroad. Until 2007, this territory was occupied by the Rossiya Hotel building, designed in the style of Soviet modernism. After long discussions about the possibilities of its reconstruction, a decision was made to demolish the hotel and build on this territory the Parliamentary Center (for the relocation of the Federal

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Assembly of the Russian Federation), a hotel and business complex and a residential quarter. However, in 2012, following a survey among residents about a possible location for Hyde Park, a decision was made to create a new park area, and the construction of the Parliamentary Center was moved to the Mnevniki district. It is characteristic that both decisions did not provoke opposition from socially active groups of the population. The authorities recognized that the greatest value for this place is as a recreational and tourist site. Despite the regional competence of the project, its federal significance was emphasized by a joint statement by Russian Prime Minister V. Putin and Moscow Mayor S. Sobyanin. According to Putin, building a parliamentary center, a business zone with a hotel complex, as previously proposed, is ineffective, since this will create an additional burden on the center of Moscow. As a result, the direct intervention of the federal center resolved the dispute about the functional future of the territory.

3. The construction of the Church of St. Catherine in Yekaterinburg has become the most resonant transformation project outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg. The urgency of the issue was due to the fact that the construction of the temple was planned in the very center of the city. This case is also interesting because, under the influence of the public, the potential location for the construction of the temple was changed four times. Seven years of sluggish public resistance to the development gave way to significant pressure from regional and municipal authorities on the issue of building the cathedral and mass unauthorized rallies of the local population in 2019. The conflict quickly became known throughout the country, and Yekaterinburg became almost a symbol of the anti-religious agenda and the people's struggle for the "right" to the city." The situation was resolved after the intervention of Russian President V. Putin, who proposed finding a compromise and conducting a survey of the population. Based on the survey results, a certain consensus was reached among city actors.

4. The territory of Tuhkov Buyan in St. Petersburg is distinguished by a significant variety of projects that have arisen for the possible use of this space. If initially, after the demolition of the State Institute of Applied Chemistry located here, it was planned to build a residential and business quarter "Embankment of Europe", then in 2012, by the decision of the President of the Russian Federation V. Putin, it was decided to build a complex of Supreme Court buildings. As part of the campaign for the election of the governor of St. Petersburg in 2019, the acting governor A. Beglov initiated the decision to implement a park in this territory, taking into account numerous requests and demands of citizens. This decision was personally supported by the President of the Russian Federation, who changed his position on the issue of building the Supreme Court in this

territory. However, in 2022, the issue of building a judicial quarter on this site again appeared on the media agenda. The only constant element during all the changes in redevelopment plans remained the construction of the Dance Academy building, publicly promised by President V. Putin to the artistic director of the theater B. Eifman

5. The project for concreting Vologda embankments was widely discussed on the regional and federal agenda. The developed plan involved the improvement of the embankments, but met fierce resistance from the local population. The principled position of the regional authorities, which called for "not to listen to anyone," led to repeated direct complaints from the local population to the President of the Russian Federation. However, in this case, even the intervention of the first person did not immediately slow down the process that had already begun. Currently, work has been partially suspended; the possibility of more rational landscaping, with maximum preservation of green areas, is being discussed.

6. The development of the territory belonging to the Russian State Agrarian University - Moscow Agricultural Academy named after K. A. Timiryazev (Timiryazev Academy) in the north of Moscow also became a large and significant project that required intervention at the federal level. In this case, we are talking about the implementation of a large residential construction project on the territory of the scientific testing grounds of the Timiryazev Academy. The situation caused discontent among the public and Academy employees, who turned to the president, who suggested leaving this territory alone. Initially, it was decided to maintain the existing construction plans, but under the influence of the public and federal authorities, the area intended for construction was reduced from 100 to 24 hectares.

