

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY IN THE SOVIET REPUBLICS*

Kadyrzhanov Rustem

rustem_kadyrzhan@mail.ru

*Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies CS MES RK
(Almaty, Kazakhstan)*

Кадыржанов Рустем Казахбаевич

rustem_kadyrzhan@mail.ru

*Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МОН РК
(Алматы, Казахстан)*

Abstract. The article examines the phenomenon of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the Soviet national republics of the USSR. It is shown that cultural and linguistic heterogeneity was the result of the policy of national-Russian bilingualism of the Soviet regime. The paper is proposed a classification of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity among the Soviet republics.

Keywords: Soviet Republic, USSR, heterogeneity, language, culture.

Introduction

One of the main elements of the Soviet nationalities policy was the spread of the Russian language in the Soviet national republics. To this end, the communist regime pursued the language policy in the republics, which was called national-Russian bilingualism. This policy created the situation of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the Soviet republics, when two languages functioned in parallel in the republics, namely, the language of the indigenous, titular nation of the republic and the Russian language. The two languages entered into a certain relationship and interaction between them dependent on which of the languages is dominant in the republic, and which is subordinate. The nature of the relationship and interaction of the national and Russian languages in the republics was influenced by various factors of historical, cultural, political nature. As a result, the USSR has developed a wide variety of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, which requires its own study. The aim of this article is to offer a classification of the forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the Soviet republics due to the policy of national-Russian bilingualism.

* This is research was funded by the CS MES RK (Grant No AP08856174 «Культурные основания национального строительства в Казахстане»).

Methodology

The main method of research in this article is classification, which plays an important role in the study of complex objects consisting of many elements. Classification is a necessary method of research in social science where the objects of the study are complex systems with their activities and functions provided through dynamic relations of institutions and processes. In the article, the method of classification is applied to the variety of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the Soviet republics. The use of this method makes it possible to study more deeply national, first of all, cultural and linguistic processes in the USSR in their diversity and specificity. The proposed classification of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity lays the foundation for the study of cultural and linguistic processes in post-Soviet states, where the national construction can be studied as a transition from cultural and linguistic heterogeneity to cultural and linguistic homogeneity.

State Language and Nation-Building

All post-Soviet states, since gaining their independence, immediately faced the need for nation-building, that is, the creation of a single political and cultural community from the multi-ethnic population that they inherited from the Soviet Union. A single political and cultural community as a nation can arise on the basis of the single identity of its members with the state of which they are citizens, and with the dominant culture in this society. The most important element of national culture is language, so the language is often identified with the culture itself due to the fact that many types of culture are based on language, and this identification of language with culture is widespread in the mass consciousness throughout the post-Soviet space.

The national language of the newly independent states is the language of the titular nation of the former Soviet republics. The languages of the titular nations in the post-Soviet states have received the status of their state language, which was enshrined in the constitutions of the former Soviet republics. The status of the state language allows it to perform a number of functions in the state and national construction of the post-Soviet states. The importance of the state language in the state construction consists in its performance as the language of all laws, normative acts and other legal documents, the vehicle of the correspondence and office work of the state bodies, the state's interaction with other states, etc.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the state language in the nation-building processes. The state language as the language of the titular nation performs an integrative function in a post-Soviet society, being the language of interethnic communication. Without such a language, which is spoken by all ethnic groups in a multi-ethnic society, it is impossible for society to exist as a single social whole. In other words, without the state language a multi-ethnic society will break up into parts, each of which will have its own language that unites their community. In order for a society to exist and function as a single national whole, it must culturally and linguisti-

cally homogeneous. This is pointed out in the classic work “Nations and Nationalism” by Ernest Gellner, who stresses that the nation-building aims in cultural and linguistic homogeneity of the community formed within its borders [1, c. 119]

It is no accident, therefore, that in the situation of the “parade of sovereignty” in the last period of the USSR’s existence, the former Soviet republics adopted the law on languages, which gave the language of the titular nation the status of the state language, and gave the Russian language the status of the language of interethnic communication. The adoption of this law clearly indicated a change in the policy of nation-building in the Union republics and the role of language in this process. From now on, the main role in the nation-building of the republics’ leadership assigned to the language of the titular nation aimed to become the cultural and linguistic basis for the formation of the nation in the union republics demonstrating their increasing autonomy.

