International Journal for Social Studies
Available at https://journals.eduindex.org/index.php/ijss

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

The Issue of Military Democracy in the Nomadic Society

Toshboev F.E, Doctor of Philosophy in History (PhD),

Mirzaev B.N, Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,

Independent researcher of the Institute of History of the

Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan ,

Uzbekistan
mirzayev.bek91@mail.ru
(+99890)643-29-64

Abstract

The authors of this article, based on written and archaeological material, analyzed the nomadic structure and origin management procedures of the nomads and concluded that statehood was formed by military democracy

Keywords: Nomads, Idanfirs, Athea, Confederation, Massagets, Saks, Stones, Huns Kang Confederation, Turkic kaganate, the Jabgu tribal unions

The issue of the political system of nomadic herders is also related to their social and economic structure. Livestock breeders have established many political structures in history, which are hard to quantify (according to their time and occupation). Their economic and political structure has remained virtually unchanged throughout their history. Accordingly, a number of scholars argue that the countries that have established livestock breeders exist as tribal alliances that are of temporary importance.

Herodotus, an ancient historian, tells of the Scythians' own king, Plutarch's Scythian kings, Idanfirs, Athaeans, and Strabon, who were nomadic Scythians, and claimed that they were ordinary people. In the political life of Central Asian herdsmen, there is a constant presence of each ruler over the nomadic tribes, these kings command military forces during the war, send ambassadors to other tribal leaders for peace or union, and the succession of the Khaganate throne. V.M. Masonic, concerning Aussies

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

before the Masonic political map, analyzed the region of nomadic lands, the fact that the herdsmen were divided into different confederations and different nomadic tribes. In the middle of the sixth century BC, the Massagets highlighted the role played by the indigenous tribes. B.A Litvinsky, who has done special research on ancient Saks, notes that many Sak tribes lived in a society where there were classical signs of the Pamir and Yaksartic tribes. These facts concerning the social life of the massaget, sak and usun tribes reinforce the idea that they were statehood in the form of tribal alliance. New data related to the permanent lifestyle of Sak and Usuns show that, along with the development of their household, social relationships had also developed. According to reports, the Huns society was made up of 24 kindred associations, each with an individual head of each kinship. The heads of each kindred met and hold a congress three times a year. At this meeting important state affairs were resolved. The Supreme Ruler was also elected at this congress. Hence, the Hun kings came to power through elections. In such a system, tribal alliances formed subordinate tribes and alliances, and the leading tribe was characteristic.

Academician K. Shaniyozov argues that there was the commander to lead the Sak tribes union in the Tashkent area before the Greek invasion, which in turn addressed economic and political issues at a council meeting of elders and heads of tribes.

The history of the first Khan Dynasty (202-225 BC) reminds us that the Kangyu king ruled over the country in consultation with his elders. The Council played an important role in the State of Kang, where tribal leaders, military commanders took an active part, and their opinion was decisive. There is a Council under the royal palace, which holds many countries under its jurisdiction, and its domestic and foreign policy and other important matters in the affairs of the state have been dealt with in that Council meeting. More precisely, the royal authority was limited to the advisory council. There were two systems under the rule of the Turkic khagan (emperor). Representatives of the ruling family, who were in charge of some of the provinces and regions, and local dynasties in some of the subordinated states and provinces, kept

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

paying tribute to khagan. Khagan cooperates with the advisory meeting. This form of government has historically been called the state system based on the principles of military democracy. During the reign of Khagan, his lands were formed by several provinces, which were governed by Jabgus. Traditionally, Jabgus were assigned from those close to the Khagan. The administration of the provinces remained under the jurisdiction of the local governing branches, who regularly paid taxes to the central government under the control of the tudans appointed by the King(Khagan).

