

РӘСӘЙ ФӘННИ ОЙОШМАЛАР ФЕДЕРАЛЬ АГЕНТЛЫҒЫ
БАШКОРТОСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАҢЫ ХӨКҮМӘТЕ
РӘСӘЙ ФӘНДӘР АКАДЕМИЯҢЫ
РФА ТАРИХ-ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ФӘНДӘРЕ БҮЛЕГЕ
РӘСӘЙ ТАРИХ ЙӘМҒИӨТЕ
РФА ӨФӨ ҒИЛМИ ҮЗӘГЕ
БАШКОРТОСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАҢЫ ФӘНДӘР АКАДЕМИЯҢЫ
РФА ӨҒҮ ТАРИХ, ТЕЛ ҺӘМ ӨЗӘБИӘТ ИНСТИТУТЫ

РӘСӘЙ ТӨБӘКТӘРЕНДӘ ГУМАНИТАР ФӘНДӘР ҮСЕШЕ

РФА Өфө ғилми үзәге Тарих, тел һәм әзәбиәт институты
федераль дәүләт бюджет ғилми учреждениеһының
85 йыллығына арналған халык-ара фәнни конференция материалдары
(Өфө к., 1–4 июнь 2017 йыл)

ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ АГЕНТСТВО НАУЧНЫХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЙ РОССИИ
ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВО РЕСПУБЛИКИ БАШКОРТОСТАН
РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК
ОТДЕЛЕНИЕ ИСТОРИКО-ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ НАУК РАН
РОССИЙСКОЕ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО
УФИМСКИЙ НАУЧНЫЙ ЦЕНТР РАН
АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК РЕСПУБЛИКИ БАШКОРТОСТАН
ИНСТИТУТ ИСТОРИИ, ЯЗЫКА И ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ УНЦ РАН

РАЗВИТИЕ ГУМАНИТАРНОЙ НАУКИ В РЕГИОНАХ РОССИИ

Материалы Международной научной конференции, посвященной 85-летию
Федерального государственного бюджетного учреждения науки
Института истории, языка и литературы Уфимского научного центра РАН
(г. Уфа, 1–4 июня 2017 г.)

УДК 009:001(470.57)(063)

ББК 72.4(2)

Р 17 Развитие гуманитарной науки в регионах России: Материалы Международной научной конференции, посвященной 85-летию Федерального государственного бюджетного учреждения науки Институт истории, языка и литературы Уфимского научного центра РАН. Уфа: ИИЯЛ УНЦ РАН, 2017. 386 с.: ил.

ISBN 978-5-91608-157-2

В данном сборнике публикуются тексты докладов и выступлений участников Международной научной конференции, посвященной юбилею Института истории, языка и литературы УНЦ РАН. В них нашли отражение актуальные проблемы развития гуманитарных наук в Российской Федерации и ее регионах, а также в сопредельных странах.

Редакционная коллегия:

А.В. Псянчин (гл. редактор), М.Н. Фархшатов (отв. редактор),
Ф.Г. Хисамитдинова, Г.Х. Абдрафикова, Б.А. Азнабаев, Н.В. Ахмадиева,
М.М. Маннапов, Э.В. Мигранова, Ф.А. Надршина, В.В. Овсянников,
А.Г. Салихов, Р.Н. Сулейманова, Н.А. Хуббитдинова, Г.Р. Хусаинова,
Г.Н. Ягафарова

Рецензенты:

к. и. н. Р.Р. Газизов, д. филол. н. Г.С. Кунафин

Составители:

И.И. Буляков (отв. составитель), Г.Б. Азаматова, А.Я. Ильясова,
Л.Ф. Тагирова, К.А. Мухамедьярова

ISBN 978-5-91608-157-2

© ИИЯЛ УНЦ РАН, 2017

При общей приверженности советскому строю лишь отдельные рабочие абстрагировались от чуждых им культурных инициатив, навязываемых различными трибунами революции на митингах, шествиях, политзанятиях и т. д. Материальное удовлетворение чаяний рабочих было отправной точкой перехода пролетариев от критики большевиков к сознательно-добровольной поддержке диктатуры пролетариата. На не пустой желудок рабочие легче поддавались воздействию и быстрее проникались осознанием своей исторической миссии и «классово»-доминирующего положения в советском обществе. Кроме фактора хлеба насущного для революционного пролетариата у рабочих не наблюдалось массового осознания ими первостепенных для них социально-политических приоритетов. От этого во многом зависела стойкость и непоколебимость выступающих, улетучивающаяся при выдаче запаздывающего пайка и боязни оказаться крайним среди бастовавших, на которых показательно отыгрывалось государство, чтобы другим было не повадно.

