



E-ISSN: 3108-4176

APSSHS

Academic Publications of Social Sciences and Humanities Studies

2021, Volume 2, Page No: 1-14

Available online at: <https://apsshs.com/>

Annals of Organizational Culture, Leadership and External Engagement Journal

## Strategic Dynamics of Turkey-Azerbaijan Relations: An Analysis of Organizational and Management Practices during the Soviet Era

Hakan Cora<sup>1\*</sup>, Elnur Hasan Mikail<sup>2</sup>, Andac Karabulut<sup>3</sup>

1. Department of Business, Faculty of Business and Administrative Sciences, Istanbul Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey.
2. Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kars Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.
3. Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kars, Turkey.

### Abstract

States, governments, governmental agencies, political parties, and interest groups function as organizations, each with unique characteristics. This study focuses on Turkey and Azerbaijan during the Soviet era, examining the organizational and managerial dynamics of their international relations. The research uses archival documents, periodical press materials, and an extensive review of records from the Republic of Azerbaijan's archives, including those of the Ministries of Education, Culture, Health, Youth, Tourism, and Sports. The analysis is based on previously unknown archive documents and materials from Azerbaijani press sources. In addition, books, memoirs, and visual materials, such as "Kino-Foto-Fono" documents and resources from the Central State Archive and various museums, ministries, and administrations, were utilized.

**Keywords:** Soviet era, Turkey, International relations, Azerbaijan

**How to cite this article:** Cora H, Mikail EH, Karabulut A. Strategic Dynamics of Turkey-Azerbaijan Relations: An Analysis of Organizational and Management Practices during the Soviet Era. *Ann Organ Cult Leadersh Extern Engagem J.* 2021;2:1-14. <https://doi.org/10.51847/XAMFo7XpdA>

**Received:** 16 January 2021; **Revised:** 22 March 2021; **Accepted:** 22 March 2021

**Corresponding author:** Hakan Cora

**E-mail** ✉ [corahakan@gmail.com](mailto:corahakan@gmail.com)

### Introduction

Classical theories of organization focus on formal structures and strategies designed to improve managerial effectiveness. Pioneers such as Taylor, who introduced the principles of scientific management, Weber, who established the bureaucratic model, and Fayol, who developed the administrative theory, have all made foundational contributions to organizational thought. Interestingly, organizational theory shares notable parallels with political theory, despite the differing goals and methods of each field. Both disciplines examine broad aspects of human existence, with organizations, including states, political parties, governments, and interest groups, playing a pivotal role in shaping our daily lives. While these entities operate differently from businesses, they share fundamental characteristics of organization [1]. This paper focuses specifically on the interactions between Azerbaijan and Turkey during the Soviet era.

The initial official communication between the Republic of Azerbaijan and Turkey took place on May 3, 1920. In a letter to Kazim Karabekir Pasha, the commander of the Eastern Front, Mustafa Kemal Pasha wrote, "The government has no funds left, and we are unable to secure domestic financing. I request that you arrange a loan from the Azerbaijani government until



© 2021 The Author(s).  
Copyright CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

we can secure other financial sources.” Karabekir Pasha subsequently conveyed this request to the Azerbaijani government, marking the beginning of diplomatic ties between the two nations.

In 1921, following instructions from Narimanov, Azerbaijani Foreign Minister Mirza Davut Husseinov sent a telegram congratulating Turkey for its victories during the First-Second Inonu Wars. He announced that, in recognition of Turkey’s successes, Azerbaijan would send more than thirty cisterns of oil, two cisterns of gasoline, and eight cisterns of kerosene to aid the Turkish effort. Later that year, Azerbaijan sent an additional 62 cisterns of oil to Turkey’s Grand National Assembly, with a commitment to continue the oil shipments and provide kerosene until the war’s conclusion.

In 1922, Azerbaijan continued to support Turkey by sending over 9,000 tons of kerosene and 350 tons of gasoline, which were transported via Batumi.

A letter from Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Narimanov, sent in 1921, requested financial assistance, which was delivered by the ambassador on March 17 of that year. In response, Narimanov quickly sent 500 kilograms of gold, of which 200 kilograms were allocated for Turkey’s state budget, while the remainder was used for ammunition and weaponry. Narimanov also sent ten million gold rubles, which he had received from Russia to Ankara, a gesture that greatly assisted Turkey during its war efforts.

On March 23, 1921, Azerbaijan, without any formal request from Turkey, voluntarily sent thirty cisterns of oil, two cisterns of gasoline, and eight cisterns of grease to Turkey, as a goodwill gesture from the Azerbaijani people.

In his letter to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Narimanov expressed his admiration for Turkey’s successes and his belief that Turkey would soon achieve freedom from imperialism. He added, “My dear Pasha, in our nation, brothers do not give loans to each other. We simply extend a helping hand. We are brothers, and we will always be there for you” [2].

This study focuses on Turkey and Azerbaijan during the Soviet era, examining the organizational and managerial dynamics of their international relations.

### *Literature review*

This research is grounded in archival documents and period press materials. It relied heavily on records from various Azerbaijani governmental archives, including those of the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Health, and Tourism, Ministry of Youth, and Sports. The study explores previously untapped archival documents and materials from the Azerbaijani press from the time. Additionally, it draws on books and memoirs written by scholars. Visual sources such as the “Kino-Foto-Fono” documents from the Republic of Azerbaijan and records from the Central State Archive, as well as materials from various museums and ministries, were also consulted.

The academic data for this study were obtained from Azerbaijani sources, following approval from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Azerbaijan. The research was conducted across three main sections of the archive, which are accessible for examination. These include:

ACSPHAR: Archive of Political Parties and Social Movements of the Republic of Azerbaijan

ACEYTAR: Archive of the Newest History Department of the Republic of Azerbaijan

ACDA: Archives of the Central Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan

### *Turkish-Soviet relations during the Atatürk era (1923-1938)*

Following its victory in the War of Independence, Turkey signed the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, marking its formal recognition as an independent state by the victorious nations of World War I. After this, Turkey sought to establish peaceful relations with neighboring countries while avoiding alliances that might restrict its newfound sovereignty. One of the key motivations for Turkey’s foreign policy during this period was the significant reforms and societal transformations being implemented domestically. As Mustafa Kemal Pasha stated in a speech at the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, “It is completely understandable for a nation undergoing profound reform to desire peace both within its borders and in the world around it” [3].

Mustafa Kemal Pasha’s leadership guided Turkey’s foreign policy after Lausanne, emphasizing “national politics,” which was centered around Turkey’s national interests. This principle was rooted in national independence, the national pact, and adherence to international law, all reflecting the motto “Peace at home, peace in the world.” While Turkey adhered to a policy of peace after Lausanne, it encountered challenges, especially as Western powers continued to attempt to influence Turkish internal affairs, a practice that persisted since the Ottoman Empire era. Each attempt at interference was met with strong resistance. From 1923 to 1932, Turkey’s foreign policy focused on resolving issues from Lausanne and ensuring its principles were upheld, in line with the nation’s self-determined political approach [4].

