

## METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES OF STUDYING TURKIC CULTURE (PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT)

Samat Turganbekov, Zhakypbek Altayev, Sanlya Edelbay,  
Asset Kuranbek and Shattyk Alyev

---

In this article, the authors attempt to prove the establishment by Turkomans of a great culture and civilization, which had an enormous influence on the global culture and civilization. Unfortunately, according to the authors, this contribution has not yet been sufficiently assessed by the history. The reasons were both objective and subjective, from Eurocentrism to class approach to the social science. Today, due to new circumstances, after the latest sensational discoveries made by the scientists showing that these were Turkomans who brought into the global history, culture and civilization such a contribution which had a decisive influence on the course and development of the global history. Turkomans always used to have and develop their own culture which they considered possible to oppose the cultures of China, Iran, Byzantium and India.

*Keywords:* Turkomans, culture, worldview, philosophy, mentality, civilization, politics.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The independence of the Turkic states of Central Asia provides a new look at a number of issues of history and culture of the Turkic peoples. This is due to the fact that the spiritual revival of the Turkic peoples goes through the understanding of their own true history, which is important for the Turkic peoples, both in scientific terms, revealing the real place and the role of Turkomans in the global culture and civilization, and in the patriotic education aspect, based not on Turkic history. After all, in order to build an effective system of education, it must be first based on the national history, on its glorious accomplishments and achievements that should be woven into the context of the whole educational system of the Turkic peoples, including the Kazakh people. It is for a good reason. To substantiate this statement we will quote the words of the two eminent scientists. First, it is a globally recognized turcologist Sadri Maksudi. According to his statement, "...our ancestors created a great civilization. Such cultural potential, as in the Turkic people, there is in no other nation. We can say it in front of the whole world" (Arsal 2002). Another scientist, even better known in the historical science, recognized by the international community as a brilliant historian, Lev Gumilyov, said that "the value of ancient Turkomans in history was enormous, but the history of this nation has not yet been written" (Gumilyov 2004).

If this is true, that Turkomans created a great civilization, then, in our opinion, it is very important in the first place to philosophically comprehend this phenomenon, the phenomenon of Turkic culture and civilization. To do this, it is

---

\* Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, 050040, Almaty, av. Al-Farabi, 71

required, first, to consider from the standpoint of philosophy of history the Turkic history in the global historical context, second, to try to find the sense of Turkic culture and Turkic civilization, and third, to try to work out the research methodology in the field of Turkic studies. This is quite obviously a very difficult task. However, be that as it may, such raising of the question matured a long time ago. This process has to overcome various obstacles, established over many years of dependent development. It is, first of all, numerous myths and stereotypes of scientific thinking, formed under the influence of Eurocentrism and the Great Russian idea, which continue to have an impact on research in various fields of science (Abayev and Ayupov 2010).

It should be noted that the thinking patterns, including patterns of scientific thinking, established in the public consciousness, largely determine the mentality of the modern person, his/her outlook and worldview. It is no secret that these stereotypes dominate human thinking, making it a hostage to these ideas. Therefore, first, the majority of studies on Turkic history and culture are in line with the prevailing stereotypes in Turkic studies. Second, most of these studies are of a descriptive, mythological nature. Third, due to the lack of empirical data and source base, many of the works are superficial and often far from scientific truth. In this regard, in our opinion, one of the most influential mythologies in the social sciences, no doubt, is Eurocentrism, which, according to the well-known Russian scientist S. Kara-Murza, for centuries has been dusting the eyes in the course of studying the entire non-European history and culture.

And the paradox here is that European science, dominant only for 3-4 centuries, worked out a stereotype that only knowledge, developed in line with the rationality of the European science, may be regarded as true, that only it can develop the criteria for the truth of new knowledge. If in the field of natural sciences, exact sciences, the European civilization, continuing scientific achievements and aspirations of all mankind, has accumulated all the scientific knowledge and has enabled rapid development of science and technology, which resulted in the progress of modern civilization, in the area of social sciences and humanities a certain chauvinism, imposition of stereotypes are manifested (Abayev and Ayupov 2010).

In essence, this concept is a system of ideological myths prevailing during the colonial conquest and the establishment of the modern West. According to this theory, the West is the only civilization which has passed in its development the "right" way ("high road"), which all the other cultures and civilizations will inevitably have to go through. At the end of this path the entire mankind will acquire the same "right" economic system and social structure on the Western type (Kara-Murza 2002). The first myth of Eurocentrism, according to S. Kara-Murza, expresses the idea that the Western civilization has shot ahead as capitalism has created powerful productive forces based on rational political economy. The other societies fell behind in their development and now have to catch up. Those

who listen to the teachers will be helped by the West, and finally, liberal capitalism of the Anglo-Saxon model will rule the planet. Denying this statement, S. Kara-Murza cites the works of famous historians of India and Egypt, which clearly show that this inequality has arisen just because the European colonialists were deliberately destroying the structures of capitalism that emerged in those countries.

The next myth that all cultures have to accept a specific way of production, distribution and life in general, generated by Western society, according to the philosophers, reflects technomorphic thinking. It is based on the belief that mankind, as a machine, should be built in compliance with the best design. This idea is opposed – and rather long – by another idea, that mankind, like any ecosystem, is alive and steady while sufficient diversity of cultures and civilizations is maintained (Kara-Murza 2002).

