

TRIP REPORT

One-month familiarization visit to the USSR (Moscow, Baku, Ashkhabad), 30 March to 30 April, 1975, sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences of the USA and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Jonathan Pool

Department of Political Science
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, N.Y. 11794

(Visiting affiliation until 31 August, 1975: Department of Psychology, McGill University, P.O. Box 6070, Station "A", Montreal, Quebec H3C 3G1, Canada)

This report begins with a basic chronology, which is followed by a description and interpretation. Many details are omitted to save space but can be provided on request.

Basic Chronology

29 iii 75. Flew New York-Frankfurt/Main.

Spoke with U. Lins (Köln), editor of Novafletero por interlingvistoj, by phone.

Flew Frankfurt-Warsaw.

Met with J. Uśpiński (journalist), J. Grum (announcer/journalist), K. Pieńkiewicz (actress), & Z. Dobrzański (actor).

Toured foreign broadcast studios of Polish Radio and Television; observed drafting and taping of a news broadcast in Esperanto.

30 iii 75. Flew Warsaw-Moscow.

31 iii 75. Explored Moscow.

1 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics (Institut iazykoznania) of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Spoke with Iu. Desheriev, head of the Dept. of Sociolinguistics (Sektor sotsiolingvistiki), & S.I. Treskova, a member of this dept.

Visited the N.N. Miklukho-Maklaia Institute of Ethnography of the ASUSSR. Spoke with Iu.V. Arutiunian, head of the Dept. of Empirical Social Research (Sektor konkretnykh sotsial'nykh issledovanii), & with M.N. Guboglo & other members of this dept.

Met with Desheriev and Treskova.

2 iv 75. Visited Lenin Library & consulted its catalog.

Attended a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Moscow International Esperanto Club.

Spoke with S.N. Kuznetsov, a member of the dept. of Germanic languages of Moscow State University and the bibliographer of the Task Force on Issues of an International Auxiliary Language (Problemnaia gruppa po voprosam mezhunarodnogo vspomogatel'nogo iazyka) at the Institute of Linguistics.

3 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Spoke with A.D. Shveitser, a theoretical sociolinguist in the Dept. of Sociolinguistics, and A.A. Leont'ev, head of the Dept. of Psycholinguistics (Sektor psikholingvistiki).

Visited the Institute of Ethnography. Spoke with Arutiunian & Guboglo. Attended a colloquium on "National Communities" (principal speaker, N.N. Cheboksarov; discussant, S.I. Bruk).

4 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Ethnography. Spoke with L.N. Terent'eva, head of the dept. of the Baltic Republics. Met Iu.V. Bromlei, Director of the Institute.

Met with Kuznetsov.

5 iv 75. Visited the Dept. of English at MSU. Spoke with A. Stepanovna, two other junior faculty members, & 3 students. Met with A.V. Grib, a scientific translator.

6 iv 75. Attended a meeting of the Moscow International Esperanto Club. Spoke with D. Armand (prof. of geography), V.S. Arolovich (president of the Esperanto movement of Soviet youth), A. Khar'kovskii (journalist), & others.

7 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics.

8 iv 75. Gave one of two lectures in a colloquium sponsored by the Dept. of Sociolinguistics of the Institute of Linguistics. Program: S.V. Neverov, "The Theory of 'Linguistic Existence' in Japanese Linguistics"; J. Pool, "Language, Communication, and Social Group Membership". Presiding: M.I. Isaev, member of the Dept. of Sociolinguistics & Chairman of the Task Force on Issues of an International Auxiliary Language. Spoke briefly with Isaev.

9 iv 75. Visited the Dept. of English at MSU. Attended a class given by junior faculty members. Spoke with O.S. Akhmanova, Chairman of the Dept., & some of the junior faculty.

10 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Spoke with N.A. Baskakov, a specialist in Turkology and language planning; & A.N. Baskakov, a specialist in Turkish linguistics & a member of the Dept. of Sociolinguistics.

Visited the Institute of Russian Language of the ASUSSR. Spoke with V.P. Grigor'ev, a specialist in stylistics & interlinguistics.

Visited the Institute of Ethnography. Gave a lecture on "Bilingualism and Ethnic Identity in Canada"; S.I. Bruk presided. Met with Iu.P. Averkieva, L.N. Fursova, M.Ia. Berzina, S. Fedorova, Sh.A. Bogina, & other members of the North American dept. Spoke with Guboglo.

11 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Spoke with L.B. Nikol'skii, head of the Dept. of Sociolinguistics of the Oriental Institute of the ASUSSR.

Met with Kuznetsov.

12 iv 75. Went on excursion to Arkhangel'sk.

13 iv 75. Flew Moscow-Baku. Met by M.Sh. Gasymov, Chairman of the Terminology Committee of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan SSR.

14 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics of the ASAzerbSSR. Spoke with M.Sh. Shiräliev, Director of the Institute and head of its Dept. of Comparative Research on Turkic Languages; Z. Budagova, head of the Dept. of Contemporary Azerbaijani; V. Aslanov, head of the Dept. of the History of Azerbaijani; M. Mämmédov, head of the Dept. of Speech Cultivation; A. Orucov, head of the Dept. of Lexicography; M. Islamov, head of the Dept. of Dialectology; & Gasymov.

Visited the Museum of the History of Azerbaijan, an institution of the ASAzerbSSR.

15 iv 75. Visited Baku Azerbaijani Middle School #132.

Visited Azerbaijan State University. Spoke with F. Bagyrov, the Rector; A. Abdullaev, the Prorector; & the heads of several depts., mostly in the language sciences.

16 iv 75. Visited the Institute of the Peoples of the Near and Middle East (soon to be renamed the Oriental Institute), an institution of the ASAzerbSSR. Spoke with H. Arasly, its Director & a specialist on Turkish history; & A. Ahmadov, a specialist on Turkish literature.

Attended a performance of Icran at the Shykhäli Gurbanov Theater of Musical Comedy of Azerbaijan.

17 iv 75. Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Gave a lecture on "Language, Communication, and Ethnic Identity".

Visited the Basic Library of the ASAzerbSSR. Spoke with M. Häsänova, the Assistant Director; and the directors of the library's exchange programs with Eastern and Western countries. Consulted the catalog.