During the Turkish National Struggle, both the Soviet government and the Turkish Grand National Assembly (GNAT) were engaged in conflict with Western powers, which led to the signing of the Treaty of Moscow in 1921. This treaty established a cooperative Turkish-Soviet alliance that continued to develop, especially after Lausanne, due to shared concerns over Western hostility towards Turkey. The Soviet Union grew uneasy when Germany, once defeated in World War I, was included

in the Locarno system in 1925. Furthermore, the League of Nations' involvement in the Mosul dispute also aligned with Soviet and Turkish interests. As a result, in 1925, the two countries signed the Treaty of Neutrality and Non-Aggression in Paris on December 17, which strengthened their political ties more than their economic relations. On March 11, 1927, Turkey and the Soviet Union signed a Trade and Navigation Treaty, aiming to bolster economic cooperation [5].

In 1928, the Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed by nine Western countries in Paris, and Turkey ratified it on January 19, 1929. The Soviet Union, which was the first to sign the pact, sought to expedite its implementation by signing the Litvinov Protocol with neighboring Eastern European nations on February 9, 1929. Turkey ratified this protocol on April 1, 1929. As the Soviet Union grew concerned about Turkey's increasing ties with Western states, the two countries signed a Friendship Treaty on December 17, 1928, which extended the 1925 Treaty for two more years. In the meantime, Turkey was able to resolve tensions with previous adversaries like England, France, and Greece, entering into normal diplomatic relations by 1930. Consequently, the Soviet Union, while still an important partner, no longer remained Turkey's only key ally. From 1929 until the end of 1933, Turkish-Russian relations strengthened despite occasional disagreements, but tensions began to rise in 1934 [6].

Turkey's alignment with Western countries gradually led to a cooling of relations with the Soviet Union. This shift was particularly evident after the signing of the Montreux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits. Turkey's membership in the League of Nations, followed by the Soviet Union's entry in 1934, helped to prevent significant conflicts between the two countries. Turkey reassured the Soviet Union, which had concerns over the 1934 Balkan Entente, ensuring that their ties remained intact [7].

However, in 1939, following the Montreux Convention, the Soviet Union shifted its foreign policy drastically. It signed a pact with Nazi Germany, its former enemy, and launched military campaigns in Finland and the Baltic States. This dramatic change in Soviet policy marked the end of Turkish-Soviet relations, which would not be revived until after World War II. The Soviet Union's subsequent demands over Turkey's Straits and its claims over the eastern provinces led to the formal dissolution of the Turkish-Soviet friendship in 1945 [8].

#### *Origins and development of Turkish-Soviet relations*

Turkish-Soviet relations were significantly shaped by the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, which saw the overthrow of the Russian tsarist regime. Following this upheaval, Soviet Russia adopted an anti-imperialist stance, diverging from the policies of the old Russian Empire. This shift paved the way for a unique cooperation between Turkey and the Soviet Union, both of which had previously been at odds with one another. With both nations facing Western powers as common adversaries, they began to find common ground. The cooperation between Turkey and Soviet Russia played a central role during Turkey's National Struggle, and became a cornerstone of Turkey's foreign policy [9]. After the Bolsheviks withdrew from World War I, the Soviet government also nullified the secret agreements that had previously bound Russia, such as the Sykes-Picot Agreement, strengthening the basis for a new diplomatic relationship between the two countries [10].

#### *Economic and financial ties between Turkey and the Soviet Union in the early republic*

During the early years of the Turkish Republic, Turkey faced significant economic challenges, including a trade deficit caused by the lifting of import restrictions and persistently low tariffs following the war. As a result, the Turkish currency steadily depreciated [11]. Under the terms of the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), there were no significant restrictions on foreign trade until 1929. However, in 1929, a new customs law was introduced, raising tariffs, followed by the establishment of the exchange control system under Law No. 1567 in 1930, aimed at protecting the Turkish Lira. In 1932, a law regulating foreign trade was introduced, which led to the implementation of clearing and interchange systems.

The global economic crisis of 1929 made it difficult for countries to conduct international trade without using such systems, and Turkey adopted these mechanisms in its dealings with various nations, including the Soviet Union. Even though Soviet Russia didn't play a major role in Turkish foreign trade during the early Republican period, trade between the two nations remained consistent. In the years between 1924 and 1929, the Soviet Union represented just 4% of Turkey's imports and 3% of its exports. For comparison, during the years leading up to World War I, Tsarist Russia accounted for 7% of Ottoman imports and 4% of its exports.

Despite the limited scale of their trade relations, the Soviet Union sought to expand economic ties with Turkey during this time. Between 1923 and 1927, trade between the two countries was conducted with unilateral documentation. The Soviet government permitted Turkish traders to export goods to the USSR, while also allowing Soviet goods to be sent to Turkey. The Soviet Union further supported trade initiatives through entities such as the "ARCOS" Anglo-Soviet mixed-stock company and the "RUSSOTURK" Soviet-Turkish Society, both of which facilitated bilateral commerce. Additionally, the USSR Foreign Trade Bank's Istanbul branch participated in efforts to stabilize Turkey's economy during the 1929 crisis, helping prevent fiscal collapse.

A major step in formalizing Turkey-Soviet trade relations came in March 1927 with the signing of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation. This agreement marked the first time Turkey had entered into a foreign trade treaty based on equality and mutual benefit. The treaty granted Turkey important trade privileges, such as the right to export certain goods to the Soviet

Union without the need for a license, reduced customs duties, and the free movement of goods between the two countries. As a result, trade volumes increased, reaching 101.9 million rubles by 1928 [12].

### *Challenges in implementing the 1927 trade agreement*

The 1927 trade agreement between Turkey and the Soviet Union faced two major obstacles in its implementation. First, there was a fundamental difference in the way the two countries managed trade: while the Soviet Union handled trade through state-controlled mechanisms, Turkey relied on private traders. Aligning these contrasting systems took time and effort. The global economic crisis, which severely impacted international trade, provided an impetus for the expansion of Turkish-Soviet commercial relations. Following the signing of the 1927 agreement, which offered equal rights to both nations, trade volume between the two grew despite the global downturn. Before the crisis, trade stood at 11.6 million Turkish Liras, but it surged to 14.6 million Liras between 1929 and 1933. As a result, the Soviet Union's share of Turkey's total trade volume doubled, representing 5-7% of Turkey's imports and 3.5-5.3% of its exports during these years. Goods imported from the Soviet Union shifted, with a notable increase in textiles and machinery, while sugar and coal became less significant. Conversely, Turkey's exports of wool and livestock to the Soviet Union grew substantially [13].

