ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА

LANGUAGE POLICY

УДК 81`27 DOI: 10.37892/2713-2951-4-8-60-85

SOVIET LANGUAGE POLICY AND EDUCATION IN THE POST-WWII PERIOD

Elena V. Shelestyuk
Chelyabinsk State University, Russian Federation

The article gives an excursus into the national and language policies of the post-war USSR, highlights the major stages, and reveals cause-effect connections. We conclude that the national and language policies of the USSR and Russia follow the pattern of dynamic fluctuations, dependent, in the first place, on the domestic political conditions and international situation - calm and prosperous times or the times of external/internal threats. These policies fluctuate from liberal laws providing for democratic self-governance of national territorial units, use of national (ethnic) languages in education and administration, institutionalization of and financing structures for the development of national media, cultures, literatures and languages to such steps as strengthening of the major national language as language of inter-ethnic communication (as well as titular languages of the autonomous republics), return to unifying patriotic ideology and education, civic consolidation, "convergence in a single nation" and etatism. In the second place, there is a dependence on the needs of modernization and technological progress, but this factor, while giving prominence to a single developed national language, also presupposes the development of minor languages based on the practices of translations from/into the H-language and borrowing/enriching terminology thereof.

Keywords*: national policy, language policy, indigenization, language building, arabization, romanization, cyrillization, titular language, language of inter-ethnic communication*

ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА И ЯЗЫКОВОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ В СССР В ПОСЛЕВОЕННЫЙ ПЕРИОД

Елена В. Шелестюк
Челябинский государственный университет, Российская Федерация

В статье дается обзор основных этапов национальной и языковой политики в СССР в период после Великой Отечественной войны и показываются причинно-следственные связи принятия тех или иных государственных решений. Анализ разнообразных факторов обнаруживает определенную динамику национальной и языковой политики СССР, зависящую от внутриполитической ситуации и международного положения. Эта политика колеблется от либерального законодательства, предусматривающего демократическое самоуправление национальных территориальных единиц, использование национальных (этнических) языков в сфере образования и администрации, организацию и финансирование структур для развития национальных культуры, литературы, СМИ и языков до таких мер, как укрепление наиболее многочисленного национального языка как языка межнационального общения (а также титульных языков автономных республик), возврат к объединяющей патриотической идеологии и образованию, гражданская и государственная консолидация, формирование «единого народа». Кроме того, существует значительная зависимость культурно-языковой политики от потребностей модернизации и технического прогресса, но этот фактор, в целом усиливая положение многочисленного языка межнационального общения (русского),

также предполагает развитие языков других этносов и национальностей, основанное на практике переводов с/на Н-язык, заимствования и обогащения терминологии.

Ключевые слова: *национальная политика, языковая политика, коренизация, языковое строительство, титульный язык, язык межнационального общения*

Historical Background

During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, the role of the Russian language as the language of international communication and a "rallying tool" of the peoples of the USSR enhanced. Military service and large population movements (more than 17 million evacuees from threatened areas in the eastern regions of the USSR in the initial period of the war in 1941-1942, about 2,4 million deportees) significantly contributed to the increase of the level of command of the Russian language among other nationalities of the USSR.

In the postwar years, the role of the Russian language steadily increased in all spheres. The victory of the Soviet Union over Nazism resulted in a growing tendency towards the unification of the liberated peoples under the communist idea. The tendency towards the unification of the Slavic peoples was also marked, in view of the tribulations fallen to their lot owing to the racist theory of Nazism. Thus, in March 1945, at a reception with the governmental delegation of Czechoslovakia, headed by E. Benes, Stalin, disavowing the "old Slavophiles" of the Russian Empire, nevertheless, said: "We, the new Slavophiles-Leninists, Slavophiles-Bolsheviks, Communists, do not stand for the joining, but for the union of the Slavic peoples... The whole history of the life of Slavs teaches us that this union is necessary for the protection of Slavdom"[10]. The Russian language asserted itself on the international arena: it became one of the working languages of the United Nations, the main foreign language at schools of People's Democracies, the working language of inter-state organizations of the socialist camp (the Warsaw Pact, CMEA (COMECON)), a language of science. In school education, the share of Russian schools began to grow. In Union and autonomous republics and regions of the USSR, schools of titular nationalities were predominant, but the study of the Russian language as a school subject was obligatory. At the same time, schools for ethnic minorities other than a titular nation of a particular republic or region were significantly reduced. Thus, while immediately before the war, in the 1940/41 academic year, there were 19 Jewish and 13 Uzbek schools in the Ukraine [Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1926-1947. USSR: 1821], after the war there was nothing like this [Belikov, Krysin, 2001: 285].

Since the 1940s, the pace of industrialization, begun in Soviet national regions in the 1930s (the Turkestan-Siberia Railway, the Grozny-Tuapse, Baku-Batumi oil-pipes etc.), steadily accelerated.

[10] *Malyshev, V.A.* Dnevnik Narkoma (Narcom's Diary), quoted in [Vdovin, 2013: 54].

There was the all-round rebuilding of the plants destroyed by the Nazis and building of new ones throughout the USSR. Power stations were built (hydroelectric on the Dnieper, the Kama, the Angara etc., atomic), metro systems in large cities created, the Kara Kum Canal and the Volga-Baltic Waterway dug, the melioration and development of virgin lands in Central Asia (Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan) begun etc. Thus, in addition to the movements of the 1940s, there were massive population movements in the post-war period, in fact, well until the 1990s. The industrial proletariat was formed of different nationalities of the USSR. Most of them were Russian or spoke Russian in their inter-ethnic contacts. This enhanced the number of the Russian-speaking population in the Union and autonomous republics, particularly in the urban areas of Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan.

"The Great Russian Language"

The year of 1945 saw the publication of Academician V.V. Vinogradov's book *The Great Russian Language*, devoted to the historic role of the Russian language. It came out in the wake of the victory of the Soviet Union over Nazi Germany, and, though written with academic rigour, was noticeably instinct with the patriotic spirit. Vinogradov emphasizes the greatness and power of the Russian language and culture, refuting the Nazi's myths of the inferiority of the Slavic race and culture. V.M. Alpatov makes several keen observations on the book. "It could as well have been published in 1915 as in 1945, and then the author would have been regarded as a man of right-wing views (which Vinogradov had never really been)." The pre-revolutionary period was extensively referred to in the book. Such writers as F.M. Dostoevsky and A.A. Fet, formerly viewed as reactionary, were named among the great Russian classics, the emigrant I.A. Bunin was twice mentioned sympathetically. The book did not refer to Imperial Russia as the "prison of nations", nor castigated the "national oppression under the Tsars", even though that kind of language still remained in official circulation at the time. The Russian language was referred to as "state", although that term had never been fixed in the Soviet Constitution. Vinogradov widely drew on Slavophilic ideas, and the book ended not with a quote of Lenin or Stalin, but with one of I.S. Aksakov[11] [Alpatov, 1997: 90-92].

Vinogradov's book apparently objectivates the strengthening of the positions of Russian and the unification of language policy. Proceeding from the concept of the inalienable connection of a language as a means "of national expression" with the history and culture of nations (K.D. Ushinsky, A.A. Potebnya), he praises the accuracy, versatility, "honest chastity and untrammelled power" (Turgenev), "richness, comprehensiveness and universality" (Dostoyevsky) and other qualities of the

[11] "No moments exceed in their sublimity those, when, with a sudden surge of the nationwide spirit, the entire centuries-old history of the country suddenly starts palpitating, becomes a moving force, and all the people begin to hear themselves as one living historical organism, solid in centuries and space" [Vinogradov, 1945: 172].

Russian language; its capacity to express numerous shades of meaning, "to produce, with its colourful and plastic expression, with its structure and order, the tangible impression of the liveliness and spontaneity of feelings, sensations, movements of the soul and external manifestations of the will," "to carry the reader away to the sphere of higher, intense ethical existence..." (*Khokhryakov P.P.* Language and Psychology, 1889). Vinogadov asserts: "The power and majesty of the Russian language are conclusive evidence of the great vitality of the Russian people, their original and high national culture and their great and glorious historical destiny. The Russian language is universally recognized the great language of a great nation" [Vinogradov, 1945: 28].

Speaking of the Old Russian literary language, Vinogradov points out its close connection both with Old Church Slavonic and varieties of the Old East Slavic language, making it particularly rich, vivid, and harmonious[12]. Common Slavic, normalised by Cyril (Constantine) and Methodius and their disciples as Old Chuch Slavonic, became the common written language of the Slavs, merging into the linguistic, imaginative and stylistic wealth of the pre-Christian East Slavic language. The written language that was eventually formed in Ancient Rus - the Old Russian literary language - was the result of the blend of Russo-Slavic with the Old Church Slavonic literary language. According to V.I. Lamansky, V.A. Istrin, S.P. Obnorsky, L.P. Yakubinsky, the Old Russian literary language included the sappy folk element, as well as the elements of the state-official and poetic styles. This contrasts with West European languages, which had long experienced the gap between the Latin language of educated literate nobility and the national languages of illiterate masses. The ancient monuments of the Russian language - the Russian Codes, The Tale of Igor's Campaign, Tale of Bygone Years, Praying of Daniel the Immured, Sermon of Law and Grace by Metropolitan Hilarion, Tale of the Princes Boris and Gleb, Admonition by Vladimir Monomakh evince stylistic variety, high artistic merits, psychological subtlety and eloquence of the speech culture. Vinogradov writes: "The Old Church Slavonic language only enriches and fertilizes the soil deeply tilled by the distinctive voice of the East Slavic culture" [Ibid.: 32].

