

Maydanali Z.

Imperial confederations and nomadic associations of Central Asia (historiography of problem)

Main conceptual positions and methodological paradigms to problem «leading a nomadic life empire» are considered in the article. There are considered different approaches and methods of the study of the shaping and operating the political system «leading a nomadic life empire». The onward development to modern history thought in study social-political sphere of the nomadic formation is shown.

Analysis of the modern historiography on the continuity and transformation of the political organization of nomadic societies in research surveys and discourse observed processes of different directions. Research evidence shows that it is necessary to take into account the problem of succession, analogies and special features of the state in the imperial tradition of the Imperial confederations. The article deals with diversified approaches to the problems by adding the migratory habits of political entities of their systematization and reconstruction of a complex set of different types and models of power coupled into a single imperial structure.

Key words: Imperial confederations, the nomads, the scientific paradigm, structure, power, management.

Майданәлі З.

Империялық конфедерациялар және Орталық Азияның көшпелі бірлестіктері (тарихнамалық мәселелер)

Мақалада «империялық конфедерация» мәселесі бойынша негізгі концептуалдық тұжырымдар және әдістемелік парадигмалар қарастырылған. Бірқатар әдіс-тәсілдер арқылы империялық конфедерацияның саяси жүйенің құрылуы мен қалыптасу ерекшеліктері айқындалады. Көшпелі құрылымдардың саяси-әлеуметтік жағдайын зерттеуде тарихи ойдың дамуы көрсетіледі. Көшпелі бірлестіктердің дамуы және саяси ұйымның саяси трансформациясы мәселелері бойынша заманауи тарихнамалық сараптау көрсеткендей зерттеу ізденістері мен шолуларда әртүрлі бағыттағы үдерістер байқалады. Ғылыми-зерттеу тәжірибесі анықтағандай бұл мәселеде жалғастық, ұқсастық және империялық конфедерациялардағы мемлекеттік дәстүрлердің ерекше белгілері ескеру қажеттілігі туындайды. Мақалада көшпелі саяси құрылымдардың қалыптасуы мәселелері көп жақты келістер сарапталады, оларды біртұтас империялық құрылымда біріккен биліктің әртүрлі типтері мен моделдері ретінде жүйелеу мен қайта құру мәселелері қарастырылады.

Түйін сөздер: империялық конфедерация, көшпелілер, ғылыми тұжырымдар, құрылым, билік, басқару.

Майданали З.

Имперские конфедерации и кочевые объединения Центральной Азии (историография проблемы)

В статье рассматриваются концептуальные заключения о таком политическом образовании, как «имперская конфедерация» и методологические парадигмы. Выявлены разные подходы и принципы исследования проблемы существования и функционирования «имперской конфедерации» и кочевых объединений на территории Евразии. Показан прогресс исторического знания в изучении проблем социально-политических структур имперской конфедерации. Анализ современной историографии по проблемам развития и трансформации политической организации кочевых объединений показал, что в исследовательских изысканиях и дискурсе наблюдаются процессы разной направленности. Исследовательская практика показывает, что необходимо учитывать проблемы преемственности, аналогий и особенных черт государственных традиций в имперских конфедерациях. В статье освещаются диверсифицированные подходы к проблемам по сложению номадных политических образований, их систематизации и реконструкции как сложного комплекса разных типов и моделей власти, соединенных в единую имперскую структуру.

Ключевые слова: имперская конфедерация, кочевники, научные парадигмы, структура, власть, управление.

**IMPERIAL
CONFEDERATIONS
AND NOMADIC
ASSOCIATIONS
OF CENTRAL ASIA
(HISTORIOGRAPHY OF
PROBLEM)**

Currently there are new conceptual – methodological approaches that allow establishing the historical, socio-political and ideological background of the genesis, formation and development of the phenomenon of «imperial confederation» and to extend opportunity of their learning. In historical science, there are several theories of state formations among the nomads. Discussion on the political structures of the nomads has a sufficiently broad historiographical base [Fedorov-Davydov; Khazanov; Markov; Pershytz; Kogan; Khalil Ismail; Khazanov; Gellner; Popov A.V.; Kradin; Massanov; Vasjutin etc.]. But this diversity of opinions and views in historical science problem nomadic imperial political confederations and nomadic structures is one of the little-known.