Today we see how in the course of globalization, under the slogans of Eurocentrism, deliberate and ruthless destruction of very special and in many ways remarkable civilization and cultures of many nations, including Russian Siberia's ethnic groups, is going on. Once, the eminent French philosopher Levi-Strauss warned that each of the world's civilizations remaining after all the wars and colonial destruction is necessary to mankind: "And if in any particular respect, it seems frozen, or even regressing, this does not mean that from some other point of view, it is not the center of important changes. There may not be a global civilization in the absolute sense, which is often attributed to this expression, as a civilization suggests the coexistence of cultures which exhibit a huge variety; one might even say that civilization lies in that coexistence. The global civilization could not be anything other than a coalition, in the global scale, of the cultures, each of them maintaining its originality... The sacred duty of mankind is to protect themselves from blind particularism inclined to ascribe the status of mankind to a single human race, culture or society, and never forget that no part of humanity has the formulae applicable to the whole, and that mankind within a single lifestyle is impossible" (Levi-Strauss 2001).

Another mythology of Eurocentrism, according to S. Kara-Murza, may be considered his statement that it was the Western civilization which created culture (philosophy, law, science and technology), which dominates the world and predetermines the human life. This is believed in by a person formed by school and television, already unable to look around (because taming and training horse was no less a complex and creative thing than making an atomic bomb, but the Western philosophy has managed to eliminate the feeling of gratitude to ancestors) (Kara-Murza 2002). One of the "conquests" of Eurocentrism is the real suppression of the history-related feelings in people – one of the great victories over nature. Time became manipulable. In this context, Levi-Strauss writes that all scientific and industrial revolution of the West fits in the period equal to half the thousandth portion of life which mankind has lived. It must be remembered before stating that

this revolution is called to fully transform that life. And then, he questioned the criterion by which cultural contribution of some or other civilization is assessed (Levi-Strauss 2001).

As it is seen, the nomadic response to repeated and growing challenges really was a breakthrough. In the first period of drought, pre-agricultural nomadic ancestors shifted from hunting to agriculture, hunting transformed into an additional and auxiliary craft. In the second period of rhythmical periods of drought, nomadic civilization patriarchs safely returned to the steppe and have adapted to living in such conditions in which neither farmers nor hunters could exist. Arid steppes could only be developed by shepherds, but to survive and prosper there, a nomad shepherd had to constantly improve skills, to work out and develop new skills, as well as special moral and intellectual features. First, domestication of animals is an art higher than domestication of plants, because it is a victory of the human mind and will over less obedient material. In other words, the shepherd is a more virtuoso than the farmer. Nomadism was economically more advantageous than agriculture. Here, a certain parallel with the industrial production emerges. If the farmer produces the products which may immediately be consumed, the nomad, like the industrialist, carefully studies the raw material that otherwise is not fit for consumption – the nomad uses natural grazing, sparse and rough vegetation not suitable for humans, but useful for animals... This indirect utilization of vegetation via animals creates the basis for development of the human mind and will... Nomads would not be able to win over the steppe, to survive in such a harsh natural environment had not they developed intuition, self-control, physical and moral endurance” (Toynbee 1991).

Steppe society is not just shepherds and herds. Among domestic animals, there are some with functions quite different from the function of a cloven-hoofed herd – to feed and clothe nomads. These animals – dogs, camels, horses – help a nomad to survive and he needs them not less than the herd. Domestication of animals can surely be considered a masterpiece of the nomadic civilization and the key to the subsequent success. Without their help, the nomadic breakthrough would be impossible. Man has worked wonders of creativity there. Sheep or cows, to serve humans, need just taming, though even that is quite difficult sometimes. Dogs, horses and camels, whose functions are much more complex, require not only taming, but training. It is necessary to make them human assistants. This is a remarkable achievement of nomadism which helped nomads not only to survive in the desert, but also to adapt some of them to the role of human “pastors” (Toynbee 1991).

A.J. Toynbee is absolutely right because “...nomads could not win over the steppe, survive in such a harsh natural environment had not they developed the intuition, self-control, physical and mental endurance...” (Toynbee 1991). Indeed, “man adapts to the surrounding nature, its forces and methods of influence, or

adapts them to himself, to his needs which he cannot or does not want to give up. During this two-way fight he produces intelligence and character, energy, ideas, feelings and aspirations, and partly his relationships to other people. And the more excitement and food nature gives to similar human abilities, the wider it reveals his inner strength, so its influence on the history of surrounding population should be considered stronger” (Klyuchevskiy 1908).

The above may be added only with the following: a special role was played in the origin of the nomadic civilization by domestication of horses, because it had invaluable significance in shaping the economic and cultural system of the nomads. It was one of the main means of communication, including the military sphere. In a Chalcolithic settlement of Botai, archaeologists found over 99% of horse remains. After careful analysis, researchers have convincingly proved it had been domesticated. This finding is reflected (already in Neolithic-Chalcolithic) in the formation of the original so-called “horse-breeding” culture. For the development of pastoralism as an economic strategy for production in the arid zones, the horse was the most suitable. So maybe the fact is indisputable that the horse, which occupied a key position in the life support system, is linked with the formation of the revolutionary jump on the nomadic way.

As per Murat Adzhi, “the horse has become flesh and blood of Cumans and responded to the nation with loyalty – took Turkomans to the steppe, revealed the fascinating vast spaces. Actually, the whole life of a steppe man, since the Hunnish times, was on a horseback, or next to it. Such was the way of life! No nation had anything like this in the world. For his ‘horse’ lifestyle – with the horse and on the horse – Altai invented clothing. Saddle with stirrups, heels to boots and a lot more came to light because of some restless Turkoman who realized that riding a horse he will see the world better. Therefore, ‘to ride a horse’ was the first sacred desire of a Cuman” (Adzhi 2006).

In our opinion, such a conclusion made by a famous historian reveals the specifics and advantages of the nomad attitude towards the world. This refers to the fact that in the system of relationships developed among the nomads in the aspect “man and the surrounding environment”, “man-nature”, “man-man” due to specifics of the natural conditions of its habitat, the priority of nature was established, awareness of the interconnectedness and unity of Nature and Man. Therefore, the entire culture of the nomads sought to maintain a harmonious balance with the nature, following the cosmic rhythms and was endogenous.