The Union Republic and the Status of Statehood

Speaking about autonomy of the union republics, it should be noted that the political structure of the USSR as the federation of fifteen republics did not presuppose their sovereignty, although the Soviet constitution specified the assertion of their statehood and the right to secede from the multinational country. In order to solve the national question, the Soviet Union was organized in political and administrative terms as an ethno-territorial federation of national republics, and the question of nationality was resolved individually as the attribution to each individual citizen of the nationality to which his parents belonged. These were, as Rogers Brubaker notes, forms of institutionalization of the territorial organization of national communities and the classification of individuals by nationality [2, p. 30].

Although the union republics had the status of statehood under the Soviet constitution, in reality their autonomy from the union center was very limited. The Soviet Union was a tightly centralized state with a pronounced unitary character in its administration. The political appointment of leading cadres throughout the country on the basis of the party principle of “democratic centralism” ensured the unquestioning subordination of the national republics to the union center. Political subordination was reinforced by the administrative subordination of the national republics through the system of ministries, when the allocation of resources was determined by Moscow and the republics received what was allocated to them from the center.

The political and administrative subordination of the Soviet republics to the Union center in the national question found one of its most striking expressions in the policy of Russification of the multi-ethnic population throughout the Soviet Union. Russification took various forms, but the most common among them in the Soviet era were the change of nationality of individuals from non-Russian to Russian, as well as cultural and linguistic Russification. This process began in the 1930s, when the Soviet regime began to use the Russian language and culture as a way to change identity of individuals of indigenous, but not only indigenous, nationality in the union and autonomous republics. The Soviet regime believed that the mastery of the Russian language con-

tributes to the identity of indigenous peoples in the republics and other national entities with the Union as a whole, and not only with their republic.

Russification and the Formation of the “Soviet People”

The importance of the policy of Russification began to increase in the 1970s, when the communist regime proclaimed the task of building “the Soviet people as a new historical community of people.” Russian language and the Russian-Soviet ideologized culture were to become the cultural and linguistic basis for the formation of this community. For the Soviet regime, Russification of non-Russian peoples was seen as a way to modernize them, since Russian was seen as the most developed language among all languages in cultural and scientific terms. Therefore, the task of introducing non-Russian peoples to the Russian language was promoted by the communist regime as the most important task of raising the cultural level of these peoples. But at the same time, the Russification of the Soviet peoples was considered by the regime as the most important political task of increasing the loyalty of non-Russian peoples to the country as a whole and its communist regime in particular.

Within the framework of the Soviet nationalities policy, the central government also pursued a policy of supporting the national language and culture in the republics. This support was provided through the education system, the state’s cultural policy, information policy, etc. Russian language policy was defined by the Soviet government as national-Russian bilingualism, when along with the support of the language of the titular nation the policy of Russification was carried out, namely, the spread of the Russian language among the indigenous nation of a republic, as well as its other nationalities. Such a policy was presented as the education of the internationalism of the Soviet peoples, overcoming the framework of national cultures and entering the world cultural space with the help of the Russian language as one of the world languages.

One way or another, Russification was a form of assimilation of the Soviet peoples as a whole and individual. For some individuals, the incentive to learn Russian was the prospect for vertical mobilization in the conditions of Soviet society. Russian language skills were largely determined by the level of the individual’s level of education, since education in many specialties, especially in technical specialties, was possible only on the basis of a good knowledge of the Russian language. The further career development of a specialist, perhaps, even was more dependent on the knowledge of the Russian language as a necessary condition for the qualified performance of their official duties. In general, in many Soviet republics there was a perception in public opinion that knowledge of the Russian language characterizes a person as culturally developed in comparison with those who do not know or do not know the Russian language well. In other words, a person who knows Russian was seen as standing at a higher level of cultural and intellectual development than someone who knows only his native language.