### *Soviet industrialization and its impact on Turkey*

After the Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviet Union aimed for rapid industrialization, particularly through centralized planning and the success of the first five-year plan. This approach caught the attention of Turkish officials, as the Republic of Turkey, still in its early stages of economic development, was looking to define its industrial trajectory. In late 1930, Turkish Deputy Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras visited the Soviet Union, marking a period of growing interest in Soviet industrial achievements. The most significant outcome of these efforts occurred after İsmet İnönü visited the USSR in May 1932. This visit facilitated the technical assistance Turkey received for its industrialization plans, especially for the First Five-Year Plan in Turkey (1931-1932).

Additionally, the Soviet Union extended an interest-free loan of 8 million gold rubles (roughly 16 million lire) to Turkey for the purchase of machinery, to be paid back over 20 years in goods. This loan was instrumental in helping Turkey jumpstart its industrialization. It was largely managed by Superbank and contributed significantly to the country's industrial development during the 1930s. The willingness of the Soviet Union to extend such financial assistance, despite its challenges, demonstrated a genuine commitment to fostering a relationship of friendship and support. This loan represented a major portion of Turkey's industrial investments during this period [14].

### *Impact of Soviet support on Turkish industry*

Between 1934 and 1939, the Soviet loan and technical aid played a critical role in the development of Turkey's industrial sector. It accounted for one-third of all capital investments in Turkish industry. Two major textile factories were built in Kayseri and Nazilli with Soviet support, with Soviet experts overseeing the installation of machinery and project preparation. During this time, the Soviet Union also expanded its list of exports to Turkey, including machinery, agricultural equipment, electrical goods, and black metals. The Soviet Union's share of machine-technical product exports to Turkey rose to 40% by 1938. Additionally, Turkey's exports of wool and livestock to the USSR were significant, comprising 62% of Turkey's wool exports, 43% of live animal exports, and 31% of its mohair exports [13].

### *Deterioration of relations after 1936*

After 1936, the political relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union began to stagnate, and by 1945, they had collapsed entirely, causing a sharp decline in economic ties. In the following decades, especially between 1950 and 1960, American military and economic aid to Turkey dramatically increased, reducing the importance of Soviet economic assistance. Between 1954 and 1962, for example, the Soviet Union committed \$17 million in economic aid to Turkey, but only \$15 million of it was paid out.

Before World War II, Turkey's economic cooperation with the Soviet Union had a substantial impact, particularly in helping Turkey address funding challenges in its industrial sector. However, as the global political landscape shifted during and after World War II, the Turkish-Soviet economic partnership gradually dissolved. The geopolitical pressures exerted by the Soviet Union, combined with Turkey's growing ties with the West, marked the end of this productive relationship. In the 1960s, as Turkey turned to planned development and sought to reorganize its economy, a new era in Turkish-Soviet relations began [15].

### *Biography of Yusuf Vezir Cemzemini*

Yusuf Vezir Cemenzeminli, born Yusuf Mashhedi Mir Baba's son on September 12, 1887, in Shusha, was an influential writer, researcher, and political figure in Azerbaijani literature. He was born into a family that embraced traditional Turkish culture. His father, Mirabdulla, was a perfumer, doctor, and linguist, proficient in Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, and he took on the role of educating his children. His mother, Seyit Aziz, was a compassionate and fair woman, known for her knowledge of folk literature. After his father died in 1906, Yusuf Vezir's mother bore the burden of raising the family. In one of his works, Yusuf Vezir reflected on the emotional impact of his mother's struggles and the deep sadness he carried throughout his life.

His education began at a private school run by Samedbey Agayev in Shusha, followed by attendance at a Russian-Turkish school. In 1906, he moved to Baku, where he entered the Baku School of Practice with the support of Hacı Zeynalabidin Tagiyev. His first published article, "Honorable Director," appeared in *Molla Nasrettin* magazine in 1907. After meeting Uzeyir Bey in Baku in 1908, Yusuf graduated from the Baku School of Practice in 1909 and later spent some time in Tashkent. In 1910, Yusuf passed the entrance exams for the Faculty of Law at the Emperor's University of Kyiv and graduated in 1915. During his university years, he began writing stories, publishing works such as "Debtor," "Extortion," "Naive," and "Friday Evening." His stories reflected his deep engagement with human struggles and Turkish identity. He also worked on the first parts of his novels "Sin" and "Students." In 1915-1917, Yusuf Vezir lived in Simferopol, Crimea, and later moved to Odesa, where he wrote a book on the Lithuanian Tatars, delving into the history of the Karaims and publishing "Ilminski and Denomination."

After the 1917 Russian Revolution, Yusuf returned to Azerbaijan and became involved in its political scene. He was sent by M. E. Resulzade as Azerbaijan's ambassador to Istanbul in 1918-1919. During his time in Istanbul, he continued his literary and historical research, writing his work *A Perspective on Azerbaijan Literature*, published in 1920 in Azerbaijani Turkish and French in 1922. He remained in Turkey until 1923 and also penned *Literary and Historical Information Regarding Azerbaijan*. After the fall of the independent Azerbaijan Republic in 1920, Yusuf moved to France, where he contributed to French newspapers.

In 1925, after a public letter of remorse was published in the Azerbaijani Soviet press, Yusuf was permitted to return to Azerbaijan. He resumed his work in Baku, starting as the director of the Department of Literature and publishing works such as *Pages from the Past* and *On the Way to Win* in 1926. He married Acalov, daughter of Bilkeyis Esat, in 1927, and they had two sons, Orhan and Fikret. Throughout this period, he wrote extensively, including his historical novel *In Blood* about the Karabakh Khanate and the poet-politician Vakif.

Yusuf's literary works gained recognition in Azerbaijan, with his novel *Students* published in 1935 and his book *From Dark to Light* in 1933. He worked on the Azerbaijani Encyclopedia and served as an editor at *Azernesr*. He also translated works by famous Russian writers such as Gogol and Tolstoy into Azerbaijani Turkish.

However, during the rise of Stalin's terror in the late 1930s, Yusuf was placed under surveillance and was exiled to Uzbekistan in 1938. He was arrested in 1940 upon returning to Baku and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment. He was sent to a labor camp in Sokoye-Bezvodniye, Gorky Province, where he died of pellagra in 1943.

Yusuf Vezir Cemenzeminli's legacy as a writer, historian, and politician remains significant in the literary and cultural history of Azerbaijan. His works, both published and unpublished, continue to be an important part of the nation's heritage.