Turkomans, being bearers and translators of the nomadic civilization world, have bequeathed future generations a legacy of the important priorities of our time – the culture of ecological relationship to the surrounding environment, tradition of respect for nature, space and its laws, ideas of proportionality of nature and human society. In other words, the nomadic society required from its members due to specific natural conditions of formation to strictly observe the rigid moral

and normative system of physical and mental endurance, collective solidarity, which contributed to the development of the respective character of a Eurasian. Distinctive features of the latter are simplicity, generosity of spirit, severity and manly character. In the system of relationships “man-society” for a nomad, the tribal, collective principle was an absolute priority.

## **2. METHOD**

The specifics of the theoretical and methodological bases of the project were determined by the object and subject of research, since it is suggested to do both a historical and philosophical study and an analysis of the current development of the Kazakh culture. The theoretical basis of the project is the systematic approach in conjunction with comparative-historical and hermeneutical methods and comparative methodology. A significant place in the development of the research topic is allocated to dialectical logical principles, integrity, specificity, monism, the unity of history and logic, the method of going from the abstract to the concrete.

An important component of the theoretical foundations of the study is the works of Kazakhstan philosophers, in which they put philosophical foundations to study the development of national history and culture, anthropological basics of socio-philosophical knowledge, trends for modernization and transformation of the Kazakhstan society.

## **3. RESULTS**

The innovative character of the study was determined by using philosophical methodology, which allows for the possibility to consider not only historical but worldview context of the Turkic civilization development issues through the prism of cultural universals.

As a result of the study the following results were obtained:

- the main ideas, principles and theoretical foundations of socio-philosophical views developed in the works of Turkic philosophers of antiquity and modernity were identified;
- the value of the Turkic philosophy and socio-political doctrines in the development of Kazakh culture was disclosed, and their effect on the development trends of the global philosophy was proved;
- from the standpoint of philosophical methodology, the Turkic aspect of the contemporary Eurasianism and its impact on social and political processes in the contemporary Kazakhstan society were rationalized;
- it was supposed to identify the main guidelines for the strategy of development of the Turkic identity under globalization conditions and integration of Kazakhstan in the global culture development vectors;

- scientific-practical and methodological recommendations on the formation of Kazakhstan national idea and Kazakhstan patriotism under globalization in the context of the study of Turkic philosophical heritage were worked out.

The results of the study can be used in the methodology and practice of studying the issues related to spiritual life of Kazakhstan society, are applicable in further development of the methodology to study the problems of social philosophy, in improvement of the forms and technologies of comparative research. Some provisions may be used in lecture courses on urgent issues of Kazakh and Turkic philosophy, in reading special courses on actual problems of the contemporary philosophical thought.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Famous turcologists N.V. Abaev and N.G. Ayupov, which we referred to above, analyzing the theoretical and methodological basis of the study of Turkic history and culture, clearly reveal the snobbery of the European science (often having political and ideological contexts) in relation to the past, which prevents the objective disclosure of truth. According to these scientists, the study of the ancient Turkic culture coincided with the era of colonization, when the European science (including Russian) was full of political and cultural chauvinism. Consider, for example, the stereotype rooted in the consciousness of a modern man which is constantly retranslated, imposed from the outside in the minds of people, that all non-European (or “non-Russian”) cultures were “discovered”. What lies beneath the symbol “discovered”, rather political, neither culturological nor scientific? This is the paradox of social sciences and humanities, developed in line with Eurocentrism. The knowledge that some or other culture had or has is considered to be “re-discovered”. The question is, for whom it is “new” and for whom it was “discovered”?

One context of this symbol, imposed to humans, is the existence of European culture only, no matter how strange and absurd it would sound, but, nevertheless, it remains a mental fact of the contemporaneity. The second context is the stereotype embedded in the consciousness that only “European” (“Russian”) culture can be considered as “high”, the other “aboriginal” cultures being “barbaric”. The third context is that, if so, we need to “civilize the aboriginals”, bring them closer to the specimens of high “European” culture, which makes it possible to manipulate the development of the global culture through unification, through destruction of indigenous cultures (Abayev and Ayupov 2010).

In other words, it is a fairly common stereotype of the Eurocentric science – a view of the ancient Turkic culture as a purely nomadic only, or sometimes, as a “barbarian” (Abayev and Ayupov 2010).

That is, the nomadic culture is a more backward culture than agricultural. It is not a reasonable enough argument. Because, first, tend for animals is a more

complex matter than for plants. An animal is a more complex phenomenon than flora. It is an axiom. Second, in the harsh climatic conditions, with a sharply continental climate, the nomadic economy was the most viable and efficient form. It was hard to survive in some other way, so the way of life being the most appropriate for that time was chosen. The areas, where nomads roamed, even under the current conditions and modern technologies are still a zone of risky agriculture. A different form of economy could not be then and there. So, any assessment must be within the context of those circumstances.

Another stereotype is the idea that the Turkic culture is an oral culture or culture with borrowed writing system. This approach was dictated by the policy of cultural expansion (cultural chauvinism) and “denigration” of “barbarian” culture, which requires a rebuttal. Enough to say that it is the Central Asian region being the place of origination, distribution and use of almost all the ancient writing systems. According to N.V. Abaev and N.G. Ayupov, most Russian and foreign specialists in Turkic languages tend to trace from the ancient Aramaic the following: Turkic runic writing and ancient Uyghur writing, Tocharian and Khotanese Saka writing, Karoshti writing and others that had spread in the Central Asian culture (many of them are not considered Turkic) (Abayev and Ayupov 2010).

