

Characteristics of Socio-Cultural Vitality of Modern Russian Settlements of the Former Gorky Line of Kazakhstan

Irina S. Karabulatova¹

Bigaysha Z. Akhmetova²

¹ Institute of Social and Political Research of RAS

² Kostanay state University named for A. Baitursynov

E-mail: Radogost2000@mail.ru

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s4p201

Abstract

The problem of ethnicity being is the most important for the border territories of Russia and Kazakhstan as a multi-ethnic and multi-religious community of the peoples, connecting Europe and Asia, West and East. At a critical stage of historical development again the problem of orientation to the West or the East, the questions of existence of Russia as a specific space of coexistence of different ethnic groups and peoples, cultures and civilizations, languages and religions has been actualized. The population of modern Russian settlements of the former Gorki lines, presented on the territory of Kostanay region, today is mixed and polyethnic. The authors aim to trace the survival of the Russian language and culture in a dense ring of the migrant (Turkic) environment. In this regard, in-depth interviews were conducted, the records of Russian speech in different time periods were compared, data from the questionnaires were analyzed, the transformation zones of the language and culture of Russians, living a long time in isolation from the parent culture in the migrant environment were revealed.

Keywords: Russians, Gorki Line, vitality of culture, ethnic identity, ethnic satisfaction, sociological polls.

1. Introduction

Wide resettlement began after the completion of construction, i.e. after 1755, although a free peasant colonization of a new area is hindered the fact that for the relocation it was necessary to obtain the authorization, granted only to the payment of tax arrears at the old place (Akhmetova *et.al.*, 2013, p. 55). The beginning of construction of fortifications of Gorki line, associated with the colonization of the South - Eastern lands of the edge of Russia, belongs to 1752. The line took its name from its geographical position, as located along the bitter lakes (bitter in Russian – Gorki). The Dzungar army invasion became a huge disaster for the Kazakh people in the late XVII century and the first quarter of XVIII century. In 1741 - 1742, Dzungar lords again attacked the territory of one of the fragile feudal Kazakh entities - Middle Zhuz. They emptied the villages on the Ishim, destroying or capturing people and abducting cattle. Survivor Kazakhs fled to the Russian borders. Only the intervention of the Russian administration delayed the further advancement of the Dzungars. However, soon there was a new invasion in the area of the Syr-Darya, and then it became aware of the preparation of the Dzungars campaign on Younger Zhuz. In 40-ies of the XIX century the Kazakhs situation is strengthened by the accession to the Russia of the Middle Zhuz (Akhmetova *et.al.*, 2013). In the 70 years of the XIX century on the initiative of the governor of Western Siberia, the adjutant general Kaznakov, has officially formed the first Russian settlements in the Kazakh (Karabulatova, 2008, p. 77-81).

In this context, special importance is attached to the Russian state border fortifications in the South of Western Siberia. By this time the line of fortresses, goals, fortified settlements are stretched from Tobol to the Irtysh in very uneven stripe, in some places strongly retreating to the North, and on its ends (the Tobol and Irtysh) advanced to the south. In this context, special importance is attached to the Russian state border fortifications in the south of Western Siberia. By this time the line of fortresses, goals, fortified settlements is stretched from Tobol to the Irtysh in very uneven stripe, in some places strongly retreating to the North, and on its ends (the Tobol and Irtysh) advanced to the south. Besides the zigzag form and lack of reliability of some of the sites (fortified points are arranged on the line unevenly), this protective strip, called Ishim line, had one very significant drawback: fields, hayfields, fishing of Russian population in some places gone beyond it, further to south, and during the field work for the protection of the peasants military teams were sent. (Karabulatova, 2008; Karabulatova, Koyche & Gulyaev, 2013).

2. Materials and Methods

Study material in accordance with the tasks, is heterogeneous in nature, combining both archival materials and contemporary recordings of speech. Totally are collected more than twenty-five thousand live speech segments of spontaneous speech in the Russian-Kazakh border area, characterizing the speech of native speakers of the region, from the studies of other authors about four and a half thousand examples of the interaction of languages are extracted, three experiments in which participated more than two hundred people are conducted. In addition, we used the index card and materials of dialectological expeditions of Kostanai state University named for A. Baitursynov.