In the final scale, we assessed the criteria for the social significance of projects for transforming the urban environment. For criteria 1.1 and 1.2, the authors introduced geographical parameters of location and scale, information about the functional status of the territory before the implementation of the project. Criterion 2.1 was designated as "Predominance of interests of actors at the beginning and end of the project" and differentiated depending on which of the actors was the largest beneficiary at the beginning of the project and at the end of the project. Criterion 2.2, which assesses the significance of the project for different levels of government, is built on a hierarchical principle - from the highest level of intervention (international, federal) to the lowest (regional, municipal). The significance of the transformation project is classified on a scale of "high - low". Criterion 2.3 focuses on the breadth of publications about the project and reflects the extent to which the discourse has gone beyond the regional (city) agenda. For assessment, a scale similar to

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

criterion 2.2 was used. Criterion 3.1 analyzes the change in the functional purpose of the territory during the project and allows us to see how the essential direction of the transformation project changes. Criterion 3.2, using the phase identification method, evaluates the number of changes in the concept of the transformation project and its functional content in the process of agreement by all actors. Finally, criterion 3.3 demonstrates whether a decision was made to move the project (or its function) to another location, which indicates the type of resolution of the conflict around the case and reflects the special social significance of the transformation project. A more detailed analysis of the substantive effectiveness of the cases, the role and participation of actors in socially significant projects is also presented additionally.

The results of the analysis of socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment demonstrate the similarity of implementation scenarios in different Russian cities. As a rule, cases become publicly significant due to their location and the gradual increase in public attention to the project. It is worth noting that all transformation projects that required the intervention of federal authorities were resolved in various forms of consensus among actors. All selected projects required the personal participation of the President of the Russian Federation, and in the case of the Okhta Center project, even the intervention of a global actor - UNESCO. As a result, none of the projects presented here were implemented in the original form. Moreover, four of the six projects considered were moved and implemented in a completely new and less conflict location (for example, the construction of a temple in Yekaterinburg was moved to the territory of a former instrument-making plant; the Okhta Center was built on the periphery of the city, in Lakhta). Such transfers largely correspond to public outcry in the media and are accompanied by a change in the concepts of projects in the original territory.

It is obvious that the cases we have chosen demonstrate a more complex system of relationships between actors. According to E.V. Tykanova and A.M. Khokhlova, the same St. Petersburg of the 2000s was characterized by a growth regime due to an obvious tactical compromise between the interests of the authorities and large construction business (according to V. Ya. Gelman - the regime of "state-predator." Stone points out that such a situation can, in principle, arise only if the authorities and business have the ability to mobilize capital. As soon as these opportunities become limited, the ground arises for the formation of a new regime. In the case of active influence of society, the formation of progressive regime of the middle class. In the case of passive influence of all actors - "status quo". According to Clarence Stone, in order to change the regime to a progressive one, the existence of an "active middle

class" (active civil society) with a significant amount of free time is necessary. General cooperative agenda For society, as a rule, the topic of ecology, anti-militarist issues, and the protection of cultural heritage becomes a topic.

In our opinion, in most cases, the closest thing to the current situation is the progressive regime of the middle class, which is formed when society begins to seriously oppose projects arising in the field of "growth" strategies. The existence of such a regime largely explains the final abandonment of such symbolic projects for the city's image as the Okhta Center, the Church of St. Catherine or the European embankment on Tuchkovy Buyan. However, in the initial phases of the implementation of these socially significant projects, the situation was more close to the growth regime due to obvious coalitions of government and business. Additionally, it should be mentioned that the most important structural factor in the formation of growth coalitions is recovery economic growth; in Russia it was widespread in the first half - mid-2000s. In turn, "growth machines" (coalitions of government and business) suppress other actors, deprive them of their voice, and society is forced to look for ways to consolidate with various political groups, parties, and urban protection organizations in order to influence the situation. This state of affairs is extremely typical for the cases of the temple in Yekaterinburg, Okhta Center, and Tuchkov Buyan in the initial stages of their implementation.

The chosen methodology allows us to take into account the different levels of involvement of business, the public and the administration in various socially significant projects. As we indicated above, our study uses the theory of urban regimes as an analytical tool that allows us to see the ability of various actors to work together to produce a socially significant result in space. The methodological approaches we have chosen are relevant, since they differentiate in as much detail as possible the state of projects for transforming the urban environment, and also allow us to visually see different local options for transitions from one urban regime to another. The local transformation of the interaction of actors triggers the transformation of the urban regime as a whole. As we have already noted, certain territories may have their own system of interactions between actors, which may differ from the citywide management system.