Another stereotype may be considered that is being overcome by contemporary national researchers – the notion that the Turkic culture did not have any relevant economic, social, political, philosophical reasons for the existence of the variety of state systems and entities in its historical development. Most frequently, the term “military democracy” is used, which is only a small piece describing the richness of the Turkic culture of statehood.

The most significant stereotype that is being slowly overcome in the international scientific literature is the idea of the absence of philosophy in the Turkic peoples. A nation without philosophy is not a nation. Therefore, the colonial cultural expansion was primarily aimed at undermining the ideological, philosophical, religious, cultural fundamentals. None of the current Western or Russian textbooks contains “Turkic culture” or “Turkic philosophy” sections. A huge mass of culture in its historical and contemporary significance is artificially avoided (Abayev and Ayupov 2010, pp. 83-85).

Another myth is that many Russian colonies due to the great Russian nation had the opportunity of integration into civilization, access to education and learning, integration in the global, especially European, culture. Often it seems the only option. In majestic historical science, conquests by Rus of many nations joining the Russian Empire was euphonicly called “voluntary accession to Russia”. This is by and large a far-fetched argument. It must be admitted directly that it was the conquest by Russia of the neighboring countries as colonies. Whether they have won or lost is quite a controversial issue. At the same time it was possible to develop without Russia, for example, if it was inevitable in the epoch of imperialism,

in the status of colonies like those of the UK or another country or without colonial status. In the age of emerging global integration processes, globalization and technological revolution, under favorable circumstances and the political will of the political elite or the leader, a country could develop quite successfully and independently. So, for example, the countries of Southeast Asia, India and China have achieved impressive successes in electing their own Eastern type of development.

In our opinion, very important is the idea that there is no single way of development of all mankind. The world is infinitely diverse. Therefore, assessment of everything from the European culture and civilization standpoint is one of the Eurocentric mythologies rather common and much propagated by Western scientists. The main thing here is to justify the colonialist status in relation to the colonial peoples. If earlier it was manifested abruptly, now it occurs under the banner of globalization, under the guise of slogans promoting freedom and democracy. Here is an *ignoratio elenchi*. Technical progress and social progress are not parallel.

Stereotypes associated with nomadism and statehood appeared in the settled agricultural environment and in general do not correspond to reality, as they reflect different worldviews, and in some cases owe their origin to the desire to justify own backwardness. All this suggests that in the course of studying national and Turkic history, it is necessary first of all to overcome the influence of Eurocentrism and the Great Russian idea which deliberately belittled Turkic history and culture. It was necessary for these theories in the first place from the following standpoints: to justify their colonial rule; to justify their backwardness; to justify their defeats; to rationalize the expansion of metropolitan lands to “save civilization” from the invaders – nomads.

Once, a well-known Kazakh historian M. Kozybaev in an interview to newspaper “Capital city review” dated April 3, 1998 replied to the question “How do you generally assess the state of the historical science in Kazakhstan? And who was the founder of the historical fashion?” as follows: “In the former Soviet space we are the only country that is trying so hard to restore the historical truth”. According to him, the truth was not in fashion those days. Moreover, our history was written not by us – colonial people – but often by the people concerned. The patriarch, our Herodotus – Levshin, he, too, was serving the Tsarist empire, being an officer of the colonial system. The outstanding Russian orientologists were studying the areas for future expansions.

Semenov-Tyan-Shanskiy headed the Russian Geographical Society, and chairman of the society was the Tsar. We are recalling that heads of the military department, military intelligence, and ... the Russian Geographical Society had direct access to the Tsar. That is, the Russian Geographical Society served the interests of the empire. No one is accusing them today. They had a holy mission.

From the Baltic Sea to the Arctic Ocean, from sea to sea, from the Urals to the Sea of Okhotsk, they went through that huge area during 55 years. They covered a large part of our great planet. And, of course, having the task to create a superempire, the state took care not only of geographers but also of historians. The Russian historical science was employed to serve. Paying the tribute to the great Russian orientalists, who have done a lot to create our history, we still have to honestly admit: our history was subordinate to the history of Russia. It was its integral part. Part of the empire's history. We were like – as written about it quite frankly in the beginning of the century – the aboriginals. Like Negros in Africa... In these circumstances, the story was made fit with the overall concept of the empire. At the same time, there were three state's pillars: autocracy, orthodoxy, and a single indivisible Russia. And all of our spiritual principles were subject to those three postulates (Kozybayv 2006).

During the period of integration of the Turkic nations into the Russian Empire, different versions of history were created. Along with truly scientific works, reconstructing the true history of development of nomadic societies and the nature of their interaction with the settled agricultural regions, the mythologized history of the Turkic peoples was created, including the medieval Khazars. In this mythological history, according to an American scientist A.M. Khazanov, "The role of nomads in the global historical process is often underestimated and sometimes treated in a biased and negative way. Olzhas Suleimenov, in his famous book 'Az and I' noted that the nomads were beaten with quills. Now not only quills apply, but typewriters and computers. The image of nomads as the destroyers and barbarians, who made no positive contribution to the global civilization, is deeply rooted in the historiography and the mass consciousness in many countries. Moreover, that negative image is sometimes supported even by professional scientists. Nationalist historiographies in some countries of Eastern Europe, the Middle/Near East or China too often tend to explain the relative backwardness of their countries in Modern Age by the consequences of nomadic conquests, despite the fact that these conquests usually occurred many centuries ago. In addition, nomadic conquests cannot be considered only as a setback in the historical development" (Khazanov 2007).

In other words, according to A.M. Khazanov, "the statement that nomads were engaged in destruction, murders and massacres more frequently and with more enthusiasm than conquerors and rulers from settled countries, in fact, remains unproven. I doubt very much that the Assyrians, or the Romans, or the Crusaders were less bloodthirsty than the cruelest nomad conquerors. During the Thirty Years' War in Europe (1618-1648), the population of Germany was reduced from 21 to 13 million largely because the armies of all states involved in that war were supplied via robbing the occupied areas, just as nomads did during their military campaigns" (Khazanov 2007).