The central methodology of the research is synergistic approach developed by H. Haken, A. Bergson, A. Nasaretyan. However, the involvement of system methodology that combines societal and comparative approaches, allows to combine the study of large-scale socio-political transformations, characteristic for Russia and CIS countries in the field of modern ethno-linguistic politics and local regional practices. The methodological basis of our research is the corner position on language and society, which includes anthropocentric, activity and integrative principles, the introduction of which in the process of the study of language contact has led to the immanent transition from linguistics to anthropocentric, allowing to identify the role of human factor in language.

Researchers have reasonably come to the conclusion that the indigenous people of Gorki line are descendants of immigrants from Northern and North-Eastern provinces of the European part of Russia, defining the initial substrate of settlers of Gorki Line. (Karabulatova, Koyche & Gulyaev, 2013; Karabulatova & Polivara, 2013 & Karabulatova, Sayfulina & Ahmetova, 2013).

Some archival sources show that in July and August of 1879, and namely this year is considered to be the founding year of the city - on the natural boundary, to Kostanayin from Orenburg arrived 300 families of early settlers, most of them left Buzuluk and Nicholas counties of Samara province. Settlers from Orel province set up camp on the left bank of the Tobol. Till late autumn, they lived in tents, waiting for the arrival resettlement Commission, which was to take the land under the homestead. But the Commission has not arrived. Frustrated settlers moved to winter in the Cossack villages of line - stations Verenka, Nadezhdinka, Grenaderka and other (Gulyaev *et al.*, 2013).

Only in 1893 in Kostanay district were formed two Russian districts - Borovskaya from the Borovoy, Mikhailovsky, Ivanovsky and Alexandrovsky villages, from Alexandrovsky, Zhukovsky, Borisov, Davydenskt settlements. By 1894 in each of the districts lived 800 - 900 families of migrants, in Kostanay in 1885 were established district and village administration and the court. (Akhmetova *et al.*, 2012, p. 59).

3. Results

The Russian population, settling in the lower reaches of the Tobol, salt lakes, came in very close contact with the Kazakhs - economic and cultural. Border relations between Russia and Kazakhstan contribute to the evolution of the languages, which is reflected in the development of the Eurasian linguistic identity, which is realized in the vector from the Turkic language learner to Russian-speaking Turkic language personality, from Russian language personality to Russian Turic - speaking linguistic identity in the space of bilateral relations, contributing to the harmonization of interethnic relations in the area of the Russian-Kazakhstan border (Karabulatova, 2013, p. 793). North Russian features in the greater part of Kostanay dialects, "the relationship of these dialects with Arkhangelsk, Vologda, Kirov (Vyatka), Perm are explained by the history of the settlement of Kostanay region (Karabulatova, 2002, p. 112).

**Analysis of the vitality of the Russian language in settlements of Kostanay region
(on the material of the tape, dialect recordings and questionnaire data):**

Studied settlements of Gorki line	Population size (peop.)	Talk in dialect of Russian language			Talk in Russian literary language		
		From 60 year and elder	from50-60year	from50-year	from 60 year and elder	from 50- 60 year	from 50- 40 year
Karabalik region							
v.Beloglinka	943	40	37	25	22	80	118
v. Esenkol	132	26	20	16	7	22	23
v. Kosoba	841	68	46	38	19	66	84
v. Akkuduk	229	30	35	24	12	38	30
v. Priozeruiy	177	20	26	15	9	30	20
v. Dalniy	150	34	30	23	8	30	20
Uzunkol region							

v. Simbirka	378	49	38	27	18	43	55
v. Ksenevka	303	30	30	22	19	47	50
v. Pochinovka	112	13	12	11	4	20	24
v. Presnegorkovka	1819	64	56	35	21	69	80
v. Peschanka	259	30	27	21	8	31	37
v. Grenaderka	158	28	22	15	5	30	34
Fedorov region							
v. Grachevka	181	29	22	17	10	30	36
v. Kurskiy	286	30	26	20	11	35	42
v. Novoukrainka	148	25	20	19	6	27	30
v. Noviy	168	24	18	14	6	28	32
v. Poltavka	176	20	18	16	7	30	33
v. Malorossiisk	918	18	19	12	15	57	70