Such ideas and views, which were widespread in the mass consciousness in a number of national republics of the USSR, contributed to the readiness of nationals to

master the Russian language, i.e. to Russification. American political scientist Brian Silver, who studied the Russification of the Soviet peoples on the materials of the Soviet population censuses of 1970 and 1979, points out that Russification occurred mainly in cities, being associated with the processes of urbanization and the growth of interethnic contacts [3]. The growth of interethnic contacts in Soviet times occurred mainly in cities as centers industrial civilization and modernization processes in Soviet society. In rural areas, agriculture prevailed with significant elements of the traditional way of life and lower social mobility of the population, which limited interethnic contacts, including cultural and linguistic communication.

In his studies of the Russification of the Soviet peoples within the framework of the policy of bilingualism, Silver introduces a classification of language qualifications or language repertoire of Soviet nationals consisting of four elements. The first of these elements is national monolingualism. This is a situation where a representative of the Soviet nationality speaks only his native language and does not speak any Russian. The second element of his classification Silver defines as unassimilated bilingualism, when a person knows Russian in addition to his native language, but applies it in a limited number of social spheres, experiencing difficulties in expressing himself in Russian. The third element of Silver's classification is defined as assimilated bilingualism, when a national uses the Russian language in most of communications, but at the same time can use the native language to a limited extent due to the worse knowledge of the native language than the Russian language. Finally, the fourth element of the classification is defined as assimilation, when a representative of a non-Russian Soviet nationality knows only Russian and does not know the language of his nationality and does not use it [4, p. 582].

This classification suggests that the policy of Russification conducted by the communist regime was aimed at the entire population of the Soviet Union, its total coverage. The most important factor in the Russification of the Soviet peoples was the education system, in which the teaching of the Russian language was of paramount importance. The implementation of this policy led to the fact that all the Soviet peoples were bilingual to some extent, having the national and Russian languages. Silver's classification suggests that different peoples had different degrees of proficiency in Russian, in addition to their native language. Russian was a higher proportion of those who had a better command of their native language than Russian, while other peoples had a higher proportion of those who had a better command of Russian than their native language. The application of this classification allowed Brian Silver and co-author of several of his articles Barbara Anderson to conclude that the most widespread category of bilingualism of Soviet nationalities is unassimilated bilingualism [5, p. 115]. In general, the Soviet nationalities remained committed to their native languages reaching at the same time different qualifications in Russian.

Bilingualism and Linguistic Heterogeneity

The Soviet policy of national-Russian bilingualism led to cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in opposition to cultural and linguistic homogeneity as an ideal of the

nation-building. The achievement of linguistic homogeneity, as the world practice of nationalism demonstrates it, acts as a decisive condition for the formation of the nation as a cultural community within a certain territorial framework. In contrast, linguistic heterogeneity means the existence and functioning of two or more languages in a society performing official and social functions. As a rule, such a language situation develops in multinational federations like India and some other states.

A stable and sustainable existence of a society under conditions of linguistic heterogeneity is possible if the spheres and functions of the languages are parallel and not intersected. If one of the languages performs, for example, federal functions, while the other language performs the main social functions in the subject of the federation. Thanks to this, languages do not compete with each other for dominance in the performance of certain functions.

There was no such division of functions between the Russian language and the titular language in the ethno-territorial federation of the USSR. Official propaganda claimed that all languages are equal and enjoy equal rights, and the Soviet state supports languages regardless of whether it is a big language or a small one. In fact, the communist regime provided the main support for the Russian language, while it supported other languages on a residual basis [6, p. 82]. Since the functions between the languages were not divided, many of the functions that were previously performed by titular languages were now performed by the Russian language. This included political and administrative functions, as well as functions in the field of education, information, and others. In many republics, the number of national schools has decreased and the number of Russian schools has increased significantly, especially in cities. These and many other problems of national languages became subjects of acute discussions during the years of perestroika, causing ethnic mobilization in the republics.

If two languages function in parallel in a society and their functions are not separated and essentially overlap, then there will inevitably be a competitive relationship between them for dominance in the areas corresponding to these functions. As a rule, in this competition, the language that has a greater linguistic and cultural potential prevails, which only increases if this language enjoys the support of the ruling regime. It is not surprising that in many Soviet republics the Russian language has taken a leading position in society, pushing the language of the titular nation into the background.