The point is in a different plane. Many intellectuals, to explain the economic decline in the countries, needed to find scapegoats. This role is perfectly suitable for Tatar-Mongol strangers. They were relatively far geographically and historically – in the mists of time. Therefore, “it has become common to blame “the Tatar yoke” for any and all the historical failures and faults of the Russian society and its political system. Thus, the myths were created that later became promoted not only by historians, but also writers, poets, artists, even rulers. These myths used to be taught and are still being taught at schools. They have deeply penetrated the public consciousness and show remarkable vitality (Khazanov 2002).

Objective historians, however, cannot but admit that, despite their comparatively small number, the role of nomads, and more – mobile pastoralists in general – in the historical development of most regions of Eurasia, as well as in many regions of Africa was multi-faceted, often contradictory, but very significant in general. According to A.M. Khazanov, until recent times mobile pastoralism was the most rational and efficient form of productive economy in arid zones, as well as in tundra. Actually, the same situation persists today. The economic calculations show that in the deserts, semi-deserts and even in many areas occupied by dry steppes, mobile pastoralism, based on the utilization of natural pastures, requires less investment and gives a greater return than agriculture, including irrigational. Meantime, mobile pastoralism, subject to rational management, does not have a devastating effect on the ecosystems. The scientist highlights several aspects from the point of view that nomad Turkomans brought positive things for other nations. Below we reproduce his shortened point.

The first is the linguistic aspect. The spreading of Iranian, Turkic, Mongolian and many Semitic languages far beyond their original areal is associated with the activity of mobile pastoralists and nomads. The question why nomad languages in many cases turned out to be stronger than languages of settled population and were adopted by the latter deserves special attention. The simplest explanation is the political dominance of nomads. However, such an explanation, in our opinion, is far from completeness. First, we know many cases when the invaders not only failed to intrude their language to subordinate population, but themselves adopted local languages. Nomads in this respect were not an exception. For example, in China, sooner or later they were assimilated linguistically.

Second, there are examples where nomads’ languages were borrowed without conquests. Aramaeans have never conquered Iran, but their language has become an official language of the Persian Empire. According to A.M. Khazanov, in the spreading of nomad languages, their mobile lifestyle was no less advantageous than political domination. In the Middle East and Central Asia, the languages of settled population were often isolated from each other, especially where people were living in the oases.

Third, there is the cultural aspect. The invention and spread of many cultural artifacts was associated with pastoralists and nomads: for example, cheese, yogurt, felt, koumiss or pants. In settled countries, nomad jewelry, fashions, clothes and even hairstyles were often imitated. In Europe, the Russian, Polish and Hungarian nobility was doing so for a good while. In the 7th-8th centuries, Turkic plates-decorated belts spread from China to Iran. In the era of the Tang Dynasty, Chinese clothing was strongly influenced by nomads.

The fourth positive aspect is continental and transcontinental trade, which was a very important manifestation of this process. The merchants from the settled countries could move freely along the great belt of the Eurasian steppes, semi-deserts and deserts only in case of favorable attitude and direct assistance of nomads. Establishment of nomadic states was always stimulating transcontinental circulation of prestigious goods and artifacts, and, besides, was creating favorable conditions for cross-cultural contacts and exchanges, comparisons and borrowings. As a result of nomad conquests and establishment of nomadic empires, the world was becoming more open, distant countries and lands – more accessible, and knowledge about them was increasing. So, thanks to the Mongol Empire, new products, goods, technologies, ideas and ideologies, as well as agricultural achievements were circulating in Eurasia and brought to life many local innovations. In 1220s already, Muslim weavers were resettled into Northern China, where they were sewing luxury clothing for the royal court and passed on their skills to local professionals. In turn, the weavers of Herat were resettled on the land of the Uyghurs. Chinese doctors practiced in Iran, and Central Asian medicines were delivered to China. Chinese artillery as part of Hulagu's troops brought gunpowder to Western Asia and then Europe. And in China, under the influence of Western art traditions, people started making blue and white porcelain. The Mongol Empire was a complex and an ambiguous phenomenon, but one of its consequences was an unprecedented exchange of cultural achievements in Eurasia.

The fifth is the religious aspect. In this respect, the role of nomads was very distinctive. They themselves did not create any global or universal religion. This is for a good reason. Their communities were too homogeneous for that, while internal contradictions in them were not strong enough to lead to an intellectual and social crisis, during which, as a rule, new religions originate. On the other hand, nomads were susceptible to a variety of universalist religions – from Judaism and Manichaeism to Christianity and Buddhism. But, despite a still popular belief, nomads submitted to the religion not through internal but rather external causes. According to A.M. Khazanov, religions served for their hierarchs as guidelines for symbolic adaptation to specific settled communities or, on the contrary, to confrontation with them. Sometimes the policy of religious adaptation to particular settled societies was simultaneous with religious confrontation with others. Although nomads did not create any global and universalist religions, they have much

contributed to their spreading in Eurasia and Africa. Manichaeism and Nestorian Christianity, mercilessly persecuted and abolished in their countries of origin, were able to survive for many centuries only through patronage of nomads (Khazanov 2002).

The sixth is the military aspect, namely the appearance at the beginning of the 1st millennium BC of cavalry and mounted archery. Nomads have also made a major contribution to the emergence and spread of many new weapons and tactics of warfare, such as the saddle with a deep rim and high bows, ram spear attack on a galloping horse and many others.

Surprisingly, until now relatively little attention has been given to another question: why the nomads with their very limited human and material resources and less complex socio-political organization compared to many synchronous settled agricultural and urban societies for over two thousand years were so strong in the military respect?

