

Ethno-cultural Aspects of the State of Eurasian Nomads

Assylkhan Bikenov¹, Gauhar Abdrakhmanova², Aigul Zharkenova³, Bibigul Muratbekkyzy⁴, Zhanar Erdenbekova⁵, Alfiya Baibulsinova⁶ and Zauresh Kolumbaeva⁷

^{1,2,3,4,5} *L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, 010000*

⁶ *West Kazakhstan State University after M. Utemisov, Uralsk, Kazakhstan, 090003*

⁷ *"Turan-Astana" University, Y. Dukenuly St., 29 Astana, Kazakhstan, 010000*

¹ *E-mail: asil_bikenov@mail.ru*

KEYWORDS Nomads. Social institutions. State. The Authority. Approaches. The Tribal Organization

ABSTRACT In this paper, authors study the prevailing problems of statehood of the nomads of Eurasia, which is one of topical issues in Kazakh khanate. Therefore researchers have explored the basic social institutions that perform important public functions. Especially on those institutions of the authority that formed socio-cultural system and since ancient times they have played an important role in nomadic societies. Exploring the written and oral sources, researchers objectively analyze the continuity and cultural features of nomadic Eurasian societies. Modernity requires a special approach, so the researchers used a new methodology for the study of nomadic society. Therefore, in this paper researchers have tried to build a modern post-colonial critique of these approaches that changed the situation, pointing out the limitations of the Western normative concept of the state.

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid- 20th century, one of the most pressing problems of historical science has been the question of statehood for nomads of Eurasia. Therefore, the researchers will try to explore the basis of the material features of the nomadic Kazakh statehood on the territory of Eurasia. Also, researches will analyze how the culture of nomadic statehood significantly differ in their forms of social organization, which has developed in parallel with - evolutionary agrarian and colonial empires. The reason that this discussion is far from the resolution lies, in many respects, in the fact that the researchers speak in different methodological languages and speak about the term 'State' in different ways. In such a situation, the scientific debate ceases to be scientific and changes into a dispute about the choice of words. Therefore, using a theoretical and methodological point of view, the readers will notice a number of new approaches and researches of scientific categories such as "state", "authority", "social organization" Eurasian nomads. In the works of Western authors, specifically dealing with the problem of social and cultural evolution of the nomads, tend to lead to the problem of the lack of nomads' domestic needs to build strong forms of statehood, the cyclical nature of the political process, the emergence of the prospects for sustainable development only in the case of symbiosis with farmers (Khazanov

2016). Thus the analysis of anthropological research shows that in examining the relative state of the nomads of Eurasia, there were different points of view. Anyway, the vast majority of researchers, regardless of their philosophical orientation, agree that nomadic societies have a less specialized and differentiated structural socio-economic organization when compared with sedentary societies. While some researchers emphasize the distinctive nature of nomadism and the inability to describe its terms, worked out on the material evolution of sedentary agricultural societies, others are trying to fit into the framework of the nomads of the picture of the world historical process. On this basis, the researchers can conclude that inadequate conceptual understanding in the tradition of his evolutionism always caused confusion among nomadologists. It is this contradiction that has given rise to various theories about the nature and the socio-political development of the nomads. Therefore, in this paper the researchers will try to build a modern post-colonial critique of these approaches (Sneath 2007) that changed the situation, pointing out the limitations of the Western normative concept of the state.

The post-colonial criticism somewhat changed the situation, pointing out the limitations about the Western normative concept of the state. Nevertheless, the question of the applicability of this concept for understanding the history of non-Western peoples has not been put. Sneath (2007)

believes that in modern anthropological studies of nomadic societies, the main explanatory concepts, as is the tribal system, which is set out in categories (race, tribe, family nature of social organizations) that are used by scientists are still primitive. Due to this structural situation, nomadic communities continues to be archetypal cases pre-state lifestyle that combines perfectly with the ethno nationalism of post-Soviet states of Central Asia, using organicist language for the assertion of its own legitimacy. Combining linguistic and historical analysis, Sneath (2007) has been developing his own unique approach to the assessment of historical (political and social) experience in nomadic communities. In his model, he has made the reconstruction of the political system of the empire of Genghis Khan. Sneath (2007) comes to the conclusion that the most appropriate language to describe her political experience is not the idiom of the modern sovereign and territorial state, and the metaphor of feudalism and aristocracy.