As a result of sociolinguistic expeditions was assembled a unique material for the preservation of the Russian language and culture in the settlements of the former Gorki line on the territory of Kostanay region. As a result the dynamics of specific preservation of relict dialectal forms of the Russian language, which gradually replaced the Russian literary language was revealed (Karabulatova, Sayfulina & Ahmetova, 2013, p. 139). In other words, for the Russians of Northern Kazakhstan language is a powerful ethnocentricity force determining the vitality of the Russian ethnos in the migrant environment (Ryazantsev, 2014).

So, the dialectal features of the pure parent (Oryol) dialects are preserved in the speech of the old residents of the villages of the Kursk (10), Grachevka (9 people) Fedorovskiy district; Grenaderka (12), Presnogorkovka (9), Sibirka (11) Uzunkolsk district; Beloglinka (15), Dalnee (10) of Karabalyk district. It should be noted that the villages Sibirka, Peschanka, Essencol, Kosoba, Leano is significantly distanced from regional and district centers. The distance from Presnogorkovka to the village Uzunkol – the district center - 74 km, to the city of Kostanay - 239 km, from v. Essencol to the village Karabalyk (the district centre) - 83 km, to the city of Kostanay - 200 km. The distance between these villages is small. So, from Presnogorkovka to Peschanka approximately 18 km, from Peschanka to Sibirka - 5 km, from Essencol to Cosba - 16 km, from Cosba to Lesnoe and 4 km (Karabulatova, Sayfulina & Ahmetova, 2013, p. 138) The inhabitants of these settlements are constantly talking to each other, many are related, therefore, on subject of ongoing contacts dialect is saved as a unity with all the common elements of the language system, and Russian culture ensures the vitality of the ethnos.

Most of it are descendants of the Cossacks, military men, and the first Russian settlers of the region, the other part single persons, who have run away in search of a better life [Karabulatova, Koyshe, 2013]. In the years of the Stolypin reforms and in hungry twenties thousands of new units of turned out by poverty peasants arrived. At the very beginning of the war (1941 - 1945) the region has experienced large flow of refugees and evacuated together with the enterprises peoples. On 1 October 1943 in Kostanay region lived 394 evacuated peoples. They came from the following republics and regions: the Ukrainian SSR - 16 876; Belarusian SSR - 1975 people; Smolensk region - 917 people; Moscow - 718 people; Tula - 835 people; Orel - 513 people; Kursk - 406 people; Voronezh - 957 people; Rostov - 465 people; other - 975 people. (Akhmetova *et al.*, 2012).

According to historians, the 50-ies of XX century. began the next stage of the movement of immigrants in Kostanay region. During 1954-1956, to Kostanay have moved more than 150 thousand people, of almost 40 nationalities (Karabulatova, Koyshe & Gulyaev, 2013, p. 150).

For the implementation of the ambitious plans of the rise of Kostanay virgin land tens of thousands of workers, the number of which was not enough in the region, were in need. Brotherly help of the Russian and other peoples of the country rescued. In late February of 1954 a meeting of young workers of industrial enterprises of Moscow, specialists and mechanics of Moscow region, headed to work in the areas of development of virgin and fallow lands was held. It appealed to all young people of the Soviet Union with a call to become the member of new labour army, to explore new lands (Karabulatova, Koyshe & Gulyaev, 2013, p. 149).

Following the example of Muscovites dozens of trains of volunteers left to the virgin lands. The envoys of Ukraine were solemnly met - the first group of settlers – Kostanay citizens in the last day of winter 1954 /19,176/. Landings of ambassadors from Dnipropetrovsk, Orel, Voronezh regions, from Donbass were landed. The settlers from Belarus, the Urals, Siberia, Kuban were arriving (Akhmetova *et al.*, 2012, p. 87). "Don't remember in what year was formed our village, because we came here from the Orel region in 1956, "says Stenickaya A. G., who is living in v. Beloglinka in Karabalyk district, "I was very surprised that here settlers are living for a long time".

