The article examines the essence, meaning and content of the concepts of "russification" and "assimilation" as such, which, according to scientists, almost do not differ. In addition to defining these concepts, the author focuses on the term "russification", which, according to some scholars, is obsolete. Domestic scholars devote much attention to the essence of this phenomenon, therefore, they suggest replacing it with the term "russification", which in their opinion more accurately reflects assimilation processes, the destruction of the Ukrainian people, its language and culture, as well as those events that took place on the territory of Ukraine at different times. Relying on the work of scholars, their quotations and conclusions, the author of the article tries to prove that assimilation, for example, of certain languages and cultures, while russification are a process of inhibition of the full functioning of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the use and development of Ukrainian culture, the spread of the native language ethnic Ukrainians, fiction, and others. Such phenomena as russification and assimilation are considered together with other problems, therefore, it is argued that the russification of the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian language and culture led to misunderstandings, confrontations, linguistic and political conflicts, the Orange Revolution, the Revolution of Dignity, the annexation of the Crimea and the Russian War in the East of Ukraine.
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**Formulation of the problem.** Around the problem of Russification of Ukrainians by language, politics and culture, a political debate was unfolding in the environment of scholars and researchers. According to I. Dzyuba, in the sphere of culture and language the "achievements" of the semi-colonial position of the Ukrainian community in modern Ukraine have not only survived but multiplied [3, p. 464]. If in the late 1980s the beginning in the 1990s, the interest in the Ukrainian language grew even in the Russian-speaking environment, then political and economic instability compromised the Ukrainian idea, which negatively affected the attitude towards the Ukrainian language and culture as a whole as the bearers of nationality. This hindered the movement towards a constructive linguistic policy as a valuable component of ensuring the unity of the Ukrainian community. The current russification of the Ukrainian community is closely linked to the linguistic policy pursued by Russia through the Ukrainian Communists and other pro-Russian-minded politicians in modern Ukraine. Her linguistic policy is connected with the "gathering of lands", which she conducts by methods of capture and annexation of foreign territories. In the basis of its policy, the newest Russia laid the linguistic and cultural question of the Russian-speaking population of the Ukrainian state. In this case, her linguistic policy is based on myths that help some Ukrainian politicians build a language strategy that meets Russian interests in Ukraine. In this case, the rate was made on the Russian-speaking population, which, according to K. Zatulin, should be used in the personal interests of the Kremlin, in order to implement the geostrategic plan of Russia. And at the same time it does not matter how this will be the Ukrainian people, but only that the idea of the restoration of Great Russia has been achieved, because without Ukraine, according to Zb. Brzezinski, Russia will cease to be an Eurasian empire and will remain only an Asian state [2]. According to O. Chirkov, Russian-speaking Ukrainians became more in comparison with Ukrainian, the number of which has been gradually diminished due to russification, which is a tendency that occurs at the present stage of development of Ukrainian society [12, p. 164, 165, 167, 180]. In particular, V. Sklyar enriched the communicative policy of studying the ethnographic and linguistic and political situation in Ukraine, which, unlike Ukrainian realities, has been developing rapidly since the mid-XX th century in foreign countries. His statement on the preconditions and reasons for Ukraine's involvement in Russian ethno-speaking space in the research community caused a lively discussion [12, p. 24]. The considerable controversy in the circle of scholars led to his statement about the division of Ukrainians into Russian-speakers, who predominantly live in the South and East of the State, and Ukrainian-speakers who live in the majority in the West and, to some extent, in the center of Ukraine [12, p. 166, 168-172, 176].

The purpose of the article is to investigate the essence, meaning and nature of concepts such as
"russification" and "assimilation" as those that underlie the destructive activity of anti-Ukrainian-minded politicians and Russian political forces and are used to destroy their native language, culture, history and statehood of ethnic Ukrainians. That is, assimilation is a linguistic and political phenomenon, which, with the help of powerful tools, involves a language policy, through which a more developed nation tries to absorb less developed economically, politically and culturally, which often leads to confrontations, conflicts, separatism and irredentism.