Objectives

In this paper authors study current problems of statehood of the nomads of Eurasia, being one of the controversial issues in nomadology.

METHODOLOGY

The reason that this discussion is far from being concluded and rested lies, in many respects, in the fact that the researchers speak in different methodological languages and speak about the term 'State' in different ways.

As a rule, in the studies of the Western authors, specially engaged in problems of the social-cultural evolution of nomads, a lack of intrinsic needs to establish firm forms of the state system among the nomads, cyclic character of political processes, appearance of perspectives of the stable development only in the case of symbiosis with farmers (Khazanov 1984; Fletcher 1986; Barfield 1989; Golden 1992).

At the same time, we can consider nomads using a degree of complexity of their society and social-political organization. However, it can be revealed that the society under consideration is more complex than the others and what criteria should be a basis of the similar classification, all the more, that the same polities (for example,

Hsiung-nu empire or Chinggis Khan's empire) have been considered by some researchers as the existing states while they were only pre-state formations for other scientists. In this case, the problem is related to the different comprehension of the term 'State'. In political science, the classic synonyms of the State are territory, population, government, and sovereignty. This proves that the classical symptoms of the state traditionally in the political and legal sciences are considered territorial division, population, government, and sovereignty. Also, as additional criteria to defining a state are a systematic taxation, the level of urbanization, the development of writing, fixed laws rather complicated social and political stratification of society, combined with the exploitation of various forms. But this methodological scheme is more acceptable for the state agricultural models of the Western and Eastern societies, than for the nomads of Eurasia. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the Kazakh society inherited the cultural achievements of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes, it is a unique phenomenon, both in its external structure and content. Those vital beginnings were uniquely, distinctively laid down in the basic core of the functioning of the nomadic society, and cannot be compared with other standard culture of the West and the East. Analyzing the ethnographic and historical materials, it should be noted that the structure of the nomadic states, in contrast to those of the sedentary peoples in general, and from Western European countries, in particular, has a number of differences. These differences are not associated with any handicap nomads or their superiority over other nations and caused by a number of natural causes, both natural (geographic) as social and economic. In the researchers' opinion, and according to the logic of the theory of Wallerstein (1974), nomadic society must be attributed to the level of mini-systems that provide the function of interacting society such as "territory", "people", "power", The natural understanding of these conventions have played a key role in the nature of public education of the nomads of the Eurasian steppes. In *World-Systems Analysis*, Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) provides a single line like the theories of development which identifies three models of society: the mini-system, the world empire, and the world-economy. But they are not treated in time and in space. This makes the idea of the stories more

complete. There are also modern multiline theories to suggest that there are several possible options for transforming the political organism. Some of them may however, lead to difficulties. For example, by the chiefdom of the nation-state, while others suggested the existence super complex community without bureaucracy (Greek polis), the third - saving in certain environmental conditions, the tribal system.

As the researchers have already said and suggested, one of the factors that qualifies a state is recorded in the sources of the name and identity of the society. Historical sources prove that the Eurasian nomads have used several terms as a synonym for the state since ancient periods. For example, in the Orkhon script Inscriptions of ancient Turks, they have long attached great importance to the state and Khanate. The words "eli" (country) among the ancient Turks and "Ulus" in Mongolian meaning "state." To convey the meaning of "state" of the Mongol-Tungus peoples of both words are used instead of «EL-ulus». The ancient dictionary concept of "eating" was used in two senses: in the narrow "the union of tribes" and wide "state" nation. In the dictionary of Mahmud Kashgari (2016) "Dīwān ul-Lughat al-Turk," "il" (el) is translated as "state". This can be confirmed by the following facts. Since 1189, Chenghiz - Khan was elected Khan "Hamag Mongol Ulus" ("Hamag" means "common"), and in 1206, his state he called "Jeke Mongol Ulus" ("Great Mongolian ulus") and declared himself a great Hagan (Chenghiz - Hagan). The title of his ulus (government) are still among the Mongols, there is the word «Gurun» or «Hol bony ulus». In the 13th -15th centuries, Country Turks were called "Turkestan" and in Persian - "Kazakhstan" (country of Kazakhs). The term "Respublica" was introduced in the XIX century using the Western model. And with this "innovation" radically changed the value and meaning of the ancient Turkic name of the country. According to the traditional methodology, in a number of factors that gave the state identity, not the last place is occupied by spatial. A distinctive feature of the statehood of the nomads of Eurasia should be called the predominant influence of the territorial factor. The natural and climatic conditions here are not only determined by the constant economic organization of life, it also left an indelible mark on the system of political, spiritual and existential values. Earth, as the substantial founda-