[12] Apparently, writing had existed in Ancient Rus prior to the adoption of Christianity in 988. A ritual earthenware vessel dating from the era of the Chernyahiv culture (2-4th cc.) bears an inscription in runes [Kaya, 1998]. There is a record that in Hersonissos Cyril himself saw books, hand-written in "Russian writings" (Pre-Glagolotic) [Kultura Drevney Rusi, 2014]. Writings were found upon utensils and implements, e.g. an earthen vessel of the early 10th c. found in one of the mounds of Smolensk, with words in Cyrillics. Prince Oleg's agreements with the Greeks of the years 907 and 911, as well as those of Prince Igor and Svyatoslav, consisted of two official legal texts, one in Greek and the other in Russo-Slavic. Old Russians appreciated books and knowledge (a chronicler praised "book learning" and compared books to "rivers watering the universe," "sources of wisdom"). Old Russian manuscripts manifest high levels of decorative art (e.g. the 11th c. Ostromir Gospel, Miscellany of Prince Svyatoslav Yaroslavich). There were schools in Ancient Rus, literacy being not just the privilege of the ruling class, but widespread among townspeople. The proof of this are Novgorod letters written on birch bark (dated approx. 11th c.), found in plenty (more than a thousand), which contain correspondence of officials, merchants, ordinary citizens [Ibid., 2014].

Vinogradov's statements were illustrated by linguistic facts and examples. Discussing the influences of Russian on the Serbian, Croatian (Illyrian), Slovenian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Lithuanian languages, their mutual borrowings, Vinogradov elicits the interaction of Slavic linguocultures [Ibid.: 50-70]. He quotes famous people, men of letters and philologists, theorizing on the unity of the Slavic cultures and languages. Vinogradov concludes: "The modern Russian language represents, one might say, a kind of unprecedented event in the history of world culture" [Ibid.: 166].

V.M. Alpatov passes the following judgement on the role of the book for the Soviet language policy: "Apparently, even a decade earlier V.V. Vinogradov's book would have been considered an extreme manifestation of "great-power chauvinism." But now it was completely in line with the public consciousness. The times of revolutionaries in politics <...> have passed, and the position previously branded as "bourgeois", was now more to the point. In general, among the changes in policy and ideology in the late Stalin period, the glorification of the great Russian language found its place alongside with the improvement of relations with the Orthodox Church, the appeal to the names of Alexander Nevsky and Alexander Suvorov, restoration of the old military ranks and shoulder straps etc." [Alpatov, 1993: 98]. So the book *The Great Russian Language* heralds the post-war Soviet ideological trend of overcoming the early manifestations of Trotskyite cosmopolitanism and self-deprecation, the return to patriotic stance and etatism [13].

The postwar period: The School Reform

The war caused enormous damage to the Soviet economy, industry, agriculture[14]. The system of education was also affected. The Nazis destroyed about 84 000 schools, colleges, and universities. The number of students in middle school dropped by half, and in the higher - 2,5 times. Yet, despite all the difficulties and hardships, by the end of the war, 687 school buildings were built, about half of

[13] I.T. Kreindler asserts, with a negative connotation, that there was a return to the "tsarist" concept of Russian as the "cement of the Empire" [Kreindler, 1982: 7]. However, the idea that a single second language as a tool of inter-ethnic communication also unites peoples and individuals in a single mindset is quite obvious and employed in all countries, as well as globally (compare the role of "global English" in the instillation of Anglo-Saxon culture, values and modes of life worldwide, given the apparent cultural and informative bias of most English textbooks). It is obvious that, until a single artificial language, enriched by the linguistic and conceptual matter of other languages, is implemented for use in the international communication, there will be major languages that influence other languages and serve as interlanguages. The current problem and the current task are, then, to make those major languages neutral, unimposing and friendly to the cultures of minorities. Rather than transmitters of a foreign culture, they should be tools of communication and exchange medium of culturally void matter, such as common concepts and scientific terms. Textbooks in foreign languages should be written and published by domestic functionaries, and their content should be related to universal and domestic matters. Only a small (about 10%) of content may be related to a respective foreign culture, and the teaching-learning of it should not involve any subconscious fascination tools ("immersion") [Shelestyuk, 2020].

[14] Suffice it to say that more than 1710 cities and towns and more than 70 000 villages, about 32 000 factories, 98 000 collective farms and 2890 machine and tractor stations were destroyed, see Chaadaev Ya.E. (1985) Ekonomika SSSR v gody Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny (1941–1945) (The economy of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War of 1941–1945. M.: Mysl').

them - in the liberated territories. After the War, within the span of 1946-1950, 18,5 thousand new schools for 2,4 million pupils were built. Many schools for young workers were established since 1944 [Narodnoe…, 1967]. In 1952, the 19th Congress of the CPSU was held, which stated that by that year the transition to the seven-year compulsory education had been completed. The transition to the ten (eleven) -year public compulsory education of children from the age of seven was set as a goal. However, this goal proved to be premature: the economy needed to be restored and the country needed workers, while polytechnics, vocational and young workers' schools could not provide enough manpower for the working and technical specialties, as the young (the scarce population of the wartime as it was) preferred to get higher education and work as engineers. In 1955, 1 068 000 young men and women completed secondary (high) school, which was almost four times greater than the intake of higher education institutions [Narodnoe..., 1977]. The main objective of high school - preparing young people for entry into higher education institutions - came into conflict with the needs of the society.

On December 24, 1958, the law "On the strengthening of ties of school with life and on the further development of the system of public education in the USSR" was adopted. This law formalized a mitigated version of the 19th CPSU Congress' declaration - the transition to the eight-year public compulsory education, with a view to implementation of universal ten (eleven)-year education. Under the law, high school took on a "polytechnic profile." After receiving eight-year education, the young were "to be included in feasible socially useful work", and all further education was associated with productive labour for the economy. Anyone wishing to obtain complete ten (eleven)-year secondary education should study at a polytechnical school with industrial training, a vocational school (college), or at evening (shift) and correspondence schools for working and rural youth [Shestakov, 2008]. It was not until 1972 that the USSR launched an active transition to universal ten-year secondary education. The general educational potential of the Soviet population increased from 2,1 in 1920 to approximately 9,1 years in 1989 [Kuzmin, 2001].

The school reform lasted from 1958 to 1964 (in the period of N.S. Khrushchev as CPSU Secretary General and shortly after him). Among other aspects, it provided for parents the right of choosing schools for their children, including choosing between the Russian and the national school. This step was designed to provide the all-Union general secondary education for all the Soviet children and facilitate its qualitative unification, for which many schools of minor nations and ethnic groups were still unready, there being not enough methodological basis (textbooks, dictionaries, manuals) for the eight-year and ten-year schooling.

Language Education and Language Policy

An important incentive for parents to have their children learn Russian as the second language was that it had become one of the major world languages of education and scientific and technical progress. The Russian language was deemed an effective means to transmit the achievements of science and culture. So a large number of families of ethnic minorities opted for the Russian language (or other languages of the Union republics) as the language of instruction.

On the negative side, the establishment of the right to a choice between the Russian and the national school resulted in the "enlargement" (integration) of education, a decrease in the number of national schools and the number of pupils in them. There was a stoppage of many national schools caused by their small intake. In the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic, the process of the "enlargement" of language education led to the stoppage of several ethnic schools: Karelian - in 1956-1958, Buryat, in lieu of the Regional Committee resolution, - in 1960, Kalmyk - in the early 1960s, Kabardian and Balkar - in the 1965/66 academic year [Namzhilov, 1994: 155]. By the early 1980s, 8 peoples of Dagestan had native schools [Silver, Anderson, 1982/84: 1036].

Nevertheless, in the early 1960s, the number of languages of instruction in the RSFSR was 47 - the number, unmatched by any country in the world [15]. In 1982, the number of the languages of instruction in the RSFSR was 17, with other 49 national and ethnic languages taught as subjects [Kuznetsov, Chekhoeva, 1982: 12]. "Currently, the instruction in the native languages is carried out to the 10th grade in the Bashkir and Tatar ASSRs, to the 8th class - in the Tuvan and Yakut ASSRs, from the 2nd to the 4th grade - in the Mordovian, Mari, Chuvash, Komi, Udmurt, Dagestan ASSRs, in the Gorno-Altai and Khakass Autonomous Regions. In other republics, regions, districts and schools of the Far North, training in Russian is carried out at the request of parents from the 1st grade; native languages and literatures are studied as subjects. Russian as a training item is studied from the 1st grade in the RSFSR schools simultaneously with the native language. L.I. Brezhnev emphasized, "all nations and nationalities populating the Soviet Union preserve their characteristics, the features of a national character, language, their best traditions. They have all the opportunities to achieve ever greater flourishing of their national cultures" (Following Lenin's course. 1974. Vol. 4. P. 243)", quoted in [Ibid.: 13].

Similar processes of "enlargement" occurred in the other Union republics of the USSR. Thuswise the number of languages of instruction in the Uzbek SSR decreased from 22 to 7 from 1939 to 1962 [Khanazarov, 1963: 176], quoted in [Alpatov, 2000: 122].

A certain optimal linguistic situation was reached by trial, and despite the decrease, the numbers of official languages and languages of instruction in secondary and higher education remain

[15] In 1927, schooling was conducted in 32 languages, in 1931 – in 70, in 1932 – in 92, in 1934 – in 104 languages.

a brilliant example to emulate. V.I. Belikov and L.P. Krysin quote 43 national languages in the Soviet Union at the end of its existence (1990) [Belikov, Krysin, 2001: 290]. It was the world leader in national languages that were taught at schools or were languages of instruction.

In the Union republics, there also appeared a trend to send children to Russian schools, although on a smaller scale than in the RSFSR. This process concerned all the Soviet republics, including the Baltics. Least of all were affected the Central Asian republics, where, according to I.T. Kreindler, parents sometimes, counter trend, actually prevented their children from attending Russian schools [Kreindler, 1985: 355]. In fact, a large part of the Central Asian population was rural, so parents saw their future as the life of agricultural workers, for which their national languages were most fit.

It should be noted that the influence of the reduction of national schools of minorities' languages was mitigated by two trends. Firstly, it basically had no influence on the functioning of day-to-day oral and written forms of minor languages [Alpatov, 2000: 122]. Secondly, despite the above-mentioned tendency in secondary school, the status of ethnic languages in higher school and development of their literary forms was not impeded. National and ethnic higher educational institutions and departments existed and prospered. There was government support for the development of national and ethnic cultures and literature, with due finance.