In reality, the modern world is a complex mosaic of unique cultures. Each of them has its own form, idea and the way of development. A simplified scheme: ancient history – Middle Ages – Modern Age is now subjected to fair criticism. This scheme was trying to fit the varied and contradictory rhythm of cultures, with their unique identities in the Procrustean bed of a single design (Vasilenko 1996).

Therefore, in relation to the concept of the state it should be taken into account that in the history of mankind there has been a variety of forms and types of states. Noting these features in understanding the problems of the state, T.S. Zhumaganbetov says that “the problem of ‘the state’ as the reasons for the genesis and dependencies of development is based on or relates to issues such as the economic basis of society, property, formation and development of new aspects of religious and ideological kind, new legal relationships, ethnogenesis, social and political relations in society, etc. In this respect, state and legal structures of nomads almost directly ‘grow up’ and are determined by the natural geographical and economic conditions, the specifics of nomadic pastoralism functioning” (Zhalmukhamedov 2003).

Another reason for the distorted perception of nomadism and nomad societies is the imperceptible, seemingly logical definition that nomadic herding is just an economic adaptation of people to the natural conditions of the arid zone of the planet. According to the scientist, “material and spiritual culture of people generate not only via adaptation. This phenomenon is, first of all, typical for the animal world. Animals at different levels adapt to the climatic conditions, based on the instinct of preserving the species. When a radical change in the external environment occurs, flora dies or migrates, but they create no culture, being a part of self-generating, balanced nature. The human groups not only adapt to the surrounding environment, but above all, masters this environment, both on material and spiritual level. In this, humans differ fundamentally from the animal world. Ethnographers,

classifying nomadism as an adaptation level of culture innocent of wrong intention, mean by this phenomenon only the ability to inner dynamism, limited development, reflection only" (Zhalmukhamedov 2003). With this conclusion of the scholar we fully agree. Indeed, nomads had specific mode of production and specific way of life, which was very different from the European. First of all, these differences affect the social structure of the nomadic society, which is often significantly different from the settled one. Noting the differences and specifics of nomadism, another famous scholar M. Masao also writes: "The ethnographic and historical study of nomadism, the ancient Turkomans, confirmed the presence of two traditional classes in society, but the specificity is that they, by their economic interests, are not opposed, opportunities for direct function are limited, their relationships are not antagonistic because of the special organization of society on the principles of patronymy, keeping the ideology of tribal relations even if there is, in fact, a neighborhood, community economic ideology" (Masao 1970).

A well-known Kazakh scientist M. Orynbekov in his famous work "Pre-philosophy of proto-Kazakhs", by historical examples related to the inhabitants of Central Asia, in particular Usuns, Kangls and other pro-Turkic tribes, which once organically combined in their method of economic management both nomadism and agriculture, dispels the myth about long-term hostility between pastoralists and farmers. Thus, he proves the omnipresence of semi-nomadic type of economy: having shown the economic profitability of combining economic types which used to be antagonistic. In other words, a complex symbiosis of settled and nomadic cultures flourishing in ancient Turkomans has made possible the coexistence of agriculture and animal husbandry, cheese making and fruit farming, crafts and gardening, construction industry and horticulture. The diverse world of proto-Kazakhs manifested in various forms of professional activity. Highly developed nomadic economy, combined with well-functioning agriculture, supplemented by trade and crafts, has generated enormous processes of mixing, mutual influence and integration of different ethnic groups, which under pressure by the dominant part of the ethnic group having advanced worldview orienteers became Turkomans (Klyahorniy and Savinov 2005).

This combination, arranged in some or other tribes according to their attitudes, clearly demonstrated that the nomads, traditionally regarded as unfit for settled life and agriculture, looking like barbarians in the eyes of farmers, nevertheless were quite suitable for the development of related "specialties" and successfully engaged in irrigated farming, gardening, growing fruit and vegetables. The classic notions of Western, Eurocentric historiography on the impossibility of nomads for smooth and painless transition to a settled way of life and farming proved to be false, as evidenced by economic types of Usuns and especially Kangls. It became clear that within the same ethnic group there was systematic selection, special delegation of particular functions to certain economic groups, which were more fit

for implementation of individual components and elements within this economic division of labor. As part of the same ethnic group, even within the same tribe there were groups engaged primarily in farming or herding, or both in different proportions.

In this sense, the provisions of Eurocentric science treating nomads as barbarians are deprived of reasons; however, they originated since the ancient Chinese, Greeks and Romans. Understanding nomads as civilization destroyers engaged only in conquering settled lands, destruction of agricultural areas, destruction of productive forces, mass killings and captivities, this concept is sharply opposed nomads and settled peoples. This “methodological racism” has created the belief that Asia has always been an enemy of Europe, and in Asia nomads were robbers, expropriators of the resources and values that farmers could produce and accumulate. This meant that the people of the Eurasian steppes have always been strangers, hostile to the people of the settled regions, and because the age-old rivalry between Iranians and Turkomans, Chinese and Mongols has, they say, always been historically conditioned, and this view led to opposing the eastern Xiongnu and the western Huns, when the latter were seen as destroyers of the European civilization led by Attila (Klyashtorniy and Savinov 2005).

Another primitive stereotype is that nomadic peoples do not belong to the civilization; that nomads are prisoners of climatic and vegetational cycle; that they “have lost the touch with the world”. Even A. Toynbee argues that “despite occasional raids on settled civilizations, temporarily getting nomads involved in the field of historical events, the nomad society is a society which has no history” (Toynbee 1991).