tion of a life of the human community, which defines the basic outline of the social and ethnic organizations, serves as the basis for subsistence, and in political theory, is meant to power over the territories.

In this regard, an important methodological aspect of the problem is to ascertain compliance with such commonly used concepts such as ownership, possession with the true attitude of nomads to the ground. It is impossible not to note the perception of the land nomads to lands as the source of their life beginning, abode of their ancestors. "Atameken", respectful, trusting relationship with it, could not give rise to a form of ownership in the cultural space-ground, and again this is without taking into account the continuity of strict observance of the nomads' state tradition laid down ruler Hun Shan Yu vogue. According to the law, the supreme ruler of "the basis of the state" at all times for the nomads performed the Earth: "Primal Fear - this is the prevailing feeling farmer who sits on his not very fertile piece of land in a fragmented, close the country and in a tough fight with the northern nature recaptures the poor harvest take, he lives in constant fear of accidents, caring for the future of eternal war on weed, fear hail, frost, drought, floods. In contrast, the original trust has a prevailing sense of a life of a nomad. Without a plan, he rides back and forth on the vast, infinite, seemingly inexhaustible steppe. He was not concerned about the worries; unknown to him, the burdens of sedentary life; he is confident in the power of inexhaustible supply of mother earth. For him, it is not the enemy, for farmers, which they snatch the fruits of his labor, and his mother, and that gracious and generous. To understand the features of Kazakh statehood, it is necessary to study the state power from the genesis - from the early nomadic states Sakas, Huns, Usun, Turks, Mongols, Kazakhs, taking into account the most important state-legal reforms, starting with the era of vogue Shan Yu, of Bumyn, Istemi Kagan and finishing transforms itself Kazakh khans - Esim, Kasim, Tauke, Abylai.

Thereafter, characteristics of Kazakh statehood on different stages of its development contain scientific assessment of what and when was effective and useful in accordance with life quality criteria in nomadic society. All of this should be analyzed with regard to definite historical peculiarities, knowledge of Kazakh culture, traditions, national and social psychology, religious and overall spiritual development of Kazakhstan

at some stage or another. Apparently, the original political culture had emerged in the Eurasian steppes already in the first millennium B.C. This polyethnic culture was represented by different synchronic and diachronic variants, but nevertheless bore many similar characteristics across the whole region. In spite of modifications, it also demonstrated remarkable stability. This should not be too surprising, since the main characteristics of the socio-political organization of the nomads also had many common and stable features.

From the above features, the following test can serve as a real sign of the state, that is, the presence of institutions of governance.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The British Encyclopedia defines the state as “political organization of the society, or the body politic. More narrowly, the term refers to the institutions of government. The term came into prominence in the 16th centuries, largely as a result of its employment by Machiavelli in *The Prince* (*The New Encyclopedia Britannica 2007*). The text paper covers the concept and distinctive features of the state as it emerged from 15th century on...” This sign is quoted in all definitions of state. It is interesting that among almost all of the nomadic people of Eurasia until the beginning of XX century, it retained the right idea about descendants of Genghis Khan to political dominance. For example, among Kazakh’s, one of the largest Eurasian nomadic ethnic groups, there was a layer torus (exclusively formed the “white bone”, while the rest of the population characterized as “black bone”), which were chosen from among the Khans and all sorts of political and military leaders. This layer enjoyed great privileges in all spheres of public life. For example, they were subject to the court by, arbitrate, and the judiciary to the rest of the population. They were freed from the punishment, and had the right to claim part of the social product in the form of offerings, gifts and “voluntary taxes.” And their right to the political dominance of authoritative recognized not only among the Kazakhs but also among the sedentary agricultural states of Central Asia, which often invited the representatives of the torus to the imperial throne. Suffice it to recall that one of the most powerful rulers of the Middle Ages Tamerlane, who came from the Mongol Barlas tribe, could not be the formal head of state.