The Soviet 1958 reform and the subsequent "enlargement" of school education received much criticism in the West, e.g. [Lipset, 1967: 187-188; Silver, 1978: 189; Kreindler, 1985: 355-356, 1989: 49; Knowles, 1989: 158; Kirkwood, 1991: 64]. Sometimes it is estimated almost as evidence of "forced russification" through outwardly democratic measures. But, of course, as V.M. Alpatov asserts, the main cause here was the desire of parents for the benefit of their children, their wish to educate them in a language that would contribute to their unlimited selection of a further/higher educational institution [Alpatov, 2000: 107]. It must be borne in mind, that more than 80% of the population of the RSFSR (and about 50% of the population of the USSR) were Russians, no wonder the greatest number of colleges and universities were Russian language.

Generally, the ethnic minorities in the Soviet Union, with mandatory education and printing in their languages, were much better off than in most polyethnic countries, where national languages were, and in many cases still remain, at best, languages of domestic and informal inter-ethnic use. According to J.A. Laponce, the degradation of national languages is accompanied by extinction of language speakers, linguistic assimilation, transition from bilingualism to monolingualism in what has earlier been a foreign language, the intermediate stage of "linguistic ghetto," where a native language is still remembered and sometimes spoken among a few kinsmen, but the possibility of its free use is extremely limited [Laponce, 1987]. All these manifestations were immeasurably far from the Soviet

reality, with ethnic languages enacted as regional languages, with the opportunities of native language education, including higher education, books, and periodicals in native languages etc.

So far from forced russification - imposition of the Russian language or inducement of local populations to use it - there appeared a situation in the Soviet Union, where national schools and languages were supported from the top-down, as a general government course, while from the bottom-up there came a desire to get their children educated in Russian (with the study of the mother tongue as a subject).

With the postulation of the new socialist community - the Soviet people - at the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 - as an ideological, ethic and spiritual envelope for the nationalities of the USSR, the reputation of the Russian language as a language of inter-ethnic and international communication still enhanced. The use of the Russian language within one state was deemed necessary for practical convenience. The turkologist A.N. Baskakov wrote: “the use of local languages in all kinds of record management, financial and other reports and official correspondence... is impractical, as it entails duplication of a large volume of information and complexity of the operation in respective spheres of social activity. The use of a number of languages in proceedings of some autonomous republics in the 1930s had not worked and had to be given up” [Baskakov, 1994a: 35]. Then, inside the country, with the knowledge of the Russian language one could almost always do without interpreters (at least in the official domains), which certainly facilitated communication. Leaders of Union republics (E. Shevardnadze, Sh. Rashidov and others) spoke in favour of learning Russian - “the language of the brotherhood of all the peoples of the USSR, of the October Revolution, of Lenin” - in addition to native languages.

At the same time, the status of national languages remained high and was guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution. Thus Article 45 of the 1977 Constitution of the USSR provided for the right to educating children in their native language. Article 159 provided that court proceedings should be conducted “in the languages of Union or autonomous republics, autonomous okrugs, autonomous regions, or in the language of the majority of a local population.” These language rights of nationalities and ethnic groups were strictly observed.

It can be summarised that, by and large, the leadership of the USSR in their language policy respected national languages and traditions and sought to enhance and develop them, converging the communist ideology therewith, with a view to fostering the new community, the Soviet people. And, given the relatively small number and influence of nationally oriented intellectuals, the language policy on top towards minorities of autonomous republics revealed an effort to preserve minority languages in cultural spheres by any means [Alpatov, 2000: 122].

But the objective laws of language functioning were reckoned with and used to advantage. In fact, for a language to persist in time, be used by linguistically different ethnic groups, dominate bilingual situations, structurally affect contact languages, this language should have developed socio-communicative functions, which, in their turn, are determined by the socio-cultural system served by it [Avrorin, 1975]. The Russian language, being the language of the national majority, at the same time served scientific progress and socialist advance, and so included in its socio-cultural domain and developmental vectors all the other languages of the USSR, as well as the languages of the COMECON, socialist-oriented post-colonial states, etc.

A language of international and inter-ethnic communication as it was, Russian did not become a second language for all the Soviet population outside the RSFSR, except for those peoples who were linguistically and culturally affine with Russians - Ukrainians and Belarusians[16]. Officially, Soviet linguists, e.g. K.K. Yudakhin in 1971 at a general meeting of the Kyrgyz Academy of Sciences, V.A. Avrorin in his book of 1975 [Avrorin, 1975: 142-143], questioned the fact that the Russian language had really become the second language of the republics or were skeptical of this concept as such, as it was valid only for a part of national intelligentsia; thus we can hardly speak of the imposition of Russian as a second language. The benign situation with the languages of the Union republics of the USSR was indicated by Western observers G.E. Lewis (1972), J. Pool (1978), G.B. Hewitt (1989), quoted in [Alpatov, 2000: 108, 115].

Census Data

In this connection it is interesting to look at census data. According to the materials of the last Soviet census of 1989, even with the Russian language being the language of inter-ethnic communication, about 30% of Bashkirs and Tatars, 35% of Chuvash, 38% of Mordovians etc. within the RSFSR; 35,6% of Latvians, 39,5% of Kazakhs, 43,8% of Ukranians, 52,9% of Armenians, 72,3% of Turkmens etc. in the Union republics did not have fluency in Russian as the second language [Boldyrev, 1990: 37-39]. However, as V.M. Alpatov points out, census data should not always be taken at face value as ubiquitously reliable information. Formulations in censuses could admit of different interpretations of the terms “native language” and “second language”, and answers were often arbitrary and did not reflect the real situation [Alpatov, 2000: 108, also see: Avrorin, 1975: 144; Guboglo, 1979: 7; Silver, 1978: 267-268; Belikov, Krysin, 2001: 217, 223, 236, 237]. For example, if one is to believe the 1979 and 1989 censuses data, the number of Uzbeks and Karakalpaks, who spoke

[16]Generally, Russian was widely used in Ukraine and Byelorussia in the 1980s, contrary to J. Stalin's and G.K. Danilov's predictions of the “overcoming speaking Russian” in urban areas of these republics and despite the top-down support by fiat of the Ukrainian and Belarusian languages. At the same time, the number of publications in Ukrainian and Belarusian was consistently big, which also held true for scientific publications.

fluent Russian in ten years had decreased almost twofold, from 49,6% to 23,8% and from 41,1% to 20,7% respectively. Also, the decrease in the percentage of those Estonians who knew Russian between 1970 and 1979 censuses is unlikely to reflect the actual process, but probably socio-political trends. It is very plausible that the Central Asian nations tended to exaggerate their command of Russian in the censuses, and the Baltic ones - to downplay it. In general, the overall number of people capable of communication in Russian was more than the censuses showed [Guboglo, 1979: 7] [17].

The proficiency in the Russian language differed greatly by region. According to M.N. Guboglo, in Moldavia the estimated number of people who did not have a certain command of the Russian language was minimal, no more than 5% of the population [Guboglo, 1979: 7], and a similar pattern was observed on the entire territory of the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and in the Baltic Republics. Lower degrees of proficiency in Russian were recorded in Kazakhstan and the Caucasus, the lowest degree being in mono-ethnic Armenia.

Thus, in Kazakhstan of the late 1970s urban families talked among themselves in Kazakh, when dealing with their Kazakh colleagues, read the press and literature in their mother tongue [Kopylenko, Saina, 1982]. But when it came to special literature, most Kazakhs, excluding agricultural specialists, preferred to read it in Russian.

In Central Asia, the majority of the rural population with lower levels of education used the vernacular and dialectal forms of native languages and could hardly speak the Russian language [Baskakov, 1994b]. According to the USSR 1989 census, only 20,7 % Karakalpaks, 23,8 % Uzbeks, 27,6 % Turkmen, 35,2 % Kirghiz, mostly urban residents, were fluent in the Russian language [Boldyrev, 1990: 37-39]. The male part of the population knew the Russian language from the army, which, in M.N. Guboglo's opinion, was the second most important source of knowledge of the Russian language after school [Guboglo, 1979]. However, in general, Central Asian "national high school graduates speak Russian poorly or do not speak it, which hampers their further education in Russian at higher educational institutions, polytechnics and vocational schools" [Baskakov, 1992: 29]. V.M. Alpatov sees it as "an endless circle", when the indigenous peoples' mastering of new professions was hampered by their lack of proficiency in the Russian language, and this proficiency was hampered by the concentration of these peoples in traditional agricultural areas [Alpatov, 2000: 109].

In the Armenian SSR, the Armenian language prevailed, the same was true about the Georgian language in the Georgian SSR. S.V. Lurie ("Yerevan phenomenon: the emergence of traditional

[17] The Soviet censuses gave a good deal of information on national language issues, though some data interpretation may not be so obvious. Meanwhile, in Belgium, for example, after 1947, in order to avoid any linguistic conflicts, questions about languages were excluded from censuses altogether, and any reliable statistics on the number of speakers of French and Flemish, bilingualism and other such matters are absent. In Japan, following the equalization of the Ainu in rights with the Japanese, this people was no longer considered in censuses, and since the 1980s quite contradictory data on the number of Ainu – from 15 to 50 thousand – could be found [Alpatov, 2000: 108].

society in the modern capital city") shows that, while before the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution Armenians of Tiflis and other cities began to lose their language, after it, the Armenian language flourished, and Yerevan became almost a monolingual city. It was established in the Soviet time as the cultural center of the Armenians, and rapidly developed. The positions of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian languages were very stable too.