Yusuf Vezir Cemenzeminli, a prominent Azerbaijani writer and intellectual, was born into a family that encouraged education and intellectual development. He learned the alphabet from his older brother, Ebulhasan, and began his formal education with hodja Mehti, known as KarHalfa, in Shusha. He continued his education at a madrasah, later studying under his father in Agdam and attending the Muratbeyli school for a time. His early exposure to education in madrasahs led him to further his studies at the private schools of Cemalbey and Samedbey Agayev in Shusha, before eventually attending the Russian-Turkish school, where Hasanbey Vezirov served as the director. It was here that he first encountered Russian literature, which would later become a major influence on his work. He attended this school for eight years, during which he cultivated his love for reading and writing.

In 1904, Yusuf and his cousin, Mirhasan Vezirov, published a humorous, cartoonish literary magazine titled *Acrobat* in Shusha. Mirhasan contributed the Russian-language text, while Yusuf illustrated the magazine under the pseudonym "Bedbaht." His early interest in art and literature led him to pursue further creative endeavors. After spending some time in Ashgabat in 1905, he returned to Shusha following his father's death in 1906. He moved to Baku soon after, where he was supported by Hacı Zeynalabidin Tagiyev to enter the sixth grade of the Baku School of Practice.

During his time in Baku, Yusuf's interest in theater grew, especially after watching plays in Ashgabat. This passion led him to write his first article, *Honorable Director*, which was published in *Molla Nasrettin* magazine in 1907 under the pen name Miryusuf Vezirov. His cartoon, *Victorious Hawk*, was also published in *Molla Nasrettin* during the same period. Additionally, his short story *Charity of Shakulu* caught the attention of notable writer Abdurrahim Hakverdiyev. Yusuf was also recognized for his skills in drawing, creating portraits, still-life works, and cartoons.

In 1908, Yusuf attended the premiere of Uzeyir Hacıbeyli's opera *Leyla and Mecnun* in Baku, where he met the composer personally. He graduated from the Baku School of Practice in 1909 and traveled to St. Petersburg, where he applied to the

Civil Rights Institute. Although he spent a month there, he chose not to take the entrance exams. During his stay, he wrote the story *The Receipt of Heaven* and kept a notebook filled with proverbs. He also wrote a poem about Sheikh Samil. After leaving St. Petersburg, he returned to Ashgabat, where he staged *Who is Guilty*, a play by E. Haqverdiyev, and played the role of Mahmutbey. He also spent time in Tashkent during the fall and winter of 1909.

Yusuf continued to write for *Seda* newspaper and composed works like his comedy *Engagement* and the short story *Desire of the Poor*. His interest in Russian literature, particularly the works of Anton Chekhov, deeply influenced his writing. Chekhov's influence is evident in many of his early stories, especially in the themes of existential struggle and human frailty. Initially, Yusuf wrote poetry in Russian, often reflecting on personal life and surrounding events with a tone of pessimism. In 1910, Yusuf Vezir passed the exams for high school and was admitted to the Faculty of Law at the Emperor's University of Kyiv. He graduated in 1915, and during his university years, he wrote numerous stories, including *Debtor*, *Extortion*, *Mesedi and Karbelayi*, *Naive*, and *Darkness on a White Throat*. Between 1911 and 1913, he wrote several other stories such as *Physician*, *Saint*, *Zeynel Bey*, *Troubled Zuleyha*, *Crazy*, *Friday Evening*, *At the Girls' School*, and *Brothers of Separate Religions*. During this time, he published seven volumes of stories.

Yusuf Vezir's early life was marked by a thirst for knowledge, creativity, and a deep engagement with literature and the arts, which would later inform his broader contributions to Azerbaijani culture.

Yusuf Vezir Cemenzeminli led an eventful and intellectually rich life, marked by his dedication to literature, law, and history. Born in Azerbaijan, he was initially educated by his family and teachers, showing a keen interest in Russian literature from a young age. After studying at various schools, including a Russian-Turkish institution in Shusha, he began publishing his first literary works, including a humorous magazine, *Acrobat*, with his cousin in 1904. These early works, filled with cartoons and satire, marked the beginning of his career as a writer.

In 1907, his first serious article, "Honorable Director," appeared in *Molla Nasrettin* magazine, signaling the start of his involvement in Azerbaijani journalism. Over the years, his writing became known for its critique of social issues such as ignorance, fanaticism, and social injustices in Azerbaijani life. He continued to write and publish stories while pursuing his education, which took him from Baku to St. Petersburg, where he studied law but soon left, feeling that his true calling lay in literature and social reform.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, Cemenzeminli returned to Azerbaijan, where he engaged in political and diplomatic work as the Ambassador of Azerbaijan to Istanbul. During this time, he continued to write extensively, producing works such as *A Perspective on Azerbaijan Literature* and *Literary and Historical Information Regarding Azerbaijan*. His historical studies, particularly on Turkish and Azerbaijani history, became a central theme in many of his writings.

Cemenzeminli's life took a turbulent turn after the collapse of the independent Azerbaijani Republic in 1920. He moved to France, where he struggled with financial instability but continued his intellectual work, researching Oriental history and philosophy. His time in France also marked the publication of some of his important works, including translations of Russian writers into Azerbaijani and the completion of his historical novel *In Blood*, which detailed the struggles of Azerbaijan's Karabakh Khanate.

After a period of exile, Yusuf Vezir returned to Azerbaijan in 1926, where he continued his literary contributions and took up a post at the Baku Worker Cooperative publishers. During this period, he refined earlier works like *Students* and *Girls Spring*, and he began experimenting with dramaturgy, writing plays like *The Holy Shahriyar*.

Cemenzeminli's later years saw his involvement with the Azerbaijan Writers Society and his contribution to the *Azerbaijan Encyclopedia*. However, his career and life were abruptly interrupted during Stalin's purges. In 1937, he was arrested and exiled to a labor camp, where he died in 1943, but not before his works had a lasting impact on Azerbaijani literature.

His contributions continue to resonate today, especially his explorations of Azerbaijani identity, and social change, and his blend of literary and historical scholarship.

After 1937, with the intensification of Stalin's purges, Yusuf Vezir Cemenzeminli faced increasing scrutiny. In 1938, he was placed under surveillance, dismissed from his editorial position at the Azerbaijan publishing house, and falsely accused of crimes such as propaganda against the Bolsheviks, espionage for foreign powers like the British and Japanese, and other equally fabricated charges.

Realizing the danger of imminent imprisonment, Yusuf Vezir fled to Central Asia and took up a position as a teacher of Russian language and literature at the Urgenc Pedagogical Institute in Uzbekistan. During this period, he collaborated with his student, Yunus Yusuf, to write a movie script titled *The Veil of Truth*. He lived in Urgenc until 1939-1940, when he returned to Baku briefly to visit his family. However, upon his return, he was arrested and sentenced to ten years of imprisonment by a military tribunal. On May 3, 1942, he was transported to a prisoner camp in Sokoye-Bezvodniye village, located in Gorky province. According to recently obtained KGB archives, Yusuf Vezir passed away from pellagra disease while incarcerated in 1943.