In this context, it is only necessary to distinguish between functional features of the socio-political institutions of Eurasian nomads. And this being a feature in the performance is not so much a question of policy and legal nature as the complex social, cultural and spiritual principles, their holistic solution. For example, originally embedded in the concept of a Turkic state, the first and primary duty of the ruler - is to promote people’s lives in prosperity. It is well known that since ancient notions of power among the nomads of the Eurasian steppes associated primarily with traditional and sanctification, justice and legality. These archetypes of perception adhered in traditional Kazakhs period 15th -18th century, Since, according to the classification of Artykbaev (2016) ethnologist, it relates to an integral type traditionalism, which for a long time remained unchanged, respected and fairly reproduced in ethnic environment metabolized-WIDE tradition, “understood as a valuable life and ensure her blah-being” knowledge and experience (Artykbaev 2016). Ideological Doctrine nomads carried out according to the principles of the inviolability of power. The idea of the divine preset power - a characteristic feature of nomadic culture. In this regard, Sultanov (2016) notes: “In the political life of the country while those operated state ideas that have been highlighted by religion or tradition, namely: 1) the idea of the divine will is not a mediocre source of sovereign power; 2) the idea of inheritance of power and in Central Asia and Kazakhstan inherited the rights of descendants of Genghis Khan operated, despite the steep political changes in the region, even in the early twentieth century (Sultanov 2015). Specifically, a vertical social stratification of the traditional Kazakh society was the fact that it is not a closed and an open, democratic, it is easy to adapt to the circumstances of the environment, based on social justice, and a distinctive political system based on the principle of genealogical relatedness. Attributive elements in this case acted nationwide kurultais, Majlis (and the right not only to participate in them, but also given a voice in the decision taken by the state issues, according to “Jety jargy” had every one who is able to bear arms” free Kazakh who reached 15 years of age); Tips khans, beys, jyrau institutions warriors. According to the researchers, in cases where the government did not meet the interests of Khan nomadic elite,

steppe aristocracy often engage him in an open armed struggle. Thus, for example, according to the treatment *kyrau* is steppe rulers.

As shown by the data of oral history of the Kazakhs, one of the most influential representatives of the steppe democracy *etnointegratsionnyh* processes in the state were the priests - bard. They were the main carriers of the state ideology. *Jyrau* needed to maintain belief in the people of its commitment to the state, as the persons who were in close proximity to the political elite to the khans and sultans. Generating public ideas, sacralization of the ruler - Khan, worship / worship of ancestors - all this relates to the functions *zhyrau*.

The other representatives of the steppe aristocracy who performed public functions were *Bies*. Influence *biys* defined as the multiplicity and strength and the antiquity of the origin and birth of their seniority headed. *Bii*, being an important link in the system of management of the Khanate, combining, thus, at least, four qualities: military chief, administrative officer, a judge and a representative of the steppe aristocracy.

This power gave *biys* certain political weight, which is expressed in the fact that the *Bies* participated along with the sultans in the resolution of national affairs, usually jointly convened on an annual "People's Assembly". *Biya* - heirs of the past, so they naturally assimilated all the control functions. *Biya Desht* - and - Kipchak ancient Chinggisids. They, in contrast to Genghis Khan - "denatsionalnomu" class, were "national" aristocracy, the elite social group "Karasuyek". The researcher of the Kazakh customary law Leontev (1890) notes that the word "biy" comes from the verb "bileydi", which means run". According to V.V. Radlov (2015), "the term" *bi* "dates back to the ancient Turkic word" *Biik* " - a tall, powerful, great and assumed the rule advisor status". At the heirs of Eurasian nomads, in particular, the Kazakhs, childbirth was not only used in a comprehensive value, they greatly played an important role in political history. They could enter into various alliances, in whole and in parts, but were determined to maintain their original political influence. It is not surprising, therefore, that the basic content of political relations between the nomads and the Kazakhs are, and in maintaining a reasonable balance between the institutions of the tribal structures and public organizations, and the mechanism of this bal-

