



THEORETICAL CONCEPTUAL VIEWS ON THE EMERGENCE OF THE NATION IN WORLD HISTORIOGRAPHY

Journal Website:
<https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjh>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Submission Date: October 01, 2022, **Accepted Date:** October 05, 2022,

Published Date: October 10, 2022

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/history-crjh-03-10-01>

Alisher Kh. Doniyorov

Professor Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

Valisher E. Abirov

Professor Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article discusses and analyzes theoretical approaches to the emergence of people in the world. Theoretical and methodological approaches to the problem of ethnos and ethnicity, ethnogenesis and ethnic history based on the approaches of primordialism, constructivism and instrumentalism are considered. The main purpose of the analysis of these approaches is to identify the current fate of the Uzbek people and the views associated with its formation, and which path is optimal for its further development. The essence of the theory of “ethnos” is explained and its consequences are considered. A critical opinion is given about the leading position of Soviet protectionism (the state of protecting one’s views) in ethnological studies of Uzbekistan. A new theoretical and methodological approach to local history is needed, related to the origin of the people, the peoples of the region, at the same time, it is important to solve this problem in the history of Uzbekistan.

KEYWORDS

Primordialism, constructivism, instrumentalism, theory of ethnos, ethnicity, scientific view, concept, methodology, historiography, ethnology.

INTRODUCTION

Along with the development of science in the world, interest in the study of the origin of mankind, its laws,

causes and effects also increased. Along with the growth of this interest, there was a process of



formation of views, approaches and theories on the formation of mankind, various research centers. Different systems of government and the contradictions between them in different countries of the world have influenced the approach to the formation of mankind.

METHODS

This article is written based on such methods as historical-genetic, retrospective, problem-chronological, diachronic, historical comparison, historical systematicity. Researches related to the problem are covered and systematically analyzed based on the principles of objectivity, historicity, consistency, and authenticity. Approaches put forward by foreign researchers to the issue of the emergence of peoples in world historiography, tasks such as determining scientific views and opinions, paying attention to their impartiality, and determining the authors' approach to the problem have been studied in terms of historiography.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Currently, there are the following main theoretical and methodological approaches to the formation of nations:

1. Primordialism (Latin “primordial” – “primitive”, “initial”) or essentialism. This direction is one of the widespread theories in ethnology, its supporters claim that ethnos or ethnicity is a specific phenomenon that has an objective basis in nature or society. [1:134]. That is, almost all the ideas of primordialists point to the fact that the people developed by themselves, without external influences and constructions.

The term “primordialism” was introduced in 1957 by the American sociologist E. Shils. Within the framework of primordialism, the ethnic issue is defined as the original property of human society and culture [2].

There are two main approaches to primordialism. According to the sociobiological approach of Pierre Van den Berge, the ethnic group is recognized as a form of extended kinship, while the evolutionary-historical approach of Clifford Geertz emphasizes cultural characteristics. The theoretical and methodological views of this direction have not gained such great popularity in Europe and the USA, but only in the Soviet era it became the main methodological tool of ethnology due to the attention paid to it and the ease of adaptation to the Marxist approach.

Among the major representatives of this trend are Western scientists: K. Girtz (C. Geertz), E. Wolf (E. Wolf), R. Gambino (R. Gambino), U. Connor (W. Connor), A. Greely (A. Greely), T. Parsons (T. Parsons), P. van den Berg (Pierre L. van den Berghe), A. Wallace (A. Wallace), paleontologist Dj. Simpson (G. Simpson), sociologist Dj. Yinger (J. Yinger); from Russian ethnographers and historians: S. Shirokogorov, L. Gumilyov, Yu. Bromley; from local scientists: K. Shaniyozov, A. Askarov, U. Abdullaev, I. Jabbarov can be included.

2. Supporters of the theory of constructivism (from the Latin “constructo” – “construction”, “structure”) completely reject the concept of “ethnos”, its historical principles, self-evolutionary formation, ideas about the natural course of this process. The main ideas of the supporters of this approach are built around revealing that the influence of external influences, certain signs, laws, and customs norms is of primary importance in the formation of each nation or nation.

There are enough supporters of this direction in the world, including Western scientists: B. Anderson (Benedict Anderson), E. Gellner (Ernest Gellner), F. Barth (Fredrik Barth), E. Hobsbawm (Eric John Ernest Hobsbawm); from Soviet and Russian scientists: V. Tishkov, V. Voronkov, V. Malakhov, S. Kardinskaya, E.