18 iv 75. Visited the Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute of Russian Language and Literature. Spoke with L. Väkilova, the Prorector; the heads of most of its 19 depts.; & members of the Lexicography Dept.

Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Gave a lecture on "The Language Question in Contemporary Canada". Spoke with Shiräliev & other members of the Institute.

19 iv 75. Participated in the annual Day of Voluntary Work (Subbotnik) by planting a tree in front of the ASAzerbSSR.

Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Spoke with Shiräliev & others.

20 iv 75. Flew Baku-Ashkhabad. Met by T. Tächmyradov, head, & A. Övezov, a member, of the Dept. of Speech Cultivation of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Turkmen SSR.

21 iv 75. Visited the Institute of L&L. Spoke with B. Charyarov, its Direktor; Z. Mukhamedova, a specialist on the history of the Turkmen language; Tächmyradov; & Övezov.

Visited an exhibit of Turkmen economic and cultural life, temporarily housed in the new building of the Ashkhabad main library.

22 iv 75. Visited the main library of the ASTSSR. Consulted the catalog.

Visited the Institute of L&L. Delivered a lecture on "Language, Communication, and Ethnic Identity".

23 iv 75. Visited ASTSSR library; consulted catalog.

Visited the Institute of L&L. Attended part of the defense of the dissertation submitted for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences by A. Myradov. Met with the Committee of Young Scientific Workers of the Institute.

Returned to the ASTSSR library & consulted books of interest.

24 iv 75. Visited Turkmen State University. Spoke with the Dean & several senior faculty members of the Faculty of Philology.

Visited the ASTSSR library & consulted books of interest.

Visited the Institute of L&L. Delivered a lecture on "The Language Question in Contemporary Canada".

Attended a performance of Ikbal, a Turkmen play.

25 iv 75. Visited Ashkhabad Turkmen Middle School # 37. Spoke with I. Ishanguliev, the Principal; & an assistant principal who is also the teacher of German.

Visited Ashkhabad Russian Boarding School # 1. Spoke with the Principal, several teachers, & some students. Attended part of a class in Turkmen as a second language.

26 iv 75. Visited the ASTSSR library & consulted books.

Met with S. Demidov, an ethnographer specializing on Turkmen spiritual culture; & N. Ibragimov, the Ashkhabad correspondent of the foreign broadcast department of Radio Tashkent. Taped an interview for Radio Tashkent.

27 iv 75. Visited the Soviet Turkmenistany Kolkhoz. Spoke with M. Sopyev, its President & former member of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Met with Tächmyradov & Övezov. Toured outskirts of Ashkhabad.

28 iv 75. Flew Ashkhabad-Moscow. Met by Treskova.

29 iv 75. Visited Lenin Library & consulted catalog.

Visited Institute of Ethnography. Spoke with Guboglo.

Visited the House of Friendship. Spoke with D. Armand (Vice-President of the Commission for Foreign Contacts of Soviet Esperantists), S. Podkaminer (member of the Leningrad Peace Committee & Vice-President of the International Esperanto Movement for World Peace), Khar'kovskii, V. Samodai (Assistant Editor of the Arabic Dept. of Moscow News), A. Berioza (Secretary

of the Commission for Foreign Contacts of Soviet Esperantists), Arolovich, D. Tsybulevskii (first vice-president of the Esperanto movement of Soviet youth in charge of foreign contacts), & A. Goncharov (director of the scientific-technical dept. & former president of the Esperanto movement of Soviet youth).

Visited the Institute of Linguistics. Spoke with V.N. Iartseva, Director of the Institute; & with Desheriev.

30 iv 75. Met with S. Krainov, agronomist & Vice-Delegate of the World Esperanto Association for Moscow; & others.

Flew Moscow-Berlin (GDR). Proceeded to West Berlin & returned to Berlin, GDR.

Visited the Esperanto Section of the League of Culture of the GDR. Spoke with D. Blanke, head of the Section.

1 v 75. Met with Blanke.

Observed 1 May celebration.

Went to West Berlin.

Met with H. Tautorat, teaching assistant in interlinguistics at Berlin Teacher Training College, West Berlin.

Went by overnight train to Heidelberg, FRG.

2 v 75. Visited the computer-assisted instruction laboratory of the Rehabilitation Foundation (Stiftung Rehabilitation), Heidelberg. Met with W.K. Schreiber, a sociologist at the Forschungszentrum für Rehabilitation, Prävention und berufliche Bildung. Worked on decision-making training and analysis programs.

Went by train to Mannheim.

Visited the Center for Surveys, Methods, and Analysis (Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen). Spoke with M. Kaase, its Director; & H. Klingemann, a political scientist on its senior staff.

3 v 75. Went by train to Köln. Met with Lins.

4 v 75. Went by train to Rotterdam. Visited Center for Research and Documentation on the World Language Problem. Worked in its office on Center business.

5 v 75. Flew Amsterdam-New York.

Symbols used in transcriptions herein differing from standard Russian transcription:

ä = e (Az. & Tm.)

í = ï (Rus.)

ç = ç (Az.), k, (Tm.)

j = j (Az.)

đ = f (Az.)

ö = ø (Az. & Tm.)

h = h (Az.)

Description and Interpretation

Caveat

The following is based on brief observations & conversations. The latter were in various languages, usually imperfectly used or understood by one or more conversants. The statements reported below as having been made by other persons cannot be assumed to be accurately reported until and unless verified by those who made them.

Sociolinguistics in the USSR

Soviet sociolinguistics has a rich history, and for various reasons topics in sociolinguistics have great practical importance for the USSR. An analytical survey of Soviet work in this field to date, with useful bibliographical information, can be found in Wolfgang Girke & Helmut Jachnow, Sowjetische Soziolinguistik: Probleme und Genese (Kronberg Ts., FRG: Scriptor Verlag, 1974), which, however, is based only on Russian sources.