ance could start *biystva* Institute. The politico-legal views of the Kazakh *biys* have reflected the bases of fair state management most precisely which have not lost the importance to this day. The contribution of the *biys* in development and strengthening of judicial authority, system of justice of the Kazakh state is immense. They have lifted traditions of the Kazakh people, legal custom and oratorical art on a new stage of development, have created the bases of legal precedent by on the disputes which have been not settled by the code of the laws "Zhetey Zhargy". Another feature of the state is known as the taxes according to the laws as we know *Tauke Khan Reform* (1680-1718), and also touched upon the tax system, as a new provision has been introduced on taxes. *Levshin* (2002) claims that regular taxation existed in pre-colonial period, "according to the ancient law of the Kazakhs".

CONCLUSION

By the modern period, almost all the nomadic societies and groups living in the Eurasian steppes, deserts and semi-deserts had at some time in the past experienced the extreme turbulence which is faced in the quest for the establishment of a state, whether founded by their own ancestors. However, amongst almost all of them, periods of existence within a state alternated with periods of existence without the state and subsequent oscillations in social organization.

Finally, some conclusions concerning the question of the state of the Kazakhs: initially need to get used to the idea that the existence of the state /political institutions/ traditional nomadic society possible. The main generator of state power for the society lies in the tribal organization of the Kazakhs. In political terms, the various stages of kinship constitute hierarchical integrity and were successfully replaced by a system of administrative-territorial units. Competitive antagonism between births is the driving force behind the evolution of society.

In conclusion, the researchers note that the Kazakh state as the heir of the Great Steppe civilization is not limited to the scope of the Kazakh Khanate (XV- XVIII centuries). As it implies the emergence and development of the Kazakh government, and its form and function at different stages of its operations, has left a deep imprint in the history of mankind. The result of all this

was that from ancient times onwards, relatively large units were very widespread amongst the nomads of the Eurasian steppes and centripetal tendencies long ago became firmly established there.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future research of the state Eurasian nomads could be extended to include a wider source base, both anthropologically and historically, to further explore the extent to which the findings are generalizable. The Kazakhs entered the historical arena in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when their social organization was based on a stratified segmentary system. The system was the result of political developments in the preceding period when their ancestors had been incorporated into different states which emerged after the disintegration of the Mongol empire. Finally, future research may use structural features of nomadic society to demonstrate the relationship between culture and political system.

REFERENCES

- Artykbaev JO 2016. *Eurasian Nomads*. Saint Petersburg: Major.
- Fletcher J 1986. The Mongols: Ecological and social perspectives. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 46(1): 11-50.
- Golden PB 2002. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and State Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kashgari M 2016. *Diwānu l-Lugat al-Turk*. Almaty: Daik Press.
- Khazanov AM 1984. *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khazanov AM 2016. *A Historical Background for the Nomads in the Old World*. Moscow: Center for Civilization Studies.
- Leontyev AA 1890. The traditional law of Kirgiz. *Law Bulletin*, 5(1): 114-139.
- Levshin AI 2002. *Description of Kirghiz-Cossack or Kirghiz-Kaisak Hordes and Steppes*. Saint Petersburg: Science.
- Radlov VV 2015. *From Siberia: Leaves from a Diary*. Moscow: Science.
- Sneath D 2007. *The Headless State: Aristocratic Orders, Kinship Society, and Misrepresentations of Nomadic Inner Asia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sultanov TI 2016. *Raised on the White Felt: The Descendants of Genghis Khan*. Almaty: School.
- The New Encyclopedia Britannica 2007. 15th Edition, Index Preface Ed.*
- Wallerstein I 1974. *The Modern World-System*. T 1. New York: Academic Press.