Ancient Turkic myths say that the center of statehood, the uniting power in the hands, was considered khagan. The dominant dynasty of kaganate was governed by three powers, the power and will of the land and water, and the creative activity of the Turkish people. In the nomads, the military ruler was the khan himself and was elected to the Elders' Council when there were no tribal alliances. The elected man accepted the royal title at the recommendation of the shaman. In addition to the ruling title, it is also named for a new state or union. Thus, there were common democratic laws governing the statehood. However, over time, the military regime in the steppe (or, more precisely, after the Greek invasion) did not meet the requirements of the time. He was unable to fully protect the tribes. The social and political processes at that time also have a profound impact on the Kangars community. As a result, nomadic and semi-nomadic Sak tribes residing in the middle streams of the Syrdarya were united with the Selevkids' dynasty. In the III century BC the Kang Confederate state was established. This state united the local peoples of the Syrdarya River and several countries. Research on the livestock breeders community suggests that the nomads had two social strata. These are the wealthy nobles who had large numbers of livestock and the poor community shepherds who serve them. It should be noted that the main source of living in the farmers community was land, while in the town there was handicraft, cattle were for nomadic population source of living. In ancient nomads, livestock was private and the pastures were owned by kindreds and tribes, and all members of the tribe had equal access to it.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

There is a discrepancy in the burial customs of the nomadic burial mounds and in the burial of the dead. This is no different from the general picture of the social structure of the settlers living in other areas. The nomadic peoples' homes also differed considerably: the riches of the wealthy people were covered with new felt, decorated with various rugs and beds, and the poor were old and deserted. The fact that the herd is a private property is an important means of social relations in the nomadic society. The presence or absence of livestock determines the position of the community members.

The burial ground of the first burial site of Gulbo 6 in the Ustrushona region was not burnt and there were no burials. Accordingly, he was a dependent person. The second deck was buried with burials rich in the main grave, and the deceased was either a great commander or chief of the tribe. In Central Asia burials, which have been studied so far, it is observed there is a great deal of funeral customs to bury with their kind of guards. A.N. Bernstam concludes that two skulls of Europoid races were buried at the entrance of the fort at the burial grounds of Kenkul , were slaves of the military nobles, the europoids were forced to obey by Huns dynasty, and the bodies of two mongoloid races buried inside the corridor were military commanders[1]. A.N. Bernstam in 1938-39 studied the Berkarra cemetery near Lake Baikulul, citing the fact that there were only one corpse in all of the graves which were with different size and he concluded that there were signs of property stratification, in one case there were signs of killing by force which means he was a slave. The above examples show that there were social strata within the nomadic social system.

Based on available sources we can say, in the nomadic community from the second century BC to the eighth century AD, there were social strata developed in the form of military democracy, while medieval nomadic society was considered as a political entity with a statehood form. From the above considerations, the emergence of early class relations and statehood as a whole has been gradual. The herdsmen were divided into tribes and kindreds, and their management was at the disposal of the elders (leaders),

[1] Bernstam.A.N.Kengolskiy mogilnik. Archeological encyclopedia expeditions of state Ermitaj.Edition. II. L., 1940. C. 29.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

and they chose a leader. Among the seed leaders were the tithes and the hundred stewards. Tribe management was often in the hands of one bigger kindred (not a family F.T), and it was inherited. In turn, livestock is the basis of patriarchal relations. It is known that the emergence of a state in cattle breeding tribes is often linked to the emergence of a wise, brave, successful leader in the tribe and then the leader who conquered other nations. The leaders of the same tribe, who subjugated several tribes under the leadership of a single captain, also united the other tribes in various ways. Adverse natural conditions, such as loss of livestock as a result of various infectious diseases, have caused other tribes to voluntarily join such unions. This uniting was often in the form of military alliances, and its collapse led to an increase in mutual disputes, tribal aspirations for independence.