In terms of Gorki line of the Russian-Kazakh border was formed environment that produces satisfaction with own nationality and pride for belonging to the people in conditions of mixed ethnic Slavic-Turkic environment (Karabulatova, 2013, p. 343-344). This conclusion is confirmed by the answers of respondents in the region.

The answers of the respondents living in Kostanay region, the question about satisfaction of own nationality, in percentage to the total number of respondents

Answer	Representatives of ethnoses		
	Russian	Tatars	Kazakhs
Satisfied	55,1	77,7	79,4
Non-satisfied	3,8	1,7	5,7
Hard to answer	24,4	7,1	12,0
Don't make anything of it	16,7	13,5	2,9

Detailed analysis of the answers of respondents living in the settlements of the former Gorki line, on the territory of present Kostanay region, depending on educational attainment, age, gender and the marriage allowed us to identify the following trends:

- 1) more educated respondents more often express satisfaction with their nationality than respondents with primary or incomplete secondary education;
- 2) dissatisfaction of nationality is often expressed by the respondents who have completed lower secondary and upper secondary education and respondents in the age group of 20 years;
- 3) respondents, consisting in monoethnic marriage, more often express satisfaction with their nationality than respondents, consisting of inter-ethnic marriages;
- 4) men more often than women are satisfied with their national affiliation.

The respondents' answers to the question about satisfaction of nationality depending on gender, in percentage to the total number of respondents

Answer	Gender	
	Male	Female
Satisfied	81,8	75,0
Non-satisfied	4,1	15,0
Hard to answer	10,7	5,0
Don't make anything of it	3,3	5,0

According to our author's research the exceed of the proportion of individuals who prefer ethnic identification requirements on ethno-cultural and psychological is found.

The answers of the respondents living in Kostanay region, on the criteria for determining nationality in percentage to the total number of respondents

Criteria	Representatives of ethnoses		
	Russians	Tatars	Kazakhs
Wishes of the person	25,3	36,8	24,4
Native language	21,0	22,5	14,0
Nationality of father	23,1	25,9	51,2
Nationality of mother	14,0	8,6	4,1
Citizenship	9,7	5,4	4,1
biographical particulars	7,0	0,8	2,3

We see two trends in the behavior of the Russian population of the former Gorki line: a) nation - directed and b) national centrifugal. As a result happen either short-circuits on oneself and/or closely related culture (Ukrainians, Belorussians etc.), or "opening" of ethnic boundaries with subsequent transformation of the Russian language personality.

4. Discussion

Studies of different cultures through comparison of their images of the world especially are relevant now, when the expanding inter-ethnic contacts reveal differences in comparator cultures (Karabulatova, 2013; Karabulatova, 2014;

Karabulatova et al., 2012; Lomakina, 2011; Mokienco, Mellerowich, 2006 & Osipov, 2002). In the evolution of a territory happens not mechanical displacement of ethnic groups, and complex processes of ethnogenesis of the peoples - contactors, which mean the aggregate formation of the ethnic groups with regard to the borrowing of individual elements of material and spiritual culture and language, respectively, which finds its direct reflection, primarily in regional onomastics (Karabulatova 2013, p. 793). Post-Soviet reality has forced many to assimilationist processes (Svargaman, <http://voprosik.net/russkie-v-srednej-azii>, 2011), or migration to Russia (Karabulatova & Polivara 2013). However, some researchers believe that the drift of Russians from Kazakhstan negatively affects on the future of Kazakhstan (Gladilin, 2011). I. Gerasimov notes that the existing problem of intensive migration to Russia from Central Asia creates social and national tensions in major Russian cities, and the problem of the erosion of Russian cultural space becomes more and more long-term threat to Russia and devalues the centuries-old efforts of the Russian state on involvement in its orbit more and more countries and nations (Gerasimov 2011). In our view, these issues are two sides of the same coin and, therefore, require interconnected solutions.