The Communist regime proclaimed and supported the policy of national-Russian bilingualism in the national republics and never made statements about the ultimate goal of its language policy. It was not clear as to what the national-Russian bilingualism would ultimately lead to: whether two languages would remain in the republics in the long term, or whether the more powerful Russian language would remain the only language in the USSR, and the national languages would die out as a result of the development of a “new historical community of people”. National languages will die out in the same way that, according to the communist theory, social classes, nations and many other social communities that emerged as a result of the development of capitalist society will disappear into oblivion.

The policy of internationalism, the most important instrument of which was the Russification of the Soviet peoples, led to cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the

national republics, in which the leading role was played by the Russian language and the Russian-Soviet culture. As for the national language and culture, they had to demonstrate their support and concern for their development by the communist regime. It was a kind of Soviet cultural and linguistic heterogeneity. The tendencies of this heterogeneity clearly indicated that in its successive development it would inevitably lead in most Soviet republics to cultural and linguistic homogeneity based on the Russian language and culture, that is, to their final Russification.

Classification of Forms of Cultural and Linguistic Heterogeneity in the Soviet Republics

The practice of national-Russian bilingualism in the Soviet Union demonstrated a different level of interaction between the national and Russian languages in the process of bilingualism. In a certain sense, there was some correlation between the interaction of the national and Russian languages in the republics and the corresponding interaction of these languages among individuals in the republics, identified by Silver. Such a correlation, defined in a fairly broad sense, can help us understand the level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in the Soviet republics, starting from Silver's classification.

As in the case of Silver's classification, a wide range of different forms of interaction between the national and Russian languages in the social practice of the republics was observed at the broad societal level. As the poles of this spectrum can be considered Armenia as the most monoethnic among the Soviet republics with almost one hundred percent indigenous population, and Belarus as the most Russified republic within the USSR. Today, as an independent state, Belorussia is called Belarus, but in Soviet times the name "Belorussia" was widely used. All other national republics were located between the poles of this spectrum in terms of their cultural and linguistic heterogeneity and the associated to it level of Russification.

As one of the poles of our classification Armenia was the least Russified among the Soviet republics, and therefore had the lowest level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity with the dominance of the national language over Russian. At the same time, we it is not true to speak of a zero cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in Soviet Armenia [7, p. 479]. This was not possible in the USSR, of which Armenia was a part. The Communist regime, as we pointed out above, pursued a policy of Russification in the national republics through the education system, the information system, the military service and other social institutions. A fairly high level of Russian language proficiency was observed in the capitals of the Union republics, including the capital of Armenia, Yerevan. A certain level of the spread of the Russian language was also observed in the major cities of the Union republics, primarily in industrial centers.

As the opposite pole of the classification Belarus was perhaps the most Russified among all the Soviet republics. The cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in Belarus was characterized by a large role of the Russian language, while the role of the Belarusian language in the social life was much lower. The dominance of the Russian language was observed not only in the capital of the Republic of Minsk, but also in

regional centers throughout the republic [8, p. 570-573]. The Belarusian language was used more in rural areas, and mainly in the western regions of the republic. As the language of the titular nation, the Belarusian language performed mainly representative functions of a symbolic nature.

Other Soviet republics, as it was said, formed elements of the spectrum of various forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, being located between the poles represented by Armenia and Belarus. In terms of the interaction of the national and Russian languages in the practice of bilingualism, the two republics of Central Asia, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan, as well as the Baltic republic of Lithuania, were located closer to the pole of Armenia in Soviet times. This was primarily due, as in the case of Armenia, to the demographic factor, that is, to the high proportion of the indigenous population in the total population of the republic. The demographic factor contributed to the spread of the titular language in the republic, and the Russian language was inferior in its use to the national language. As a result, the bilingualism was dominated by the titular language and the Russian language had a narrower use in these republics.

Russian was widely spoken in the republics' capitals as their political and administrative center and the largest city with the highest concentration of the Russian population and other nationalities in the republic. In Tajikistan, the Russian and other non-indigenous population lived in the second largest city of Leninabad, as well as on the construction sites of hydroelectric power stations on the large mountain rivers Nurek and Vakhsh [9, 504]. In Turkmenistan, the Russian language was widely used in the capital Ashgabat and in cities associated with large natural gas fields [10, p. 636]. The indigenous population in both republics was characterized by a low level of urbanization, living mainly in rural areas, where people had little interethnic contacts. In this respect, Lithuania was markedly different from the republics of Central Asia with a high level of urbanization of the population. However, apart from Vilnius and Kaunas, there were no major cities or industrial centers in Lithuania, so the level of interethnic contacts with the predominance of the titular Lithuanian population was low, which made Russification much more difficult [11, c. 71-72].