An interesting psycholinguistic behavioral pattern of strongly assimilated ethnic minorities can be observed in the censuses data: the farther away from a traditional national territory, the higher the percentage of those who called their ethnic languages, rather than the titular language of their environment, "native." Thus, according to the data of the 1989 census, among the Orochs, a small Tungus-related people of Khabarovsk Krai, who lived in their traditional areas in the North, just 10,4% called their ethnic language native; in other areas of Khabarovsk Krai the estimate was 14,3%; in other areas of the RSFSR outside of Khabarovsk Krai, the estimate was already 25,8%; in other Soviet republics - 46,9%. Even more strikingly, this phenomenon appears in the case of the Chuvans - the people genetically close to Yukagirs, which had been partially linguistically assimilated by the Chukchi already by the beginning of the XX century. In Anadyr region, where 60% of Chuvans are concentrated, those calling their ethnic (practically extinct) language native were only 3,7%, whereas in other areas of Chukotka they were 17,8%, and outside of the RSFSR - already 53,5%. A similar anomaly is observed when comparing the urban and rural population. Based on the materials of the 1989 census, for all the peoples of the North the pattern was that those who recognized their ethnic tongue as native were fewer among rural populations than among urban residents. As V.I. Belikov and L.P. Krysin conclude, here the recognition of an ethnic language as native is more likely to mean a symbolic identification with one's ethnic group; it happens more often when one is not in the environment of one's kinsmen [Belikov, Krysin, 2001: 168][18].

With all the above-mentioned facts in view, it becomes clear that periodic campaigns for the centralized promotion of the Russian language (especially its use in education), which were perceived in the West as a victory of "hardline" policy towards the nationalities, were primarily due to the overall inadequate level of proficiency in Russian as the language of inter-ethnic communication, in national republics. The Russian language was often taught unsatisfactorily, and it was deemed necessary to take measures to solve that problem.

[18]Perhaps, the reflections of this phenomenon are observed by [Zamyatin, 2012] in native or titular school preferences in contemporary Russia: "...in Tatarstan there is native language instruction for a few hundred Mari and Udmurt schoolchildren in secondary education, and in Bashkortostan for a few hundred Udmurt schoolchildren in primary school and approximately 3000 Mari schoolchildren in basic secondary education... The situation for these nationalities is worse in their own titular republics: the 11 000 Mari and 19 000 Udmurt schoolchildren in the Republics of Mari El and Udmurtia respectively learn the native language as a subject only."

National Languages in Culture, Science, Literature

In higher education, national faculties and departments were opened. Among the languages of instruction at universities in the RSFSR were Russian, Tatar, Bashkir, Udmurt, Buryat, Yakut, Karakalpak, Abkhazian, Komi and others. In national and autonomous republics, higher education was carried out predominantly in titular languages. Outside of national republics, the languages of these republics were taught at specialized university departments. For example, Moscow State Institute of Theatrical Arts (GITIS) had national studios, where young people were trained in different languages of the USSR, and whole troupes were prepared, which became cores of their national theatres [SSSR..., 1983]. National science in research institutes was developing, too, and so did national languages of science[19].

In the USSR, there was the largest number of languages, in which literature was written and published, owing to numerous national philology departments at universities and institutes. In 1934, the USSR Writers Union included 2500 writers. In March 1976, they were already 7833, writing in 76 languages of the USSR (Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1969-1978: Soyuz pisatelei SSSR (USSR Writers Union)). In the 1980s, writers published their books in 77 languages [SSSR..., 1983]. In 1984, 15 149 books were turned out in the languages of the peoples of the USSR in a total edition of 225 915 800 copies, including 2019 books in the Ukrainian language, 1940 - in Lithuanian, 1714 - in Georgian, 1274 - in Estonian, 1186 in Lettic, 1004 in Uzbek etc. [Pechat'…, 1985: 24]. The majority of national writers wrote in their native language (take the South Ossetian writer N. Dzhusoyty, asserting that "literature outside of its native language is false"), others also wrote in the Russian language (C. Aitmatov, Yu. Rytkheu, F. Iskander, O. Suleimenov, A. Kodar etc.).

To mention but a few RSFSR national writers of eminence, who wrote in their native languages: G. Bashirov, Musa Cälil, Ildar Yuzeev, M. Khabibullin (Tatar), S. Mukanov, M. Karim, N. Nadzhmi (Bashkir), V. Yukhnin, Ya. Rochev (Komi), A. Timonen (Karelian), N. Yakkola (Finnish), K. Abramov (Mordovian), R. Gamzatov (Avar, Dagestani), A. Kulakovsky, S. Danilov (Yakut), S. Saryg-ool (Tuvan), D. Kugultinov (Kalmyk), V. Krasnov-Asli, N. Ilbekov (Chuvash), K. Kuliev (Balkar), H. Teunov, A. Shortanov (Kabardian), D. Kostanov (Adygey), M. Mamakayev, A. Suleimanov (Chechen), N. Domozhakov (Khakassian), Yu. Rytkheu (Chukchi), N. Shestalov (Mansi), G. Khodzher (Nanai), V. Sangi (Nivkh).

[19] Thus, according to the Global Index of Chemical Publications for 1980, the Ukrainian language (588 books and articles) was superior to many other languages, among them Dutch and Swedish, while Belarusian (101 articles) took priority over Greek, Norwegian and all the languages of Asia and Africa, except Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Turkish, as well as other languages of the USSR [Laponce, 1987: 72]. In general, by the number of scientific publications, as reflected in international directories, the Ukrainian language was part of the second ten of the world's languages [Ibid.: 67]. Noteworthy is the fact that in the Ukrainian language the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Cybernetics was released in Kiev, although in Russian such publications did not appear through the entire Soviet period [Moskovich, 1989 (1990)], quoted in [Alpatov, 2000: 117].

In the Union republics there were such outstanding writers writing in their native languages as G. Mustafin, S. Maulenov, J. Muldagaliev, M. Auezov, A. Nurpeisov, T. Ahtanov, D. Doszhanov, O. Suleimenov (Kazakh), T. Sydykbekov, A. Tokombaev, S. Eraliev, U. Abdukaimov, C. Aitmatov (Kirghiz), Mehdi Hüseyn, Rasul Rza, Elçin, R. Ibrahimbekov (Azerbaijani), F. Pestrak, J. Kolas, J. Bryl, M. Tank, P. Brovka, I. Melezh (Belarusian), A. Gudaitis-Guzyavichyus, T. Tilvitis, I. Avizhyus, E. Mezhelaitis, V. Mykolaitis-Putinas, V. Petkyavichyus, V. Bubnis, M. Sluckis (Lithuanian), I. Kocherha, S. Zhurahovich, Ivan Drach, Yu. Smolich, I. Stadnyuk, O. Gonchar (Ukrainian), S. Shanschiashvili, G. Leonidze, N. Shengelaja, T. Tabidze, G. Chikovani, K. Kaladze, N. Dumbadze (Georgian), B. Shinkuba (Abkhazian), D. Mamsurov, N. Gagloyev (Ossetian), M. Tursun-Zade, F. Mukhammadiev, J. Ikrami, F. Niazi, P. Tolis (Tajik), V. A. Saxe, Valsyunene (Latvian), A. Hint, R. Sirge, P. Kuusberg, E. Vetemaa (Estonian), A. Saghyan, S. Kaputikian, R. Kochar, M. Shatiryan, G. Mahari, G. Matevosyan (Armenian), A. Lupa, L. Deleanu, V. Beshlyage, S. Shlyakhu, I. Druce, G. Meniuc (Moldavian), Aybek, R. Faizi (Uzbek), T. Kaipbergenov (Karakalpak) and many others.

Literature was also published in languages of such minor peoples, as Abaza, Gagauz, Dungan, Kurdish, Koryak, Mansi, Nenets, Khakassian, Khanty, Evenk, Even, Eskimo, Yukaghir, which is still an unattainable goal for most polyethnic countries. Say, almost all American Indian literature in United States and Canada is written in English, and the Japanese Ainu people hardly have any writer. No wonder that, for example, the identity of the Udehe writer Jhansi Kimonko attracted the attention of Western experts, as in [Imart, 1965: 235], quoted in [Alpatov, 2000: 131].

Speaking about periodicals, as of March 1, 1976, the USSR Writers Union published 15 literary newspapers in 14 languages of the peoples of the USSR and 86 literary magazines in 45 languages of the peoples of the USSR, including the monthly literary magazine Friendship of Peoples (Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1969-1978: Soyuz pisatelei SSSR (USSR Writers Union)). In 1989, newspapers and journals were published in 56 languages of the USSR [Belikov, Krysin, 2001: 290]. In the 1980s, 2377 newspapers were published in the peoples' of the USSR languages, including 1275 Ukrainian, 204 Uzbek, 172 Kazakh etc. [Pechat'…, 1985: 110-112].

In general, these facts and figures can hardly be interpreted otherwise but as evidence of the care for the national heritage of the peoples of the USSR, of nurturing and developing their national languages and cultures. Indeed, the socialist period may truly be called the heyday of the spiritual and creative faculties of the Soviet peoples, and a real golden age for the development of national languages of the USSR, in which humanistic and life-asserting literature was written. While many Western nations tended to eliminate the linguistic and cultural identity of their own and colonial peoples, and now have to restore and even reconstruct them, within the Russian civilization, national

languages and cultures have maintained their identity, developed, mutually enriched themselves and gradually raised their status. For its part, Russian has become a peculiar medium of creative polylingual consciousness, in which Russian and national cognitive features have been internalized, and one of the factors of the phylogeny of the nationalities.