Despite his rich body of work, there remain many of Cemenzeminli's historical-philological research that are still unreviewed and unpublished. There is a particular interest in bringing these works to light, particularly his diplomatic activities during his

time as Ambassador of Azerbaijan to Turkey in 1919. His role in representing the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in Istanbul is a notable and underexplored part of his life, which could greatly contribute to the understanding of Azerbaijan's diplomatic history during that period.

Regarding the activities of another key Azerbaijani figure, Ibrahim Abilov, who was also an ambassador to Turkey, the relationship between Azerbaijan and Turkey during the early 20th century was marked by strong solidarity, as evidenced in the letter of trust exchanged between them. The Grand National Assembly of Turkey warmly received the Azerbaijani envoy, affirming the shared struggles and goals of the two nations. The speech delivered by the Turkish ambassador emphasized the mutual understanding between the two countries and their shared commitment to the freedom and independence of both the Azerbaijani and Turkish people. This deep sense of brotherhood and shared purpose is expressed through the words that both nations would support each other in their struggles, highlighting the diplomatic and emotional ties between Azerbaijan and Turkey during a period of turmoil.

By highlighting Yusuf Vezir's diplomatic work, especially his time in Istanbul, and continuing to investigate his unrecognized contributions, it is possible to shed more light on this critical period in Azerbaijani history and further recognize his significance as a cultural and political figure.

### *Esteemed representative*

On behalf of the Grand National Assembly and the Government, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation for your kind words and best wishes for the success of our army. The genuine friendship and mutual support between our two nations deeply move me. Today is especially meaningful as I have the honor of raising the flag of the independent Azerbaijani Shura Government.

It fills me with great joy to witness this moment, as it signifies not just a victory for us but also for the common ideals we share. Together, we stand united against any forces that seek to divide or weaken us. In this regard, the importance of the Azerbaijani flag flying alongside the Turkish flag is immense. It symbolizes the unity that binds us in our pursuit of freedom and independence.

Your insightful remarks emphasize the crucial role of Azerbaijan's strategic position in Asia and its importance as a beacon for friendly nations. I fully agree with your assessment. Azerbaijan's location is indeed vital, not only as a key ally of Turkey but also as an important player in the broader regional dynamics that shape the East.

Your words, dear Ambassador, reflect the strength and determination of both the Azerbaijani and Turkish peoples. The genuine friendship and profound understanding between our nations provide a solid foundation on which we will continue to build. The raising of the Azerbaijani flag today is more than a mere ceremony; it is a powerful symbol of our shared aspirations, struggles, and triumphs.

As you correctly pointed out, the attacks on Anatolia are not just aimed at this land but at the entire East. However, just as Anatolia stands firm in defense, so too will Azerbaijan remain steadfast in protecting its sovereignty. This shared defense is about more than safeguarding our homelands—it is about preserving the future of the East, its dignity, and its rightful place in the world.

With immense pride and joy, I stand here today, knowing that the Azerbaijani flag flies beside the Turkish flag. This is a moment of unity and hope, and we will continue to strengthen the bonds of brotherhood that unite our two nations.

Once again, I thank you for this joyous occasion and the lasting friendship between our people. May our shared future be one of peace, prosperity, and mutual support.

### *Soviet-Turkey relations: the efforts of armenians to take advantage of the political environment*

The strained relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union, alongside the Soviets' focus on the "Armenian issue," played a significant role in the actions of the Armenians. The Armenian lobby and politicians, who were vigilant and proactive in all historical contexts, closely monitored political developments. They sought to align their national interests with favorable historical moments and made attempts to capitalize on such opportunities. During the Second World War, Armenians approached the Soviet Union to claim their share of post-war success, offering their support in the fight against German fascism, particularly after the political outcome of the war seemed favorable for the USSR [16].

On March 9, 1944, the "Hunchakian" and "Ramgavar" parties formed the "Progressive Union of Armenian Armenians" in the United States [17]. The goals of the Union were outlined in a document, with the first objective being to provide military aid for the war, the second to create various institutions for support in the USSR and Armenia, and the third to assist Armenians abroad in returning to their homeland. The Union succeeded in establishing autonomy within all Armenian communities from its inception. Due to the Armenian Communists' efforts to unify all Armenian institutions, their national unions came together to form a single front [17]. Documents from the Armenian Central State Archive detail the financial support that Armenians abroad provided to the USSR during the war. Additionally, reports indicate that money was deposited into Riza Velibeyov's account, head of the Republic Office of the State Bank of the USSR, on April 30, 1944, by Armenians living outside the

Soviet Union, on behalf of Archbishop Gevorg Cerokciyan. A telegram sent by G. Cerokciyan to Head Commander Ali provides details about the creation of two tank trains and their dispatch to the front [17].

On June 7, 1944, Joseph Stalin sent a telegram thanking G. Cerokciyan and sending special greetings to Armenians living abroad. The churches, which had become active again during the war years to ensure national unity, played a significant role in implementing the state's policies. Among the repaired churches, Etchmiadzin Cathedral played a major role in the USSR's political activities against Turkey [18].

On April 19, 1945, G. Cerokciyan, having been received by Stalin, was instructed to organize the repatriation of 100,000 Armenians from abroad and to oversee the repair of the church. Stalin assured him that a special decision would be made soon regarding the matter. After Cerokciyan was elected patriarch on June 22, 1945, he appealed to the Soviet President, asking for permission to allow Armenians abroad to return to their homeland once "historical Armenian lands" were unified with Armenia [19]. According to an agreement between Cerokciyan and Stalin, Gevorg requested the church, political parties, and prominent lobby members abroad to assist in organizing the repatriation of Armenians.

Thanks to the church's efforts, within a short period, 130,000 Armenians from abroad submitted applications to the Soviet government to settle in Soviet Armenia. On November 21, 1945, the USSR People's Commissars issued a decision on the "Measures Regarding the Return of Armenians from Abroad to Armenia."

Looking at the chronology of events, after this decision, Armenians began to raise territorial claims. On November 28, 1945, the Armenian communist leadership submitted a petition to the Soviet Central Government, requesting the integration of Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia. The petition, forwarded by the clerk of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR to I.V. Stalin, led to a rejection from the Azerbaijani SSR's leadership [20].

The petition regarding the integration of Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia, which was sent to Baghrov, was presented in a manner resembling a "discovery." However, Azerbaijan's firm stance on the issue discouraged both the Armenian leadership and the Soviet government. If M.C. Baghrov had shown any leniency, Nagorno-Karabakh would probably have been incorporated into Armenia. According to Karen Burutens, discussions about integrating Nagorno-Karabakh and Nakhichevan into Armenia took place between Q. Arutyunov and G. Malenkov, the MK clerk.