The next area of the spectrum of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity among the Soviet republics was occupied, in our opinion, by Georgia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Latvia and Estonia. They shared the dominance of the national language with a fairly high use of the Russian language in certain regions of these republics and areas of social practice. In Georgia, the high proportion of the indigenous population with ancient culture and historical traditions ensured the dominance of the Georgian language in social practice [12]. At the same time, the capital of the Republic of Tbilisi and major cities of Georgia used Russian as well as Georgian. This process began before the revolution and was developed in the Soviet era. In the autonomous republic of Abkhazia, along with Georgians, Russians and Abkhazians lived contributing to the region's Russification. In general, the Russian language contributed to the greater cultural and linguistic heterogeneity of Georgia than Armenia.

In favor of the dominance of the Uzbek language in Uzbekistan as a whole, the demographic rise of the Uzbek population, which began in the 1960s, spoke. This popu-

lation mainly lived in rural areas, and the level of urbanization of the Uzbek population remained generally low. This meant that Uzbek society retained significant elements of traditional culture and a low level of inter-ethnic contacts, thus contributing to the preservation of the titular language in Soviet conditions and preventing the spread of the Russian language. Nevertheless, Russification in Uzbekistan has been more developed than in Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. This was facilitated by the fact that Uzbekistan in the Soviet period (and later) received greater economic development than the neighboring republics of Central Asia, except for Kazakhstan. In Uzbekistan, during the Soviet era, large industrial cities of Angren, Navoi, Chirchik and others appeared, in which the Russian and Russian-speaking population prevailed. These cities and their environs had a high level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity. In the same way could be characterized the capital city Tashkent and some regional centers, where the national-Russian bilingualism has been sufficiently developed [13, p. 199].

Despite the marked differences in socio-economic and cultural development, there are some similarities between Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan in national-Russian bilingualism and cultural-linguistic heterogeneity. In demographic terms, a noticeable increase in the titular population in the republic as a whole and its cities occurred since the 1960s. The capital of Azerbaijan and its largest city, Baku, was an international city until the 1960s, where the Russian language was widely used. Since the 1960s. Baku is becoming a more mono-national city, the Azerbaijani language is becoming more widespread in it and in other cities of the republic, its industrial centers, but the Russian language remains the language of inter-ethnic communication, despite the reduction of the Russian and Russian-speaking population. In general, by the time of the collapse of the USSR, the use of the Russian language and a fairly high level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity remained in Azerbaijan, with the increasing dominance of the Azerbaijani language [14].

Of particular interest is the consideration of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in Latvia and Estonia, taking into account their development in the post-Soviet period. These republics were annexed to the USSR in 1940 after a twenty-year period of their existence as independent states. This led to a clear and largely hidden resistance to their incorporation and integration into Soviet society, including attempts to Russify them. They could not avoid the communist regime's policy of spreading the Russian language and other socio-economic measures that resulted in the Russification of the indigenous population. Among these measures, the industrialization of these republics was crucial, for the implementation of which a significant Russian and Russian-speaking population was resettled in the republics. This led to the formation of the Russian-speaking region of Narva in Estonia, and in Latvia, the capital Riga became at the same time a major industrial center of mechanical engineering, which was mainly occupied by the Russian-speaking population. Since Riga was a large city in the USSR, and in general the population of Latvia was twice as large as in Estonia, the level of Russification in Latvia was significantly higher than in Estonia. Accordingly, the level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity in Latvia was significantly higher than in Estonia. Nevertheless, we refer both republics to the category of those national entities in the USSR, that are

characterized by the dominance of the local language over the Russian language, and the cultural-linguistic heterogeneity contained the prerequisites for the transition to cultural-linguistic homogeneity under more favorable political conditions [15, p. 95].