Belkova, Yu. Oleynikova, S. Madyukova, K. Reznikova; from local researchers A. Ilhamov, V. Khan, I. Khojakhonov, M. Askarov, Yo. Artykov and others can be listed.

Representatives of the constructivist approach F. Barth, E. Gellner, E. Hobsbawm, W. Tishkov et al define ethnicity as the broadest category of social identity. They arise from the fact that the ethnic feeling and the concepts and doctrines formed in its content are “mental constructions” deliberately created by writers, scientists, politicians or social institutions. Although there are few researchers who have directly studied the issue based on the constructivist approach in the ethnology of Uzbekistan, it can be seen that the number of researchers who use these theoretical views in their scientific work is increasing. This indicates that local researchers began to study the scientific theories developed in Europe and the United States more and more deeply, understanding the essence of the issue, the “ethnos theory” has become obsolete both in terms of meaning and methodology, and they have begun to realize that more constructivist views are suitable for understanding modern phenomena.

3. Instrumentalism (Latin “instrumentum” – “tool”, “weapon”) is an approach of the American philosopher John Dewey (John Dewey) (1859-1952), according to which images, concepts and theories are tools, weapons for achieving practical results and adapting to the environment. is interpreted as. Proponents of this approach are united around the view that the policies carried out by the government, public administration bodies or leading individuals served as the main tool in the formation of various peoples or nations.

Representatives of the direction of instrumentalism A. Cohen (Abner Cohen), N. Glazer (Nathan Glazer), A. Peterson-Royce (Anya Peterson Royce), D. Moynihan

(Daniel Patrick Moynihan), Dj. Nagel (Joane Nagel), D. Horowitz (Donald L. Horowitz), S. Olzak (Susan Olzak), A foreigner like Dj. De Vos (George De Vos), M. Guboglo, L. Drobijeva, Z. Sikevych, V. Yadov and other Russian researchers can be included.

Proponents of the instrumentalist approach came from the fact that differences between groups of people in society can serve as a basis for the formation of the ethnic identity of each group, which, in turn, determines the nature of intergroup relations and mobilizes ethnic groups. Therefore, instrumentalist concepts are often based on socio-psychological views that interpret ethnicity as an effective tool for overcoming alienation and restoring ethnic equality, as a tool for stabilizing the social situation.

The three main scientific theories mentioned above still hold their place in the field of ethnology and anthropology today. Only in connection with the development of modern Western studies, new trends such as “neoconservatism”, “postmodernism”, “ethnosymbolism” were formed, which tried to eliminate certain shortcomings of the previous scientific theoretical views by examining their viability and ability to adapt to the times.

In ethnology and anthropology, one of the issues that have been discussed for many years is the term “ethnos” and its meaning. The term “ethnos” and its essence, boundaries, fixed and variable parts do not have a unanimous definition and size. The adjective “ethnic” was used in the English language in the 15th century to describe the characteristics of non-Christian or non-Jewish groups. At that time, the term ethnicity was equivalent to words such as “heathen” or “pagan”.

In the 19th century, the adjective ethnic came to be used more and more in its modern sense as “pertaining to or having common racial, cultural, religious, or



linguistic characteristics, and in particular denoting a racial or other group within a larger system”. [3]. The most commonly used definitions in science are as follows:

1. This word is derived from the Greek “ethnos” and its corresponding adjective “ethnikos”[4];
2. In encyclopedias and specialist studies, “ethnos” is defined as a group of people with a common language, common economic and cultural practices, and a common origin.
3. Louis Laurent Gabriel de Mortillet (Louis Laurent Gabriel de Mortillet) (1821-1898), a physical anthropologist and a follower of the French paleoethnological tradition, was one of the first to show the influence of the landscape on the nature of ethnic relations. In his comments, the word “etnie” similar to the term “ethnos” can be found.
4. Ethnographer D. Arzyutov writes that the French origin of the concept of “ethnos” and its transfer to Russian soil is not the only bridge in the field of anthropology in countries.

Thus, discussions on ethnos and its definitions and necessity have not yet come to an end. Scientists' approaches to this issue are changing over time. While some consider ethnos and ethnicity to be an important tool for self-awareness, others consider it a dangerous tool that can lead to “ethnocentrism” and later to “nationalism,” i.e., nationalism.

At the beginning of the 20th century, several representatives of the “theory of ethnos” gathered around the Russian anthropological society, which were united by several common aspects:

- First of all, most of the scientists who developed the theory of ethnos gave a high place to the natural sciences and evaluated the

laws of biosocial nature from a positivist point of view.;

- the first researchers of ethnos were familiar with physical anthropology;
- Based in a certain sense on the theory of geography and geographic determinism;
- taking the example of German and French anthropology, brought some of their views into Russian science;
- in particular, the presence of influence from French anthropology, which interprets society in the form of the concept of natural-historical development and ethnography within it, etc.