Work on sociolinguistic questions continues at a great rate, especially at central institutions of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. One locus of such work is the Dept. of Sociolinguistics (Sektor sotsiolingvistiki) of the Institute of Linguistics (Institut Iazykoznania) of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. This dept. sponsors both theoretical & empirical research. Its staff includes:

Head of the Dept. (Zaveduiushchiĭ Sektorom):

Dr. Iu.D. Desheriev

Senior Scientists (Starshie nauchnye sotrudniki):

Dr. A.D. Shveitser

Dr. A.N. Baskakov

Dr. V.K. Zhuravlev

Dr. M.I. Isaev

Dr. V.Z. Panfilov

Cand. V.Iu. Mikhailchenko

Junior Scientists (Nauchnye sotrudniki):

S.I. Treskova

T.I. Kaganova

N.G. Kolesnik

T.V. Kriuchkova

Associated with this Dept. are two other organizations: (1) the Soviet Committee of Sociolinguistics of the Soviet Sociological Association, and (2) the Scientific Council on the Complex Problem of the Regularities in the Development of National Languages in Relation to the Development of Socialist Nations (Nauchnyi sovet po kompleksnoi probleme "Zakonomernosti razvitiia natsional'nykh iazykov v sviazi s razvitiem sotsialisticheskikh natsii"). Desheriev is the President & A.N. Baskakov the Vice-President of the latter, which has 55 members in all. It in turn has a section on interlinguistics, headed by Isaev. Furthermore, in May of last year the Institute established a Task Force on Issues of an International Auxiliary Language (Problemnaia gruppa po voprosam mezhdunarodnogo vspomogatel'nogo iazyka), in response to a request by the Presidium of the

Academy of Sciences for research on the applicability of such a language "under present conditions". The chairman of the Task Force is Isaev, & its members include:

Cand. A.V. Superanskaia
 Cand. A.B. Dol'gopol'skii
 Cand. A.M. Shakhnarovia
 Cand. V.P. Grigor'ev
 Cand. S.N. Kuznetsov
 N.F. Danovskii

Current sociolinguistic (including interlinguistic) research at the Institute of Linguistics is expected to lead to several publications in the next few years, including books on the following topics:

Sociolinguistic Problems of Developing Countries (1975;
 Desheriev, ed.)
 Contemporary Sociolinguistics: Theory, Problems, and
 Methods (Shveitser; 325 ms. pp.)
 Social Linguistics: Towards a General Sociolinguistic
 Theory (Desheriev; 625 ms. pp.)
 Synchronic Sociolinguistics: Theory and Problems (1976; L.B.
 Nikol'skii; a theoretical work on the sociology of
 language and sociological linguistics)
 The Development of National-Russian Bilingualism (900 ms.
 pp.; based on data from Lithuania, Estonia, Azerbaijan,
 & Buriat ASSR; to deal with bilingualism among Russians
 and local nationalities)
 The Soviet Experience in Language Planning and the
 Development of Standard Languages (to be published in
 English and perhaps French)
 Language and Culture (Desheriev, ed.)
 Philosophical Bases of Contemporary American Sociolinguistics
 Problems of an International Planned Language (by 1978)
 Problems of Interlinguistics: Typology and Evolution of
 International Planned Languages (in press)
 Problems of Language Creation: The Structure and History
 of International Planned Languages

Conferences are also planned for the future, including on:
 Problems of Bilingualism among Closely Related Peoples
 (Minsk, Sept.-Oct., 1975)
 The Development of Bilingualism among Pupils in Non-Russian
 Schools of the RSFSR (Nal'chik, June, 1976; sociological,
 linguistic, pedagogical, psychological, & methodological
 aspects)
 Turkology (All-Union Turkological Conference, Sept.-Oct.,
 1976)
 Problems of Terminology: Sociolinguistic Aspects (1977)
 Sociology and Sociolinguistics (international symposium,
 probably 1977)
 World-Wide Linguistic Processes (international symposium,
 tentative)

The second central institution at which important
 sociolinguistic research is being conducted on a continuing basis
 is the N.N. Miklukho-Maklaia Institute of Ethnography of the
 Academy of Sciences of the USSR. This work is methodologically
 and substantively different from that mentioned above, and its

practitioners use the term "ethnolinguistics" rather than "sociolinguistics" to describe it. But the work itself is of definite sociolinguistic interest. The major effort is that of the Dept. of Empirical Social Research (Sektor konkretnykh sotsial'nykh issledovanii), headed by Iu.V. Arutiunian. This dept. conducts sample surveys of subpopulations of the USSR on topics of nationality and ethnicity. Results of their prior work in the Tatar ASSR have appeared in Sotsial'noe i natsional'noe, edited by Arutiunian (Moscow: Nauka, 1973). Since then, a survey has been carried out on the sociology of nationality, with a 105-item questionnaire that was administered by interviewers to approximately 30,000 respondents in Moldavia, Georgia, Estonia, RSFSR, & Uzbekistan. Among the questions asked are which language the respondent knows best, which languages he uses under what conditions, and which language he would like his children to take in school. The results of the language questions and other questions on cultural life will be analyzed together with those from social-structural and lifestyle questions on the same survey to add to our knowledge about national characteristics, national psychology, and the relationships among national groups. The interviewing was done by scientific staff members at cooperating institutions in the Republics being surveyed. The questionnaires are pre-coded, and the responses are hand-transferred onto coding sheets before being punched on IBM-format cards for automatic processing. The research group has a statistician/programmer, who performs the analyses they ask for. They have unlimited access to computer time. I observed the code-transferring process during my visits to the Institute. The findings of this survey will be published in several volumes, most of which will present the results for individual nationalities and the last of which will be a general comparative study. Among the members of this research group, M.N. Guboglo is the one most actively interested in the linguistic aspects of ethnicity. He designed a survey of ethnolinguistic attitudes and behaviors that was conducted in Moldavia in 1969; the questionnaire contains some very interesting items that might usefully be tried in other sociolinguistic surveys outside the Soviet Union. Other depts. of the Institute also conduct sociolinguistically relevant work. The North American dept., for example, has a knowledgeable and active group of scholars studying ethnic and racial relations in the U.S. and Canada. L.N. Terent'eva, head of the Baltic Republics dept., spends part of her research time working on the phenomenon of mixed marriages. Three of the aspects that concern her are the choice of nationality by children of such marriages, the choice of names for their children by the couples so married, and the effects of existing trends on the ethnic composition and distribution of the USSR. The entire Institute participates in discussions of the theory and terminology of ethnicity and nationality. Their debates about the roles played by language and other factors in national identity, going on during my visit, were informed by considerable familiarity with language situations and ethnic relations around the world. The publication of a large volume on Contemporary Ethnic Processes in the USSR is expected in August. In the spring of 1976 a (second) conference will be held in Estonia on the relationship between language and culture.

