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ABSTRACT
The current state of linguistic diversity in the world in the context of globalization is characterized by various political and legal regulations of linguistic relations. On the one hand, the process of giving global status to only those languages whose dominance in the world has developed historically and is conditioned by geopolitical processes continues. On the other hand, we can say with confidence about such a global trend as the preservation and development of minority languages. As a result of the research the author makes a well-founded conclusion that giving the status of state to a large number of languages in Russia does not guarantee political stability and national security. The growing influence and dominance of the world's major languages is inevitable. But, first, among them, the position of the Russian language should be restored, and secondly, the desire to create a single global language-a utopian and destructive phenomenon. A balance must be found between the unique palette of linguistic diversity on the planet and the undeniable presence of several well-known world languages. One of these harmonious and evolutionary ways is the development of bilingual education.

1. Introduction

One of the generally accepted scientific versions is that in antiquity there was a single proto-human language. This is what, in one way or another, is written in the Holy Scripture, as well as in the texts of various ancient ideological and philosophical doctrines and concepts.

According to S.A. Starostin (Starostin, 1986, Starostin & Burlak, 2005) 15 thousand years ago there was a Nostratic family - a community that gave birth to Indo-European, Altai, Ural and some other languages. Nostratic family consists of Indo-European, Kartvelian, Ural, Dravidian and Altai language families.
There is also the so-called Afrasian language family (in Western literature it is commonly called Afro-Asian, also known as the Semito-Hamitic or Hamito-Semitic language group) - a macro family of languages common in northern Africa from the Atlantic coast and the Canary Islands to the coast of Red Sea, as well as in Western Asia and the Island of Malta. Mostly these are different dialects of the Arabic language, spoken today by about 270 million people. (Diakonoff, 1988).

The Afrasian language family includes Semitic languages (for example, Arabic and even Maltese); the Egyptian branch (for example, Coptic (today a dead language); the Berber-Canarian branch (for example, the Tuaregian or Old Libyan epigraphic languages); the Chad branch (for example, mountain, river, Central Chad groups of languages); the Cushitic branch (for example, the North Cushitic, Central Cushitic, East Turkic, etc. groups of languages); and the Omotic branch (for example, Southwind, Northwind, etc.) (Porhomovskij, 1990).

Recently, the Afrasian macrofamily is excluded from the Nostratic and is considered along with the latter as separate and independent, but as the closest relative of a Nostratic family.

S.A. Starostin (1986) notes the similarity between Nostratic and Afrasian families as a result of finding common vocabulary.

In addition to these two families, there are also Sino-Tibetan languages that existed in the 5th millennium BC. They contain a lot of terminology related to livestock and agriculture. The most probable habitat for these peoples was Nepal.

The Sino-Tibetan language family includes about 300 languages. The total number of speakers of these languages is at least 1.2 billion people - thus, according to the number of speakers, this family ranks first in the world.

The Sino-Tibetan family is divided into two subfamilies - Chinese (sinitic), consisting of several Chinese languages (for ideological reasons referred to as dialects), and Tibetan-Burmese (Starostin, 1996). By the way, the Chinese language constitutes a collection of very differently different dialects, and therefore is considered by most linguists as an independent language branch, consisting of separate, albeit related, linguistic and/or dialect groups.

Nostratic, Afrasian and Sino-Tibetan (or Sino-Caucasian) families in their unity could have existed 18-20,000 years ago. Among these languages, connections and correspondences are established, and chronological calculations are carried out (Zelenko & Starostin, 2003).

The arguments in favor of the existence of the proto-world's language are rooted in anthropology, the direction of human migration and the assumption of the ability of prehistoric people to speak. From Africa, along with the first proto-language, the Cro-Magnon people spread from Kenya to Spain or the south of France. The isolation of the language occurred along with migrations, and the population growth only contributed to the splits of the groups, which left their native territories and set off to master the other lands. Separation of the groups leads to the separation of languages. They change, and within 1000 years become unrecognizable.

Most scholars agree that language originated from a single source. The theory of monogenesis - the origin of all languages of the world from a single proto-language is found throughout the globe.

The earliest human ability to speak is the fundamental ability of the Homo sapiens. The word in this sense is an expression or manifestation of the ability to think and translate one's thoughts into being. In order for these thoughts not to disappear without a trace, there is the ability to record them with the help of any symbols and signs. That is how written language came about. The entire subsequent history of mankind is inseparably linked with the origin and development of written languages, and is based on them.