That is, it can be seen from the above information that the spread of the “ethnos theory” in Russia and then in the whole Soviet Union was greatly influenced by the French school of anthropology and its approaches. In this process, physical anthropologist, ethnographer and archaeologist F.K. Volkov’s services are great.

N. Mogilyanskyi (1871-1933) and S. Shirokogorov (1887-1939) was inspired by the researches of F. Volkov. S. Shirokogorov studied in Paris and was influenced by the French school of anthropology. He worked in Russia for some time, then moved to China, where he worked in various educational institutions until the end of his life. But S. Shirokogorov differed from F. Volkov and N. Mogilyanskyi in his views. That is, he considered ethnography to be a humanitarian science that studies the material, social and spiritual culture of ethnic groups. But, like many other representatives of the theory of ethnos, he did not deny the biological aspects of ethnos. S. Shirokogorov's concept is distinguished by the fact that he tried to determine certain psychological characteristics of the people, based on the data of language and physical anthropology. In most of his books, in particular, such as “Psihometalnyy kompleks tungusov”, “Sotsialnaya organizatsiya severnyx tungusov”, “Sotsialnaya



organizatsiya Manchurov”, the main focus of his research was, as he intended, either clan, group or ethnos in general. S. Shirokogorov developed a "psycho-mental complex" aimed at describing the ethnos as a separate group. The views of the “transition from the individual to the social group” that he introduced to science are the most important aspects of his concept. Russian ethnographer and anthropologist S. Shirokogorov assesses the similarity of his views with the views of the French ethnographer Marcel Mauss (1872-1950) and his French education.

Today, the “ethnos theory”, which has remained unchanged for years in Uzbekistan, was actually formed on the basis of the biological views of archaeologists and physical anthropologists. In fact, even in the Soviet Union at one time (20-30s of the 20th century), it was severely criticized and expelled from the field of science. Its manifestations were accused of biologicalism and racism. After the Second World War, the topic of the theory of ethnos was raised again, but this time within the framework of I.V.Stalin’s views on the nation. Therefore, this theory regained its position in ethnography and rose to the center of scientific views. In particular, in his views, P. Kushner provides information about how correct Stalin’s ideas about the nation and national culture are, and that the nation is one of the last types of human society, one of the most developed manifestations of the ethnic community. With the power of propaganda and ideology, various meetings and discussions were held at the Institute of Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in order to methodologically reexamine Stalin’s views on nation and language in a new spirit and to increase attention to the problems of ethnogenesis. As a result, the “ethnos theory” was closely connected with Stalin's views on the nation and its language with the help of mature scientists of the science, and this connection remains to this day. The language, like other signs of ethnicity, first passed through the stages

of becoming the language of the clan, then the tribe, the people, and finally the nation, and according to the laws of Marxist sociology, it became a chain connecting ethnic communities to the stages of development of society. S. Tokareva and N. Cheboksarov tried to reveal this aspect in their work. In such a situation, with the power of ideology, Stalin’s views on the nation became a long-term theoretical basis of ethnology and went down in history under the name “Soviet ethnos theory”.

In the 50s and 60s of the 20th century, as a result of the beginning of research on the types of ethnic communities by ethnographers, there were cases of comparing society to a living organism. This situation brought the theory of ethnos closer to the natural sciences. In 1966 Yu. Bromley’s appointment as head of the Institute of Ethnography increased the emphasis on the biological aspects of ethnos. Yu. Bromley further developed his views and proposed a “dualistic theory” of ethnos [5]. According to him, ethnos embodies, on the one hand, ethnic language, culture, ritual, ethnonym, and ethnic identity, consisting of specific ethnic characteristics. On the other hand, the formation and existence of ethnic elements is considered to be related to natural-geographical, territorial, economic, social and other characteristics. According to this division, any ethnos has a “dual” (dualistic) nature and is manifested in two senses - narrow and broad. In a narrow sense, the author of the theory called ethnos “ethnikos” and in a broad sense “ethnosocial organism”. If we take the narrow and broad meanings of the concept of “ethnos” as an example of the Uzbek people, according to this theory, Uzbeks living all over the globe are ethnicos, while Uzbeks living in Uzbekistan are an ethno-social organism [6:25].