The coexistence of these two problems could not be better illustrated by the contradictions in the situation of modern Russia, which is not politically control Central Asia, but, as before, is the center of attraction of strong migration flows from the region and, therefore, faces the consequences of the policies which is pursued by the local elite. This obliges the Russian leadership to completely isolate itself from the increasingly troubled region, or again, to take responsibility for his present and future, remembering that Central Asia is one of the cornerstones that make up the Foundation of the Russian world power.

Radical changes in the life of the people, a crisis situation, related to the need to adapt to new conditions, activate defense mechanisms - cultural archetypes (constants) of the ethnic community, a support on which helps to overcome the identity crisis

5. Conclusions

In sociolinguistics and related sciences the concept of "national sentiment", i.e. the relation of personality to own nation and other nations, to the way of life that helps to strengthen ethnic constants in the language and national stereotypes, including the language of the plan are widely used. Analysis of the census materials (1989-2014) only shows the preservation of the Russian language as the family, it was gradually forced out of the official sphere, more conserving in domestic usage. Since its emergence in the South of Western Siberia, on the border with Kazakh Sept designated as a Gorki line in 2nd part of the XIX century, Russian colonists, that is, peasant settlers constantly lived under more or less close interaction with local indigenous population. Cultural, social, household differences between the two groups invariably introduce an element of ethnic tension in relationships. The models of inter-ethnic relations, and socio-political factors, largely determining them, throughout the XX century quickly were changing, each time becoming qualitatively different: at the Royal authority, in the period of the civil war, collectivization, during the so-called socialist construction "developed socialism", in the post-Soviet period. Residents of the relatively small Russian enclaves in the countryside had again and again to adapt to the changed socio-political realities, building with the local population a new system of relations. The formation of these relationships was the most important component of the process of adaptation of the Russian population, providing the opportunity for its development and survival (in a social and cultural sense), what has influenced on various aspects of life of this group. In some periods, the Central government had different concepts about the desirability of this or that type of interethnic relations in the Central Asian region and the extent of its influence on their formation. In practice, the role of the state in the construction of these relations was limited, because the people themselves having the contacts, built them from "bottom" on a personal level, which does not coincide with the models of group, impersonal relations. Differences in economic orientation of immigrants and the indigenous population have contributed to the rapid establishment of business relations between them. Indigenous people, performing in Russian villages the work, unusual for Russians, in parallel, taught them the techniques of irrigation and cultivation of local crops. At the same time, under the influence of Russians the next door lived indigenous people have been fundamentally changed not only in economic activities, construction machinery, but also in the very way of life; previously almost unknown knowledge (in the field of medicine, agronomy, veterinary medicine), new profession were spreading. Neighboring with Russian enclaves wandering groups of Kirghiz and Kazakhs mastered the practice of fodder for the winter and are easier moving to sedentary life than their compatriots in mono-ethnic areas.

Today realities put the issue of the preservation of these "Islands" of Russian culture in the migrant Kazakh environment. In the XIX century, despite the negative attitude of the Orthodox Church with non-Christian marriages, the Cossacks, merchants, and peasants and other service people in Siberia were almost totally married to local women, which resulted in sub-ethnic Russian community - groups of mixed population, anthropologically close to the peoples-the

neighbors, there was the new Russian population in these places (Karabulatova, 2002). In their speech, increasingly, we are seeing local Turk-Kazakh traits, turns, lexemes, humor. Now this population is struggling to find a way out for himself and their descendants, trying to determine: weather they are Russians or Kazakhs?