Analysis of recent research and publications. As can be seen, some aspects of this problem were investigated by such scholars as Sb. Brzezinski, I. Dziuba, A. Kolodiy, O. Kuts, V. Lysanchuk, A. Pogribny, V. Sklyar, O. Chirkov and others. The term "russification" instead or "assimilation" was used by A. Kolodiy, V. Lizanchuk and other domestic scholars under the influence of the Russian-speaking environment. Russification according to scholars, the language policy of Muscovy, the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, as well as the pro-Russian-minded power of modern independent Ukraine. It should be noted, however, that the pro-Russian ideology, to which we often refer, should be understood as an orientation to support the political system of Russia and the political regime of Vladimir Putin, belonging to the Russian people, his culture, traditions, customs and values [13, p. 233]. In place of Russism, the "russification" of domestic scientists, in particular O. Kuts, V. Sklyar, A. Pogribny, O. Chirkov, and others, suggest the use of the term "russification", which is equivalent to the term "assimilation". The Russification of the Ukrainian people is explained by the scholars of "the purposeful policy of internationalization" that manifest itself in the Holodomor, the elimination of education and the press in the languages of national minorities, the export of Ukrainians beyond the state, and the resettlement of Russian population from other republics into Ukraine. As a result, in Ukraine there has been a crisis demographic and linguistic situation regarding Ukrainian and non-Russian languages. In particular, O. Chirkov offers the borrowed from the Russian language the term "russification" not to use in general and derivatives from it concepts used to characterize socio-political processes of the XVIII - XXI centuries, on the ethnon of "rossirovanie" or "russification" [14, p. 287]. At the same time, I. Belebeha, I. Dzyuba, I. Diyak, I. Ivanchenko, B. Kravtsev, V. Kubiyovych, O. Musiyenko and others. scholars of the term "russification" pay special attention. They interpret this concept as "the forcible introduction of the Russian language and culture, flooding Ukrainian life, immortalizing national culture, destroying Ukrainian customs, the Ukrainian language, devastate the people's soul and fostering hordes of Janissaries" [14, p. 292]. According to O. Chirkov, derivatives of this term are such modern phenomena and concepts as "russification", "hypocrisy", "paternity", "russeting", "scattering", and others. Most of these concepts, unlike those created from the term "russification", are created from the root rus, which, in the opinion of this scientist, is the main terminological element in a group of modern terms of russification. The essence of the term "russification" and its significance are described, as O. Chirkov notes, such concepts as "linguistic russification", "russification course", "total russification", "collapse", "twist", "russified element", "verbally russified" and many others [14, p. 291]. O. Chirkov relates the term "russification" not only to the culture and language of the Ukrainian people, but also to the ethnic process, that is, the biological reproduction of ethnic Ukrainians. Proceeding from this, he proposes to convey the essence of the russification of the terms created from ethnonym - "russianization", "irrigation", etc. At the same time, he understands the term "russification" as a process of substituting the ethnic essence of a particular people, that is, his language, literature, traditions, national memory [8, p. 245], lifestyle, etc. Russian ethnicity. A number of authors in their own research, these two terms, which are "russification", which lead to the correct thought of O. Chirkov, to change consciousness, decline and dying of culture, death of language, loss of identity and disappearance of the people, are used in parallel [14, p. 293]. Pro-Russian-minded Ukrainian scholars oppose such a statement and consider the term "russification" and the derivative from it - "russification" to be incorrect, inappropriate and inadmissible. That is, this is the Soviet consciousness and legacy that has been transferred to the soil of the newly-proclaimed independent Ukrainian state.