Various individuals at other agencies of the Academy of Sciences also work on sociolinguistic topics. A.A. Leont'ev, head of the Department of Psycholinguistics at the Institute of Linguistics, described studies dealing with national differences in linguistic and communicative behavior. Data have been collected from Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Kirgiz, Tajik, Kabardian, Moldavian, Kalmyk, & Russian for a comparative analysis of the speed of speech, hesitations, speech labeling, gesticulation, the connotations of colors, etc. A study of language choice and the use of non-verbal communication in situations where a common language is absent is forthcoming. A study of the expression in communication of social prestige differences, based on Russian and other language data, and a study of differences in perception and memory between Russians and Vietnamese are among the other projects mentioned by Leont'ev. A basic finding from some of this research to date, he said, is that psychological orientations are more predictive than social context of the type of communication that will take place in a group. Nikol'skiy is the head of the Department of Sociolinguistics at the Oriental Institute. He has been doing research on Korean and is planning to analyze its subsystems (dialectical, social, functional, etc.) in his future research. Other work is going on at the Institute of Russian, at the Dept. of English of Moscow State University, & elsewhere in Moscow. The Institute of Linguistics also has a Dept. of Applied Linguistics, but its research area includes computational and statistical linguistics and information theory, rather than problems of language teaching etc. The above examples by no means exhaust or even fairly represent the rich and varied research being conducted in Moscow on sociolinguistically related topics.

The sociolinguistic work in Baku and Ashkhabad differs substantially from that being done in Moscow. The former is (a) more recent, (b) more applied, & (c) more national. Basic sociolinguistic research is only beginning, or only about to begin, in Baku and Ashkhabad. Language scientists there are aware of the desirability of such research and of the fact that they have theoretically fascinating local linguistic situations on which to do empirical work; but they have considered it necessary to accomplish higher-priority goals first. These include (1) alphabetizing the national languages, (2) standardizing them, (3) developing their technical terminologies, (4) writing & publishing textbooks on & in these languages for the schools, (5) training teachers of these languages for the schools, (6) training scientific manpower for further work on these languages, & (7) recording their dialects, which are fast disappearing in favor of the standard varieties. While scholars in the language sciences in Moscow are typically occupied with description and analysis, scholars with similar titles in Baku & Ashkhabad are often concerned more with influencing language and language behavior. They are racing against technology to expand their languages' terminologies. There are depts. of speech cultivation (*kul'tura rechi, dil mädänijjäti*) which maintain a vigilant watch on the mass media's use of the language, to make sure that errors in vocabulary, grammar, and style are caught & corrected; these depts. are treated by their colleagues in

linguistics as indispensable. Many persons are working to overcome the dearth of dictionaries in these languages: the dictionaries that have been published are long since out of print & are considered inadequate anyway. Even those whose job relates to the Russian language are involved in this lexicographical work, whose main effect is to standardize & develop the local national language. In the M.F. Akhundov Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute of Russian Language and Literature, the Lexicography Dept. is compiling a 3-volume Azerbaijani-Russian dictionary, to be followed by a Russian-Azerbaijani one three times the size of the dictionary currently being compiled at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan SSR. The room in which this work is being done at the Pedagogical Institute is stuffed with drawers containing file cards with words, translations, and definitions. The staff informed me that the cards number almost 3 million by this time. I was shown the incomplete typed manuscript: the letter "A" alone occupies more than 500 double-spaced pages. The enthusiasm among those working on this project was evident. According to one outside scholar, there are 50 co-workers in the project.

Thus scholarly activity in language planning seems to be subject to a geographic more than institutional division of labor. Scholars in Moscow work largely on general theoretical, methodological, & comparative studies, & also on the Russian language. Those in the non-Russian Republics work largely on their respective national languages. Studies relating to both categories (e.g. comparative Turkology) are carried out both in Moscow & in the various Republic centers. This is not likely to be just a temporary situation; the plan of activities recently adopted by the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Turkmen SSR, reaching to 1990, provides for work almost exclusively on the Turkmen language & literature. The expectation that this division of labor will be long-lasting is illustrated by the fact that on 28 April the Lenin Library in Moscow removed from the main catalog hall the alphabetic catalog of holdings in the non-Russian languages of the Soviet Union. It was explained that this catalog was rarely consulted, and that those who read in the non-Russian Soviet languages mostly use the respective Republic libraries. (Persons wishing to use this catalog may of course still do so, in a different room to which a consultant will lead them. In that same room is also a very useful subject catalog of holdings in the non-Russian Soviet languages, by language.)

Although foreign exchange resources available to sociolinguists are quite limited, domestic resources are plentiful. Manpower is made available, as indicated above, for enormous surveys. Cooperation is also offered by government agencies. The Institute of Ethnography, for example, hopes soon to get the government to administer a questionnaire to every nationally mixed couple applying to get married, and to every child of such a marriage when he or she at age 16 applies for a passport.

In his off-the-cuff but perceptive and candid remarks as chairman of the seminar on 8 April, Isaev summed up the present state of Soviet sociolinguistics by saying that its first decade had been devoted to publicity and to staking out the boundaries of the field, and that it was now time to begin a second decade of "theoretical growth."