После октября 1917 г. почти на всех уровнях бремя власти обрушилось на неопытных, малокомпетентных и неквалифицированных «назначенцев», которые не смогли остановить вызванное Первой мировой войной разрушение системы жизнеобеспечения населения России от Балтики до Тихого океана. Не оповещающая общество о постигшей их неудаче, революционные управленцы к началу 1921 г. сполна осознавали, что проигрывают низложенному капитализму. Спасение искалось во всем, что предотвращало самопроизвольную регенерацию отрицаемого буржуазного строя. Когда ЦК РКП(б) окончательно понял, что материальная чаша опустела и правящая партия безвозвратно может погибнуть, так как ей неоткуда больше брать ресурсы для содержания страны и нечем оплачивать «счета» своих сторонников, подпитывать лояльность сочувствующих, не говоря уже о попутчиках, она нашла спасение в контролируемой и управляемой сверху хозрасчетной Новой экономической политике. Теория социализма не была догмой и спасовала перед политическим цинизмом, присущим любой власти, а не только советской, срочно заключавшей в 1921 г. сделку с обществом ради гарантированного сохранения у власти.

Источники и литература

1. Национальный архив Республики Башкортостан (НА РБ). Ф. 251. Оп. 1. Д. 15.
2. Российский государственный архив социально-политической истории (РГАСПИ). Ф. 17. Оп. 6. Д. 195.
3. Там же. Ф. 17. Оп. 12. Д. 172.
4. Центр документации новейшей истории Оренбургской области (ЦДННАО). Ф. 76. Оп. 1. Д. 4.

Ryosuke Ono

(Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan)

TURK-TATAR DIASPORIC MOBILITIES FROM THE FAR EAST TO THE MIDDLE EAST AS SEEN FROM A TATAR NEWSPAPER *MILLI BAYRAQ* AND FROM JAPANESE DIPLOMATIC AND INTELLIGENCE REPORTS (1936–1941)

In late 2016, the former Mekteb-i İslamiyye, a building located behind the Tokyo Camii (Mosque), was pulled down due to its deterioration. This symbolises the fall of an immigrant community, which Turk-Tatars from the Volga-Ural region had established during the Interwar and the WWII period. Interactions with these Turk-Tatars who had settled down in Tokyo, particularly with leading figures such as Gabdurrashid Ibragim, Gabdulkhay Kurbangali and Gayaz Ishaki, had cultivated one of the most important motives for Japanese interests and strategic approaches to Asian Muslims [3, s. 160–173, 188–203]. They were engaged in trade, for example, they peddled woolen clothes. Most of them re-emigrated to Turkey and U.S. in the 1950s [14]. At the same time, the socio-cultural, religious and even political aspects of Turk-Tatar communities

in the Far East (Japan, Manchuria, Korea and Northern China) were similar to those of Turkic émigrés who had sought asylum in Turkey and in European countries.

Turk-Tatars had expanded into the Far East, along with the construction of the Siberian and Chinese Eastern Railways, and founded their own communities in cities such as Harbin, Hailar and Mukden in Manchuria since the late nineteenth century [9, pp. 200–201]. After the Russian Revolution, they lost Russian citizenship and many of them remained stateless. Hundreds of them had reached Japan in the early 1920s and settled down in Tokyo, Nagoya, Kobe and other cities. The diaspora in Tokyo was headed by Gabdulkhay Kurbangali, who had developed relationships with political, economic and military notables in Japan. The first building of the Tokyo Mosque (founded in 1938) and Mekteb-i Islamiyye were eminent products of his efforts [4, 94–106]. Meanwhile, Gayaz Ishaki, a leader of the Idel-Ural Movement, visited Japan and Manchuria in 1933–35. He organised Turk-Tatar diaspora in the Far East, founding the Association of Idel-Ural Turk-Tatar Civilization (hereinafter AIUTTC). In February of 1935, this movement succeeded in organising the first Far Eastern Qurultay in Mukden and launched the Tatar newspaper *Milli Bayraq* in the same city and year [9, pp. 202–211].