The farther the people spread around the planet, the more their language became increasingly unrecognizable, but all the stages of historical and geopolitical transformations were reflected in each specific
language, absorbing the unique and inimitable gamut of expressive linguistic means. This range of language means was absorbed by new generations, and thus culture, traditions and customs were born. All contemporary cultures and traditions of civilized (not feral) peoples also have much in common.

With the formation of states, a new trend is beginning - linguistic enslavement and, as a result, the loss of languages. In fact, the destruction of the people first of all means the destruction of the language, and vice versa. Not surprisingly, the saying goes: if you want to conquer the people, conquer or destroy their language. In translation from the Church Slavonic, the Russian word "language" means "people". The writer Fedor Dostoevsky has an equally well-known phrase: "The language and people, in our language these words are synonyms, and what a rich deep thought it is!"

As O.M. Smetanina notes (2001), at the largest world forum of scientists, workers of culture and education - the 31st session of the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in late 2001 (it was attended by officials from more than 180 countries) – the delegates stressed that the process of globalization, which is fundamentally of a financial and economic nature, and is essentially directed by the largest transnational corporations, increasingly undermines the economic and political positions of a number of states, causes damage to their sovereignty and national development, and tries to subordinate the sphere of culture and education of these countries to the single standards developed in the think tanks of these corporations. The most vulnerable area in this respect is multilingualism. Preservation of the diversity of native languages, the main guardians of civilizations, is presented as an outdated practice. At the current pace of the inconspicuous destruction of native languages, according to UNESCO studies, about 3,000 languages are on the verge of extinction. The processes of globalization, the creation of an information society lead to the situation where fewer and fewer languages become a means of international communication. They are gradually being taken out of the life of the world community, and the disappearance of even one language means an irreparable loss for the entire world civilization. The situation with the study of foreign languages is similar.

One of the important outcomes of such studies, for example, as noted by E.S. Gritsenko, A.V. Kirilina (2014), became the conclusion that in the new geopolitical conditions characterized by globalization shifts and transnational expansion, as well as the growth of local nationalisms, the cultural and linguistic sovereignty of large states, communicatively powerful regional non-English languages, is at risk; there is a theoretical disavowal of cultures and ethnic groups through the weakening of the position of the language and the politicization of its concepts (Gritsenko & Kirilina, 2014).

Currently, there are up to 7,102 languages in the world. The 40 most common languages are spoken by about 2/3 of the world's population.

The preservation of national languages varies from country to country (Lorenzo, 2017).

As P.S. Bitkeev (2014) notes: "The extinction and dying of languages is a real negative process, the intensity of which is threatening for culture on a world scale. It is a well-known fact that today every day one language disappears from the face of the earth. And the speed of this process is growing, unfortunately, year after year. Each language is a cultural and historical value for all humankind, therefore the loss of a language is a tragedy for its bearers and an irreparable loss for the world civilization. Progressive people of the world are concerned about this circumstance, take the necessary measures and many international organizations, in particular UNESCO, announced, as is known, February 20 the Day of Native Language. The solution of the problems of the language situation is directly connected with the preservation and development of national cultures, which are an integral part of the world civilization. This program is also aimed at implementing the provisions of the President's Address to the Federal Assembly regarding the need to develop the cultures of the peoples of the country and the moral improvement of our society. However, the problem of the language
situation is one of very complex phenomena, regardless of the language or place of its functioning. It has a multidimensional character; it affects many aspects of the sociocultural life of native speakers. Naturally, it requires scientific study of the language system, speech activity, the functioning of the language, its interaction with other languages, the creation of a scientifically grounded set of teaching materials, the development of language teaching methods that meet the modern requirements of teaching foreign languages "(Bitkeev, 2014).

At the same time, in the era of globalization, it is no longer necessary to say that humanity can interact without using several major world languages.

There are 7 world languages today. The Han, Chinese language occupies the first place – there are over a billion speakers. The second places goes to English and Spanish - 500 million, then French - about 400 million, Hindi - 330, Arabic - 270 million and finally - Russian - about 250 million.

The current situation in the world testifies that no language has ever reached the status of a regional or universal "lingua franca" without having a large number of speakers being citizens of a strong state. However, once the language conquers the leading position and becomes a means of international communication, the strength of its position does not directly depend on the influence of the nation that originally spoke it: more than a thousand years have passed since the fall of the Roman Empire, but the educated layers of the European population still use the Latin language.