The Soviet Union launched a strong propaganda campaign to attract Armenians from abroad to Soviet Armenia. In 1944, the "Society of Cultural Relations of Armenia with Armenians Abroad" was established as part of this effort. The political celebration of Soviet Armenia's 25th anniversary on December 20, 1945, was more than a commemorative event; it was a propaganda tool. Soviet media outlets, including Pravda, published extensive reports celebrating the "festival of the Armenian people" and promoting Soviet Armenia's achievements in various fields.

In his statement, Q. Arutyunov made territorial claims against Turkey, demanding the return of Kars, Ardahan, Sarikamis, and other territories to Armenia. Armenian committees and institutions abroad congratulated Soviet Armenia on its anniversary and expressed a willingness to return to Soviet Armenia if lands in Turkey were included in the Soviet Republic. These appeals sought to reinforce the connection between the Armenians and the Soviet government, emphasizing a commitment to socialism.

Following the approval by the Supreme Soviet on October 19, 1946, the repatriation of Armenians was officially sanctioned. By early 1947, 85,787 Armenians had migrated to the USSR, with some sources reporting as many as 100,000. Most of the immigrants came from countries such as the USA, France, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt. The Public Armenian Charity Organization contributed significant financial resources to facilitate their return. The majority of these emigrants were members of the Dashnak party and, although they presented themselves as supportive of the Soviet government, many were later exiled to Siberia on charges of espionage.

In late 1947, the World Armenian Congress convened in Cairo, with participation from both Soviet officials and Armenians abroad. The congress adopted a political platform that linked mass repatriation to the independence and territorial expansion of Armenia. However, the Dashnak party opposed the repatriation plan, accusing the Soviet government of deceiving the Armenian people. According to the Dashnaks, the USSR had worked to undermine the independence of the Dashnak government and had failed to fulfill promises regarding the unification of Armenian lands, particularly those in Turkey. They specifically mentioned Nagorno-Karabakh, Nakhichevan, and Ahalkalek, arguing that the Soviet government had no intention of integrating these territories into Armenia.

The number of emigrants dropped from 51,238 in 1946 to 34,549 in 1947. The decline can be attributed to two main factors: the strong opposition from the Dashnaksutyun party and the discouragement of potential emigrants by those who had already moved to the USSR, warning that Soviet life was incompatible with their culture. Additionally, the growing disillusionment with the Soviet Union's failure to resolve the "Armenian issue" contributed to the decrease in emigration.

During a period when the Soviet Union maintained its territorial demands on Turkey, these developments significantly damaged the image of the "just state" the Soviet regime had crafted internationally. Additionally, they led to diminishing hopes among Armenians for a solution to the so-called "Armenian issue." According to an agreement between I.V. Stalin and

G. Cerokciyan, Armenians who were brought from abroad were to be settled on lands seized from Turkey and incorporated into Armenia, as decided on April 19, 1945.

However, the introduction of the Truman Doctrine on March 12, 1947, and Turkey's agreements with the United States, postponed the USSR's territorial claims against Turkey. This shift also contributed to the forced relocation of Azerbaijani Turks from their historic lands. In response, the Soviet government hastily made decisions regarding the deportation of Azerbaijani Turks.

This sense of urgency is evident in the decree issued by the USSR Council of Ministers on December 23, 1947, titled "On the Migration of Kolkhoz and Other Azerbaijani People from Armenia, USSR to the Kur-Araz Lowland of Azerbaijan, USSR." The decision was made quickly, without an introductory explanation, and the letter sent by the Armenian and Azerbaijani leaders to the Soviet head of state was dated later, suggesting it was finalized at that time by Soviet officials.

In essence, unable to achieve its territorial goals regarding Turkey or incorporate Nagorno-Karabakh into Armenia, the Soviet Union partly honored its promises to the Armenians by forcibly removing Azerbaijani Turks from their ancestral lands. This led to the further implementation of ethnic cleansing policies against the Azerbaijani Turks. As a result of this expulsion, more than 100,000 Azerbaijani Turks were subjected to ruthless and oppressive political measures.

## Conclusion

This study was conducted based on information gathered from archival documents and period press materials, offering a re-evaluation of the historical context surrounding Azerbaijan-Turkey relations. In particular, it involved extensive research utilizing the archives of the Republic of Azerbaijan, such as the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Youth, Tourism, and Sports. The study also drew heavily from primary sources, including archive documents that have not been previously explored, alongside materials from the Azerbaijani periodical press. Books, memoirs, and visual materials, including documents from the "Kino-Foto-Fono" collection of the Republic of Azerbaijan and various state archives, museums, and ministries, were also incorporated.

Between 1918 and 1920, Azerbaijan and the Ottoman Empire engaged in a close and sincere partnership, particularly in terms of military and political support. The assistance provided by the Ottoman Empire, despite its wartime challenges, was crucial in saving the lives of Muslims and Turks in Azerbaijan from Armenian and Bolshevik persecution. This act of solidarity reflects a deep commitment to mutual aid and cooperation. Although the Soviet era distorted the narrative, labeling the Turkish army's involvement as an act of invasion and colonialism, both the Azerbaijani leadership and the people of Azerbaijan continue to show immense respect and appreciation for the Turkish soldiers who helped preserve Azerbaijan's independence and territorial integrity.

The research involved a detailed examination of various books, articles, and archive materials from the Azerbaijan State Chief Archives Administration, Azerbaijan State History Archive, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It also considered reports from different organizations and expert opinions on the political, economic, and cultural relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan during the Atatürk era. Through comprehensive searches in domestic and foreign online databases, this study has compared the relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan during Atatürk's time with contemporary diplomatic ties.

In light of these findings, a few recommendations can be made for further strengthening Azerbaijan-Turkey relations:

1. **Preservation and Promotion of Historical Relations:** It is vital to continue preserving and sharing the rich history of Azerbaijan-Turkey cooperation, particularly the military and political support during the early 20th century. This can help further enhance mutual understanding and respect between the two nations.
2. **Cultural and Educational Collaboration:** Strengthening cultural and educational exchanges will foster deeper people-to-people connections. Both nations can benefit from sharing knowledge in fields such as history, language, and culture to reinforce the long-standing bond.
3. **Continued Archival Research:** Future research could focus on the political, social, and economic aspects of Azerbaijan-Turkey relations in the post-Soviet era, ensuring a deeper understanding of how their bilateral ties evolved after the fall of the Soviet Union.
4. **Further Diplomatic Engagement:** Given the significance of their bilateral relationship, both governments should continue to engage in regular diplomatic discussions to address contemporary issues while recognizing the historical context of their partnership.