References

- Akhmetova, Z.V., Zhmagulova N.S., Karabulatova I.S., Koyshе K.K. & Polivara Z.V. 2013. Linguistic identity in a transforming society (on the example of bilinguals in a multi-ethnic environment). Tyumen: Vectorbox. pp. 191.
- Gerasimov, I. 2011. The Future of Russian culture in Central Asia, from 21.11.2011.
- Gladilin, I. 2011, Russians wake up! You can not escape from Central Asia., from 28.08.2011.
- Gulyaev, V. N., Koyshе K.K. & Karabulatova I.S. 2013. On the formation of polisegmentary Eurasian linguistic identity in Russian-Kazakh border: linguistic, social and economic factors. In the: Scientific review. Series 2. The Humanities. M. №1-2. pp. 160-171.
- Karabulatova, I.S. 2002. Russian toponymy in ethnopsychological aspect. The dissertation on competition. Cand St.Dr. Philol.N. Tver state University. pp. 501.
- Karabulatova, I.S. 2008. Prognostic toponymy: the transformation of toponymic space in the linguistic consciousness of the modern Russian language speakers. Tyumen: Printer. pp. 254.
- Karabulatova, I.S., Koyshе K.K. & Gulyaev V.N. 2013. Variability of the modern Eurasian Russian-speaking linguistic identity: Russian Turkic linguistic personality in the territory of the Russian-Kazakh border area. In: Bulletin of the Orel state University. Series: New Humanities research. № 2 (31). pp. 148-151.
- Karabulatova, I.S. & Koyshе K.K. 2013. Transformation of the modern Eurasian linguistic identity of the Russian-Kazakh border area. In: Vestnik of Kemerovo state University of culture and arts. Kemerovo. No. 22/2. pp. 10-18.
- Karabulatova, I.S. 2013. Eurasian linguistic identity: the nature of the interaction of Slavic and Turkic languages in the communicative space of the Russian-Kazakh border area. In: People and language in a communicative space. – Coll. of sc. art. Vol. 4. No. 4. pp. 343-348.
- Karabulatova, I.S. 2013. The Problems of Linguistic Modeling of New Eurasian Linguistic Personality in Multilingualistic and Mental Environment (By Example of Onomasphere). In the: Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research 17 (6). pp. 791-795.
- Karabulatova, I.S. & Polivara Z.V. 2013. Turkic and Slavs: Bi-Polylinguism in Globalization and Migrations (On an Example of Tumen Region). In the: Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research 17 (6). pp. 832-836.
- Karabulatova, I.S., Koyshе K.K. & Gulyaev V.N. 2013. The Dialogue of Kazakh Steppe and Russian Forest: About the Character of Turkic-Speaking Linguistic Personality on the Territory of Russian-Kazakhstani Border-Zone. In the: Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research 17 (7). pp. 853-858.
- Karabulatova, I.S., Sayfulina F.S. & Ahmetova B.Z. 2013. Ethno-linguistic aspect of the functioning of the modern Russian dialects in northern Kazakhstan (for example Kostanai region). In the: World Applied Sciences Journal Issue 27 (Education, law, economics, language and communication). pp. 137-140.
- Karabulatova, I.S. 2014. Specificity of the Russian-speaking linguistic personality in the conditions of the Russian-Kazakh border area. In: problems of history, Philology and culture. No. 3. pp. 115-116.
- Lomakina, O.V. 2011. Idioms and Proverbs as semantic dominants of literary text (based on the works of L. N. Tolstoy). In: Questions of Philology, Moscow. No. 38. pp. 67-72.
- Karabulatova, I.S., Smagulova G.K., Khairtdinov A.M. & Abisheva K.M. 2012. National specific comparisons in the language picture of the world (in the Russian, Kazakh and Tatar languages). In: Scientific review. Series 2: Humanities. M.: publishing house "Economicheкое obrazovanie ". No. 3-4. pp. 154-160.
- Mokienko, V.M. & Mellerowic A.M. 2006. Semanticization of interlanguage phraseological correlates and linguistic picture of the world. In: Problems of the semantics of language units in the context of culture (Linguistic and linguo-didactic aspects). International scientific-practical conference 17-19 March 2006. "Publishing "Elpis". pp. 21-29.
- Osipov, G.V. 2002. Sociology and social myth. - Moscow: Publishing house NORMA (Publishing group NORMA – INFRA . M). pp. 656
- Ryazantsev, S.V. 2014. On the linguistic integration of migrants as a new benchmark migration policy of Russia. In: Socis. No. 9. pp. 25-29.
- Svargaman, 2011. The Russians in Central Asia. The online source, 21.12.2011. <http://voprosik.net/russkie-v-srednej-azii/>, date of base 29.03.2015.