As follows from the materials, all significant projects for transforming the urban environment that were considered were initiated either by business or government. Almost all of them initially had a business/commercial goal (one had a religious-business goal), which was abandoned in the process of interaction between the actors in favor of a new socially significant one. An exception may be the case of the Timiryazev Academy development project, where the scale of the project was reduced in favor of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

preserving part of the territory for existing functions. According to the theory of urban regimes, the initial phase of all projects obviously took place in the realities of local urban growth regimes with the predominance of the interests of established coalitions of business and government. The increase in the role of public activism in projects that followed at the next stages and the change in goal setting in all projects under its influence allows us to assert that during the implementation of the above criteria, a change in the local urban regime occurred. Since the composition of the coalitions influencing projects expanded at the expense of the social actor and it was his interests that became governing in the final stage of all projects, we can claim that in five cases we observed a change in local urban regimes from “growth” to “progressive”, since the realized interests of society there were associated not with conservation, but with development in the interests of the urban middle class, and in the case of the Timiryazev Academy, the regime transformed more towards the “status quo” regime. For the urban environment in total, the transition to a “progressive” regime leads to an increase in the number of public spaces in the city in relation to commercial and administrative spaces, which was noticed in the 2010s, which, in our opinion, is an important indicator of the transformation of the urban regime as a whole.

However, changes in the interests of actors do not always occur in one direction. As we noted above, in the case of the Timiryazev Academy, public opinion was taken into account: in most of the territory the existing function was preserved; however, on a smaller part, business interests still prevailed. On the other hand, the implementation of a park on Tuchkovy Buyan was de facto officially authorized in the public interest, but taking into account the interests of the federal government. Therefore, it is important to note that the transition to a middle class regime does not necessarily mean a complete transition of all actors to the position of public opinion. Consensus can be found taking into account the interests of society, but also taking into account the interests of government and business. However, the fundamental difference between the “progressive” regime and the “growth” regime will be the fact that the situation can no longer be unambiguously resolved in anyone’s favor without taking into account and the influence of public position.

A number of fundamental, analytical and exploratory scientific works by domestic and foreign authors, based on various, often incompatible and diametrically opposed theoretical and methodological approaches, are devoted to the study of the sources and vectors of transformation of the modern system of international relations. At the same time, most researchers recognize, or at least do not deny, the dominant influence on the state and processes of change in the existing and institutionalized world

order of the triad of immanently contradictory megatrends of globalization - de-globalization, integration - disintegration, democratization - de-democratization. The structural and substantive characteristics of alternatives to these megatrends make it possible to integrate other vectors (trends) of global development (active introduction and use of information technologies, the formation of a digital society and digital culture, chaotization of the consequences of uncontrolled migration flows, etc.), significantly expanding and complementing the realities of the first third of the 21st century

Within the framework of this article, the current world order will be considered as a transformation of the system of international relations. At the same time, the authors, in order to clearly argue their position on the issues of the place of the Russian Federation and its role in the restructuring of the modern architecture of international relations, rely on the conceptual provisions of M.M. Lebedeva that “the political organization of the world is understood as a structure formed by three main levels, namely:

- 1) Westphalian political system;
- 2) a system of international (interstate) relations, including the configuration of the leading states of the world, as well as other structures formed by states (international organizations, integration associations, club formats of interaction, etc.);
- 3) the totality of political systems of various states of the world. At the same time, all three levels experience mutual influence from each other, which in modern conditions, with their simultaneous transformation, forms the effect of a “perfect storm.”

The capabilities of the selected system analysis are complemented by the research tools of the realistic approach in international relations, which makes it possible to specify the factors and conditions and the direction of their transformation.

The work uses the ideas and theoretical constructs of a number of methodological approaches - conflictology, riskology, globalization and regionalization to characterize the qualitative and quantitative parameters of the main actors in the restructuring of the system of international relations. The authors consciously tried to overcome ideological bias and the limited potential of certain concepts when analyzing specific facts, mechanisms, conditions and factors, formulating and defending national-state and other interests in the political space of the global world from a historical perspective.