This weekly, four-page newspaper (published every 10 days starting in 1942) was published until mid-1945, producing around 440 issues in total. A large part of it is located in the University of Shimane's library (Shimane Prefecture, Japan). Even though the collection does not include the first 50 issues, it shows us social, cultural, religious and economic situations related to pro-Ishaki Turk-Tatar diaspora in the Far East. Using this collection, Larisa Usmanova submitted her dissertation and published it in 2007 [19]. Her work is comprehensive, focusing on two Far Eastern Qurultays and the social lives of each community in the Far East. However, it is rather chronological, and she paid more attention to structures in the headquarters (Markaz) in Mukden and branches of the AIUTTC. Of course, her main framework is arranged in the north-eastern Asia; however, there were some currents that encouraged Turk-Tatars to migrate from the Far East (i. e., fleeing from under Japanese control) to the Middle East, more precisely to Cairo and Istanbul. These mobilities in times of difficulties show us characteristics of the Turk-Tatar diaspora. Using articles from *Milli Bayraq* and various Japanese and Manchurian diplomatic and intelligence reports, this paper focuses on two such types of migrations seen during wartime (1936–1941). Using two kinds of sources, different in language and perspective, this study is aimed at comprehending Turk-Tatar mobilities more vividly.

When the first Far Eastern Qurultay was held in 1935, education for Turk-Tatar children was already regarded as one of their social problems. At the time, the Qurultay decided to dispatch students to Islamic countries [10, 1937/1/15]. The Markaz in Mukden sent two student groups (five students per group) to al-Azhar University, Cairo, in 1936. Articles concerning a farewell party for the second group (aged 16–18) held in Hailar explain the background of this dispatching of students. In his speech, the chairman of the Hailar AIUTTC indicated that because national and religious scholars were increasingly being sought after, the Markaz had applied to al-Azhar University to send their students there and 10 students would be accepted at al-Azhar's expenses. Here, it is noteworthy that he welcomed the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact between Japan and Germany (November 1936), which occurred barely 10 days before this farewell party. In other words, these students were expected to play active roles in their homeland after the USSR's collapse [10, 1937/1/8]. The students departed from the Kobe Port to Cairo by an international ferry line in January 1937.

Unfortunately, there is fragmental information concerning their lives in Cairo. At al-Azhar, they enrolled for elementary courses and belonged to the Turkish boarding students' group [10, 1937/5/21/; 1937/7/23]. They organised cultural–political meetings. In April of 1938, they held a meeting commemorating the 25th anniversary of Gabdullah Tuqay's death. There, Tuqay's verses were fused with their desire for national liberation [1, s. 23; 10, 1938/6/3]. In another meeting held in October of 1938, they prayed for the eradication of both the USSR and the Kuomintang Government, which had suppressed their compatriots, Eastern Turkestanis [10, 1938/12/16].

These activities seem to have strengthened their national feelings and ties with other Turkic/non-Turkic students of al-Azhar.

However, all Turk-Tatar students left al-Azhar before autumn of 1938. The Japanese chargé d'affaires in Cairo sent a telegram to Ankara saying that the Turkish embassy had not permitted their visas because they held Nansen passports; however, they got visas unexpectedly, and five students departed for Istanbul in October. Since some of them understood the Japanese language, they may have been utilised politically [21, pp. 2–4]. For most of the 1930s, the Turkish government had restricted the activities of Turkic émigrés strictly to avoid hurting the feelings of the Soviets. Their publications, including *Milli Bayraq*, were banned under the Press Law [18, s. 161–170, 179]. However, after the Montreux Convention of 1936, Turkey left its pro-USSR attitude and approached Britain [20, s. 97–103]. Moreover, it seems that one of the reasons behind Turk-Tatar students' getting visas suddenly was Atatürk's disease which killed him in November of 1938. In May, the Japanese embassy in Ankara reported Atatürk's condition, indicating that – depending on Atatürk's successor – Turco–Soviet relations may return to friendship [15, pp. 12–15].