Even taking into account the possible decline in the US influence in the coming half-century and the development of other economic centers, especially in Asia, and given the desire of many foreigners to learn not only English, but also Chinese, Arabic or Spanish, it is unlikely that people will be ready to master at once all the languages of the world - no, they will all also need a common means of communication, which, most likely, will remain to be English.

Over the past 20 years, teaching English as the first foreign language in schools has spread throughout the world: this happened even in the former Soviet countries. Not so long ago English became compulsory for study in China (Yuan, 2017). To the obvious displeasure of the French, it is even used as the working language of the European Union, although only two of the 25 EU member states (Great Britain and Ireland) are English-speaking. Even the Germans - the allies of France in the affairs of the European Union - have replaced French to English as the second foreign language in the sphere of education and business. A similar situation is observed in Sweden and the Netherlands.

It is interesting to note that the further pace of English expansion now depends on the language policy of India, a country with countless number of local dialects. The British promoted the popularization of Hindi on a national scale, however, since the middle of the XIX century it was English that was proclaimed the official administrative language of India. Even people from low-income Indian families strive to master English perfectly, realizing its importance for a further career.

Today we can confidently say that by 2050 India will become the largest country in the world (with a population of 1.6 billion people). By this time, China will be a state with a highly developed economy, not much behind the United States. As a result, two of the three largest world powers will actively use English for communication purposes. It is likely that China will be bound to follow the general English-speaking trend.

Global globalization requires a single means of communication, and the amount of investment contributed by millions of people from all over the world in the study of the English language suggests that it will acquire this honorary status of "lingua franca" (Kaur, 2014).

Moreover, as some researchers from Malaysia point out, learning English stimulates income growth, and is also an important factor in the continuous education of a citizen (Yunus et al., 2012).

Knowledge of English, Spanish or French today has already become an indispensable component of the
modern civilized individual. Moreover, the researchers are already asking questions about the development of a single unified English language, which will be understood by everyone without exception, given that international communication in the business context today is largely not conducted by native English speakers, and their language can be described as BELF (English as Business Lingua Franca), which in many respects differs from "standard English" (Louhiala-Salminen & Kankaanranta, 2012).

However, we should not neglect the Russian language historically dominating the world's largest state-territorial formation. The Russian language is an eastern subgroup of the group of Slavic languages of the Indo-European language family of the Nostratic group. As the state language of the Russian Federation, it is the form and the highest variety of the existence of the national Russian literary language, accepted by its bearers for an standard, historically developed and stable system of commonly used linguistic means and rules for their use in the spheres established by the Federal Law "On the State Language of the Russian Federation".

In the process of forming new independent states in the post-Soviet space, a gradual disintegration of a single language space occurred. The status of the Russian language in each country in the post-Soviet space has its own particularities. This is due to a number of factors, such as: the particularities of the country's economic and political development in the post-Soviet period, the number of Russian-speaking population residing on the territory of the country, the specifics of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation in relation to a particular state.

Russian is the only major world language that has not only lost its position in the world for the last 20 years, but has lost it rapidly. Currently, the Russian language is native to 130 million citizens of the Russian Federation, for almost 25 million residents of the republics of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Baltics, for 7 million residents of foreign countries. That is, about 160 million people now speak Russian as their mother tongue. But still a significant number of people, the exact number of which is very difficult to establish, speaks Russian as a second language mainly in the CIS and Baltic countries.

Article 35 of the Charter of the Commonwealth of Independent States (1993) stipulates that the working language of the Commonwealth is Russian, and in the analytical report on the results of the CIS activities for 10 years and tasks for the future it is noted that the Russian language is a native or second native for most of the population of the CIS, largely remaining a means of inter-ethnic communication in the post-Soviet space. It is very important that the decision on the analytical report was signed by all the leaders of the CIS member states (including Georgia).

At the same time, it is also interesting to note that in Israel and the USA today the Russian language has some official functions. In Israel, manufacturers and importers of drugs are required to put detailed information on the medication packaging in Russian and Arabic.

In the US, New York state, according to an amendment to the electoral law introduced in 2009, in all cities in the state with the population of over a million people, all documents related to the election process should be translated into Russian. In 21 US states out of 50 you can take a written exam for obtaining a driving license in Russian.