The analysis of the main directions and priorities of Russian foreign policy in accordance with the “Concept of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation” adopted in 2023 is based on a number of provisions of the civilizational approach. It is important to emphasize that the actualization of the civilizational “view” of the modern world presupposes, on the one hand, overcoming the Western-centric “emphasis” on understanding and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

studying civilizations. On the other hand, a rethinking of two largely dominant alternative cultural and civilizational versions, one of which “believed that the organizing principle of the world order was the opposition of a unitary and universal human civilization in its potential,” and the other “started from the coexistence of multiple civilizational projects and assumed that the foundations of a new world order will be developed, and its prospects will become clearer directly in the process of intercivilizational interaction.”

Justifying the place of the Russian Federation in the conditions of transformation of the modern world order, the authors of the article proceed from the recognition of more than a thousand years of experience in the existence of independent Russian statehood, “they define the special position of Russia as a distinctive state-civilization, a vast Eurasian and Euro-Pacific power that has united the Russian people and other peoples, constituting the cultural and civilizational community of the Russian world.” At the same time, one should take into account the debatable nature of points of view in the scientific community when stating the basic characteristics of Russian civilization in comparison with other civilizational formations, which V.G. quite rightly focused on in his two-volume monograph, published in 2022. Khoros.

The empirical basis for this work was the regulatory documents of the Russian Federation; results of studies conducted by leading centers such as: VTsIOM, FOM, Levada Center*. A significant role in the selection of the evidence base to substantiate the author’s positions was played by the results of theoretical and empirical research, and scenario approaches outlined in the reports of the Valdai International Discussion Club.

The approval in March 2023 of the “Concept of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation” marked, in our opinion, a new starting point in the reasonable articulation and implementation of national interests and strategic goals of Russia in the context of the increasing pace of transformation of the existing world order in general and the system of international relations in particular. “The unbalanced model of global development, which for centuries ensured the accelerated economic growth of colonial powers through the appropriation of the resources of dependent territories and states in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere, is irreversibly becoming a thing of the past. The sovereignty is strengthened and the competitive capabilities of non-Western world powers and regional leading countries are increasing.”

Such an effective position of Russia on restructuring the system of international relations is largely due to the fact that neither the country’s leadership nor the majority of citizens currently “have illusions” regarding the possibility of positive cooperation between the Russian Federation and the

countries of the Western world [6; 25]. In fact, Russia was one of the international actors that initiated the process of purposeful consolidation of non-Western countries to form multipolarity and overcome the hegemony of a few led by the United States. It should be recognized that the acquisition of foreign policy autonomy and the ability to freely plan one’s own regional and global projects took a fairly long period of painful rethinking and overcoming the consequences of pseudo-liberal reforms (socio-economic, political-legal, military, etc.) of the 90s. last century. At the same time, limited resources, on the one hand, and the inexpediency of the policy of isolationism, to which a number of unfriendly countries are pushing Russia, on the other hand, objectively make it possible to pursue a multi-vector, pragmatic foreign policy course based on the principles of equal international cooperation to solve common problems and defend mutually beneficial interests.

Thus, the functional necessity of having a superpower in the structure of the currently institutionalized world order is lost. The unconditional hegemony of one superpower in the person of the United States as a consequence of the cessation of the existence of the USSR and the policy of maintaining a “balance of power” between the two poles of gravity showed significant signs of devaluation due to the destructive practices of the uncontested imposition of the liberal model of globalization, ideologically justified by the concept of the “end of history.” The ideological and institutional consolidation of a “unipolar world,” determined directly by the interests of the United States and its closest allies, primarily NATO, at the end of the 20th century, negated the real sovereignty of the Russian state. As noted in the annual report of the Valdai Club, “Russia became the first major power that, guided by its own ideas about security and justice, decided to abandon the benefits of “global peace” created by the only superpower.