In the same month (May of 1938), the envoy in Cairo also sent a report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo. Here, he stated that he wanted to detain students at al-Azhar for two reasons: 1) to counter the Chinese students at al-Azhar who were brewing an anti-Japanese campaign and 2) to exploit Turk-Tatars in Xinjiang (or other Islamic regions) in the future [5, pp. 7–13, 20–21]. In short, Japanese authority in Cairo found strategic importance in Turk-Tatar students.

One of these students, Ali Akış of Hailar, who left al-Azhar for Warsaw that autumn, recalls in his memoir Japanese attempts to detain Turk-Tatars. According to Akış, Japanese Muslim student Omar Iyemura tried to make Akış remain in Cairo by both offering him money and threatening that they would arrest his family in Manchuria [1, s. 23–24]. Although his memory was not 100% correct, this Japanese student from al-Azhar, real name Kobayashi Tetsuo, would be engaged in organising local Muslims in the Sulawesi Islands, Indonesia, after completing his study [8, pp. 259–267]. It is doubtless that Kobayashi utilised his experiences (and perhaps personal friendships with Indonesian students) in his al-Azhar days. Similarly, many Turk-Tatars' experiences in Cairo were favourable for Japanese intentions to approach to Asian Muslims, as Turk-Tatar students were expected to play just Kobayashi's role in Northeast Asia.

Finally, all of them did not participate. Three students went back to the Far East (due to sickness), five went to Istanbul directly (later becoming Turkish officers) and the last two – including Ali Akış – went to Warsaw (later obtaining Turkish citizenship). Akış supported Ishaki closely, and after his death, he succeeded in his leadership of the Idel-Ural diaspora.

The second type of international migration was migration to Turkey to obtain citizenship. Because of Japanese censorship [19, pp. 64–65], *Milli Bayraq* did not argue for or encourage migration to Turkey. However, according to articles concerning farewell parties and letters to the editor, we can confirm that, between 1937 and early 1941, at least 58 Turk-Tatars from 20 families, migrated to Turkey from Japan (mainly Kobe), Korea (Busan), Manchuria (Harbin, Mukden, Xinjing [Changchun], Jilin) and Northern China (Tianjin, Kalgan [Zhangjiakou]).

With concern to Turk-Tatar migration to Turkey, it is worthy to point out several things: A) Conflicts between Ishaki and Kurbangali. When Ishaki came to Japan in 1933, Turk-Tatars divided into two groups and they conflicted each other. Ishaki prospected the Russo-Japanese War in the future and advocated to obtain Turkish citizenship while Kurbangali kept in deep connection with Japanese authorities [6, pp. 14–15; 9, pp. 204–206]. The Turkish ambassadors to Tokyo supported the former, to be more precise, they were against Kurbangali [6, pp. 34–36]. B) Turkey's preparation to WWII. Since WWII broke out in 1939, the Turkish government had to manage war situations. According to several Japanese reports, to supply human resources, the Turkish government eased naturalisation for Turkic peoples and encouraged them to migrate giving them several privileges [11, p. 14; 12, pp. 285–286; 16, pp. 12–15]. C) Problems in education. As seen with dispatching students to al-Azhar, higher education was a common problem in Turk-Tatar

diaspora communities. During a farewell party for migrants to Turkey held in September 1937, Kobe, community leaders stressed the importance of educated in Turkey («our second homeland») or other Islamic countries. Some leader referred to Fatih Kerimi and Ismagil Gasprali, both of whom had been educated/stayed in the Ottoman Empire as their role models [10, 1937/10/1]. And D) Economic and social changes. However, the most remarkable points are definitive changes among Turk-Tatar diasporas: in Japan, it was economic, while social in Manchuria. According to a report observing Turk-Tatars in Japan, they had enjoyed economical merits as «stateless» persons. In other words, they were not obligated to pay Japanese taxes. The report points out a fatal blow saying that «Since the Greater East Asian War [Pacific War including Sino-Japanese War] started, they had duty of tax payment like Japanese and became dissatisfied in their hearts» [11, p. 6]. From such a critical point of view, we may consider that losing their strong commercial merit prompted Turk-Tatars to leave Japan. In other words, they utilised their statelessness severely.