The Russian Federation today has a complex state structure: it is divided into 85 subjects of the federation (including Crimea and Sevastopol), unequal neither in size or value of the economic activities of the country, nor of the social and national composition, among other factors. The real conditions for the existence of a particular language and, consequently, its social functions depend on the type of the subject of the federation, which ultimately affects its status - legal and factual (functional).

In the Russian Federation, 277 languages and dialects are used today, 89 languages are used in the state education system, of which 30 are used as the language of instruction, and 59 as the subject of study.
The linguistic revolutions that swept the USSR in 1989 led to the adoption of laws on state languages in the union republics that approved this status for the languages of the titular nation. The Russian language was defined, at best, by the term "language of interethnic communication", which has no clear legal interpretation (Mitrofanova, 2017; Tastan et al, 2018).

Laws on languages became the first legislative acts that divided the population of the republics according to a linguistic characteristic, yet, in fact, by ethnicity. The destruction of the Soviet Union began with the splitting of one of its supporting structure – one common language for all peoples (Zatullin, 2011).

Many researchers make conclusions on this basis that a metropolis should have a single language that is the basis for the unity, sovereignty and integrity of a huge multinational country (Framing, 2014; Hardya & Woodcock, 2014; Abas, 2015).

And this is even despite the opinion of some scholars that "the national language is largely artificial, based more on "public opinion" and socio-political motives than on the actual linguistic characteristics of the integration of different dialects into a single super-structural entity" (Terkulov, 2012). This opinion, of course, is very controversial.

Russia's aspiration to developing the study of the Russian language in the country and in the neighboring countries is no longer just a whim, but a matter of national security, the so-called "linguistic security." Of course, it should be noted that such aspirations in Western countries are often perceived as neo-imperial ambitions. Despite this, Russia continues to increase efforts in strengthening the positions of the Russian language in the far abroad countries as well. Currently, the Federal Target Program "Russian Language" for 2016-2020 is being implemented, aimed at increasing the number of teachers of the Russian language as a non-native and foreign language, increasing the number of textbooks of the Russian language and literature, expanding the range of participants in cultural and educational activities, etc.

However, the most important aspect of modern political linguistics or, as it is possible to say, socio-educational geopolitics, is the general achievement of modern pedagogy and philology, namely, the realization that the unique formation of individual personality occurs in the language environment in which a person is born and bred. That is, the basis of personality formation is the recognition of its unique national and linguistic identity, and the construction of its own mental worldview with the help of native language tools and national and cultural traditions and customs. And thereupon, a person must be able to express his or her views with the help of some general "lingua franca". Therefore, the issue of bilingual education is fundamental in the modern world. It is inconceivable without the issues of preserving and developing national (minority) languages.

Most researchers agree on the need to develop bilingual education (Rogers & McLeod, 2006; Nair-Venugopal, 2013; Prouta & Hill, 2012; Egana et al., 2017).

As Professor Z.M. Zagirov (2017), ethnocultural education is an education aimed at preserving the ethnocultural identity of a person through familiarizing with the native language, culture, traditions and customs of one's people while simultaneously mastering the values of world culture. Ethnocultural education is a component of the general primary education, which has wide possibilities for the formation of national identity among the younger schoolchildren, the system of positive national values, including the spiritual, moral, social, general cultural and intellectual development of the individual.

Therefore, we can say with confidence that the basis of the national security of any state is every individual who grew up in native conditions and received education in their native language, who gratefully accepts the state that has preserved and allowed to absorb their national mentality, who feels being part of a large multinational family. After all, in the end, any of us, in defending our country, first of all thinks about what is dear and valuable to us, and what one wants to preserve for the next generations. And national culture, traditions
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and particular customs perform in this capacity based on various cultural traditions, including the religious ones. And all this together is unthinkable without one’s native language and its linguistic means, which have shaped a particular mentality so dear to each individual.

2. Methodological Framework

The author used several research methods in order to form the most complete, comprehensive and objective conceptual opinion on the further development of Russian statehood: the historical digress allowed to assess the general features of the occurrence and development of languages on the planet as a whole, a comparative legal analysis demonstrated the trends in the development of legal views of the world community that revealed a number of problems of the implementation of international legal norms in the Russian legal system. Structural and logical analysis made it possible to concentrate the main attention on the phenomenon of linguistic diversity as a whole and to justify the scientific construction of objects of pedagogical bilingual reality.

3. Results and Discussions

And now it is time to go on to the most important part of the article, from the point of view of this research: regarding the legal means to preserve and develop minority languages.