Presenting main material. Assimilation, as well as russification, is a long-standing political process aimed at forcibly merging two or more languages into one language. This is a consequence of the centuries-old or multi-year policy of russification conducted by the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union on the territory of Ukraine, where the policy of Russification took place already in the seventeenth century, as a result of which the Old-Ukrainian (Russian) language was banned as a business in printing, culture, education, in particular and in the church, and so on. Russification of the
spheres and branches of the socio-political life of the Ukrainian people took place when the Ukrainian language and culture were influenced by Muscovy, and eventually by the Russian Empire. As a result of linguistic and cultural policy of assimilation at the end of the seventeenth century. (1686) Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC) was united with Russian. That is, the UOC was essentially destroyed, and along with it - church books and Ukrainian-speaking priests who sent the Divine Service in the Old Ukrainian (Russian) language. The Valuev Circular and the Ems Decree were forbidden to print books in Ukrainian, to import them from abroad, to use the Ukrainian language in theater, church, public places, education, art, science, etc. Assimilation of the Ukrainian people continued in the Soviet era until the late 1980's. The first half of the 1980's was marked by the intensive Russification of all spheres and sectors of the country's social and political life. As a result of such language policy, the share of scientific and technical literature in the Ukrainian language was only 12.8%. This negatively affected the distribution of communications in the Ukrainian language in the Soviet era, the offensive was committed, as noted by V. Andrushchenko, V. Babkin, V. Kremin, and others. Domestic scholars, in the Brezhnev-Suslovian times, when it began to disappear in educational institutions and scientific literature [5, p. 153].

The assimilation of the non-Russian population of the former USSR, in particular Ukrainian, led to a change in its ethnic composition and linguistic structure, which was reflected in the works of O. Antoniuk, V. Baran, O. Boyko, V. Danilenko, I. Dzyuba, I. Diyak, C.Kulchytsky, P. Lavriev, Yu. Levenets, V. Lizanchuk, L. Masenko, G. Pivtorak, A. Rafalsky, V. Sklyar, I. Terlyuk, V. Tkachenko and others. According to I. Dzyuba, V. Sklyara, L.Masenko, the assimilation policy implemented in the USSR led to a social split when the population of this superpower was divided into Russian-speaking urban and rural-language rural, which became the main obstacle to linguistic and cultural unity. And this was a policy that was aimed at increasing the distance between the Ukrainian-speaking village and the Russian-speaking city in order to hang a shortcut to the Ukrainian language of inferiority and to accuse it of low-grade, underdevelopment, and unscientificness. Thus, according to L. Masenko, in the depths of the empire, the language barrier between the Ukrainian city and the countryside has transformed the city centers of the Russian Ukraine, with Kyiv inclusive, into the province of Moscow, distorting the feeling of national identity, which has weakened the sense of national dignity to a critical level and national solidarity in the Ukrainian society. The language barrier between the two cultures - the urban Russian and rural Ukrainians - was intensified by the Soviet authorities in order to discredit the Ukrainian language. This led, for example, to the fact that, for example, the population of the Soviet Union, which gradually moved from village to city, began to abandon native language education in favor of Russian-language language, for which specialists-philologists paid up 15%. At the same time, a powerful instrument of language and political assimilation in the Soviet Union was also the certification, the resettlement of non-Russian peoples outside the historical homeland. In this regard, Ukraine has not lost its colonial dependence not only in the field of economy and the sphere of politics, but also on the level of culture and language. Therefore, in the late 1980's, protests against the policy of Russification became organized in nature: numerous informal associations operated in L'viv, in particular the Ukrainian Cultural Library, the Club of Lover's Friends of History and Culture, etc., which set the task of reviving Ukrainian culture and language and give the last state status. At the beginning of the 1990's, the assimilation language policy, which was transported to independent Ukraine, was suspended. Despite the fact that during the years of independence in the area of liquidation of assimilation policy a lot has been done, at the same time it was not possible to eradicate its consequences at the same time. Nowadays in Ukraine there are more than 14% of Russified ethnic Ukrainians who either do not remember their ancestors or do not pay any attention to their belongings, so they use Russian and consider themselves Russian. Factors of such progress are the artificial and planned politicization of the language problem, which originates from the reign of L. Kuchma. He suspended the process of Ukrainization by inauguration speech, and further delayed it by adopting the law "On the ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages" which gave the green light for spreading communications in Russian as a regional one. Due to such linguistic policy of the Ukrainian state, assimilation processes continue, especially in the South and East of the country, where the Russian language received the status of a regional one. Such linguistic policies, in particular assimilation and hereditary communications, are analyzed by D. Gorenburg [4], which points to its chain reaction. That is, russification, in his opinion, as a phenomenon is a partial or complete loss of the
ПОЛІТИЧНА КУЛЬТУРА ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЯ

native language and the transition to the language of the metropolis - Russian, the displacement of the native culture and the borrowing and use of someone else. The "voluntary" transition of Ukrainians into Russian is the language of communication and learning, which domestic scholars call the myth [11, p. 66], which was invented and applied by the Soviet authorities as a kind of technology for the russification of Ukrainians. In connection with the linguistic policy of russification in Ukraine in the 1989 census of 6 million 249 thousand people, nationality and Russian language did not coincide [5, p. 133]. To get rid of this phenomenon, O. Chirkov proposes to abandon the use of borrowed Russian terms [14, p. 294]. It may be somewhere to agree, but somewhere, if we consider that the process of russification, which began to increase in the mid-1990s, was not only not stopped but also legalized by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (July 3, 2012), which adopted a new law "On the Principles of State Language Policy". This law split the Ukrainian society by language and politics [5, p. 84], since only nine regions of Ukraine, in particular, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, have ratified it. Its adoption was a challenge, as well as the issue number one in both political discourse and in the media for those Ukrainians who live in the Center and in the West, who did not ratify this law and opposed the provision of the Russian language as a regional one in a number of oblasts and Ukrainian bridge [11, p. 167].

The consequences of such a linguistic policy, a profound split in spiritual and political cultures, the weakness of mechanisms for reaching a compromise between different political forces, power and people are mentioned in the writings of O. Bulvinsky, I. Kostyr, L.Kharchuk, and others. The split of Ukrainian society is based on political discussions about official bilingualism or Russian one-language, which pro-Russian-minded politicians, sheltering multilingualism and caring for the languages of ethnic minorities, laid the foundation for this law. In particular, L. Kharchuk notes in this connection that conditions are created in Ukraine in which the Ukrainian language and culture in the southern and eastern regions of Ukraine becomes unnecessary even in education and the state sector, while Russian, Romanian and Hungarian languages are instruments of foreign policy influence of neighboring countries [10, p. 94].

Evidence of such linguistic policy is the law on education that has given the national minorities the right to study at preschool and junior high school in their mother tongue at public expense, which is not allowed by any country in the world where national minorities receive their own language education at their own expense. In this case, domestic scholars argue about the russification of ethnic and other Ukrainians, which not only continues in the territory of independent Ukraine, but also gaining momentum. In particular, L. Ugrin believes that assimilation pressure due to humanitarian policy causes the Russian-speaking population of the South and East of Ukraine, radical nationalist Russian organizations, and regional political elites [8, p. 333] and pro-Russian politicians who manipulate linguistic issues. Ideological weapon of Russification [9, p. 587], according to L. Ugryn, are the old imperial ideologues "about the Ukrainian state as a mistake of history", "Russian measure", the superiority of the Russian language and culture, the distortion and falsification of the history of the Ukrainian people, the activities of historical figures. Russification of Ukrainians is facilitated by the Internet space, the lack of patriotism, caused by statelessness in the past, low political culture - all this allows manipulating and speculating on linguistic issues [9, p. 587].

It does not contribute to the unity of the Ukrainian community and the integrity of Ukraine, according to Y. Badzio, and the national idea [1], which has a pro-Russian component for the people of South and East Ukraine, and pro-Ukrainian for the Center and the West. For example, the Ukrainian language combines the inhabitants of the Center and the West of Ukraine, and Russian - residents of the South and East of the state. Separate language and political and others. ideas that eventually turned into demands of pro-Russian-minded politicians were implemented in the East and South of the country after the adoption of the Law "On the Principles of State Language Policy", which, according to V. Moysik [6], can not exist at all. We are lamentable and now, despite the revolutionary events that took place at the end of 2013 - at the beginning. In 2014, the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the Russo-Ukrainian War, which Russia continues in the East of Ukraine, has not changed much. According to L.Nagorna, socio-cultural breakdown is a consequence of such a protracted political crisis, which is not only a brake on the path to reformation, but also a factor that makes it impossible to formulate a generally accepted national idea [7, p. 174, 182].