It is possible to agree with the opinion of E.E. Bacon [1966] that a similar situation with the advance of one main national language occurred in many countries exposed to the forces of modern industrialization and technology. An important feature distinguishes the Soviet linguistic situation, though. Despite the strengthening of the position of the Russian language, there was comparable progress in the development of the languages of nationalities; the country's policies stipulated a significant development of all nationalities and national languages over the post-revolutionary period [Alpatov, 2000: 135]. The Soviet national policy, including language policy, greatly developed the national consciousness of its peoples. This was particularly noticeable in Central Asia, where every Uzbek, unlike during V.V. Barthold's and E.D. Polivanov's time, already knew they were Uzbek, and even their command of the Russian language did not lead to assimilation [Bennigsen, Quelquejay, 1967; Crisp, 1989 (1990); Bacon, 1966]. An important role in this belongs to the fact that, unlike in the 1920s, for example, the Uzbek language had clear boundaries and linguistic norms [Fierman, 1985]. While there was no such medium of ethnic consolidation as religion in the Soviet era, the development of national languages, in varying degrees, was given state support, and this, regardless of the actual role of these languages in communication, increased their symbolic role in terms of distinguishing "us" from "them" [Alpatov, 2000: 135]. So, despite the problems arising from a few script changes and Russian taking over certain functional domains of communication, it should be stated that the USSR has revealed to the world a sample of democratic and flexible national language policy.

It should be mentioned in connection with the USSR national and language policies that the anti-Soviet rhetoric sometimes posed two opposite trends of "domestic" criticism. "Russian nationalist" stance frequently contains accusations against Lenin and the Bolsheviks of the neglect of the largest nation's interests on the territory of Russia, of their Westernism and separatism, of destroying the unitary political system, whose viability had been proven by Russia's ages long history, and thus of menacing the territorial integrity of the state. At the same time, local nationalist and liberal cosmopolitan ideologies habitually contain allegations of Lenin and the Bolsheviks' Russian chauvinism, and of "the right of nations to self-determination" being only a smokescreen to hide their plans for the russification of the suburbs. From these narrow perspectives, both groups may find some proof, as, in the years running, a variety of national and language policies had been pursued in the USSR, like previously in the Russian Empire, and a few excesses, which usually amounted to no more

than scattered cases, may be gleaned to prove their point. But in fact, the time of the Soviet power, the socialist period, as is shown, may truly be called the prime of time for all the Soviet peoples. As for their communication, for the 70 years of the Soviet power, Lvov, Baku, Tbilisi, Tallinn and other towns began to speak Russian, alongside with their own languages, without coercion on the part of the authorities, on the contrary, attempts were made to restrain the spread of the Russian language. As Lenin had predicted, voluntariness, coupled with the rapid economic development and the objective needs of economic, cultural, scientific, technological etc. exchange, conditioned the extensive use of the Russian language. At the same time, it was the era of prosperity for all the other national languages of the peoples, nations, and nationalities of the USSR, in which multiple works of literature were created, national culture and arts developed.

Speaking about the linguistic situation in the Soviet Union, it is impossible not to compare it with national language policies of democratic capitalist countries of not so long ago. For example, the U.S. Congress passed a law on the languages of Native Americans (Indians) (the Native American Languages Act) only in 1990, and later the Senate held a special hearing on the issue of financial support for the program of indigenous languages revival. New Zealand only in 1987 adopted a law on the Maori language (the Māori Language Act), according to which it was declared the official language, and in connection with which a commission was established to develop measures aimed at expanding the Maori language social functions and improve the conditions of its use as a means of communication. Similar laws came in the 1990s in Egypt, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Australia. However, Canada, for example, advised the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations that its government would not provide the necessary financial assistance to indigenous groups in the use and development of the native languages for the implementation of administrative or other official activity on the federal scale, but only within the limits of their own communities[20]. According to the Government of Canada, more than 50 indigenous languages of the country could create huge financial and organizational difficulties, Information Submitter by the Government of Canada, UN. Doc. E/CN, 4/Sub, 2/AC, 4/1990, at 3, 1990, quoted in: [Ilishev, 2000: 70].

Conclusion

Summarizing the above exposition, we should conclude that the national and language policies of Russia follow the pattern of dynamic fluctuations, dependent, in the first place, on the domestic political conditions and international situation - calm and prosperous times or the times of

[20] Canada is home to over 60 indigenous languages. However, taken together, they are spoken by less than one percent of the population. According to the 2011 census, less than one percent of Canadians (213 485) reported an Aboriginal language as their mother tongue. URL: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011003_3-eng.cfm

external/internal threats. These policies fluctuate from liberal laws providing for democratic self-governance of national territorial units, use of national (ethnic) languages in education and administration, institutionalization of and financing structures for the development of national cultures, literatures and languages to such steps as strengthening of the major national language as language of inter-ethnic communication (as well as titular languages of the autonomous republics), return to unifying patriotic ideology and education, civic consolidation, "convergence in a single nation" and etatism. In the second place, there is a dependence on the needs of modernization and technological progress, but this factor, while giving prominence to a single developed national language, also presupposes the development of minor languages based on the practices of translations from/into the H-language and borrowing/enriching terminology thereof.

References

Alpatov, V.M. (1993) Yazykovaya politika v SSSR v 20-30-ye gody: Utopii i real'nost' [Language Policy in the USSR in the 1920s-1930s: Utopia and Reality] // Vostok. (5). Pp. 113-127. (In Russ.)

Alpatov, V.M. (2000) 150 yazyikov i politika: 1917-2000 [150 Languages and Politics: 1917-2000]. M.: Kraft+, Oriental Studies Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 224 p. (In Russ.)

Alpatov, V.M. (2014) Yazykovaya politika v Rossii i mire [Language policy in Russia and the world] // Yazykovaya politika i yazykovyye konflikty v sovremennom mire [Language policy and language conflicts in the modern world]. International Conference, Moscow, September 16-19, 2014: Proceedings / Resp. ed. A.N. Bitkeeva, V.Yu. Mikhalchenko; Institute of Linguistics RAS; Research Center for National Language Relations. M. Pp. 11-24. (In Russ.)

Alpatov, V.M. (2020) Yazykovaya politika i rodnoy yazyk [Language policy and native language] // Sotsiolingvistika. No. 3. Pp. 114-124. (In Russ.)

Amanzholova, D.A. (2010) Formatirovaniye sovetskosti: natsional'nyye men'shinstva v etnopoliticheskom landshafte SSSR, 1920-1930-ye gg. [Formatting of the Soviet People: National minorities in the ethnopolitical landscape of the USSR, 1920-1930s]. M.: Assembly. P. 156. (In Russ.)

Arutyunova, M.A. (2012) Yazykovaya politika i status russkogo yazyka v SSSR i gosudarstvakh postsovetskogo prostranstva [Language policy and status of the Russian language in the USSR and the states of the post-Soviet space] // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 25. Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya i mirovaya politika. No. 1. Pp. 155-178. (In Russ.)

Avrorin, V.A. (1975) Problemy izucheniya funktsionalnoy storony yazyka (k voprosu o predmete sotsiolingvistiki) [Problems of Studying the Functional Aspect of Language: (On the Subject of Sociolinguistics)]. L.: Nauka. 276 p. (In Russ.)

Bacon, E.E. (1966) Central Asians under Russian Rule. A Study in Cultural Change. Ithaca ; New York: Cornell University Press. 273 p.

Bahtikireeva, U.M. (2009) Hudozhestvennyi bilingvizm i osobennosti russkogo hudozhestvennogo teksta pisatelya-bilingva [Creative bilingual identity (features of Russian texts of authors of Turkic origin)]: monograph. 2nd ed. Astana: CBO and MI Publisher. 259 p. (In Russ.)

Baskakov, A.N. (1992) Sotsiolingvisticheskiy analiz yazykovoy situatsii v regione Sredney Azii i Kazahstana [Sociolinguistic analysis of the linguistic situation in the region of Central Asia and Kazakhstan]. Nukus ; Bilim. 48 p. (In Russ.).

Baskakov, A.N. (1994a) Sotsiolingvisticheskiye aspekty yazykovogo zakonodatel'stva v Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Sociolinguistic aspects of the language legislation in the Russian Federation] //

Yazykovye problemy Rossiyskoy Federatsii i zakony o yazykah. M.: Institute of Linguistics, RAS. Pp.32-37. (In Russ.)

Baskakov, A.N. (1994b) Tipy yazykovykh konfliktov v regione Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana [Types of language conflicts in the region of Central Asia and Kazakhstan] // Yazyk v kontekste obschestvennogo razvitiya. M.: Institute of Linguistics RAS. Pp. 171-180. (In Russ.)

Bazarova, V. (2008) Korenizatsiya gosudarstvennogo apparata v Buryat-Mongolii kak opyt natsional'noy politiki v 1920-1930-kh gg. [Indigenization of the state apparatus in Buryat-Mongolia's experience of national policy in the 1920-1930s] // Vlast'. (7). Pp. 53-55. (In Russ.)

Bazarova, V. (2009) Eksperimenty yazykovoy politiki pervoy poloviny XX v. [Experiments in language policy in the first half of the 20th century] // Vlast'. (8). Pp. 94-97. (In Russ.)

Belikov, V.I., Krysin, L.P. (2001) Sotsiolingvistika [Sociolinguistics]. M.: Russian State Humanitarian University. 439 p. (In Russ.)

Bennigsen, A., Lemercier-Quelquejay, Ch. (1967) Islam in the Soviet Union. London : Central Asian Research Centre.

Boldyrev, V.A. (1990) Itogi perepisi naseleniya SSSR: po dannyim Vsesoyuznoy perepisi naseleniya 1989 g. [Population of the USSR according to the Soviet census of 1989] // Gos. kom. SSSR po statistike [State Committee of the USSR on Statistics]. Information Publishing Centre. M.: Finansy i Statistika. 47 p. (In Russ.)

Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya [The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia], 1st edition (1926-1947), 2nd ed. (1949-1958), 3rd ed. (1969-1978). M.: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. (In Russ.)

Boltenkova, L.F. (1988) Internatsionalizm v deystvii [Internationalism in action]. M.: Mysl'. 221 p. (In Russ.)

Bruchis, M. (1982) One Step Back, Two Steps Forward: on the Language Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the National Republics [Moldavian: a Look Back, a Survey and Perspectives, 1924-1980]. Boulder ; New York: East European Monographs. No. 109. Boulder, Co: East European Quarterly, 1982. 371 p.

Chinn, J., Kaiser, R. (1996) Russians as the New Minority: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Soviet Successor States. Boulder : Westview Press. 308 p.