In modern democratic states, the normative legal framework in the field of legal language relations and national and cultural development includes, to varying degrees incorporates the implemented principles and norms of the fundamental international legal instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (2018), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (2018), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (2018), as well as various international treaties of cooperating states in the field of ensuring human rights and freedoms.

The minorities rights for the member states of the Council of Europe, as well as in the OSCE region, were generally formulated in the document of the Copenhagen meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension (2018) and are reflected in the package of recommendations adopted by the High Commissioner on National Minorities: The Hague Recommendations on the rights of national minorities in the field of education (1996); Oslo recommendations on the language rights of national minorities (1998); Boltsantskih recommendations on national minorities in interstate relations (2008).

Technical progress and development of modern television, radio broadcasting and the information and telecommunication network of the Internet, increasing opportunities for the use of several languages in the field of communications are reflected in the Recommendations on the Use of Minority Languages in Broadcasting (2003). In addition, the European Charter on Regional and Minority Languages (1992) is the most important document in the field of ethno-linguistic policy of the European Union.

The European Charter, however, cannot be considered an effective instrument, primarily because many countries have refused to ratify it, for example, France and Italy.

In France, for instance, the signing and ratification of the Charter was subject of political conflicts. The Charter was signed by France under the government of L. Jospin, but the Constitutional Council considered that it contains provisions that are contrary to the constitution. In this decision of the Constitutional Council of France of June 15, 1999 (1999), it is noted that the use of French is mandatory for all subjects, and private individuals cannot invoke the right to use another language in relations with authorities and public services. Having analyzed the Preamble, according to which "the right to use the regional or minority language in private and public life is an inalienable right", as well as Article 7 of the Charter, the Court considered that the Charter, granting special rights to groups using regional or minority languages, encroaches on the constitutional
principles of the indivisibility (indivisibilite) of the Republic, equality before the law and the integrity (unicite) of the French people. These provisions were also found to be contrary to Article 2 of the Constitution ("Language of the Republic - French"), since they recognize the right to use a language other than French, not only in private but also in public life (Sampiev, 2013).

Moreover, on March 20, 2018, the French leader Emmanuel Macron called on French-speaking countries to promote French as a "world language" (Le Monde, 2018).

In addition, the Charter cannot become an effective tool for international legal regulation of language legal relations also because the main means of its provision is the system of periodic reports, which, based on the results of the study, may prepare the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. That is, the Charter is an international treaty with a very complex structure, the objects of protection of which are languages. This document refers to mandatory documents, and not to documents guaranteeing the observance of rights, as the participating States take upon themselves the choice of a system of paragraphs (paragraphs) to protect the non-dominant or less used languages spoken by the citizens of these states.

The basis of the mechanism for fulfilling Charter commitments, in addition to the already mentioned periodic reporting and the findings of the Committee of Experts of the Council of Europe, as S.V. Sokolovskij (2010) points out, is the idea of constantly improving the system of commitments aimed at the gradual development of languages and ensuring the linguistic rights of citizens of participating states. As new reporting cycles and the following tasks of managing linguistic diversity were passed, practically all participating states had acquired new tasks and goals, under the Charter's protection, new and previously unaccounted language communities were located, and the number of language units that were protected by the Charter is constantly growing.

An important place in the system of international legal instruments in the area under consideration is the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, in particular its second article. The position of the international legal community of states in the field of securing the rights of peoples and national minorities, in particular, with regard to linguistic rights, is formulated in article 27 of the said Covenant: "In countries where there are ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, persons belonging to such minorities cannot be denied the right, together with other members of the same group, to enjoy their culture, to practice their religion and perform its rites, and also to use their native language.

In addition to the above, there is a whole group of international legal documents directly aimed at satisfying the rights of peoples and national minorities in the field of their national, cultural and linguistic development. The Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities is the most important among them (2018); Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995); Convention of the International Labor Organization 1989 No. 169 "On Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries" (1989). The mentioned documents contain norms aimed at satisfying the national and cultural needs and interests of peoples and national minorities.

In the Russian Federation, the history of the development of modern language legislation has gone through a difficult path, beginning in 1991, when the entire political structure of our state was subjected to complete deformation, reformation and transformation. In general, it is built on the basis of the basic international legal principles adopted, signed and ratified by Russia, but, nevertheless, has its own essential features and even contradictions.