As to Turk-Tatars in Manchuria, some reports point out that they – around 6,000 – were unwilling to be dealt with as «White Russians». Since 1934, White Russians in Manchuria had been organised under the administration of the Office of the White Russians (Byuro po delam rossiyskikh emigrantov v man'chzhurskoy imperii in Russian, hereafter OWR), a semi-autonomous organisation that received instructions from Japanese Special Service Agency (hereafter SSA) in Harbin. However, pro-Ishaki Turk-Tatars did not participate in this administration, and it took about 6 year to affiliate them to the OWR [17, p. 8–10].

Farewell parties were often held as follows: reciting the Qur'an, speeches by community leaders, providing national dishes/tea, speeches by immigrants, singing folksongs or playing national games. While being seen-off at some station or port, they usually recited «Allahu Akbar» (tekbir).

Although immigrants were celebrated by others, these migrations caused support for each community to decline. For example, the Gaffars of Kobe were pillars of the local community. Gabdunnafi Gaffar was one of the earliest merchants in Kobe and he engaged in trade for more than 20 years [10, 1939/5/5]; and his son, Gabdurrahman, was vice-chairman of the Kobe AIUTTC and a board member of the Kobe Mosque [10, 1937/9/10]. Hasan Nizameddin of Harbin served as the executive director of the national community for six years and dared to resign his directorship with the aim of migrating to Turkey [10, 1939/12/1]. Gizzetullah Gabdurrahman of Busan was a merchant who coordinated advertisements for *Milli Bayraq* [10, 1939/7/28]. Among articles about immigration to Turkey, we can find a courtesy title «Tutash» several times [10, 1937/9/10; 1937/10/1; 1938/4/22; 1940/6/21; 1941/3/21], which means unmarried young lady and, according to Nizameddin's letter, they were Tutashes who taught at national elementary schools [10, 1939/12/1]. The case of Gabdurrahman Mustafa of Kobe was more influential. Originally in Kobe, Madiyar Shamguni had served as the imam of the mosque and head of the financial board of the Markaz located there. When he passed away in 1939, Mustafa succeeded in imamship and board membership temporarily. Thus, successive migrations worried those who remained in Japan that they might not be able to perform socio-religious activities well [10, 1941/2/7; 1941/3/21].

It was late 1940 when Japanese and Manchurian authorities recognised the importance of these migrations. The Japanese Superintendent General was worried that they may be exploited by the Turkish government, «an implement of Soviet» [16, p. 12] Meanwhile in Manchuria, the chief officer of the Kwantung Army, General Kimura, reported Turk-Tatar migrations frequently under the term of «Transfer Problem» to Tokyo. According to Kimura, the Kwantung Army refrained from direct interference, but strengthened counterintelligence and as a most remarkable measure, decided to dismiss those who obtained Turkish citizenship from OWR membership and stop rations for them on 10 January 1941 [17, pp. 5–7]. In less an one month, however, he admitted they could not stop their «Transfer» movement by the measures mentioned above. He was afraid that this movement prompted uneasiness among White Russians and their applications for USSR citizenship. Kimura was also worried that this problem might develop into disturbance in Manchuria by plots of the Comintern, Britain and the U. S. [17, pp. 17–20]. Kimura attributed

Ishaki's visit to Manchuria as directed by the USSR, which was not welcoming to the Japanese approaching Xinjiang [7, p. 2].