The possibilities for future collaboration in sociolinguistics

Soviet scholars working on sociolinguistic topics are interested in improving contacts & cooperation with colleagues abroad. But they also realistically understand that an increase in cross-national collaboration can be achieved only after careful planning. My conversations left me with the impression that collaborative research even on questions of great political and philosophical importance, such as language policy, will be possible between Soviet and, for example, United States sociolinguists. Considerations in the planning of such work on the Soviet side will include: (a) whether the proposed sites for comparative research have enough in common, in spite of sociopolitical differences, to make comparison fruitful; (b) whether the foreign colleagues involved have the area knowledge required to make responsible use of Soviet data; (c) whether they have purely scientific and cooperative interests in the use of Soviet data; (d) whether favors granted to foreign scholars will be reciprocated; (e) whether favors received from foreign scholars will be such that it is possible for the Soviet side to reciprocate them; (f) whether the normal interests of project directors in the opportunity for first access to their own data will be safeguarded; (g) miscellaneous questions of protocol, diplomacy, & public policy. The climate for collaboration seems positive, in that the Soviet scholars with whom I talked were willing to discuss openly any topic at all and were interested in listening as well as talking. After an initial period of familiarization, my Soviet hosts were willing to discuss not only those questions on which a firm Soviet position exists, but also those on which debate is still going on within the country.

The feeling that collaboration is needed is not based just on the desire for more information from outside the Soviet Union, but also on the sincere (and correct) belief that many of those who write on sociolinguistics, language planning, bilingual education, and related topics in the West seem to think they are breaking new ground, but fail to take account of the early (1920's) and continuing work in these areas in the USSR. Soviet specialists in language teaching are somewhat skeptical of the methods and fads characterizing this field in the West. E.g., a specialist in Baku was familiar with the Russian language textbooks used in the University of Ankara & considered them "primitive". Another suggested that those who are starting second-language immersion programs look at the Soviet experience. Another said that it isn't methods anyway, but enthusiasm, dedication, knowledge, and cultural awareness that make a good language teacher.

Not all contacts with Soviet institutions will have to be directed through all-Union offices. The libraries of the Academies of Sciences of Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan both maintain their own active book, microfilm, & photocopy exchange programs with dozens of institutions & individuals in other countries, & many Soviet & foreign scholars exchange publications on an individual basis.

In addition to bi- or pluri-national programs, more than one Soviet scholar suggested the idea of international sponsorship of collaborative sociolinguistic research, basic and applied. Some thought UNESCO should launch a world-wide sociolinguistic research program, & support by Soviet scholars for any such initiative was promised. Both Desheriev & Nikol'skii suggested that the Research Committee on Sociolinguistics of the International Sociological Assn. undertake this initiative. Those working on interlinguistics were especially eager for cross-national collaboration and hoped to see the Center for Research and Documentation on the World Language Problem coordinate work in this field.

Soviet scholars are, of course, eager to participate in international conferences and congresses where appropriate. They often reminded me, however, that in order to process necessary formalities they need to be invited about a year in advance of the actual event.

Soviet ideas for the 9th World Congress of Sociology

As organizer of the sociolinguistics program for this congress (expected in 1978), I requested ideas from several Soviet sociolinguists about the program. In general, they were troubled by the continuing uncertainty about what sociolinguistics is, i.e. what it includes & what it excludes. Desheriev expressed the view (also supported by Nikol'skii) that the sociology of language and sociological linguistics should be studied together, not separately. He also thought it important to recognize that the field has major futuristic & applied components. He wants to see sociolinguistics emerge as a field with its own subdivisions, categories, & units of analysis, not ones borrowed from other fields. The ethnographers, on the other hand, seem particularly interested in the behavioral rather than the linguistic aspects of sociolinguistics. Whatever their natural differences in orientation, both linguists & ethnographers asked for a panel in which sociolinguists would look critically at their own field as a field: its boundaries, its conceptual frameworks, & its progress toward a general theory. Arutiunian also said Soviet ethnographers could best participate in the sociolinguistics program if it included a session broad enough to allow for their only partly linguistic approach to ethnicity. Interlinguists expressed a desire for at least one panel on world-wide linguistic developments and international language planning. Nikol'skii wanted language planning in general to be emphasized. Guboglo suggested an interesting scheme for organizing the presentation and distribution of papers: each paper giver would furnish 30 copies & be entitled to order 20 papers from the program. The 5-10 papers in a group would be distributed in advance to the group's members & one discussant. They would be discussed but not read or even summarized at panels.

Some observations on language policy

Although critics of Soviet language policy sometimes characterize it as "Russificationist", this is a distortion of reality. In fact, where there is a coherent policy, in comparative perspective it could well be called anti-Russificationist instead. Considering the linguistic trends that would seem most likely in the absence of a deliberate policy, the Soviet government is doing much to preserve & extend the life of the non-Russian languages, if the situations in Azerbaijan & Turkmenistan are indicative. Some evidence for this has already been mentioned. Language planning activities in these two Republics are, with hardly any exceptions, in the hands of members of the basic Republic nationalities. These people are serious about their work to enrich their languages & extend their social roles. One of the few questions of mine eliciting an emotional response was whether the Azerbaijani language would in the future be used as a language of science more, less, or the same amount. The Azerbaijani professors to whom I asked this were vociferous in their claim that the Azerbaijani language would certainly enjoy a "more glorious" role in the future than now; they proudly displayed the university textbooks they had written in Azerbaijani as proof of their commitment. Their view was reinforced by the displays at the Museum of Azerbaijan History, showing how the Azerbaijani people, having settled many centuries ago on the territory of the present Republic, have been subject to many invasions and have lost many things to foreign conquerors, but have never lost their language, which, on the contrary, they have even imposed on their conquerors.

Sometimes Soviet policy opposes Russificationist tendencies existing among the population. Azerbaijani & Turkmen publications on good usage, for example, often warn against excessive use of borrowed Russian words when the internal resources of the native language can provide a needed word. Standard literary Azerbaijani & Turkmen do not employ Russian adverbs, even though bilingual Azerbaijanis & Turkmen were heard using such words as immeno, srazu, uzhe, v obshche, kak raz, sovsem, naverno, tol'ko, & (adverbially) znachit in their Azeri & Turkmen colloquial speech. According to Moscow ethnographers, surveys show that many parents (e.g. Tatars, Gagauzes, & members of small peoples of the North) send their children to schools with instruction in their native language because there is no choice, but would prefer to send them to Russian-language schools.