The independent successful economic and financial policies of China, the strengthening of the military-political sphere of the Russian Federation, the strengthening of regionalization processes in the non-European part of the world with the institutionalization of new economic, intergovernmental, military-strategic blocs and structures allow us to speak about an increasing tendency, on the one hand, to the loss of positions by supporters of a unipolar world, and on the other hand, to identifying problematic aspects of Russia as a subject of international relations. At the same time, a number of experts point to the asymmetry of the emerging relations between the Russian Federation and the PRC, which could lead to Russia’s potential dependence on China and the deprivation of our country’s freedom of action, at least in the field of international cooperation. In this context, it is the implementation of the multi-vector foreign policy of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

the Russian Federation, which consists, among other things, in the development of multilateral interstate relations, especially within the framework of the Eurasian structures being created, that will avoid mutual distrust and mistakes.

From the authors' point of view, it is difficult to ignore the fact that, in conditions of concentrating on solving internal socio-economic and political problems, the PRC and the Russian Federation believed that US dominance was a temporary phenomenon with equal cooperation possible in the future. However, the United States did not plan a dialogue with these countries as independent entities. It was this circumstance that largely brought China and Russia closer at the beginning of the 21st century. Moreover, none of these countries, in their domestic and foreign policies, claims to recognize the universality of their value, economic and political systems for the world community. Rather, on the contrary, they focus on their historical uniqueness and uniqueness.

Taking into account the civilizational specifics of individual states and their unions is reflected in the recognition of Russia itself as a distinctive state-civilization, on whose territory live the peoples who form the community of the Russian world. The use of a civilizational approach in analyzing the transformation of the modern world order expands the possibilities of political science tools to consider the interactions of states and societies as an organic / intermittent / conflict process of the development of distinctive national cultures. At the same time, the current structure of the world order is based on the parameters of European civilization, which practically does not recognize (or rather ignores) the achievements of other civilizations, which leads to a "clash of civilizations."

Consequently, one of the directions for analyzing the transformation of the system of international relations is objectively rethinking the mechanisms and forms of combining previously incompatible civilizations that claim to have and implement political content and form. In philosophical-historical and then political science discourse, until recently, the prevailing position was that the incompatibility of value systems is the main reason for the difference between one civilization and another. In this sense, the practice of the existence of China as a state-civilization and its vectors of interaction with Russia are aimed at reproducing and defending the civilizational foundations of the non-Western world in the conditions of the established global civilization.

The civilizational component allows us to take a different look at the processes of exporting democracy, democratic transits to other countries and regions, which the United States, together with its closest allies in NATO and the EU, are implementing through various forms of expansion. It was they who

took upon themselves the "historical mission" of spreading and rooting the values of democracy and democratic transit in their version of interpretations and indicative indicators in other states and regions with completely different civilizational codes of organizing life activities, including political ones.

Of no less importance for understanding the vectors of transformation of the system of international relations is the recognition of the limits of the impact of globalization on state sovereignty. It has become a practice that members of integration associations voluntarily renounce part of their sovereignty, delegating it to the supranational level. However, this does not mean that in a globalizing world state sovereignty does not exist, thereby allowing other subjects of international relations (states, regional and global organizations) to interfere in the internal affairs of states under one pretext or another. From our point of view, one of the most important conditions for the existence of the Russian Federation as a sovereign state is the preservation of its territorial and constitutional unity.

Earlier in this article, it was emphasized that the United States and its closest allies do not give up attempts to interfere in the affairs of Russia as a sovereign state, exerting information, economic (sanctions) and other types of pressure on the institutions of the state and civil society, including on individual citizens. Back in 2017, the Temporary Commission of the Federation Council to protect state sovereignty and prevent interference in the internal affairs of the Russian Federation was created and is actively working. The main tasks of the commission are to monitor external threats to Russian sovereignty, including attempts to influence the foundations of the constitutional system, the foreign and domestic policies of the Russian Federation, its territorial integrity, the composition of public authorities, and to develop recommendations for preventing real and potential threats by improving national legislation.