Studying by the Russian Federation of the international experience in carrying out language policy allowed the introduction of some developments of foreign countries in this field. Moreover, in Russia, language policy has its personal very rich history of development and unique features that have no equals in any other country.
For example, in accordance with Part 2 of Art. 68 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the republics constituent of the Russian Federation are entitled to establish their own national languages as state languages, on a par with Russian. Thus, the Constitution of the Russian Federation recognizes the distinctive features of the legal status of the republics within the Russian Federation as state entities. Today, Russia is the only country in the world where 34 state languages are legally established. The Republic of Dagestan alone has 13 state languages!

Adaptation on the basis of knowledge of the Russian language, respect for history and culture, traditions and lifestyle of Russians, is an effective means of balancing the inter-ethnic relations between the indigenous population and migrants.

At the same time, a lot of problems exist in the mechanism of legal regulation of language legal relations, which will be covered in subsequent research articles. Here it can be said that the situation with the underdeveloped language law, in our opinion, is a consequence of the legal uncertainty that exists now since the formation of ethnocratic models of the state power structure in our country. In this regard, the threat of taking advantage of the position of the state language to achieve certain political goals, and not for the comprehensive functional development of the national language has immeasurably increased. It should be noted that the consolidation of state language of titular nations is still not a guarantee of a balanced language policy in individual republics.

According to P.M. Voronetskij (2009), the introduction of the state language of the republic can be due only to the need to involve the titular peoples of the given republic in the process of democracy and ensure their participation in realizing the sovereignty of the multinational people of the Russian Federation. The establishment of the state language of the republic cannot be motivated solely by the desire to maintain and preserve this language as a cultural value, since there are other mechanisms for solving this problem (Voroneckij, 2009).

We consider it necessary to agree with the opinion of L.N. Vasi'l'eva (2006), who believes that the right given to the republics to establish their own state languages without the legal fixation of the definition of this concept may provoke further disputes over the extent of the sovereignty of these subjects of the Russian Federation, and again "bring to life" those tendencies that were distancing some of the republics from the Federation. She suggests granting the republics the right to establish languages with official status on the territory of these subjects, rather than state ones. Unlike the state language, the official language does not indicate the state-forming role of a certain ethnos that has fulfilled the integration function of uniting different peoples into a single sovereign state, so it cannot become a symbol of this state (at least as long as such an ethnos exists). It is a language that is not connected with a certain "domestic content". The essence of establishing the language as an official language is the fulfillment of organizational tasks, primarily related to its use in official spheres of communication, which would ensure the full operation of judicial, state power bodies, etc.

In the last decade, the government bodies, the public and scientific circles hold discussions about the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, namely, the possibility of applying the Charter's strategy in the regulation of the language situation in the Russian Federation. Russia signed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 2001, but has not yet ratified it. The purpose of the European Charter is to regulate the use of minority and regional languages in education, consumer services, the media, cultural, economic and public life. At the same time, these obligations are applicable to all regional and minority languages within the state. The state that ratified the Charter must report to the Council of Europe on the measures taken to fulfill these obligations.

Discussions on the ratification of the Charter were held at the state level, with the involvement of the
authorities and experts from the constituent entities of the Russian Federation. It was not yet possible to reach a compromise; it was suggested that there could be developed a State Charter program, in spite of the European Charter, for regulation and organization of the language life in Russia.

As A.N. Bitkeeva (2014) points out, the factors hampering ratification of the Charter in Russia are the following: the insufficiency of the social and communication system in Russia, the status of languages (the state language, the state languages of the republics, minority languages, etc.), the number of peoples, the nature of their settlement (compact / dispersed), which are important social factors in the expansion of social functions, the uneven social and cultural development of Russian territories, the undesirability of translating the language issue into the political sphere in the regions, with a significant conflict potential and financial costs that can follow ratification.

For example, according to the terms and conditions of the Charter, languages should function fully in all spheres of state power, workflow management, legal proceedings, etc., which is problematic in the context of the prevailing language situation in the country, the different structural and functional status of national languages in the regions, etc. There are difficulties with translation of business records into the national languages, and consequently the question arises whether this is a rational step, since not many native speakers actually speak their mother tongue in the majority of republics, there are terminological problems with respect to national languages in the subjects of the Russian Federation, the languages, which are proposed to be nominated as regional. Some peoples do not find this option acceptable, for example, the Republic of Tatarstan. It is worth noting that it is important that the Charter's approach should guide legislation and policies to solve the problems of non-dominant languages as such, and not to support ethnic communities. In Russia, it is traditionally considered that the object of state-legal protection should be the ethnic communities per se, and language is considered to be an inherent attribute of such communities. If the state supports ethnic communities through the legislation and other institutions, it automatically allows preserving their culture and language.