On the other hand, no-one tries to pretend that the relationships between Russian and the other Soviet languages are symmetrical. Not only is much more emphasis put on the learning of Russian by non-Russians than on the learning of Azerbaijani, Turkmen, etc. by Russians, but also Russian is treated as a source for the enrichment of the other languages much more than vice versa. It is generally accepted that in the Turkic languages new terms which are not based on native roots will be borrowed from Russian. Gasymov explained to me that for Azerbaijani an exception would be made for roots that have international currency but are not used in Russian. If, however, Russian uses the international root in a deviant

form (simvol may be an example), the Russian rather than the international form will be adopted. (This parallels the traditional practice in Turkish vis-a-vis French forms (e.g. sembol, prensip, enstitü).

Baku is farther along the road to full utilization of Azerbaijani than is Ashkhabad for Turkmen. Public signs are more consistently bilingual in Baku, & the proportion of radio broadcasts in the national language seems considerably higher there. This is natural, in view of the two cities' national compositions: Baku has 46% Azerbaijanis & only 28% Russians, while Ashkhabad has 43% Russians & only 38% Turkmen (1970). Also, national language development began earlier in Azerbaijan. Turkmen language planners said they called in Azerbaijani ones for help in the beginning. By this time, however, professional language planners can be & are trained in each Republic without necessarily ever leaving the Republic or studying via another medium than the Republic language. Now that there are enough national specialists in foreign languages as well, Azerbaijani linguists assured me that everyone agrees on the principle of translating foreign literature into the national languages directly, and not, as some used to advocate, via the Russian translations of this literature. T. Tächmyradov, head of the Dept. of Speech Cultivation of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Turkmen SSR, said that the job of surveying language use on public signs and organizing their bilingualization where necessary belonged precisely to his dept. & would be on its agenda.

Another common misconception in the West is that Soviet language policy is entirely centralized, so that few people are actually involved in decision-making. It is hard to measure centralization, but ample evidence of policy debate & consultation is apparent even to a visitor. While I was in Moscow, for example, ethnographers & linguists were vigorously debating the wording of the language questions to be used in the 1980 Soviet census. Some linguists expressed doubts that the term "native language" (*rodnoi iazyk*) was properly or uniformly understood and urged that the term be replaced, perhaps by something like "first language ever spoken". Some ethnographers, however, were said to want to keep the term to preserve longitudinal comparability. The debate was occasioned by a request for advice from the Central Statistical Administration. A related disagreement exists over the term "second native language" (*vtoroi rodnoi iazyk*), which refers to Russian as a language spoken by Soviet citizens with other native languages, or as the native language of portions of the non-Russian nationalities. This term has been used in writings by political philosophers dealing with the nationality question, but I was unable to find any scholar who approved of its use. Scholars call it a non-scientific term used figuratively, or a term perhaps applicable to some small ethnic groups whose members all speak native-like Russian but not to Azerbaijan or Turkmenistan, where a perfect command of Russian as a second language is rare. Colleagues did not fear to disagree with each other in my presence, either. In Ashkhabad, for example, I asked two linguists whether 20 years from now a Russian & a Turkmen meeting on an Ashkhabad street & not acquainted would more

likely speak Russian or Turkmen. One guessed Russian still, but the other, remarking that members of other nationalities in Ashkhabad were already beginning to consider sending their children to Turkmen schools, felt the tide had begun to turn and that in 20 years the two hypothetical citizens on the street would more often use Turkmen. Disagreements, although minor ones, were also encountered on the extent of needed orthographic reforms in the Turkic languages. But if such reforms are to be carried out, the linguists in each Republic believe it is their business to decide what to change how & when in their own language. If two different Republics decide to solve the same orthographic problem in two different ways (e.g. Azerbaijani & Turkmen renderings of /i/+V), this is regarded as a small price to pay for national control over the national language. (In a forthcoming article I shall analyze some of these policy discussions in more detail.)

The debates, of course, do not go on only among language planners, but also between them and language users. Terminology & speech cultivation agencies' decisions sometimes have the force of law (e.g. Committee on Terminology of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan SSR) & sometimes not, but in either case the pre-codification debates were reported to be at times very lengthy; & once they lead to decisions, they are sometimes followed by resistance or objections among writers, broadcasters, etc., & then by attempts at persuasion and/or reconsideration. This process may be similar to that in which language planning agencies in other countries engage and would in any case be interesting as a subject for study.

In the schools, great emphasis is placed on successful language teaching. The professional language teachers whom I met, whether of Russian or of foreign languages, & whether in the schools of Baku & Ashkhabad or the Dept. of English at Moscow State University, were enthusiastic about their jobs & seemed to be doing them very well. There is no question about the fact that students in Russian schools outside the RSFSR learn the local national language, as well as vice versa, although not necessarily as intensively. In Turkmenistan, for example, Russian is taught in Turkmen schools beginning in the 2nd grade, while Turkmen is taught in Russian schools beginning in the 5th grade. Although this difference was explained to me as a result of the fact that Russian is a more difficult language than Turkmen, I think it would be truer to say that the commonly aspired-to level of competence in Russian is harder to achieve than the commonly aspired-to level of competence in Turkmen (in each case as a second language). Given the socioeconomic factors associated with each language, a hypothetical policy aiming at equal competence by each group in the other's language would probably require reversing the difference in years of study. From what I could see, Russian in the non-Russian schools and foreign languages in general are taught with a communicational approach, emphasizing and providing contact with the living language & its speakers. The one class I saw in a non-Russian Soviet language (Turkmen) in a Russian school was being taught by a substitute teacher, so the method used there may not be representative, but in that class a traditional grammatical approach was being employed.

The policy on languages of world communication is for obvious reasons more centralized than those just discussed, but here too it can be seen that different groups and individuals are advocating different points of view. Further, different foreign languages are taught in different parts of the Soviet Union: Arabic and Persian are offered in some of the schools where the national language is related to or has been influenced by these languages. Soviet policy supports the use of Russian as a language of world communication, but I found few people who thought it would ever become "the" international language. On the contrary, the Soviet Union is apparently the only country where serious official thought is being given to the possibility of supporting a universal planned language. The above-mentioned Task Force on this question appears to be sympathetic to the idea which it is charged with studying. No-one I met would forecast the government policy on this issue, but two statements were made: (1) any policy change would be highly influenced by the advice of the Academy of Sciences; (2) any Soviet government decision to support an auxiliary planned language will not be a half-measure: it will put the USSR into the lead of all those in favor of this move.