At the same time, even in the current world order, there is a positive practice of cooperation between countries that have full sovereignty in the growing BRICS organization. It should be emphasized that this organization, in a fairly short time, has evolved from an artificial construct created by a group of countries and called BRICS, to the development of a fundamental criterion for full inclusion in its structures - the ability to pursue a completely independent policy. At the same time, this criterion is not simply declared, but is supported by the economic potential of each country. Thus, participation in BRICS is a marker of participation in a system beyond Western domination. The authors focus on the fact that in this case, almost all countries included in the BRICS are under pressure from the Western alliance. In this context, the viability of the organization is based not on opposition and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIHII (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

confrontation with other states, but on the ability to minimize risks from interaction with them.

One of the resources to counter the transformation of a unipolar world to a multipolar one is the use of the technology of “geopolitics of perception,” defined as the dominant discourse “developed by the dominant powers and imposed on the rest of the world as an idea of the essence and significance of world-political processes, as well as one’s own place in the world.” Western countries formulate and impose their own interpretation of the development of the world system, not allowing for a different vision of the situation, other trends that are “maturing” and objectified in the 21st century. An example of the use of “geopolitics of perception” is the Russophobic rhetoric caused by the expansion of the EU and NATO to the East, to the borders with Russia.

Summarizing the political science analysis of the vectors and factors of transformation of the modern system of international relations, the question logically arises about the place and role of Russia in the conditions of chaotic activity of institutional / non-institutional entities, turbulence and inconsistency of the political organization of the world. Currently, several variants of forecast scenarios for the inclusion of the Russian Federation in the world order, characterized by a high level of conflict and unpredictability, dominate: - “dissolution” of Russians in the demographic structure of the global community with a narrowing of the territorial-state framework and loss of subjectivity in the dominant system of international relations, namely:

- civilizational regionalization of Russia within the framework of a system of limited influence on individual countries that were previously part of the structure of the USSR;
- etatization of all intrasocial relations with the accelerated institutionalization of a self-sufficient “closed society”;
- liberal, implying the final consolidation of Western values and standards of living with the loss of the sovereignty of the Russian state;
- East-centric, based on the dominance of China and the subordinate position of Russia as a civilization state;
- independent (restrainedly optimistic), characterizing Russia as one of the sovereign actors in the emerging multipolar world.

At the same time, Russia’s foreign policy and its place in the transforming system largely depend on mutual understanding with friendly and unfriendly countries, including the relationship between two basic vectors – values and interests. Russia proceeds from the fact that the democratization of social life and government in various countries acts as an internal evolutionary process, taking into account historical, civilizational characteristics and socio-economic priorities.

Conclusion

The materials obtained allow us to draw informed conclusions about the progress of the process and the results of the change in local urban regimes. It is shown that in five studied cases we observed a transition of local urban regimes from “growth” to “progressive”, and in one - from “growth” to a greater extent towards the “status quo” regime (the case of the Timiryazev Academy). The results of the applied research confirm the correctness of the hypothesis put forward: all the identified criteria for the social significance of projects for transforming the urban environment were in a significant differentiating mutual influence with changes in the parameters of urban regimes. The main “cut-off” criterion for intervention by federal authorities, used in the selection of the cases under study, together with the criterion of the subsequent radical change in the concept of the project in the conditions of the peculiarities of the Russian political system, allows us to assume that the studied cases, although they describe only local changes in urban regimes, nevertheless become potentially “precedent”, at least for the cities studied. A more reasonable extrapolation of conclusions about local regime change to cities as a whole, however, requires additional research. Here we have described to a greater extent the mechanisms of such a change and the participation in it of socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment.

Based on the results of the study of such mechanisms, the authors identified the following principles of mutual influence of socially significant transformation projects and urban regimes in the Russian Federation, namely:

1. **The principle of competitive public interaction of all types of actors.** The comprehensive, effective interest in the project on the part of all types of actors, which predetermines the social significance of projects, is common to all studied cases of change in the local urban regime, regardless of the type of such change. Transformation becomes socially significant as a result of interaction, accompanied by the presence of conflicting clashes between actors.

2. **The principle of changing or moving a project as a spatial way of resolving conflict.** Such a change under the influence of public activism is the most important reaction, demonstrating high social significance, and indicates a local transformation of the urban regime. The idea of relocating the project with the transfer of its original function to another territory increases the significance even more (relocating the Okhta Center, the temple in Yekaterinburg, the complex of buildings of the Supreme Court, the Parliamentary Center).