From all of the above, it is possible to formulate five fundamental reasons why ratification of the Charter by the Russian Federation at the present time is still premature.

Thus, the first reason is the particularities of Russian linguistic diversity. And here, among other things, it should be noted that the legislation of the Russian Federation regulating the legal status of languages was adopted in the era of the formation and foundation of Russian statehood in its present form. This factor, in our opinion, influenced the different character of the norms regulating language relations in the regions of the country, which, given the background of multinational relations, require legislative improvement and a more detailed elaboration of the legal mechanism for their implementation. The absence of a full-fledged legal regulation could very likely lead to an increase in the imbalance within the linguistic relations, which conceals a potential threat to inter-ethnic accord.

In addition, the territorial aspect is also important here, which constitutes the second reason. The territory of Russia is twice as large as the whole of Europe; therefore, the collection of sociolinguistic information and monitoring of needs would cause significant difficulties, and would also require a multiple increase in the costs of such studies.

All this preconditions the third reason - the economic one. The greatest financial costs would require quite the non-written, restored languages or languages with interrupted tradition. S.V. Sokolovskij (2010) refers to such languages as the ones "with weakened infrastructure support".

The fourth reason is the conflictogenic. It is well known that in countries with high linguistic diversity and a complex linguistic situation, there is a danger of language conflicts occurrence and even the so-called “school wars” arising during the "linguistic expansion" among languages with the declared “state” status and other
linguistic communities. One of the most striking examples today is the situation with the teaching of the Tatar language in the general educational institutions of the Republic of Tatarstan. The teaching of the Tatar language exceeded the time allotted for the teaching of the Russian language, which caused a rather acute situation, which has not yet found its peaceful and final solution. In Ukraine, the ratification of the Charter led to a socio-political crisis.

And the last, the fifth reason. These are the risks associated with Russia's foreign policy image. Ratification should be so thoughtfully and carefully planned that the commitments undertaken minimized the risk of conflicts and at the same time created real opportunities for a more effective protection of each language. Any mistakes in this sensitive area could entail a worsening of the already low image of Russia in the eyes of the world community..

4. Conclusion

There is no need talking today of the advantages of preserving and developing native languages. They are the depository of folk wisdom; they trace the dynamics of historical change and development of speech in the life of the peoples. But, as a living organism, languages need constant attention. Yet, the officials, parents, and pedagogues mistakenly think: the earlier the children are introduced to the Russian language, the faster and better they will acquire it. They tend to forget, however, that the most important didactic principle of education is violated herewith: from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex, from the native to the non-native, from the easy to the difficult, etc.

The state should create conditions for the preservation, maintenance and development of minority languages. The main means of achieving an optimal balance between linguistic groups from the point of view of linguistic security is the elaborated system of legislation that provides a clear and understandable mechanism for the legal regulation of linguistic legal relations, as well as the improvement of the teaching system of the Russian language in the educational organizations of the republics that constitute Russia, taking into account regional and ethno-cultural peculiarities, and in situations with a long ago and systematically experienced shortage of development programs with these components, teaching aids, that help the teacher cope with the historically established multicultural and multilingual situation. Undoubtedly, such activities are inconceivable without the creation of bilingual teaching aids and comparative grammars that facilitate the early acquisition of phonetic and phonological, lexical and semantic, morphological and syntactic features of Russian and other national (minority) languages of the Russian Federation.

The experience of foreign, in particular European, legislation in this sense presents the most valuable and acceptable source (Thuy, Hoa & Nguyen, 2017; McCormick, 2014; Henderson, 2017).

In Russia today, lawmakers have refused to give even a definition, that is, a legal definition of the state language in the Law on the State Language. Taking into account the fact that more than 10 years have passed since the adoption of the Law, it is necessary to recognize the validity of the V.M. Baranov’s and M.D. Hajretdinova (2007) words: "In the legal literature and practice, the social danger of the lack of key concepts has not yet come to awareness... that is why and therefore many legislative definitions, with the general recognition of their necessity, are not formulated for decades" (Baranov & Hajretdinova, 2007). In the case of the concept of "state language", the absence of a legal definition is undoubtedly caused by the difficulty of its formulation, including because of the lack of a thorough linguistic elaboration of the problem.