The relations among the nationalities

From what I could see, the members of different nationalities have relaxed and respectful interpersonal relationships in Azerbaijan & Turkmenistan. I saw only one or two instances of interpersonal friction which might plausibly be attributed to national differences; otherwise the officially encouraged spirit of friendship among the peoples of the USSR appears to be working well. Azerbaijanis & Turkmens seem generally grateful to, rather than resentful of, the Russians as a group. Russians, in turn, are egalitarian rather than condescending toward Azerbaijanis & Turkmens. Some Russians are even slightly heteronationalistic: they appreciate the local nationality's accomplishments & hope for its continued success in eliminating its dependence on Russian & other manpower. These good relations exist in spite of the fact that Azerbaijani & Turkmen national identities, & some differentiating traditions, are strong. According to my hosts, practically no Azerbaijanis or Turkmens ever eat pork (the collective farm I visited is only about to begin raising it--for non-Turkmen consumption). Practically no Azerbaijani or Turkmen women ever marry European men. Azerbaijanis & Turkmens rarely send their children to Russian schools; the linguists I spoke to about this all said they were sending all their children to the national schools, and they did not think there were any strong reasons why a knowledgeable Azeri or Turkmen parent would do otherwise. They insisted that there is no substantial tendency to send the children of one sex to Russian schools more than those of the other, & my visual observations detected no such difference. Azerbaijani national music flourishes (about 30 records on the market), as does Turkmen to a lesser extent (about 7 records). Turkmen national dress is very widely used among women, including even (especially younger) non-Turkmen women in Turkmenistan.

Some observations on language behavior

Among scholars, there is some tendency to prefer Russian to another available language in formal situations or when a stranger is the conversation partner. This tendency is not very strong, however; more than anything else, the pragmatic question of who speaks & understands which languages determines the medium of communication. In Moscow I was usually addressed in Russian, although speakers of English or Esperanto, or less often other languages I could understand, also used these willingly. My Moscow lectures were both in Russian. In Baku & Ashkhabad, my hosts began to use Russian, but in the course of the first hour or two of conversation raised the possibility of, and then suggested, speaking Turkic (i.e. their speaking Azeri or Turkmen and my speaking Turkish, which is mutually intelligible with Azeri & to a lesser extent with Turkmen). My lectures there were one in Russian & the other in Turkish in each case, with approximately equal apparent comprehension. The most senior scholars in Baku & Ashkhabad were generally the quickest to suggest speaking Turkic, occasionally even in groups that included one or two Russians. Scholars among themselves in Baku & Ashkhabad speak mainly the national language. Even in the Institute of Russian Language and Literature in Baku, I heard more Azeri in informal conversation than Russian. Many Turkmen scholars are able to modify their pronunciation to simulate Azeri; 2% of the Ashkhabad population is Azerbaijani, & they seem to be more visible (& audible) than their numbers would suggest. At the dissertation defense which I attended, the chairman (Scientific Secretary of the Institute) and the official opponents gave their remarks in Russian, while the dissertant himself responded to them & gave his prepared remarks in Turkmen.

Other than this, I did not notice any Russian-Turkic bilinguisme passif, nor did my hosts & I practice it, even though it probably would have been the optimal system in light of our active & passive repertoires. Between closely related Turkic languages, however, we often used bilinguisme passif, & my hosts said this is also common in conferences attended only by speakers of Turkic languages.

Among the rest of the population, each nationality's members were usually seen speaking the national language. But when Russians conversed with Azerbaijanis or Turkmen, both almost always spoke Russian. Azerbaijanis conversing with Turkmen in Ashkhabad seemed to use Azerbaijani or Turkmen or both. But Russian was occasionally seen being used in Ashkhabad between a buyer & a seller both of whom appeared to be Turkmen.

The knowledge of Russian by Azerbaijanis & Turkmen who are in frequent contact with it is superb & sometimes native-like. The inverse phenomenon is very rare, but cases were reported to me. On the collective farm I visited near Ashkhabad, where about 95% of the population (1555 members, 5435 total residents) is Turkmen, I was told that the members of the 10 other nationalities speak Turkmen, which is used as the common language. All public signs on the farm were also in Turkmen.

As mentioned above, Russian has had an obvious influence on Azerbaijani & Turkmen colloquial speech, especially among those

who know Russian. The reverse influence is not so apparent. Even the Russian spoken as a second language by educated Azerbaijanis & Turkmen appears practically free of lexical influences from the first language.

In the Russian boarding school I visited in Ashkhabad, I was introduced to some students as examples of language competence. One Russian girl in the 10th grade had taken both Turkmen & English for 5 years; she was proficient in Turkmen but very weak in English, even though she planned to make a career in foreign languages. A 9th-grade Azerbaijani boy who had grown up in Ashkhabad speaking Azerbaijani at home, Turkmen in the neighborhood, & Russian at school, had a clear preference for, & the greatest command of, Russian. In the Turkmen school I visited, I was informed that every pupil may choose to take English or German, & that a slight majority chooses to take German, apparently because it is taught with more audio-visual aids, personal contacts with the GDR, etc. At Azerbaijan State University, there are two divisions, an Azerbaijani & a Russian one, in each of which instruction is given in the corresponding medium. About 70% of the students are in the Azerbaijani division. Of those studying Western foreign languages, about 50% are taking English, 30% German, & 20% French. Of the 250 studying Oriental languages, about 40% are taking Arabic, 35% Persian, & 25% Turkish.

It was commonly said wherever I was that the USSR has solved its language problem & that the solution is a satisfactory one. In Moscow, statements of this sort were elaborated only with reference to the learning of Russian by non-Russians. In Baku & Ashkhabad, the solution is not interpreted so one-sidedly; bilingualism among Russians living there is also seen as part of the solution, even though that part has been taking longer to achieve. But the essence of the solution, according to one Ashkhabad linguist, is the basic decision that was made to preserve & extend the various national languages, rather than let them wither away. These are not disagreements, but just differences in emphasis.