**Conclusions and perspectives of research.** Thus, modern russeting should be understood as a language-political and cultural situation when Ukrainian-speaking Ukrainians continue to be Russified
in their own independent state. The new language law, adopted by the Verkhovna Rada on July 3, 2012, helps to rally them. This suggests that communications in Ukrainian can not be developed freely and effectively, as well as spread in the Ukrainian society run by pro-Russian-minded politicians. The discussion about the problem of the russification of Ukrainians is taking place now, when the number of Russian-speaking Ukrainians is increasing, while the Ukrainian-speaking population is decreasing. Evidence of the proliferation of russetting policies in modern Ukraine is the newly adopted law on education, which allows national minorities, including Russian, to study in their native language for public funds in pre-school educational institutions and in junior high schools. And this is a dangerous phenomenon, when the consciousness of small Ukrainians is formed in a non-Ukrainian language. On the other hand, the evidence of russification in Ukrainian society is high officials, some of which even judge with activists, in order to obtain a legal right to use the Russian language. In order to get rid of such phenomena as Russification (russification) and assimilation, it is necessary: a) to repeal the law "On ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages" as a way offsetting those values that were originally laid down on the basis of it; b) to abolish the illegitimate law "On the Principles of State Language Policy", which deepened the split of Ukrainian society by language and culture; c) adopt a law on the proper functioning and dissemination of the Ukrainian language as well as the study and protection of other languages. At the same time, given the importance and relevance of the problem under investigation, it will continue to be in the next intelligence.
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Савойська С. В. Руссифікація, російщення чи асимилювання: до визначення понять.

У статті досліджується сутність, значення та зміст понять «руссифікація», «російщення» та «асимилювання» як таких, які, на думку науковців, майже нічим не відрізняються. Увага автора акцентується на терміні «руссифікація», який, на думку окремих науковців, є застарілим. Вітчизняні науковці багато уваги приділяють сутності цього явища, тому пропонують його замінити на термін «російщення», який, на їх думку, більш точно відображає асимилюаційні процеси, нищення українського народу, його мови і культури, а також ті події, які відбувалися на території України у різні часи. Спираючись на праці науковців та їх висновки, автор статті намагається довести, що асимилювання – це уподобання, наприклад певних мов і культур, а руссифікація і російщення – це процес гальмування повноцінного функціонування Української православної церкви, розвитку української культури, поширення рідної мови етнічних українців, художньої літератури та ін. Такі явища як російщення та асимилювання розглядаються у комплексі з іншими проблемами, тому у роботі стверджується, що російщення українського народу, української мови і культури призвели до непорозумінь та мовно-політичних конфліктів, Помаранчевої революції, Революції гідності, анексії АР Крим та російської війни на Сході України.

Ключові слова: руссифікація, українська мова, російщення, російська мова, асимилювання, офіційний, Україна, державний, мова політика.

Савойська С. В. Руссифікація, порусення чи асимилювання: до визначення понять.

В статті исследуется сущность, значение и содержание понятия «русификация», «порусение» и «асимиллияция» как таких, которые, как считают учёные, почти ничем не отличаются. В то же время внимание автора акцентируется на термине «русификация», который, как считают отдельные учёные, является устаревшим. Отечественные учёные много внимания уделяют сущности этого явления, поэтому они предлагают его заменить на термин «порусение», который, по их мнению, точнее отображает ассимиляционные процессы, уничтожение украинского народа как этноса, его языка и культуры, а также — те события, которые происходили на территории Украины в разное время. Опираясь на труды учёных и их выводы, автор статьи старается доказать, что ассимиляция — это уподобление, например языков и культур, а русификация и порусение — это процесс торможения полноценного функционирования Украинской православной церкви, развития украинской культуры, расширения родного языка этнических украинцев, художественной литературы и др. Такие явления как порусение и ассимиляция рассматриваются в комплексе с другими проблемами, поэтому в работе утверждается, что порусение украинского народа, украинского языка и культуры привели к непониманию и языковым политическим конфликтам, Оранжевой революции, Революции достоинства, анексии АР Крым и русской войне на Востоке Украины.

Ключевые слова: русификация, украинский язык, порусение, русский язык, ассимиляция, официальный, Украина, государственный, языковая политика.