Chomsky, N. (2000) The Architecture of Language / Ed. by N. Mukherji. New Delhi ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Comrie, B. (1981) The Languages of the Soviet Union. Cambridge: CUP. 317 p.

Coupland, N. (2010) The Handbook of Language and Globalization / Ed. by N. Coupland. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 676 p.

Crisp, S. (1990) Soviet language planning 1917-53 // Language Planning in the Soviet Union / M.Kirkwood (Ed). Houndmills ; London: Macmillan. Pp. 23-45.

Danjoux, O. (2002) L'état, c'est pas moi: Reframing Citizenship(s) in the Baltic Republics. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur. 362 p.

Desheriev, Yu.D. (1976) Zakonomernosti razvitiya literaturnyih yazykov narodov SSSR v sovetskuyu epohu [Patterns of development of literary languages of the USSR during the Soviet era]. M.: Nauka. 430 p. (In Russ.)

Dixon, R.M.W. (1997) The Rise and Fall of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyatlenko, P. Yazykovyye reformy v Tsentral'noy Azii: trendy - tseli - itogi [Language reform in Central Asia: Trends - Objectives - Results] // Vestnik Yevrazii [Bulletin of Eurasia]. 2008. No. 4. Pp. 80-111. (In Russ.).

Fairclough, N. (2006) Language and Globalization / N. Fairclough. Routledge.

Fierman, W. (1985) Language Development in Soviet Uzbekistan // In Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages / Ed. by Isabelle T. Kreindler. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 205-233.

Fishman, J.A. (2005) The new linguistic order / J.A. Fishman // Language and Linguistics in Context / Ed. By H. Luria, D. Seymour. New York: Imprint. Pp. 252-259.

Franceschini, R. (2009) Genesis and development of research in multilingualism: Perspectives for future research / R. Franceschini // The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition [AILA Applied Linguistics Series 6] / L. Aronin, B. Hufeisen (Eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 27-61.

Gosudarstvennaya yazykovaya politika Rossiyskoy Federatsii: sostoyaniye i perspektivy [State language policy of the Russian Federation: state and prospects] // Materials of the Round Table. November 28, 2013. M.: The State Duma Press, 2014. 48 p. (In Russ.)

Guboglo, M.N. (1979) Razvitie dvuyazychiya v Moldavskoy SSR [The Development of Bilingualism in the Moldavian SSR]. Chisinau: Shtiintsa. (In Russ.)

Ilishev, I.G. (2000) Yazyik i politika v mnogonatsionalnom gosudarstve: Politicheskie ocherki [Language and Politics in a Multinational State: Political Essays]. Ufa: Kitap. 270 p. (In Russ.)

Imart, G. (1965) Le movement de "Latinization" en U.R.S.S. // Cahiers du monde russe et sovietique. Paris (VI). Pp. 223-239. (In French)

Isaev, M.I. (1979) Yazyikovoe stroitelstvo v SSSR: protsess sozdaniya pismennosti narodov SSSR [Linguistic construction in the USSR: the process of creating written languages of the peoples of the USSR]. M.: Nauka. 350 p. (In Russ.)

Istoriya ukrayinskoy movi [History of the Ukrainian Language] // Ukrayinska mova. Entsiklopediya [Ukrainian language. Encyclopaedia] (2004). 2nd ed. / Institute of Linguistics named after A.A. Potebnya. Kyiv: Ukrayinska entsiklopediya. Pp. 235-239. (In Russ.).

Kaya A. Runy [Runes] (1998). M.: Lokid. 429 p.

Khanazarov, K.H. (1963) Sblizhenie natsiy i natsionalnyie yazyiki v SSSR [The Drawing Together of Nations and the National Languages of the USSR]. Tashkent: Academy of Sciences of the UzSSR. 240 p. (In Russ.)

Kirkwood, M. (1991) Glasnost', "The National Question" and Soviet Language Policy // Soviet Studies. (43-1). Pp. 61-81.

Knowles, F. (1990) Language in the Soviet Baltic Republics: an Analysis of Demographic and Sociological Trends // Language Planning in the Soviet Union / Ed. by M. Kirkwood. London: Macmillan. Pp. 145-173.

Kopylenko, M.M., Saina, S.T. (1982) Funktsionirovanie russkogo yazyika v razlichnyih sloyah kazahskogo naseleniya [The Russian Language Functioning in Various Layers of the Kazakh Population]. Alma-Ata: Nauka. 112 p. (In Russ.)

Kreindler, I.T. (1982) The Changing Status of Russian in the Soviet Union // International Journal of the Sociology of Language. (33). Pp. 7-39.

Kreindler, I.T. (1985) The Non-Russian Languages and the Challenge of Russian: The Eastern versus the Western Tradition // Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages: Their Past, Present and Future / Ed. by I.T. Kreindler. Berlin, etc.: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 345-367.

Kreindler, I.T. (1989) Soviet Language Planning since 1953 // Language Planning in the Soviet Union. London: Macmillan. Pp. 43-63.

Kultura Drevney Rusi (2014) [Culture of Ancient Rus] // Vsemirnaya istoriya: V 10 t. [History of the World in ten volumes] / Eds.: V.V.Kurasov, A.M. Nekrich, E.A. Boltin et al.; Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Institute of History. Institute of Asia. Institute of African Studies. Institute of Slavic Studies. M.: Mysl'. URL.: http://www.history-at-russia.ru/x-xii-veka/kultura-drevnej-rusi.html (15 October 2021). (In Russ.)

Kuzmin, M.N. (2001) Natsional'naya shkola Rossii v kontekste gosudarstvennoy obrazovatel'noy i natsional'noy politiki [National School in Russia in the Context of the State National and Educational Policy] // The Electronic Journal "Russkiy yazyik". August. URL.: http://gramota.ru/biblio/magazines/gramota/28_81 (14 October 2021). (In Russ.)

Kuznetsov, G.D., Chekhoeva, S.A. (1982) National School of the RSFSR in Modern Conditions // Sovetskaya pedagogika (Soviet Pedagogy). (11). Pp. 10-15. (In Russ.)

Kymlicka W. (2004) Assessing the Politics of Diversity in Transition Countries // Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries / Ed. by F. Grin; Open Society Institute. Pp. 1-29.

Laponce, J.A. (1987) Languages and their Territories. Toronto ; Buffalo ; London: University of Toronto. 265 p.

Lepretre, M. (2002) Language Policy in the Russian Federation: language diversity and national identity // Sociolinguistica international. Primavera. URL: https://www.gencat.cat/llengua /noves/noves/hm02primavera/internacional/a_marc.pdf (14 Oct 2021).

Lewis, E.G. (1972) Multilingualism in the Soviet Union. The Hague ; Paris. 332 p.

Lewis, E.G. (1982) Movements and agencies of language spread, Wales and the Soviet Union compared / Cooper, R. (Ed.) //Language Spread. Studies in Diffusion and Change. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. 214-259.

Lipset, H. (1967) The Station of National Minority Languages in Soviet Education // Soviet Studies. (XIX). Pp. 181-189.

Moskovich, W. (1990) Planned Language Change in Russian since 1917 // Language Planning in the Soviet Union / Ed. M. Kirkwood. London: Macmillan. 85-99.

Namzhilov, Ch.N. (1994) Yazykovaya situatsiya v Respublike Buryatiya [Language Situation in the Republic of Buryatia] // Yazykovye problemy Rossiyskoy Federatsii i zakony o yazyikah [Language Problems of the Russian Federation and Laws on Languages]. M.: Institute of Linguistics RAS. 534 p. (In Russ.)

Narodnoe obrazovanie, nauka i kultura v SSSR [People's Education, Science and Culture in the USSR] (1977). M.: Statistika. 247 p. (In Russ.)

Narodnoye obrazovaniye v SSSR. 1917-1967 (1967) [Popular education in the USSR. 1917-1967] / K. Aimanov et al.; Ed. M.A. Prokofiev et al. M.: Prosveshcheniye. 541 p. (In Russ.)

Nizamova, L.R. (2020) Dvuyazychiye v sovremennom Tatarstane: individual'noye i sotsial'noye izmereniya [Bilingualism in modern Tatarstan: Individual and social dimensions] // Sotsiologiya i obshchestvo: traditsii i innovatsii v sotsial'nom razvitii regionov [Electronic resource]: Proceedings of the VI All-Russian Sociological Congress (Tyumen, October 14-16, 2020) / Resp. Ed. V.A. Mansurov; Ed. E.Yu. Ivanova. M.: Ros; FSRSC RAS, 2020. Pp. 2466-2474. (In Russ.)

Obrazovaniye, nauka i kul'tura v SSSR [Education, science and culture in the USSR]. (1977) M.: Statistika. 247 p. (In Russ.)

Ornstein, J. (1959) Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice // The Slavic and East European Journal. (XVII). Pp. 382-392.

Pechat' SSSR v 1985 godu: Stat. sb. [Print of the USSR in 1985: Statistical Collection] / Vsesoyuznaya ordena «Znak Pocheta» knizhnaya palata (All-Union Order of Badge of Honor Book Chamber). M.: Finansy i statistika, 1986. 311 p. (In Russ.)

Reznik, V. (2001) Language Policy and Reform in the Soviet 1920s: Practical Polemics against Idealist Linguistics. Annual conference, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge. https://web.archive.org/web/ 20130220125834/http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/Slavonic/Epicentre/langpolicy.htm (14.10.2021)

Romanova, G.A. (2003) Reformirovanie sistemyi shkolnogo obrazovaniya v 1958-1964 gg. (Na materialah Kuybyishevskoy oblasti) [The reform of the school system in 1958-1964 on the materials of the Kuibyshev Region]. Diss. for Candidate Degree in History. Samara: Samara State University Publishing House. 222 p. (In Russ.)

Rusinova, S.I. (1970) Lenin o burzhuaznoy avtonomii [V.I. Lenin on the autonomy of the bourgeois nations] // Pravovedenye [Jurisprudence]. (2). Pp. 129-133. (In Russ.)