As Russia's experience shows, the granting to a large number of national (minority) languages the status of the state language does not ensure the proper level of development of the legal relations under consideration and the implementation of a balanced state language policy, since other methods do exist or can be found for this
purpose. In this connection, the indicative example existing in Russia is of interest: in the Republic of Karelia the status of the state language belongs only to the Russian language, the Karelian, Finnish and Vepsian languages receive stable state support, without possessing the status of state languages, and at the same time are not infringed. By the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 2237-r dated December 3, 2012 (revised as of October 31, 2015) "On the Approval of the Program of Fundamental Scientific Research of the State Academies of Sciences for 2013-2020" (2012), scientific research topics have been approved, including, for example, the study of the wedding ritual Karelian folklore, the publication of the folklore heritage of the ethno-local group of the Pomor coast of the White Sea; comprehension of tendencies in the development of the literature of Karelia of the XX century in four languages (Russian, Karelian, Vepsian, Finnish). And for this very significant funds have been allocated.

Therefore, one of the most important conclusions here is the realization that the presence of 34 state languages in one country conceals a potential threat to national security in Russia. Just as the lack of appropriate legislative, socio-political and organizational-structural measures aimed at preserving and developing such rich linguistic diversity like in Russia. This variety is the most straightforward answer to those who think that it is enough to have 6-7 languages in the world, or even better to have just one universal language, as well as with cultures - one global, universal would be enough.

As V.S. Nesterenko, E.V. Vychuzhanina and O.I. Milovanov (2015) noted, the English language and the situation in which it became involved during the 21st century are truly unique. None of the languages in history had received the same distribution and popularity in such a short period of time. The socio-cultural conditions in which this transformation takes place are also unique. The fact is that at the moment we are witnessing overwhelming processes in Western countries that lead to the elimination of any kind of differences: religious, national, gender, etc. This dominant tendency is based on the idea of freedom. The very idea is of great importance for the civilized humanity, but when it becomes predominant and dominant in all other values, it turns out to be destructive and even dangerous, since the basic social institutions, for example, the family, sharply decrease in importance. In this regard, it should be highlighted that the eastern countries are ready to defend and preserve their identity with every means. This desire has a favorable effect on the demographic situation in these countries, which, in turn, plays a significant role for the status of their languages.

The centuries-old search for a universal language and, correspondingly, the failure of artificial languages (for example, Esperanto), as noted by other researchers V.M. Smokotin and G.I. Petrova - are connected with the search for a means of overcoming linguistic and cultural barriers and satisfying the need for a lingua franca especially now, throughout the period of globalization. Numerous language projects were based on assumptions about the imperfection of natural languages as the products of the masses. Another reason for the alleged inability of natural languages to achieve the status of a universal language is their close links with the corresponding ethnic or national languages, which would be a serious obstacle to their recognition as the language of general communication. However, what was considered their weakness was their strength: natural languages derive their power from the power base of ethnic groups and peoples who use them, which allows them to become powerful communication tools. Artificial languages, devoid of any ethno-cultural ties, are very difficult to respond to the challenges of a changing world in all spheres of life. Equally important, artificial languages lack the political support to ensure changes in international law, so that they can be incorporated into national education systems with the aim of making them a means of global communication.

Therefore, certainly, the broadest language spectrum of the peoples of Russia is a blessing. It guarantees the salvation of the identity and uniqueness of such a huge multinational family. But this is a given that requires scrupulous, careful, consistent, and very cautious management and regulation, which is lacking in Russia today.
Otherwise, this same national and regional uniqueness may become a bone of contention, especially given the developed modern "dirty" political technologies.

The entire millennial experience of humankind, traversed from one pre-language to today's more than seven thousand languages, attests to the constant process of enriching cultures. Children who enter rural schools directly from the family home (and there is an overwhelming majority in the world) bring with them ready-made forms of thinking in the mother language: knowledge about all the phenomena of nature, the surrounding world, social life, etc. Such diversity contains in itself the superhuman beauty of special and unique formation of the human personality, as well as the special and unique formation of worlds in the infinite universe. Therefore, artificial attempts undertaken by individual representatives of various philosophical or ideological schools of thought to return humankind to the original proto-language and monoculture is, in our deep conviction, destructive and capable of casting back humankind many million years back.
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