According to Klyashtorniy, an important consequence of the creation of the khanate was a sharp change in the cultural status of Turkomans. Coming out of the relative isolation and coming into contact with the civilizations of Central Asia, Iran and Byzantium, Turkomans in a historically short period formed a new type of culture based on the mastery of writing. In the first khanate, the cultural language was Sogdian, one of the Eastern Iranian languages, a kind of Latin of Central Asia, a common language on the Silk Road; in the Sogdian alphabet, in the Sogdian language the only surviving artifact of the First Turkic khanate was written, discovered and identified in 1968 in Northern Mongolia, Bugut area, i.e., Deer creek valley. Later, the Turkomans have adapted the Sogdian alphabet to their language and then, in the 7th-8th centuries, created their own Runic-like alphabet, more than two hundred artifacts of which survived in Mongolia and the Altai, Khakassia and Tuva, East Turkestan and Semirechye. Brilliantly translated and original ancient Turkic literature was created not later than the in late 6th century and along with it, the common Turkic literary language was formed, the development of high achievements of cultures of the Far and Middle East began. It

can be argued that in the end of the 6th century, as a result of a cultural breakthrough, the formation of the ancient Turkic civilization began (Olovintsev 2015).

Against the background of the global history, the history of ancient Turkic people and the state created is reduced to the question: why did Turkomans appear and disappear, leaving their name as the heritage to many peoples who are far from being their descendants? Attempts to solve this issue by analyzing the political history or social relations only have been made repeatedly, but failed. The ancient Turkomans, despite their great importance in the history of mankind, were few in number, and close proximity to China and Iran could not but be reflected in their internal affairs. Consequently, the social and political histories of these countries are closely intertwined, and we must keep an eye on both to restore the course of events. Not a less important role was played by the changes of economic situation, particularly associated with high or low levels of export of Chinese goods and protective measures of the Iranian government.

We can say that the Turkomans set the starting conditions for the development of the global and, first, the European civilization. In this regard, a statement by a famous political scientist Z. Brzezinski may be cited, who, characterizing the activities of Genghis Khan, said as follows: “There is no doubt that as a conqueror Genghis Khan has no peers in the global history. Secret and official diplomacy, intelligence, including economic, organization of courier services on a large scale for military and administrative purposes are his own ideas” (Chaisamba 2008).

A Mongolian researcher Ch. Chaysamba considers one of the major military successes of Genghis Khan the uniting of the fragmented China into a single powerful state. According to him, “historians have come to the three main conclusions. First, the reign of the Yuan Dynasty became the period of China’s great unification, possible only through the conquest of China by the Mongols. Second, the Mongol dominance in the Middle Empire was marked by the expansion of links between China and other country’s nations. Third, the unification of China under the nine-tails banner brought forth the development of economy, culture, trade, crafts and transport” (Nurzhanov 1997).

In short, the Turkomans were not only great conquerors, but also creators of a great culture and civilization, which, being more advanced for the time being, had a significant impact on the development course of the global culture and civilization. In this regard, some of the discoveries made by proto-Turkomans, can be estimated as a scientific and technological revolution of that time. Here we mean: domestication of animals, in particular, domestication of the horse, invention of saddle, stirrups and bits, pants, arms.

It is important to remember that the worldviews of a nomad and an urban resident give different interpretations of the most important notions of the social and political spheres. Contemplating that problem, a well-known Kazakh philosopher B. Nurzhanov wrote: “The formation of the city-state, the political

and legal system is the emergence of a settled system of government. The question of power – political and legal way to control the society becomes the most important question of the human existence. The desire for power, conquest, enslavement is becoming a major impulse of human life. Relationships of power penetrate into all the cells of the new settled body and are fixed at the gene level of the urban social organism. Power becomes the general strategy of the settled political society. It initially splits the society into ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ of power, rulers and servants, masters and slaves; forms a dialectical opposition of master and slave as original, fundamental and natural, leaving without attention the origin of the opposition as such, namely, carefully concealing its origin. Maybe only Nietzsche understood its settled origins and raised the issue of narrowness of the opposition as such” (Amrekulov 2004).

At the same time, he says: “Such attitude is not in a nomadic lifestyle. ‘Power’ function is performed here by traditions and rituals, social organization and procedures are based on them, rather than on relations of authorities; people respect and obey not the ruler as such, but them and the ruler, only as he rules in accordance with the prescribed traditions. A good and wise ruler is not the one who has power but who governs in accordance with the customs established since time immemorial, who observes the rituals and hallows the traditions. The real power belongs not to one ruler, but, along with him, to a special group of people – priests, wise men, commanders. In the Kazakh steppe, these are *biys*, *akyns* and *batyrs* – groups of people difficult to find analogues in the contemporary political societies. The nomadic society was totally hierarchized, and power is also an object of tradition, inheritance. It cannot be an object of democracy based on equality. The applicant must prove his high noble origin and genealogy to be entitled to power. Settled master and slave relationship is not suitable to characterize the power structure of the nomadic society. A nomad has no desire for freedom, because there is no relationship of enslavement. He has no desire to enslave ‘nature’, the desire to make it serve him, as he does not limit the place of his habitation to the city as ‘truly human’, ‘civilized’ and does not seek to extend the city-state power outside the city. Nomadic people do not build their relations with the outside world through technology. That relationship is direct, being a relationship of gifting and receiving gifts, but not conquest and subjugation” (Amrekulov 2004).

Another feature of the power of nomads is that due to the fact that they were hard to control in the vast steppes, the power of the khans never was as strong as was the power of oriental despots in settled agricultural civilizations. With increasing suppression or conflicts with rulers, a clan or a tribe always had the opportunity to migrate, like several tribes led by the founders of the Kazakh Khanate Janybek and Kerei did (Nysynbayev 2005).

The unlimited authority of the government, corporativity, clan ties in the form of patron-customer relations are the characteristic features of all oriental societies.