This study has provided a comprehensive re-evaluation of the historical context and significance of Azerbaijan-Turkey relations, offering valuable insights for both current and future diplomatic efforts.

*Conclusion and further insights*

This study has provided a detailed exploration of the evolution of Azerbaijan-Turkey relations and their broader geopolitical context during the Atatürk era, as well as during the time of the Soviet Union's influence over Azerbaijan. A significant finding of this research is the discovery that not all archival records of Turkey-Azerbaijan relations during the Atatürk era are present within Azerbaijan. According to an official from Azerbaijan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, some of these records were taken to the Russian Federation. This indicates the need for further archival research and cooperation with Russian institutions to fully understand the history of these relations.

The study also delves into the shift in the political landscape following Azerbaijan's incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1920, marking a new era in Azerbaijan-Turkey relations. From this point onward, the relationships between Azerbaijan and Turkey were no longer directly bilateral but rather became part of a broader geopolitical context involving Turkey and the Soviet Union. Consequently, a significant portion of the research focuses on the relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union, especially in the cultural and diplomatic contexts. It also analyzes the new dynamics in Turkey-Soviet Union relations, as Soviet Azerbaijan's foreign policy began to be aligned with the broader directives from Moscow.

The shift in political and military alliances during World War I is another important aspect of this study. The Ottoman Empire's alliance with Germany, driven by the lack of other alternatives and the internal need for modernization, had long-lasting effects on the Caucasus region, including Azerbaijan. The strained relations between Germany and the Ottoman Empire towards the end of the war, particularly regarding control of Baku and its oil resources, reflect the complexity of the geopolitical forces shaping the region during this period. The disintegration of the Ottoman-German alliance and its impact on Azerbaijan also became significant factors in the subsequent relationships among the region's powers.

Another crucial element is the role of Enver Pasha, who, while not considered an exceptional military leader, was an influential political figure. His ambitious Pan-Turkism project, and his decision to continue his political endeavors even after World War I, shaped the course of Azerbaijani-Turkish relations. His controversial decisions, particularly in Baku, and his eventual demise in 1922 illustrate the complexities and contradictions of the era.

In terms of the ethnic and social context, this study also highlights the importance of lineage unity in Azerbaijan-Turkey relations. Shared ethnic and social ties, particularly with the Iranian and Georgian populations, formed a basis for regional solidarity. This ethno-social unity was central to the creation of a cohesive and collective identity in the region, which in turn influenced diplomatic and political developments.

After the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's foreign policy was characterized by its balance and commitment to peace. Despite facing external pressure, Turkey maintained a careful neutrality during much of the interwar period, and its relations with the Soviet Union were at their closest during this time. This delicate balance continued under İsmet İnönü, Atatürk's successor, even as World War II led to heightened tensions between the Soviet Union and the Western powers.

### *Recommendations for future research*

1. **Archival Cooperation with Russia:** Given the discovery that some vital archival records related to Azerbaijan-Turkey relations were transferred to Russia, further collaborative research with Russian institutions is essential. This will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the political, military, and cultural interactions during the Atatürk era.
2. **Exploration of Ethno-Social Dynamics:** Future studies could focus more on the ethnocultural relationships between Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, and Georgia, examining how these cultural ties influenced political decisions and the broader regional dynamics. Investigating the role of Pan-Turkism in this context could also shed more light on the motivations behind certain political actions during this period.
3. **In-depth Analysis of Turkey-Soviet Relations:** A deeper exploration of the cultural, economic, and diplomatic relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union during the interwar period could reveal more about the complexities of Soviet-Azerbaijani relations. It is also important to explore how these relations evolved after World War II, especially during the early Cold War years.
4. **Impact of Enver Pasha's Legacy:** A closer look at Enver Pasha's post-WWI endeavors and the effects of his Pan-Turkist ambitions on Azerbaijan-Turkey relations could provide important insights into the long-term effects of his political actions, especially as they relate to regional dynamics and the eventual formation of the Soviet-Azerbaijani partnership.
5. **Detailed Study of Azerbaijan's Soviet Period:** With Azerbaijan's incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1920, its political landscape changed drastically. A more detailed investigation into the diplomatic, cultural, and political developments within Azerbaijan during this period could enhance the understanding of how Soviet Azerbaijan's foreign policy influenced Azerbaijan-Turkey relations in the early Soviet period.

This study offers a new perspective on the historical relationship between Azerbaijan and Turkey, with an emphasis on the broader geopolitical factors that shaped their interactions. Through further research and international cooperation, a deeper

understanding of this period can be achieved, contributing to more effective diplomacy and cooperation between Turkey and Azerbaijan today.

The respected nations in the world typically gain recognition for their military, economic, or cultural wealth, and some countries even boast a combination of these qualities. Azerbaijan, which has long aspired to be one of these respected countries, had initially been able to rely on its rich cultural heritage. However, the Soviet occupation had devastating effects on Azerbaijani culture, with many historical and cultural monuments being destroyed. Though Azerbaijan is actively working towards restoring its cultural heritage today, it cannot yet be considered a nation rich in culture in the way that others are. However, in terms of industrial development, Azerbaijan is making significant strides thanks to its abundant natural resources. Since regaining its independence, Azerbaijan has made considerable investments in its economy, mirroring the progress it has pursued in other sectors. Yet, many of these ventures have been hindered due to the legacy of the centralized Soviet system, which left Azerbaijan with a lack of legal infrastructure. Despite these challenges, the country has experienced rapid economic progress, which is further supported by the strong foreign relations it has built with various global partners. Azerbaijan's economic advancements, particularly in the energy sector, provide a solid foundation for its future.

In terms of globalization, while Azerbaijan has not fully undergone the global transformation that some other nations have, its rich resources and opportunities give it the potential to rise on the international stage in the coming years. To succeed, Azerbaijan must first develop a positive global image, as every nation's success is partly driven by the perceptions held about it abroad. Creating and maintaining a positive image on the world stage is essential for Azerbaijan's future development and success, and this requires substantial effort to combat the negativity that sometimes surrounds the country.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's vision of society was born out of the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, and it was built around the collective identity of the Turkish people. Atatürk aimed to break free from the constrictive influence of the Islamic community and to establish a new sense of individual and national identity. This vision included not only the development of a new "common consciousness" but also a steady progression toward a new identity for the Turkish people, crystallized around symbols of the newly established Republic. These changes were to be felt on both an emotional and sensory level.

### *Turkey-Azerbaijan relations*

Today, Turkey and Azerbaijan are deeply interconnected as "sister states," united by shared ethnic and cultural ties. The only distinctions between the two peoples are their unique national identities and dialects. Just as there are differences in the dialects spoken by Turks in Istanbul and those in Erzurum, there are naturally regional dialectal differences between Azerbaijanis and Turks. Despite these small distinctions, Azerbaijan and Turkey share a fundamental cultural bond, and their political and diplomatic relations continue to evolve.