Each authority of Ministries of Foreign Affairs and War and General Staffs Office in Tokyo had not given any instructions, so the Kwantung Army took measures against the «Transfer Problem» as follows: recommendation and propaganda by the SSA, control of rations by the ORW, strengthening counterpropaganda [17, pp. 21–26]. Finally in early March 1941, the Kwantung Army succeeded in making Ahmadshah Gizzetullah, the head of the Markaz in Mukden, issue a statement that Turk-Tatars in Manchuria are giving up obtaining Turkish citizenship [17, pp. 30–32]. Thus migration movement came to an end. According to Japanese police, the numbers of applicants were 264 in Japan and 600 in Manchuria [13, p. 361]. Although these measures were just rehashes of those planned in January, control of rations was rather effective this time. When five Turk-Tatars of Mulin, Mudanjiang, wanted to obtain Turkish citizenship in March of 1941, the ORW stopped their rations and passports for two months. They gave up Turkish citizenship and implored to the Mudanjiang SSA via the Harbin AIUTTC to solve their difficulties. The SSA ordered the Mulin ORW to resume rations and the latter prohibited these Turk-Tatars from travelling outside for a while. According to the Japanese consul of Mudanjiang, dissatisfactions of the Turk-Tatars with being dealt as White Russians made them want to take up Turkish citizenship [2, pp. 1–3]. In short, the «Transfer Problem» in Manchuria was closely related with Japanese (SSA/ORW) controlling Turk-Tatars from the beginning to the end.

In summary, two types of international migrations of Turk-Tatars from the Far East to the Middle East occurred, both due to essential problems relating to the social, economic and religious bases of Turk-Tatar communities – more precisely, pro-Ishaki communities. But their mobility also attracted Japanese intelligence authorities. In this manner, their migrations were ways of escaping from Japanese exploitation, more precisely, from Japanese control over their diasporic characteristics. However, those characteristics did not come to end with Japan's loss of WWII in 1945. Instead, throughout the second half of the 20th century, the Turk-Tatar diaspora would develop on new stages, in Turkey, in Europe and in the U. S.

Bibliography

1. Akış, Ali, *Aklımda Kalanlar*, Ankara, 2002.
2. Dai-Toa Senso Kankei Ikken: Joho Shushu Kankei, Botankou Joho, JACAR (Japan Center for Asian Historical Records), Ref. B02032463300.
3. Dündar, Ali Merthan, *Panislâmizm'den Büyük Asyacılığa*, İstanbul, 2006.
4. Dündar, Ali Merthan, *Japonya'da Türk İzleri*, Ankara, 2008.
5. «Ejiputo», *Kakkoku ni okeru Shukyo oyobi Fukyo Kankei Zakken: Kaikyo Kankei*, vol. 2, JACAR, Ref. B04012551000.
6. *Honpo ni okeru Shukyo oyobi Fukyo Kankei Zakken: Kaikyo Kankei*, vol. 1, JACAR, Ref. B04012533000.
7. *Kakkoku ni okeru Shukyo oyobi Fukyo Kankei Zakken: Kaikyo Kankei*, vol. 3, JACAR, Ref. B04012551900.
8. Komura Fujio, *Nippon Isuramu-shi*, Tokyo, 1988.
9. Matsunaga Akira, «Ayaz İshaki and the Turco-Tatars in the Far East», Selçuk Esenbel, Inaba Chiharu (eds.), *The Rising Sun and the Turkish Crescent*, İstanbul, 2003, pp. 197–215.
10. *Milli Bayraq* *Each date of issues is shown as yyyy/mm/dd.
11. *Minzoku Mondai Kankei Zakken: Ajia Minzoku Mondai*, vol. 3, JACAR, Ref. B04013202400.
12. Naimusho Keihokyoku (ed.), *Gaiji Keisatsu Gaikyo Showa 15-nen*, Tokyo, 1980.
13. Naimusho Keihokyoku (ed.), *Gaiji Keisatsu Gaikyo Showa 16-nen*, Tokyo, 1980.
14. Numata Sayoko, «Fieldwork Note on Tatar Migrants from the Far East to the USA», *Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies*, no. 28–2 (2012), pp. 127–144.
15. *Shogaikoku Naisei Kankei Zassan: Toruko-koku no bu*, JACAR, Ref. B02031521200.
16. «Toruko», *Kakkoku ni okeru Shukyo oyobi Fukyo Kankei Zakken: Kaikyo Kankei*, vol. 2, JACAR, Ref. B04012551100.
17. *Toruko «Tataru» ni kansuru Ken (Den)*, JACAR, Ref. C01003645300.
18. Uluskan, Seda Bayındır, *Atatürk'ün Sosyal ve Kültürel Politikaları*, Ankara, 2010.