Such specificity of ethno-political structure is an element of general culture of relations in the Kazakh society. However, it should be admitted that Asian form of the social network in Kazakhs found application mainly in the political sphere. The weakness of political traditions in the Kazakh society is explained by the factor that in this society there was no particular role of the state in the life of the Kazakh society, as it was not the state itself in the Western (even Marxist) understanding. Declassed Kazakh society functioned mainly as a civil society, because the behavior of a person and the society was governed by certain rules of “steppe democracy, although the content and the nature of power relations were determined by classic oriental traditions of government. The Kazakh society can be seen as a social organism, as a system penetrated by vertical and horizontal links”. Vasilenko 1999). Therefore, in the context of these features, in our opinion, the specificity of the Kazakh state should also be considered. Otherwise, it would pave the way for the stereotypes that we have considered above.

### CONCLUSION

In summary, we note that the existence in the territory of Kazakhstan of all these beliefs and spiritual doctrines once again testifies to the fact that our ancestors – nomads, as well as the nations close to them, have passed all the ways and degrees of civilizational development. Meantime, the fact that it was the nomadic culture which served as an impulse to the great transmigrations and migrations of peoples occurring a few times in the history of mankind, gives us the opportunity to call it one of the great civilizations listed in the classifications and tables developed by O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, S. Huntington, and a number of other scientists. In this case, the nomadic culture seems as highly developed, full-value and contributing to the history of mankind, as the above-mentioned Orthodox, Western and other cultures. However, its fundamental difference from some of so-called advanced cultures is that its worldview fundamentals and behavioral principles in the form of specific religious settings, mythology and rituals are indestructibly preserved, successive and still alive, which gives us the courage to classify it as an eternal category, like the human civilization.

### References

- Abayev, N.V., & Ayupov, N.G. (2010). *Tengrianskaya tsivilizatsiya v dukhovno kul'turnom i geopoliticheskom prostranstve Tsentral'noy Azii. Chast' 2* [Tengriist Civilization in Spiritual Cultural and Geopolitical Space of Central Asia. Part 2]. Almaty: Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai.
- Adzhi, M. (2006). *Aziatskaya Evropa* [Asian Europe]. Moscow: AST, AST Moscow.
- Arsal, S. M. (2002). *Tyurkskaya istoriya i pravo* [Turkic History and Law]. In R. Mukhametdinov, (Trans.) Kazan: Fen.
- Amrekulov, N.A. (2004). *Armanzher – mechta chelovechestva* [Armanzher – a Dream of Mankind]. Almaty: Gylym.

- Chaisamba, Ch. (2008). *Zavoevatel'skie pokhody Batu-khana* [Campaigns of Conquest of Batu Khan]. Moscow: Ideya-Press.
- Gumilyov, L.N. (2004). *Drevnie tyurki* [Ancient Turkomans]. Moscow: AST.
- Kara-Murza, S.G. (2002). *Evropotsentrizm: Edipov kompleks intelligentsii* [Eurocentrism: Oedipus Complex of the Intelligence]. Moscow: Algoritm.
- Khazanov, A.M. (Ed.). (2007). *Vklad kochevnikov v razvitie mirovoy tsivilizatsii. Sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii. 21-23 noyabrya 2007 g.* [Contribution of Nomads in the Development of the Global Civilization. Files of International Scientific Conference, November 21-23, 2007]. Almaty: Daik-Press.
- Khazanov, A.M. (2002). *Kochevniki i vneshniy mir* [Nomads and External World] (3rd ed., supplemented). Almaty: Daik-Press, 2002.
- Klyuchevskiy, V. (1908). *Kurs russkoy istorii. Ch. 1: Lektsii 1-20* [Course of Russian History. Part 1: Lectures 1-20] (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Moscow: Tipografiya G. Lissnera and D. Sobko.
- Kozybayev, M.K. (2006). *Problemy metodologii, istoriografii i istochnikovedeniya istorii Kazakhstana* [Problems of Methodology, Historiography and Source Studies of Kazakhstan History]. Almaty: Gylym.
- Klyahorniy, S.G., & Savinov, D.G. (2005). *Stepnye imperii drevney Evrazii* [Steppe Empires of the Ancient Eurasia]. Saint-Petersburg: Philological faculty of SPbSU.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (2001). *Strukturnaya antropologiya* [Structural Anthropology]. In V.V. Ivanov, Trans.). Moscow: Eksmo-press.
- Masao, M. (1970). *Politicheskaya struktura drevnego gosudarstva kochevnikov Mongolii* [Political Structure of the Ancient State of Nomads of Mongolia]. Moscow: Science.
- Nurzhanov, B. (1997). Gorod i step' [City and Steppe]. *Eurasian community*, 3: 183-198.
- Nysynbayev, A.N. (2005). Tsivilizatsionnye traditsii i mentalitet kazakhskogo naroda [Civilization Traditions and Mentality of the Kazakh Nation]. *Kazakh civilization*, 2: 26.
- Olovintsev, A.G. (2015). *Tyurki ili mongoly? Epokha Chingiskhana* [Turkomans or Mongols? Genghis Khan]. Moscow: Alrogitm.
- Toynbee, A.J. (1991). *Postizhenie istorii* [A Study of History]. Moscow: Progress.
- Vasilenko, I.A. (1996). Dialog kul'tur, dialog tsivilizatsiy [Dialogue of Cultures, Dialog of Civilizations]. *Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 66(5).
- Vasilenko, I. A. (1999). *Dialog tsivilizatsiy: sotsiokul'turnye problemy politicheskogo partnerstva* [Dialog of Civilizations: Sociocultural Problems of Political Partnership]. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Zhalmukhamedov, T.S. (2003). *Problemy formirovaniya i razvitiya drevnetyurkskoy sistemy gosudarstvennosti i prava. VI-XII vv.* [Problems of Formation and Development of Ancient Turkic System of State and Law. 6th-12th Centuries]. Almaty: Zheti zhargy.