The “theory of ethnos”, which took the lead in the science of Soviet ethnography and was inculcated in all



union states by the movement of scientists, was revised only at the end of the 80s of the 20th century, and began to be criticized both methodologically and politically. As a negative consequence of the “ethnos theory”, the various ethnic conflicts that took place during the years of reconstruction were taken as a basis. Because the division of the peoples living in the union states into primary (titulnyy) and non-primary (netitulnyy) parts, the formation of a separate national state for the primary (titulnyy) peoples, as a result of this, the increase of ethnic and border problems between the peoples who have lived together for years, and nationalism is aimed at nationalism caused the development of moods. Even the “ethnos theory” was formed and turned into the main approach in the state’s views on the study of the people. This theory was called “dangerous” by the new generation of Russian scientists and was proposed to be excluded from the public and academic circles [7].

Summarizing the above points, it can be said that today the “ethnos theory” and its supporters still exist in the Russian Federation and outside it. In particular, traces of this theory can be found in the ethnology of Uzbekistan. Because archaeologists and ethnologists, who were educated and conducted research on the basis of this ethnological theory, continue their activities. Even after 30 years of independence, almost no changes were observed in their views on the issue. In ethnological research, Soviet protectionism, that is, the state of protecting one’s views, is still the leader, and as much as possible, new scientific theories developed in the West and supported by most of the world’s scientists are denied. A few researchers who want to bring new theories of social and cultural anthropology into the field of ethnology are accused of denying the ancient history of the Uzbek people, of Westernization, and of supporting unscientific views.

Nevertheless, on the basis of the existing theory, the topical, little-studied or controversial aspects of the problem of the thematic complex “ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people” are the periodization of ethnic history, the completion time of the formation of the nation, the uniqueness of the formation of the Uzbek people, the Uzbek language, as well as “Uzbek” the ethnic formation process and issues of the people have not yet been resolved [10].

CONCLUSION

In the conditions of modern Uzbekistan, it is very important to introduce well-developed theoretical and methodological approaches to local science. Because it is only in the conditions of competition, conflicting opinions and scientific discussion that the national mentality, the Uzbek spirit and the ancient cultural heritage can be embodied, and at the same time, they can solve the modern problems of the people that have arisen today. It becomes possible to form an approach that encourages the generation to think and draw new conclusions. Otherwise, Uzbek ethnology will be forced to remain for many years only as a science that describes the past life, antiquates its history, calls for abandoning the legacy of the Soviet era, but in practice did not abandon the Soviet “ethnos theory”.

REFERENCES

1. Ashirov A. Etnologiya. O’quv qo’llanma. Ikkinchi nashr. – Toshkent: YANGI NASHR, 2014.
2. Shils E. Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties: Some Particular Observations on the Relationships of Sociological Research and Theory // The British Journal of Sociology. – London: 1957. Vol. 8. №2. – Pp. 130–145.
3. The Oxford English Dictionary, second ed., 1989. Earlier Version First Published in New



- English Dictionary, 1891 ed., Online Version March 2012.
4. Mathias, Bös. Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups: Historical Aspects. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. – 2015. – Pp. 136-141.
5. Bromley Yu. V. To the question of the essence of the ethnos // "Nature". 1970. No. 2. – P. 51–55; Ethnos and ethnography. – M.: Nauka, 1973. – 285 p.; Osha muallif. Essays on the theory of ethnos. – M.: Nauka, 1983. – 412 p.; Essays on the theory of ethnos / Aftermath. N. Ya. Bromley. - 2nd, additional .. - M.: LKI Publishing House, 2008. - 440 p.
6. Askarov A. A. The history of the origin of the Uzbek people. - Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2015.
7. Tishkov V. A. From ethnos to ethnicity and after // Ethnographic Review, 2016. - No. 5. - p. 5–22.
8. Doniyorov, A. K. Scientific-Historical Knowledge is the Basis of Ethnographic Methodology. Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, Nov 26, 2021, 30498-30506.
9. Abirov, V. E. Analysis of Research on the History of the Origin of the Uzbek People in the “New Uzbekistan” Stage // International Journal of multidisciplinary research and analysis. Volume 05, Issue 04. – California: 2022. – Pp. 799 – 802.
10. Doniyorov, A. K. (2020). Problems of Ethnogenesis and Ethnic History of Uzbek People at the Current Stage. PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17(6), 8968-8974.
11. Khudoyberdiyevich, D. A. (2018). On general methodological, ethnopolitical and ethnocultural aspects of “Diaspora issues”(To the theoretical formulation of the problem and the ways of its practical solution). ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 8(11), 68-74.