In the Soviet Union, Moldova was one of the agricultural regions with a developed food industry. There was not a major heavy industry enterprise in the republic, but at the same time there was a significant Russian and Russian-speaking population in the republic, so in the national-Russian bilingualism, the weight of the Russian language was significant, but not decisive. In general, the leading position was occupied by the language of the titular nation, but there were Russian-speaking regions in the republic. One of them was Transnistria, where almost all the mixed population spoke Russian. The capital of Moldova and its largest city, Chisinau, was a predominantly Russian-speaking city. Therefore, Moldova was distinguished by a fairly high level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity with the dominance of the national language [16].

The three republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine were located on the spectrum of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity of the Soviet republics closer to the opposite pole of Belarus. They are characterized by the dominance of the Russian language in the national-Russian bilingualism, and the high level of Russification of the indigenous population of the republic is an important characteristic of them. This is the result of many reasons, not only political, but also historical, socio-economic, socio-psychological and others.

The Russification of Kazakhstan began in the 1920s as a necessary condition for the industrialization of the republic, which had rich reserves of coal, metals, and energy resources. The industrialization of Kazakhstan was carried out by the hands of Russian and Russian-speaking workers mobilized by the communist regime from Russia and the European part of the USSR. Their migration to Kazakhstan slowly but steadily led to a change in the ethnic balance in the republic, that is, to an increase in the Russian-Slavic population and a decrease in the indigenous population. In 1950-60. this process has led to a dramatic decline in the share of the titular nation in the total population of the republic, especially in the cities. The low proportion of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz in the cities contributed to their strong Russification, as they had to live in a large Russian-speaking environment. Such tendencies have led to the split of these nations, especially the Kazakhs, into two parts: the urban minority with the dominance of the Russian language and the rural majority with the dominance of the national language. It should be noted that among rural Kazakhs, especially in the northern and eastern regions of Kazakhstan, Russification also took place, that is, in their language repertoire, the Russian language dominated over the Kazakh language [17, p. 174-175].

Russification was a regional phenomenon in Kyrgyzstan, meaning that there was a large Russian population in the northern part of the republic and the Russian language was widely spoken. The capital and largest city of Soviet Kyrgyzstan, Frunze (now Bishkek), was a very Russified city, like the capital of Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata, and other Kazakh cities. In the southern half of Kyrgyzstan, the Russian language was much less widespread, here, along with the Kyrgyz language, the Uzbek language was widely spoken [18].

When we talk about the Russification of Ukraine, we mean the eastern and southern parts of the republic. Russification of this part of the republic has a historical character, since for several centuries it was part of the Russian Empire, and then the Soviet Union. Russian population, who made up twenty-two percent of the population of Ukraine in 1989, are very mixed with the Ukrainian population, and for a long time the language of communication was Russian. The situation was different in the western part of Ukraine, where the Ukrainian language had a leading position, and the Russian language was spread thanks to the support of the communist regime. The national-Russian language heterogeneity therefore had a regional character in Ukraine, namely, the southern and eastern parts of the republic had a pronounced heterogeneity with the predominance of the Russian language, and its western part was more homogeneous with the predominance of the Ukrainian language [19].

Conclusion

The analysis carried out in the article shows that cultural and linguistic heterogeneity is a serious problem of the nation-building in the post-Soviet states. The elites of the post-Soviet states strive to ensure that the language of the titular nation is not only the state language in its legal status, but that cultural and linguistic homogeneity is established in society on the basis of this language. As a result, the nation-building in post-Soviet states can be represented as a transition from heterogeneity to homogeneity in the cultural and linguistic foundations of post-Soviet society.

Cultural and linguistic heterogeneity is a product of the Soviet policy of national-Russian bilingualism, which was carried out by the communist regime in the Soviet republics. The cultural and civilizational diversity of the Soviet republics gave rise to a wide variety of forms of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity among them. As a result, a whole range of forms of national-Russian bilingualism and cultural-linguistic heterogeneity has emerged. As the poles of this spectrum, we single out, on the one hand, Armenia as the republic with the lowest level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity and, accordingly, the highest level of homogeneity of language and culture. As another, opposite pole of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, we distinguish Belarus with the highest level of Russification and cultural and linguistic heterogeneity with the dominance of the Russian language over the national language.