Attitudes towards the Turkish language

As mentioned above, Turkish is highly mutually intelligible with Azerbaijani, although there are definite differences. Except in one instance, no-one on the street to whom I spoke in Azerbaijan seemed to recognize that I was speaking Turkish. They did not say I was speaking some other language close enough to Azerbaijani for them to understand; rather, they said I spoke Azerbaijani. The written Turkmen language is far closer to Azerbaijani & Turkish than is spoken Turkmen, which is highly affected by phonetic assimilation & in which /s/ & /z/ are pronounced [θ] & [ʒ]. This difference is an example of a language policy that does not necessarily, as some critics have claimed, attempt to maximize the diversity among the Turkic languages.

Two of the Azerbaijani scholars I met were familiar with the debate over the standardization of Turkish. They were very unsympathetic with the purist position of the Turkish Language

Foundation (Türk Dil Kurumu). It is rather with the (mostly strongly anti-Communist) opponents of the purist policy that the Azerbaijani scholars agree. The purist position that they oppose is mostly held by left-wing intellectuals. Thus the Azerbaijanis' feelings in this debate must be genuine ones based on ideas about principles of language planning, not mere political convenience.

Some observations on general national & social attitudes

Azerbaijanis & Turkmens have, as suggested above, an intense national identity, historical consciousness, & pride. They are interested in documenting their peoples' long histories, in helping their Republics build themselves industrially, in training indigenous manpower for all their basic needs, and in establishing friendly relations directly with individuals, organizations, & official institutions throughout the world. A staff member of the Ashkhabad botanical garden proudly told me that it exchanged specimens with countries around the world, absolutely regardless of political differences. The Museum of Azerbaijani History prominently displays all the gifts received by the Government of Azerbaijan from foreign countries. (Next to magnificent oriental rugs from Iran & Egypt, a beautiful ensemble of traditional musical instruments from India, & a roomful of other substantial official gifts, is displayed the only gift ever received from the U.S.: a framed "Free Angela Davis" poster presented by a visiting representative of the U.S. Communist Party.) The intelligencia in each Republic also seems concerned for the welfare of their fellow nationals in other Republics. They are aware of these people & try to help them. For example, the teacher training institutions in Baku & Ashkhabad accept Azerbaijanis & Turkmens, respectively, who live outside the Republic without making them compete for admission; they are trained as teachers & then return to their homes to serve their fellow nationals (e.g. in Armenia or Tajikistan) in their separate national schools.

National pride in Azerbaijan & Turkmenistan does not seem, however, to interfere with acceptance & support of the Soviet social & political order. Organized & individual expressions of Soviet patriotism were frequent wherever I went, and even more so in Baku & Ashkhabad than in Moscow. Except for just one or two people, those I spoke with seemed to feel sympathetic with the goals of the CPSU & to feel that the existing political system is basically just. At the same time, I did not encounter the expected reluctance to discuss such questions as dissident writers, emigration policy, & freedom of expression. My hesitation to raise such questions turned out to be unnecessary. Soviet citizens' knowledge of public affairs is often very specialized: there are, for example, persons who are well versed in Marxist-Leninist philosophy or Czarist history but cannot answer elementary questions about the formal Soviet political structure. The people I talked to were generally agreed on the need for increased exchanges of persons, information, & ideas. They listened to broadcasts from Western stations, including Turkey, Iran, & stations unfriendly to Soviet policy. They had in some cases read American books on the Soviet nationality

question (particularly by E. Allworth). They believed that everyone should have access to any publication, including an anti-Soviet one, & that first-hand familiarity with anti-Soviet writings is not only not a fault & not only a right, but even a duty of an informed Soviet citizen. (The infrastructure to make this possible in the social sciences, i.e. the bibliographical, abstracting, microfilming, photocopying, & interlibrary-loan systems, has become excellent recently.) At the dissertation hearing I attended, the dissertant was criticized more than anything else for not making use of the relevant foreign literature. Any need to shelter the citizenry from unfriendly views is seen as a temporary one which has already mainly or entirely passed, since the success of the CPSU in achieving the rebuilding of Soviet society is no longer seen as in any danger. Similar tolerance for pornography from abroad does not exist, however. No circumstances are foreseen under which its admission into the country would be justified. This distinction was echoed in a documentary which I saw in an Ashkhabad movie theater, explaining the need for baggage inspection at Moscow's international airport. Tourists were shown entering the USSR with guns, Soviet currency, anti-Soviet propaganda, religious tracts, & pornography hidden inside their clothes, hollow heels, hollow canes, & fake candy boxes; & exiting with religious icons concealed inside TV sets. The camera focused right onto the front page of Novoe Russkoe Slovo & other anti-Soviet literature, but carefully avoided even a glimpse of any pornographic pictures; instead, it just showed customs officials inspecting these. This conforms to a more general syndrome: the absence of symbols of any kind of sensuality from the Soviet media.

What visitors should bring & expect

Contrary to the information distributed by the National Academy of Sciences, soap & toilet paper were in abundant supply in the stores. Felt pens as gifts were not appropriate, since they are available in stationery stores. (Yoyos & slinkys, however, are unknown there.) According to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, those Academy visitors wanting to send their allowed one package of books home through the Embassy must have brought the right amount in U.S. postage stamps with them!

Soviet hospitality was excellent & sometimes profuse, but not continuous, at least in Moscow, where people are busy & expect the visitor to fend mostly for himself after the first few days. I had no trouble modifying the initial schedule that had been prepared for me, to the point where it bore little resemblance to the actual program of appointments. Scheduling was greatly expedited by the one or two individuals who in each city were assigned to take care of me throughout my stay. These persons (S.I. Treskova in Moscow, M.Sh. Gasymov in Baku, & A. Övezov & T. Tächmyradov in Ashkhabad) did this very generously, competently, & conscientiously, at a great sacrifice of time for themselves. I was left alone enough to do a good deal of sightseeing in & around the cities where I was. I had only one brush with the law: after running across a Moscow street to avoid being run over, I was stopped by a policeman & told that it is illegal to run across the street. Otherwise people were helpful & friendly, including in service establishments. I was not recognized on sight as foreign; in fact, many people approached me on the street to ask for directions.