In the Chinese source Shiji (Historical Memories), the earliest information on Kangkia-Kang is very short, with the country being located in the northwestern part of the Great Parkona (Dewanan-Davan), its economic basis is that of the livestock and the traditions of Ruzie (Yuechji). It has 80-90,000 archers and fighters, it is bordered by the Hun Empire in the north-east, Great Parkona in the east, Da-yuejji in the south, and to some extent by the Huns. Later at the beginning of the II century BC the Kang state subordinated the Syrdarya river, northwest Fergana, Ustrushana, Sogd and Khorezm. The main center of this state was in the middle stream of the Syrdarya river. In the northeast, it was bordered by the Usun and Yuejji tribes. While the Turkish empire was independent under the rule of Ustrushana during the period, the Arab invasion was a blow to these regimes and subsequently lost its status as an independent property.

Thus, the political system in the form of military democracy, which emerged in the middle of the first millennium BC, existed until the Middle Ages. The tribal elders, tudu, tarkan and hagans who ruled the society according to ancient traditions knew exactly the numbers and pastures of their people. This way of life and management arrangements in the nomadic society have remained virtually unchanged for millennia.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

As Zahiriddin Babur wrote about this , "There were tied kinship with Mongolian program…Among Mongolians as Chingizkhan made"

The nomadic society dates back to the Middle Ages and consisted of, especially in the reign of the Sheybanids periods, the khan or sultan, government officials, deputies, biy, white bones - noble families, runners, chokars, black-bodied cattle-shepherds and shepherds, the socio-political composition of farm workers, servants of nobles and slaves. There were also individual traders, representatives of spirituality, and social groups such as Mullah(religious educator) and Bakhshi(musical storyteller). It should be noted that in the area, which included present-day Kazakhstan, western Siberia and much of south-western Khorezm, ancient settlers have been known to live nomadic lives. Peasants lived here, including the present-day rivers of Kazakhstan, Syrdarya, and engaged in farming, handicraft and trade. However, livestock was the main occupation of the Dashti Kipchak population. Heads of nomadic Uzbeks were also khan. However, tribal leaders, priests, nobles, and sultans played an important role in managing the state. The Khan, of course, consulted with them if he wanted to hold an event of national importance. In the states of Uzbek khans, the highest state positions were mainly in the hands of elders of two tribes (Uighurs and Kushchi tribes). In the military affairs of nomadic Uzbeks, the military regime and principles prevailed during the Chenghis Khan era. For example, the right wing of the Uzbek army consisted of volunteers from the Dorman, Tubai, Chimbay and Uighur tribes, and the left wing was composed of Burkuts, Qiyots, Qongirots, Naymans, Qushchi, Mangits, Ushuns, and Ijan so-called tribes. Volunteers from other tribes (tangut, utaji, ukaresh-nayman, jat, khatai, karluk, kenagas, ichki, tuman, ming) were at the center of the army. It is noteworthy that some of the Uzbek Sultans tried to form their troops from the same language speakers. For example, in the winter of 1509, when the Sheikhan-khan attacked the Kazakh khan Suyunchkhujahan, 10,000 out of 13,000 Tashkent's governor were only Uzbek cavalry.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 05 Issue 11
November 2019

Until the second half of the 15th century, Kazakhs formed the same ethnic group as the Uzbeks[2]

Thus, nomads were distinctive governing arrangements, and these social and political relations had become more accomplished in later periods and have played an important role in the traditions of statehood. This form of government has historically been called the state system based on the principles of military democracy. These traditions of rule have united the dispersed nations, bringing together large territories into one single capacity. The benefits have been shared. These processes, which took place during the Kang confederation, laid the foundation for further independent state-building.

References:

1. Bernstam.A.N.Kengolskiy mogilnik. Archeological encyclopedia expeditions of state Ermitaj.Edition. II. L., 1940. C. 29.
2. N.Elmurodov. Uzbek folk ethnic groups of Zarafshon area. Academic-methodic manual.Samarkand:SSFLI publication, 2008. – B. 14-15.
3. www.ensyclopedia.uz
4. www.ziyonet.uz

[2] N.Elmurodov. Uzbek folk ethnic groups of Zarafshon area. Academic-methodic manual.Samarkand:SSFLI publication, 2008. – B. 14-15.