Schiffman, H.F. (2008) Language, Language Policy, and Citizenship : Three Views Compared // The Future of Citizenship / Jose V. Ciprut (Ed.). Publisher: Cambridge, MA (etc.) : MIT PressYear. Pp. 75-95.

Schweitzer, A.D. (1977) Sovremennaya sotsiolingvistika: Teoriya, problemyi, metody [Modern sociolinguistics: theory, problems, methods]. M.: Nauka. 176 p. (In Russ.)

Shejko, V.M., Tishevskaya, L.G. (2006) Istoriya ukrainskoy kultury [History of Ukrainian Culture]. Kiev: Condor. 264 p. (In Russ.)

Shelestyuk, Elena (2020) Exercising Eco-Linguistic Approach in Teaching English: Proposed Conventions for TESOL/TEFL Pedagogy // Ahwaz Journal of Linguistics Studies, ISSN: 2717-2643. Vol. 1. No. 3. Pp. 42-61.

Shestakov, V.A. (2008) Noveyshaya istoriya Rossii s nachala XX v. i do segodnyashnego dnya[(Recent history of Russia: from the early XX century to the present]. M.: AST. 480 p. (In Russ.)

Shiokawa, N. (1999) The History of Soviet Language Policy Reconsidered // Slavic Studies. (46). URL: http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/publictn/46/shiokawa/shiokawa-eng.html (14.10.2021)

Silver, B.D. (1978) Language Policy and the Linguistic Russification of Soviet Nationalities // Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices. New York: Praeger. Pp. 250-306.

Silver, B.D., Anderson, B.A. (1982/84) Equality, Efficiency and Politics in Soviet Bilingual Schooling Policies, 1934-1980. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Washington, DC, October 14-17 // American Political Science Association 78 (December 1984). Pp. 1019-1039.

Smith, M.G. (1993) The Eurasian Imperative in Early Soviet Language Planning: Russian Linguists at the Service of the Nationalities // Beyond Sovietology: Essays in History and Politics / Ed. By Susan G. Solomon. Armonk ; New York: M. E. Sharpe. Pp. 159-191.

Sovetkin, F.F. (1974) Izbrannyie trudy [Selected Works] / Ed. by Pint A.O. Vol. 1. Saransk: Mordovskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo. 240 p. (In Russ.)

Subachev, A.A. Yazykovaya politika v SSSR i RF na rubezhe 80-90-kh gg. [Language policy in the USSR and the Russian Federation at the turn of the 1980-90s] // Tret'i universitetskiye sotsial'no-gumanitarnyye chteniya. 2009: Materials: In 2 vol. Irkutsk, 2009. T. 2. Pp. 469-473. (In Russ.).

SSSR - 100 voprosov i otvetov (USSR - 100 questions and answers). (1983). M.: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House. 136 p. (In Russ.).

Stepanov, V.V. (2010) Podderzhka yazykovogo raznoobraziya v Rossiyskoy Federatsii [Support of the linguistic diversity in the Russian Federation] // Etnograficheskoe obozrenie [Ethnographic Review]. (4). Pp. 101-115. (In Russ.)

Vakhtin, N.B., Golovko, E.V. (2004) Sotsiolingvistika i sotsiologiya yazyika [Sociolinguistics and sociology of language]. SPb.: Humanitarian Academy, Publishing House of European University. 388 p. (In Russ.)

Vdovin, A.I. (2013) Russkie v XX veke. Tragedii i triumfyi velikogo naroda [Russians in the twentieth century. The tragedies and triumphs of the great nation]. M.: Veche. 624 p. (In Russ.)

Vinogradov, V.V. (1945) Velikiy russkiy yazyik [The great Russian language]. M.: OGIZ: State Publishing House of Imaginative Literature. 172 p. (In Russ.)

Zak, L.M., Isaev, M.I. (1966) Problemy pis'mennosti narodov SSSR i kul'turnoy revolyutsii [Problems of writing of the peoples of the USSR in the Cultural Revolution] // Voprosy istorii. No. 2. Pp. 2-16. (In Russ.)

Zakon SSSR “O yazykakh narodov SSSR” of 24.04.1990 [The Law of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics of April 22, 1990 “On the Languages of the peoples of the USSR”]. URL: https://sudrf.cntd.ru/document/9035984 (12.10.2021). (In Russ.)

Zamyatin, K. (2012) The Education Reform in Russia and its Impact on Teaching of the Minority Languages: An Effect of Nation-Building? // Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe. Vol 11. No. 1. Pp. 17-47.

Литература

Аврорин В.А. (1975) Проблемы изучения функциональной стороны языка (к вопросу о предмете социолингвистики). Л.: Наука. 276 с.

Алпатов В.М. (1993) Языковая политика в СССР в 20-30-е годы: Утопии и реальность // Восток. № 5. С. 113-127.

Алпатов В.М. (2000) 150 языков и политика: 1917-2000. 2-е изд., доп. М.: Крафт + Институт востоковедения РАН. 224 с.

Алпатов В.М. (2014) Языковая политика в России и мире // Языковая политика и языковые конфликты в современном мире: Международная конференция (Москва, 16-19 сентября 2014): Доклады и сообщения / Отв. ред. А.Н. Биткеева, В.Ю. Михальченко; Институт языкознания РАН; Научно-исследовательский центр по национально-языковым отношениям. М. С. 11-24.

Алпатов В.М. (2020) Языковая политика и родной язык / В. М. Алпатов // Социолингвистика. №3 (3). С. 114-124.

Аманжолова Д.А. (2010) Форматирование советскости: национальные меньшинства в этнополитическом ландшафте СССР, 1920-1930-е гг. М.: Собрание. 156 с.

Арутюнова М.А. (2012) Языковая политика и статус русского языка в СССР и государствах постсоветского пространства // Вестник Московского ун-та. Сер. 25. Международные отношения и мировая политика. № 1. С. 155-178.

Базарова В.В. (2008) Коренизация государственного аппарата в Бурят-Монголии как опыт национальной политики в 1920-1930-х гг. // Власть. № 7. С. 53-55.

Базарова В.В. (2009) Эксперименты языковой политики первой половины XX в. // Власть. № 8. С. 94-97.

Баскаков А.Н. (1992) Социолингвистический анализ языковой ситуации в регионе Средней Азии и Казахстана. Нукус: Билим. 48 с.

Баскаков А.Н. (1994a) Социолингвистические аспекты законодательства в Российской Федерации // Языковые проблемы Российской Федерации и законы о языках. М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН. С. 32-37.

Баскаков А.Н. (1994b) Типы языковых конфликтов в регионе Средней Азии и Казахстана // Язык в контексте общественного развития. М. С. 171-180.

Бахтикиреева У.М. (2009) Творческая билингвальная личность (особенности русского текста автора тюркского происхождения). 2-е изд., доп. Астана: Издательство «ЦБО и МИ». 259 с.

Беликов В.И., Крысин, Л.П. (2001) Социолингвистика. М.: РГГУ. 439 с.

Болдырев В.А. (1990) Итоги переписи. По данным Всесоюзной переписи населения 1989 г. / Отв. за выпуск А. А. Исупов. Москва: Издательство «Финансы и статистика». 47 с.

Болтенкова Л.Ф. (1988) Интернационализм в действии. М.: Мысль. 221 с.

Вахтин Н.Б., Головко Е.В. (2004) Социолингвистика и социология языка. М.: Гуманитарная Академия. 388 с.

Вдовин А.И. (2013) Русские в XX веке. Трагедии и триумфы великого народа. М.: Вече. 624 с.

Виноградов В.В. (1945) Великий русский язык. М.: ОГИЗ: Государственное изд-во худ. лит-ры. 172 с.

Губогло М.Н. (1979) Развитие двуязычия в Молдавской ССР. Кишинев: Штиинца. 157 с.

Дешериев Ю.Д. (1976) Закономерности развития литературных языков народов СССР в советскую эпоху : развитие общественных функций литературных языков [Акад. наук СССР, Отд. литературы и языка, Ин-т языкознания, Науч. совет по комплексной проблеме «Закономерности развития нац. яз. в связи с развитием социалист. наций»]. М.: Наука. 430 с.

Дятленко П. (2008) Языковые реформы в Центральной Азии: тренды - цели - итоги // Вестник Евразии. № 4. С.80-111.

Зак Л.М., Исаев М.И. (1966) Проблемы письменности народов СССР в культурном строительстве // Вопросы истории. № 2. С. 2-16.

Илишев И.Г. (2000) Язык и политика в многонациональном государстве. Уфа: Китап. 270 с.

Исаев М.И. (1979) Языковое строительство в СССР (Процессы создания письменностей народов СССР). М.: Наука. 350 с.

Кайа А. (1998) Руны. М.: Локид, 1998. 429 с.

Копыленко М.М., Саина С.Т. (1982) Функционирование русского языка в различных слоях казахского населения. Алма-Ата: Наука. 112 с.

Кузнецов Г.Д., Чехоева С.А. (1982) Национальная школа РСФСР в современных условиях // Советская педагогика. № 11. С. 10-15.

Кузьмин М.Н. (2001) Национальная школа в России в контексте государственной национальной и образовательной политики // Электронный журнал «Русский язык». Август. URL.: http://gramota.ru/biblio/magazines/gramota/28_81 (14.10.2021).

Намжилов Ц.Н. (1994) Языковая ситуация в Республике Бурятия // Языковые проблемы Российской Федерации и законы о языках. М.: Институт языкознания РАН. 534 с.

Низамова Л.Р. (2020) Двуязычие в современном Татарстане: индивидуальное и социальное измерения // Социология и общество: традиции и инновации в социальном развитии регионов: Сб. докладов VI Всероссийского социологического конгресса (Тюмень, 14-16 октября 2020 г.) / Отв. ред. В.А. Мансуров; ред. Е.Ю. Иванова. Москва: РОС; ФНИСЦ РАН. С. 2466-2474.