In development of the theory of a nomadism the huge contribution was made by L.N. Gumilev. The idea about the nature and character of early statehood at nomads is most brightly expressed in Gumilev's works. The statehood at huns arose, according to the historian, because of transition of the nomads separated by ailam of nomads to year-round migrations. According to L. Gumilev this germ of statehood is more ancient, than institute of the class state. The Hun scientists consider as a society dominated by tribal institutions and defines as «generic empire» [1]. As part of the Eurocentric approach G. E. Markov developed nomadism problems. According to his concept, in nomadic societies there are processes of property differentiation and allocation of the dominating layer – military and breeding leaders [2, page 14]. Strengthening military organization eventually led to the emergence of nomadic empires, personified the military centralization of pastoralists. But the nomadic empires were the ephemeral education and did not have a strong economic base. Association of various tribes to the nomadic empire could be carried out only on condition of creation of the uniform control system relying on strong military force. However when weakening the central power disintegration of the nomadic empire began, the military management system stopped the existence and steppes came back from «Military and nomadic» in the «Community – nomadic» state. Thus, the nomadic empires, according to the concept of Markov, are not a state in the full sense of the word. G.E. Markov puts forward conceptual situation that in traditional society fictional idea of «unity of an origin» acts as an ideological form of understanding

of really existing military-political, economic, ethnic and other communications [3, p. 83-84]. The modern Russian researcher A.I. Selitsky believes that all members of a team the connected with secret military cult, system of sacral knowledge, the strict organization, the initiation ceremonies «turning» them into «soldiers animals». It is interesting that, on the one hand, these military associations went against the principles of the breeding organization, often broke the signed peace contracts, plundered the next tribes, and their leaders could become rivals to the local breeding authorities. But, on the other hand, when squadleaders became military leaders of the tribes / unions of tribes and teams turned into a kernel of breeding army, these contradictions were removed [4, p. 99]. The modern Russian researcher V. V. Trepavlov believes that there was an organic communication of the nomadic states with each other. This communication defined continuity in them socially – economic and political development that allowed the above-named author to present each subsequent nomadic state education arising in the history as a stage or «steps of uniform development of a social order of nomad» [5, p. 14-15].

One of the actual parties of modern historical science is need of development of criteria which would allow defining accurately the nature and the maintenance of imperial structures of nomadic associations. The research paradigm of N.N. Kradin considers essence of object, defines two main signs of «the nomadic empire»: 1. big territories, 2. existence of dependent or colonial possession. Characterizing the nomadic empire as the nomadic society organized by military hierarchically principle, occupying rather big space and operating the neighboring territories by means of external forms of operation (robberies, war and contribution, extortion of «gifts», nonequivalent trade, tribute, etc.) the researcher allocates the following signs of the nomadic empire: multistage hierarchical character of the social organization, dual or triad principle of administrative division of the empire, military and hierarchical public organization, coachman service as specific way of the organization of administrative infrastructure, specific system of inheritance of the power, etc. Further N.N. Kradin models structure of the power in nomadic educations and allocates three of their levels: 1. governor of the nomadic empire and his rate; 2. the imperial deputies appointed to operate the tribes entering the empire; 3. local breeding leaders [6, p. 22]. Modern researchers note inheritance the ancient Turkic of the state traditions with different degree of their completeness later Turkic state educations [7, p. 228-261]. One of

interesting research constructions is the point of view of S.G. Klyashtorny and T.I. Sultanov who as follows define the term «empire» in relation to the states created by nomads of Central Asia. «Without trying to universalize the option of definition, we will note that the concept «empire» extends us only on the multiethnic educations created by military force in the course of a gain, created by military force in the course of a gain, operated by military and administrative methods and which are breaking up after decline of political power of the founder of the empire... At the first stage of a gain the factor defining its purposes is consolidation of steppe tribes under the power, one dynasty and one tribe. Then there are aspirations realized usually during military actions – to put into dependence on the consolidated military power of nomads of area and the state with more difficult device and more diverse economic activity, such balance of forces assumes the final result – treaty dependence or any forms of direct political submission. At this stage of the state, created by nomad tribes, will be transformed to the empire» [8, p. 9].

Essential to historical science is a solution of a question of institutes of the state type in the developed nomadic associations covering the considerable mass of actually nomadic population. Modern historians concentrate the attention on one of such problems in nomadic associations of Central Asia as structure of the power. Thomas D. Barfield, analyzing the nomadic states of Central Asia, comes to conclusion: «The nomadic states represent «imperial confederations», autocratic and state-like in foreign and domestic policy, but the deliberative adhering to the principles and federalism in internal affairs. They included the administrative hierarchy consisting, at least, of three levels: 1. imperial leader and his yard, 2. the imperial deputies appointed for control of the tribes entering the empire, 3. local breeding leaders ... Vassal tribes were controlled by the empire by means of system of deputies, often members of the imperial yard. Imperial deputies dealt with regional problems, organized a set of recruits and suppressed discontent of local breeding leaders. The imperial government monopolized the sphere of the international relations and military science, speaking at negotiations with other powers on behalf of all empire» [9]. Analyzing components of these nomadic educations, it defines them as autocratic and state-like in foreign and military policy, but the deliberative adhering to the principles and federalism in internal affairs. For such political associations stability of existence it was maintained

due to extraction of financial resources outside the steppe. T. Barfield puts forward the theory of cycles of the power, i.e. synchronism in dynamics of changes is state – a bureaucratic organism in China and military – political structure of nomads in the steppe [9, p. 44].