The patterns of such mutual influence identified in the research materials and subject to verification on a larger sample include the following:

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

1. The prevailing shift from realizing the interests of government and business to the benefit of society. It has been recorded that during the implementation of transformation projects there is a change in the influence of actors. In most cases, social significance was closely related not simply to the clash of interests of actors, but to the predominance of the interests of society over the interests of other actors. If in the early stages the influence of government and business is high, then during the implementation of the project the role of society grows noticeably. According to the authors, this allows us to talk about the gradual formation of a “progressive middle class regime.”

2. The involvement of paternalistic instruments de facto allows reaching consensus. The intervention of the federal government is a characteristic method for Russian practice in resolving situations around socially significant transformation projects. The participation of the president or federal institutions in resolving issues around transformation projects speaks of crisis nodes in the relationships of actors in cities, and also indicates insurmountable public pressure. Ultimately, federal intervention leads to a decision based on public opinion.

It should be noted that the identified principles and patterns significantly influence changes in the urban environment. Thus, thanks to changes and transfers of projects, territories appear where the original redevelopment plan could not be implemented, the number of free spaces and green areas increases instead of the original development projects (Zaryadye Park, Truda Square in Yekaterinburg, park on Tuchkov Buyan). The relocation of projects opens up the potential for the development of new urban peripheral territories, a previously untapped urban environment.

Selected socially significant projects for transforming the urban environment are fully indicators of changes in local urban regimes, as they allow us to see the clash of interests of actors and its results at the local level, using a “game of scale.” In the cases we have chosen, the “growth” regime is gradually being replaced by elements of the “progressive” middle class regime. It should be emphasized that in connection with the described cases we should not talk about different regimes in different cities, but about local regimes formed by specific projects in the local environment during a certain period. These conditions are studied in detail and briefly described in the work for each case. Such conditions can arise at a certain period in any large Russian city, and then we can expect results of transformation of space similar to those described. Currently, there is a significant local transformation of the dominant urban regimes in Russian cities; certain parameters of their mutual influence with the transformation of urban space are described by the authors in this article.

The Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation clearly ranks Russia's regional priorities in the context of the turbulence of modern world political processes: the near abroad, the Arctic, the Eurasian continent, China, India, the Asia-Pacific region, the Islamic world, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, the European region, the USA and other Anglo-Saxon states, Antarctica. At the same time, it is necessary to conclude that there is a high level of dynamism of change and often unpredictability in the development of international relations. Thus, from the authors' point of view, the modern world order as a whole represents only a relatively stable state of the international system, limited in spatial and temporal dimensions, characterized by the effective-functional specificity of state / non-state, institutional / non-institutional actors with recognized / limitedly recognized rules of behavior on international arena.

At the same time, basic components and their characteristics are identified, subject to transformation and ultimately determining the structure and nature of the world order in a specific period of world history. Modern transformation processes of the world order, from our point of view, appear, on the one hand, to be logical, taking the completed form of the “end” of the bipolar confrontation between the two powers and based on class, ideological differences between the systems of the USSR - USA, socialism - capitalism. On the other hand, despite the more than thirty-year period of cessation of the existence of the USSR, the Russian Federation, as the legal successor of the Soviet state, is still perceived by a certain part of the ruling elites and the population in the “image of an enemy” who was defeated in the Cold War, but claims to establish the principles of a new world order in coordinates of multipolarity based on the community of non-Western countries.

The established crisis system of international relations at the beginning of the 21st century, determined by a sharp aggravation and confrontation between Russia and NATO; infringement of Russia's rights in European regional structures and organizations (Council of Europe and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe); aggravation of positions and relationships between the permanent members of the UN Security Council, etc. At the same time, the principles of international law have largely been transformed into a symbolic policy carried out according to certain rules established by the only global superpower, the United States.