The other twelve Soviet republics were located between these two poles of the spectrum. Of these, three republics – Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Lithuania – were close to the pole occupied by Armenia, that is, a low level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity and a high level of homogeneity of language and culture. At the opposite pole, next to Belarus, there were three republics-Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine. They were characterized by a high level of cultural and linguistic heterogeneity and a high level of homogeneity in the form of the Russian language dominance (for Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine, the Russian language dominance was regional in nature). The other six republics-Georgia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Latvia and Moldova – were located in the middle between these poles, but they were generally characterized by the predominance of the national language.

List of references

1. Геллнер Э. Нации и национализм. – М., Прогресс, 1991. – 320 с.
2. Brubaker R. Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 202 p.
3. Silver B. Social Mobilization and the Russification of Soviet Nationalities // *American Political Science Review* 68, no. 1, 1974. – pp. 45-69.
4. Silver B. Methods of Deriving Data on Bilingualism from the 1970 Soviet Census // *Soviet Studies* 27, 1975. – pp. 574-97.
5. Anderson B. and Silver B. ‘Some factors in the linguistic and ethnic Russification of Soviet nationalities: is everyone becoming Russian?’ in L. Hajda and M. Beissinger (eds.). *The Nationalities Factor in Soviet Politics and Society*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1990. – pp. 95-130.
6. Pavlenko A. Russian as a lingua franca // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. – Vol. 26. – 2006. – pp. 78-99.
7. Dudwick N. Armenia: paradise lost?’ in Bremmer I. and Taras R. (eds.). *New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. – pp. 471-504.
8. Marples D. National awakening and national consciousness in Belarus // *Nationalities Papers*. – Vol. 27, no. 4. – 1999.– pp. 565-578.
9. Nagzibekova M. Language and education policies in Tajikistan // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.– Vol. 11, nos. 3-4.– 2008. – pp. 501-508.
10. Nissman D. Turkmenistan: just like old times’ in Bremmer I. and Taras R. (eds.). *New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. – pp. 635-654.
11. Арефьев А.Л. Русский язык и русскоязычное образование в Литовской Республике. *Alma Mater-Вестник Высшей Школы-Международное Сотрудничество*. – № 8. – 2020. – С. 70-84.
12. Law V. Language myths and the discourse of nation-building in Georgia. In: Smith, G. et al. *Nation-building in the post-Soviet borderlands: the politics of national identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1998. – pp. 167-196.
13. Bohr A. Language policy and ethnic relations in Uzbekistan. In: Smith, G. et al. *Nation-building in the post-Soviet borderlands: the politics of national identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.– 1998. – pp. 197-223.
14. Fierman W. Language vitality and paths to revival: contrasting cases of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Social Linguistics*. – 2009. – pp.75-104.
15. Druviete I. The state language as a symbolical and instrumental background for integration of society in Latvia. В кн.: *Национальное строительство и этнополитика в современном Казахстане: Сборник материалов международной научно-практической конференции*. – Алматы: Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МОН РК, 2020. – С. 94-102.
16. Ciscel M.H. A separate Moldovan language. – *Nationalities Papers*. – Vol.34, no. 5. – 2006.– pp. 575-597.
17. Fierman W. Language and identity in Kazakhstan: Formulation in policy documents 1987-1997. – *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*. – Vol. 31, no. 2. – 1998. – pp. 171-186.
18. Huskey E. The politics of language in Kyrgyzstan. – *Nationalities Papers*. – Vol. 23, no. 3. – 1995.– 236 p.
19. Wilson A. Redefining ethnic and linguistic boundaries in Ukraine: indigenes, settlers and Russophone Ukrainians. In: Smith, G. et al. *Nation-building in the post-Soviet border-*

lands: the politics of national identities.– Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1998. – pp. 119-138.

Transliteration

1 Gellner, E. Natsii i natsionalizm. [Nation and Nationalism]. M.: Progress, 1991. 320 p.

2 Brubaker R. Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 202 p.

3 Silver B. Social Mobilization and the Russification of Soviet Nationalities // American Political Science Review 68, no. 1, 1974. – pp. 45-69.