T.D. Skrynnikova and N.N. Kradin define process of creation of government institutions in nomadic associations as «need for association and creation of the centralized hierarchy at nomads arose only in case of war for existence sources, for the organization of robberies of farmers or expansion on their territory, establishment of control over trade ways. In this situation folding of the difficult political organization of nomads in the form of nomadic empires at the same time is both a product of integration, and a conflict consequence between nomads and farmers. From this point of view creation of nomadic empires – is a special case of «the aggressive theory» of a politogenesis». The conceptual conclusions and the research principles of these authors indicated absence in nomadic empires of opportunity to control the power and to carry out sanctions by means of legitimized violence [10, p. 34]. Research receptions and the theorist – methodological creation of S.A. Vasyutin denies possibility of existence of ethno cultural integrity with the general ideological system in the Mongolian empire (carriers of such «imperial» ideology only Mongols and, first of all, their elite could act). «In the middle of the XIII century result of aggressive

actions of troops of Genghis Khan as a part of the state appeared both nomadic territories and lands mainly with settled population. The Mongolian empire was transformed to the Mega Empire including various political, economic, ethnic, religious and other subsystems (uluses, «wings», segments of decimal system, tribal structures, oases, the cities and agricultural territories, confessional communities, etc. It was a peculiar symbiosis of tribute and aggressive types of the nomadic imperial organizations that distinguished the Mongolian empire from most of her predecessors» – the author emphasizes [11, p. 271].

The sequence of historical thinking and the concrete historical, retrospective analysis and modeling in modern the theorist – methodological approaches shows that related structures and genealogy caused «dispersion» and acentrifugal of nomadic societies. However in nomadic confederations military – hierarchical bodies of political management, closely intertwined with tribal segments, at the same time towered over them, controlled them, organized their effective use in compliance with the purposes of the imperial management. Updating in modern historical science of such layers as «imperial confederation of nomads», «nomadic political system», «political legal relations» in nomadic associations and designing them on the basis of new historical methods allows to present complete model of difficult development of nomadic statehood.

Литература

- 1 Гумилев Л.Н. Хунну: Срединная Азия в древние времена / АН СССР. – М.: Ин-вост. лит-ры, 1960.
- 2 Марков Г.Е. Кочевники Азии. – М., 1967.
- 3 Марков Г.Е. Скотоводческое хозяйство и кочевничество. Дефиниции и терминология // Советская этнография. – 1981. – № 4. – С. 83-84.
- 4 Селицкий А.И. //Монгольская империя: этнополитическая история. – Улан-Удэ, 2005.
- 5 Трепавлов В.В. Государственный строй Монгольской империи XIII в.: проблема исторической преемственности.
- 6 Крадин Н.Н. Кочевые империи: генезис, расцвет, упадок// Восток, 2001. – №5.
- 7 Жумаганбетов Т.С. Проблемы формирования и развития древнетюркской системы государственности и права. VI-XII вв. – Алматы, 2003.
- 8 Кляшторный С.Г., Султанов Т.И. Государства и народы евразийских степей: от древности к новому времени. – СПб., 2009.
- 9 Барфилд Т. Дж. Опасная граница: кочевые империи и Китай (221 г. до н.э.-1757 г. н.э.). – СПб., 2009.
- 10 Крадин Н.Н., Скряникова Т.Д. Империя Чингис-хана. – М., 2006.
- 11 Васютин С.А. Монгольская империя как особая форма ранней государственности? // Монгольская империя и кочевой мир. 1 том. – С. 271.

References

- 1 Gumilyov L.N. Hunnu: Sredinaya Azia v drevnie vremena// SSSR. – М.: In-vost. Lit-ra, 1960.
- 2 Markov G.E. Kochevniki Asii. – М., 1967.
- 3 Markov G.E. Skotovodcheskoye hozystvo I kochevnichestvo // Sovietskay Ethnographya. – 1981. – № 4. – P. 83-84.
- 4 Selitsky A.I. Mongolskaya Emperia: etno-politicheskaya istorya. – Ulan-Ude, 2005.

- 5 Trepavlov V.V. Gosudarstveniy story Mongolskaya Emperia XIII v.: problem istoricheskoy preemstvennosti. – M., 1993.
- 6 Kradin N.N Kochevie imperii: genesis, rascvet, upadok// Vostok, 2001. – №5.
- 7 Zhumaganbetov T.S Prroblemi formirovania I razvitia drevneturkskoy sistemi gosudarstvennosti I prava. VI-XII v. – Almaty, 2003.
- 8 Klyashtorny S.G, Sultanov T.I Klyashtorny S.G., Sultanov T.I. Gosudarstva I narodi Eurasiiskih steppey. Drevnost i srednevecovie. – SPb., 2004.
- 9 Barfield T.J. Opasnaya granaica: kochevie imperii I Kitai. – St. Petersburg., 2009.
- 10 Kradin N.N Skrynnikova E.T.C. Empiria Chingis-hana. – M., 2006.
- 11 Vasjutin S.A Mongolskaya imperia kak osobaya forma ranney gosudarstvennosti?// Mongolskaya imperia I kochevoi mir. – Ulan-Ude. t.1