Романова Г.А. (2003) Реформирование системы школьного образования в 1958-1964 гг.: на материалах Куйбышевской области : дис. … канд. ист. наук. Самара. 222 с.

Русинова С.И. (1970) В. И. Ленин о буржуазной автономии // Правоведение. № 2. С. 129-133.

Советкин Ф.Ф. (1974) Избранные труды / Под общей редакцией А.О. Пинта. Т. I. Саранск. 240 с.

Степанов В.В. (2010) Поддержка языкового разнообразия в Российской Федерации // Этнографическое обозрение. № 4. С. 101-115.

Субачев А.А. (2009) Языковая политика в СССР и РФ на рубеже 80-90-х гг. // Третьи университетские социально-гуманитарные чтения 2009 года: Материалы: В 2 т. Иркутск. Т. 2. С. 469-473.

Ханазаров К.Х. (1963) Сближение наций и национальные языки в СССР. Ташкент: Изд-во Академии наук Узбекской ССР. 240 с.

Швейцер А.Д. (1976) Современная социолингвистика. Теория, проблемы, методы. М.: Наука. 176 с.

Шейко В.М., Тишевская Л.Г. (2006) История украинской культуры: Учеб. пособие. Киев: Кондор. 264 с.

Шестаков В.А. (2008) Новейшая история России с начала XX в. и до сегодняшнего дня. М.: АСТ. 480 с.

Bacon E.E. (1966) Central Asians under Russian Rule. A Study in Cultural Change. Ithaca ; New York: Cornell University Press. 273 p.

Bennigsen, A., Lemercier-Quelquejay, Ch. (1967) Islam in the Soviet Union. London: Central Asian Research Centre.

Bruchis M. (1982) One Step Back, Two Steps Forward: on the Language Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the National Republics (Moldavian: a Look Back, a Survey and Perspectives, 1924-1980). Boulder ; New York : East European Monographs, Columbia University Press. 371 p.

Chinn J., Kaiser R. (1996) Russians as the New Minority: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Soviet Successor States. Boulder : Westview Press. Xii. 308 p.

Chomsky N. (2000) The Architecture of Language / Edited by N. Mukherji - New Delhi; New York: Oxford University Press. xv + 89 p.

Comrie B. (1981) The Languages of the Soviet Union. Cambridge : CUP. xxxi +. 317 p.

Coupland N. (2010) The Handbook of Language and Globalization / Ed. by N. Coupland. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 676 p.

Crisp S. (1990) Soviet language planning 1917-53 // M. Kirkwood (Ed.) Language Planning in the Soviet Union. Houndmills / London: Macmillan. Pp. 23-45.

Danjoux O. (2002) L'état, c'est pas moi: Reframing Citizenship(s) in the Baltic Republics. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur. 362 p.

Dixon R.M.W. (1997) The Rise and Fall of Language. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. vi + 169 p.

Fairclough N. (2006) Language and Globalization. Routledge. 186 p.

Fierman W. (1985) Language Development in Soviet Uzbekistan // In Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages / Ed. by Isabelle T. Kreindler. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 205-233.

Fishman J.A. (2005) The new linguistic order / J.A. Fishman // Language and Linguistics in Context / Ed. by H. Luria, D. Seymour. New York: Imprint. Pp. 252-259.

Franceschini R. (2009) Genesis and development of research in multilingualism: Perspectives for future research // The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition [AILA Applied Linguistics Series 6], L. Aronin, B. Hufeisen (Eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 27-61.

Imart G. (1965) Le movement de "Latinization" en U.R.S.S. // Cahiers du monde russe et sovietique, Paris. (VI).Pp. 223-239.

Kirkwood M. (1991) Glasnost', “The National Question” and Soviet Language Policy // Soviet Studies. (43-1). Pp. 61-81.

Knowles F. (1989) Language in the Soviet Baltic Republics: An Analysis of Demographic and Sociological Trends // Language Planning in the Soviet Union / Ed. by M. Kirkwood. London: Macmillan. Pp. 145-173.

Kreindler I.T. (1982) The Changing Status of Russian in the Soviet Union // International Journal of the Sociology of Language. (33). Pp. 7-39.

Kreindler I.T. (1985) The Non-Russian Languages and the Challenge of Russian: The Eastern versus the Western Tradition // Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages: Their Past, Present and Future / Ed. by I. T. Kreindler. Berlin, etc.: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 345-367.

Kreindler I.T. (1989) Soviet Language Planning since 1953 // Language Planning in the Soviet Union. London: Macmillan. Pp. 43-63.

Kymlicka W. (2004) Assessing the Politics of Diversity in Transition Countries // Nation-Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries / Ed. by F. Grin. Open Society Institute. Pp. 1-29.

Laponce J. A. (1987) Languages and their Territories. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto. x, 265 p.

Lepretre M. (2002) Language Policy in the Russian Federation: language diversity and national identity. Sociolinguistica international. Primavera. URL: https://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves/noves/hm02primavera/internacional/a_marc.pdf (14.10.2021).

Lewis E.G. (1972) Multilingualism in the Soviet Union. The Hague; Paris. xx, 332 pp.

Lewis E.G. (1982) Movements and agencies of language spread, Wales and the Soviet Union compared / Cooper, R. (Ed.) // Language Spread. Studies in Diffusion and Change. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. 214-259.

Lipset H. (1967) The Station of National Minority Languages in Soviet Education // Soviet Studies. (XIX). Pp. 181-189.

Moskovich, W. (1990) Planned Language Change in Russian since 1917 // Language Planning in the Soviet Union / Ed. M. Kirkwood. London: Macmillan. Pp. 85-99.

Ornstein J. (1959) Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice // The Slavic and East European Journal. (XVII). Pp. 382-392.

Reznik V. (2001) Language Policy and Reform in the Soviet 1920s: Practical Polemics against Idealist Linguistics // Annual conference, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge. URL: https://web.archive.org/web/20130220125834/http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/Slavonic/Epicentre/langpolicy.htm (14.10.2021)

Schiffman H.F. (2008) Language, Language Policy, and Citizenship : Three Views Compared // The Future of Citizenship / Jose V. Ciprut, Ed. Publisher. Cambridge, MA (etc.): MIT Press. Pp. 75-95.

Shelestyuk E. (2020) Exercising Eco-Linguistic Approach in Teaching English: Proposed Conventions for TESOL/TEFL Pedagogy // Ahwaz Journal of Linguistics Studies, ISSN: 2717-2643. Vol. 1, No. 3. Pp. 42-61.

Shiokawa N. (1999) The History of Soviet Language Policy Reconsidered // Slavic Studies. (46). URL: http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/publictn/46/shiokawa/shiokawa-eng.html (14.10.2021)

Silver B.D., Anderson B.A. (1982/84) Equality, Efficiency and Politics in Soviet Bilingual Schooling Policies, 1934-1980. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Washington, DC, October 14-17 // American Political Science Association 78 (December 1984). Pp. 1019-1039.

Silver B.D. (1978) Language Policy and the Linguistic Russification of Soviet Nationalities // Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices. New York: Praeger. Pp. 250-306.

Smith M.G. (1993) The Eurasian Imperative in Early Soviet Language Planning: Russian Linguists at the Service of the Nationalities // Beyond Sovietology: Essays in History and Politics / Ed. by Susan G. Solomon. Armonk ; New York: M.E. Sharpe. Pp. 159-191.

Zamyatin K. (2012) The Education Reform in Russia and its Impact on Teaching of the Minority Languages: An Effect of Nation-Building? // Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe. Vol 11. No. 1. Pp. 17-47.

Источники и словари

Большая Советская Энциклопедия (БСЭ), 1-е изд. (1926-1947), 2-е изд. (1949-1958), 3-е изд. (1969-1978). М.: Советская Энциклопедия.

Государственная языковая политика Российской Федерации: состояние и перспективы. Материалы «круглого стола». 28 ноября 2013 года. М.: Издание Государственной Думы, 2014. 48 с.

Закон СССР от 24.04.1990 «О языках народов СССР». URL: https://sudrf.cntd.ru/document/9035984

Історія української мови // Українська мова. Енциклопедія / Інститут мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні НАН України. Київ: Українська энциклопедія, 2004. С. 235-239.

Культура Древней Руси // Всемирная история: В 10 т. / Академия наук СССР. Институт истории. Институт стран Азии. Институт Африки. Институт славистики / Ред.: В.В. Курасов, А.М. Некрич, Е.А. Болтин и др. М.: Мысль. URL.: http://www.history-at-russia.ru/x-xii-veka/kultura-drevnej-rusi.html (14.10.2021).

Народное образование, наука и культура в СССР: Сб. статей. М.: Статистика, 1977. 247 с.

Народное образование в СССР. 1917-1967 / К. Айманов и др.; под ред. М.А. Прокофьева и др. М.: Просвещение, 1967. 541 с.

Образование, наука и культура в СССР: Сб. статей. М.: Статистика, 1977. 247 с.

Печать СССР в 1985 году: Стат. сб. / Всесоюзная ордена «Знак Почета» книжная палата. М.: Финансы и статистика, 1986. 311 с.

СССР. 100 вопросов и ответов. Вып. 4 / Ред. В. Прошутинский. М.: Новости, 1983. 136 с.

Шелестюк Елена Владимировна - доктор филологических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры теоретического и прикладного языкознания Челябинского государственного университета
Адрес: 454001 Россия, г. Челябинск, улица Братьев Кашириных, 129
Эл. адрес: shelestiuk@yandex.ru

Для цитирования: *Шелестюк Е.В.* Языковая политика и языковое образование в СССР в послевоенный период [Электронный ресурс]. Социолингвистика. 2021. № 4(8). С. 60-85. (На англ.) DOI: 10.37892/2713-2951-4-8-60-85

For citation: *Shelestyuk E.V.* Soviet language policy and education in the post-WWII period [online] // Sociolinguistics. 2021. No. 4 (8). Pp. 60-85. (In Eng.) DOI: 10.37892/2713-2951-4-8-60-85