Currently, from our point of view, only a limited number of countries and regional organizations are included in the process of transforming the world order from one polarity to a multipolarity, which characterizes a positive trend in the system of restructuring international relations led by the Russian Federation, China, and other BRICS countries. However, serious efforts are being made by the United States and its closest allies to preserve or slightly

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

modify the unipolar world, with these countries preserving their existing global privileges. Hence the “unwinding” of the flywheel of conflict through confrontations along the “perimeter” with Russia, without hiding the desire and goal of its not just weakening, but defeat and destruction as a sovereign subject of international relations.

Consequently, the current stage of the political transformation of the world will most likely take a long time, and Russia, China, as well as other non-Western countries will have to defend their right to sovereignty and multi-vector cooperation in the context of the “resistance” of Western countries to the

world’s movement towards multipolarity. Inevitably, a struggle arises for the development and implementation of a model for reforming the UN, consolidating the status of the new members of the Security Council as today the only legitimate international institution for coordinating the main directions in the system of international relations. At the same time, Russia as a state of civilization has internal (which need to be strengthened) and external resources (which need to be expanded) to function as one of the leading centers of gravity in a multipolar world.

References:

1. Ageeva, A. F. (2019). Analysis of approaches to assessing socially significant investment projects in the Russian economy. *Bulletin of the Academy*, 2, 40–51.
2. Bakharev, V. V., & Demina, V. A. (2019). Participation of network communities in the formation of social capital in the process of participatory design of the architectural and landscape space of the city. *Regionalology*, 2 (107), 354–381.
3. Bederson, V. D., Zhelnina, A. A., Zaporozhets, O. N., Minaeva, E. Yu., Semenov, A. V., Tykanova, E. V., Khokhlova, A. M., Chernysheva, L. A., & Shevtsova, I. K. (2021). *Cities of diverging streets: trajectories of development of urban conflicts in Russia*. M.; SPb.: FNISC RAS.
4. Borisova, N. V., Sulimov, K. A., Kovina, O. V. (2011). Coalitions in the cities of the Kama region: factors in the formation and preservation of urban political regimes. *Bulletin of Perm University. Series: Political Science*, 1, 5–14.
5. Galustov, K. A., & Khodachek, I. A. (2021). Beyond Statistics: A Qualitative Study of the Transformation of the Primary Economy in the Post-Soviet Russian Arctic. *Arctic and North*, 42, 60–80. <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2021.42.60>
6. Zamyatina, N. Yu. (2022). *Models of political space*. In: *Political Geography: Modern Russian School: Reader*. (pp.512-527). M.: Aspect Press.
7. Zakharova, E. E. (2017). Public spaces as factors in the sociocultural development of local territories. *Bulletin of Culture and Arts*, 2 (50), 122–127.
8. Ivanova, V. V., & Zykova, M. A. (2017). Urban architecture as a way of constructing and deconstructing the social practices of citizens. *Bulletin of NSU. Series: Social and Economic Sciences*, 2, 150–159.
9. Klyukanova, L. G. (2019). Sustainable cities: integrated development of urban areas and legal mechanisms to ensure the realization of citizens' rights to a favorable environment. *Eurasian Law Journal*, 1, 213–219.
10. Koroleva, M. N., & Chernova, M. A. (2017). Tactics for implementing urban projects in the context of modern management practices and legislation. *Urban Research and Practice*, 3, 28–41.
11. Koroleva, M. N., & Chernova, M. A. (2018). Urban activism: management practices as a resource and barrier to the development of urban projects. *Sociological Research*, 9(9), 93–101.
12. Petrov, A. A. (2018). Analysis of priority factors for the development of the construction sector in Russia and identification of possible directions for neutralizing influences. *Current problems of economics and management*, 2 (18), 56–62.
13. Pustovoit, Yu. A. (2018). “Land” and “freedom”: urban regimes and protest communities in Siberian cities. *Power and Elites*, 5, 295–330.
14. Samataryova, K. A. (2017). Methodology for studying the urban political regime. *Political Conceptology*, 4, 252–256.
15. Ter-Voskanyan, O. Sh. (2018). Patterns of formation of the pedestrian environment in the city. *Academia. Architecture and Construction*, 23(3), 94–99.
16. Tkachenko, S. B. (2019). Zaryadye development concepts: from hotel to park. *News from universities. Investments. Construction. Real Estate*, 1(28), 196–213.