4 Silver B. Methods of Deriving Data on Bilingualism from the 1970 Soviet Census // Soviet Studies 27, 1975. – pp. 574-97.

5 Anderson B. and Silver B. ‘Some factors in the linguistic and ethnic Russification of Soviet nationalities: is everyone becoming Russian?’ in L. Hajda and M. Beissinger (eds.). The Nationalities Factor in Soviet Politics and Society. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1990. – pp. 95-130.

6 Pavlenko A. Russian as a lingua franca // Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. – Vol. 26. – 2006. – pp. 78-99.

7 Dudwick N. Armenia: paradise lost?’ in Bremmer I. and Taras R. (eds.). New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.– pp. 471-504.

8 Marples D. National awakening and national consciousness in Belarus // Nationalities Papers. – Vol. 27, no. 4. – 1999.– pp. 565-578.

9 Nagzibekova M. Language and education policies in Tajikistan // International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. – Vol. 11, nos. 3-4.– 2008. – pp. 501-508.

10 Nissman D. Turkmenistan: just like old times’ in Bremmer I. and Taras R. (eds.). New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. – pp. 635-654.

11 Aref’ev A.L. Russkii yazyk i russkoyazychnoe obrazovanie v Litovskoi Respublike. [Russian Language and Russian-Language Education in the Republic of Lithuania]. Alma Mater-Vestnik vysshei Shkoly-Mezhdunarodnoe Sotrudnichestvo. – № 8. –2020. – S. 70-84.

12 Law V. Language myths and the discourse of nation-building in Georgia. In: Smith, G. et al. Nation-building in the post-Soviet borderlands: the politics of national identities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1998. – pp. 167-196.

13 Bohr A. Language policy and ethnic relations in Uzbekistan. In: Smith, G. et al. Nation-building in the post-Soviet borderlands: the politics of national identities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1998. – pp. 197-223.

14 Fierman W. Language vitality and paths to revival: contrasting cases of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. International Journal of Social Linguistics. – 2009. – pp.75-104. and Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Social Linguistics*, 198, pp.75-104.

15 Druviete, I. The state language as a symbolical and instrumental background for integration of society in Latvia’. V kn.: Natsionalnoe stroitelstvo i etnopolitika v sovremennom Kazakhstane: Sbornik materialov mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii. – Almaty: Institut filosofii, politologii i religiovedeniia KN MON RK, 2020. – S. 94-102.

16 Ciscel M.H. A separate Moldovan language. – Nationalities Papers. – Vol.34, no. 5. – 2006.– pp. 575-597.

17 Fierman W. Language and identity in Kazakhstan: Formulation in policy documents 1987-1997. – Communist and Post-Communist Studies. – Vol. 31, no. 2. – 1998. – pp. 171-186.

18 Huskey E. The politics of language in Kyrgyzstan. – Nationalities Papers. – Vol. 23, no. 3. – 1995.– 236 p.

19 Wilson A. Redefining ethnic and linguistic boundaries in Ukraine: indigenes, settlers and Russophone Ukrainians. In: Smith, G. et al. Nation-building in the post-Soviet borderlands: the politics of national identities. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1998. – pp. 119-138.

Кадыржанов Р.К.

Кеңестік республикалардағы мәдени-тілдік гетерогенділік

Аңдатпа. Мақалада КСРО-ның кеңестік ұлттық республикаларындағы мәдени және тілдік гетерогенділік құбылысы зерттеледі. Мәдени-тілдік гетерогенділік кеңестік режимнің ұлттық-орыс қостілділік саясатының нәтижесі болғаны көрсетіледі. Кеңестік республикалар арасында мәдени-тілдік гетерогенділік формаларын жіктеу ұсынылады.

Түйін сөздер: кеңестік республика, КСРО, гетерогенділік, тіл, мәдениет.

Кадыржанов Р.К.

Культурно-языковая гетерогенность в советских республиках

Аннотация. В статье исследуется феномен культурно-языковой гетерогенности в советских национальных республиках СССР. Показывается, что культурно-языковая гетерогенность стала результатом политики национально-русского двуязычия советского режима. Предлагается классификация форм культурно-языковой гетерогенности среди советских республик.

Ключевые слова: советская республика, СССР, гетерогенность, язык, культура.