-
19. Usmanova, Larisa, *The Türk-Tatar Diaspora in Northeast Asia*, Tokyo, 2007.
20. Yüceer, Saime, «Atatürk Dönemi (1918–1938) Türk-Rus İlişkilerinin Siyasi Boyutu,» İlyas Kamalov, İrina Svitsunova (çev. ve haz.), *Atatürk'ten Soğuk Savaş Dönemine Türk-Rus İlişkileri*, Ankara, 2011, s. 61–106.
21. *Zaigai Honpo Ryugakusei oyobi Kenkyuin Kankei Zakken*, vol. 1, JACAR, Ref. B04011307500.

R.I. Yakupov
(IHLL USC RAS, Ufa, Russia)

LONG PRE-HISTORY OF HUMAN SCIENCE OF BASHKORTOSTAN

The science of Bashkortostan has a rather long prehistory, dating back to the times when it was spontaneous, and based mainly on a lively and practical interest in the surrounding world. We trace its origins in the mythology of the Bashkir people, as well as later migrants, ethnographic groups of the other peoples of the Volga-Siberian vast range. In particular, in the epos of «Ural-Batyr», we discover the presence of such common peoples knowledge as: the creation of a world emerging from the water element, through the allocation of land, filling it with living beings, the duality of phenomena and the contradictory nature of the ongoing development processes, as a stimulator of the movement and much more [2; 8].

In parallel, the system of practical knowledge is developing. Bashkir ethnos, in the process of its formation and in the following phases of ethnic history in the territory of modern Bashkortostan, passed a series of successive stages of transition from the classical nomadic economy to agricultural and pastoral, and accordingly survived several periods of intensive adaptation, when Bashkirs, for centuries, not only borrowed knowledge from neighbors – Finno-Ugric and Turkic peoples, but also developed their own, new traditions and methods of interaction with the environment, adapting to it the own an experience of integrated new «economic-cultural type» (the term., *R.Ya.*). Similarly, migrants to the southern Urals from the Middle Volga region in the 16th–19th centuries, adopting cattle-breeding practices, being among the Bashkirs, and had adapting their own agricultural skills to the new landscape and climatic conditions, significantly enriched their own knowledge and experience in farming, cattle breeding, everyday life and spiritual experience [11, p. 50–56].

In the course of this continuous interaction, the inhabitants of the South Urals continued to consistently increase practical knowledge of the environment, improved methods of interaction with wildlife and the ways of using of its resources. The Bashkirian «*rudoznatsy*» (rus., *R.Ya.*) not only developed and used the knowledge of the geology and geography of the Southern Urals, but also, during the «first industrialization» of the region, in the «Peter's era» (they actively shared them with the Russian «breeders»). They knew the location of iron ore, gold, precious and building stone, coal. The extraction of hunting raw materials (fur and leather), the production of honey, acquired such volumes that they became the subject of foreign trade and fiscal relations within the state, the extraction of timber and other forest products actually reached industrial volumes [5].

The knowledge of the Bashkirs in the field of folk medicine and meteorology was vast. Amazing examples of household architecture and arrangement of a residential economic space are demonstrated by the peoples of the Southern Urals: from the unique Bashkir yurt to multi-storey (two or three) dwellings, mills, religious buildings, farm buildings [5; 10, p. 50–56]. Accumulated over the centuries, the types of dwellings that differ in terms of building materials and methods of architectural solutions are discovered at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, were count more than a dozen forms that existed on the territory of Bashkortostan [10; 12, p. 219–223].

With the spread of Islam in the Southern Urals, the epoch of enlightenment and dissemination of systematic knowledge, especially humanitarian, but also natural and exact sciences, begins. First of all, it is linguistics and its part the grammar (Arabic), literature, pedagogy, logic, geography, astronomy, the fundamentals of biology, mathematics, chemistry, medicine. These sciences are taught in *maktabas* and *madrassahs* and are studied in a private, though rare