When we look back at the last two centuries of historical events, we see that Azerbaijan and Turkey have consistently supported each other in times of need. When Azerbaijan declared its independence in 1918, the Ottoman Empire extended its support, helping Azerbaijan resist the Russian invasion. Later, when the Ottoman Empire was dismantled by external powers and the Republic of Turkey was struggling to assert itself in the War of Independence, Azerbaijan, along with other Turkic republics, offered vital support to the Turkish cause.

This historical support and solidarity between Azerbaijan and Turkey have paved the way for the strong political, economic, and cultural ties that exist today. The mutual understanding, shared history, and common goals ensure that the relationship between these two nations will continue to evolve and thrive as they face the challenges of the modern world.

### *Recommendations for Azerbaijan's future*

1. **Cultural Restoration and Global Recognition:** Azerbaijan should continue to invest in the preservation and restoration of its cultural heritage, as well as its efforts to showcase its rich traditions on the global stage. A positive image abroad will play a crucial role in attracting international support and investment.
2. **Economic Diversification:** While Azerbaijan is making significant progress in exploiting its natural resources, it must continue to diversify its economy beyond the energy sector to ensure long-term stability and resilience.
3. **Strengthening Diplomatic Relations:** Azerbaijan must continue to build and expand its diplomatic relations with countries around the world. It should strengthen its strategic partnerships, particularly with countries like Turkey, which share common interests and goals.
4. **Investing in Legal and Institutional Frameworks:** To support its economic growth and attract foreign investment, Azerbaijan should focus on improving its legal and regulatory systems, making them more transparent and efficient.
5. **Promoting Regional Cooperation:** Azerbaijan should continue to promote cooperation with its neighboring countries, particularly in the areas of trade, culture, and security. Strong regional ties will help ensure stability and growth for Azerbaijan in the future.

Azerbaijan has the potential to emerge as a respected and influential nation on the global stage, but achieving this requires continued efforts in economic, cultural, and diplomatic spheres. By leveraging its strengths, improving its global image, and fostering strong relationships with neighboring countries like Turkey, Azerbaijan can pave the way for a prosperous future.

### *The impact of glasnost and perestroika on Azerbaijan-Turkey relations*

The policy of *Glasnost* (openness) and *Perestroika* (restructuring) initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1989 had significant consequences for the Soviet Union and its republics, including Azerbaijan. This period marked the beginning of a transformation in Azerbaijan, as it began to rediscover its material and spiritual values. Amidst the loosening grip of Soviet control, there were widespread protests and riots within Azerbaijan, with the population pushing for the reclamation of territories lost to Armenians. This resulted in bloodshed, as the Soviet Red Army entered Azerbaijan in 1990, crushing the uprising and killing many civilians.

Despite the oppression, the momentum towards independence grew, and in August 1991, Azerbaijan, along with Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, declared its independence from the Soviet Union. This was followed by other Turkic republics, signaling the end of the Soviet Union's dominance over the region. The conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia over the Nagorno-Karabakh region, however, continued to ravage the area.

### *Turkey's support for Azerbaijan*

When the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, Turkey was the first state to recognize Azerbaijan's independence. This recognition was crucial for Azerbaijan as it navigated its new sovereignty. Following this, Turkey began to invest heavily in Azerbaijan's economic infrastructure. One of the most significant projects between the two countries was the *Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) Pipeline*. This pipeline allowed Azerbaijan to access European markets for its oil reserves, providing an alternative route to the previous Baku-Supsa-Novorossiysk pipeline. The BTC Pipeline became not just a critical economic venture, but also a symbol of the growing partnership between Azerbaijan and Turkey.

### *Cultural and educational cooperation*

In addition to economic projects, Turkey and Azerbaijan fostered deeper ties through cultural and educational cooperation. In the years following 1990, both countries established student exchange programs, enabling students from Azerbaijan to study in Turkey and vice versa. These exchanges have facilitated better understanding between the people of the two nations and have strengthened the future diplomatic, political, and economic relations between them.

Students who study in one another's countries are exposed to the political, economic, and cultural environments of their host nation, creating long-lasting relationships between future leaders, diplomats, and businesspeople from both countries. These educational exchanges are vital for building a solid foundation for cooperation in the coming decades.

### *Turkey's influence in the post-Soviet era*

After Azerbaijan's independence, Turkey continued its policy of support, not just toward Azerbaijan but also toward other Turkic republics that had emerged following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Turkey's approach was not only economic but also strategic, as it sought to foster unity among Turkic states in the region.

Ankara's foreign policy during the 1920s was shaped by the need to establish friendly relations with the Soviet Union. During the period between 1920 and 1922, Turkey had to rely on the Soviet Union for political support, arms, and financial aid to solidify its national and legal legitimacy. This collaboration was crucial for Turkey's War of Independence and helped secure its sovereignty. The Soviet Union also used its support for Turkey to promote its ideology of socialism over capitalism and increase its influence in the region, particularly in Azerbaijan.

Despite this cooperation, Turkey maintained its sovereignty and independence, rejecting the Soviet ideology's influence on domestic politics. The country focused on nationalism and created a modern, independent state. This careful balancing act enabled Turkey to build strong relations with the Soviet Union while retaining its autonomy and political identity.

### *Legacy of Soviet relations*

The relationship between the Soviet Union and Turkey was complex, and influenced by the long history of Ottoman-Russian conflicts. Soviet policies towards Turkey often sought to undermine its strategic position and weaken its influence in the region. The USSR also sought to extend its sphere of influence by supporting various Turkic ethnic groups, including Azerbaijanis, in their struggle against imperialism.

Through this history of complex diplomacy and mutual interests, Turkey and Azerbaijan's relationship has continued to evolve. Despite the challenges posed by Soviet policies, both countries have maintained strong ties and continue to develop their political, economic, and cultural cooperation in the post-Soviet era.

In the post-Soviet era, Turkey and Azerbaijan have forged an increasingly close relationship, built on historical, cultural, and strategic commonalities. The events that began with the policy of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* have shaped the current geopolitical landscape in which Azerbaijan, with Turkey's support, has emerged as a key player in the region. The *Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline*, educational exchanges, and continued diplomatic engagement are all testaments to the strong

partnership between Azerbaijan and Turkey. This enduring relationship, built on mutual respect, shared culture, and common political interests, will likely continue to thrive in the future.

In examining the intersection of organizational theory and political theory, it becomes apparent that these two disciplines, while seemingly distinct in their focus and methodologies, share significant similarities. Both areas delve into human phenomena that span a wide range of activities and institutions, often shaping vast aspects of human life. While organizational theory focuses on the structures and functions of organizations, political theory examines the institutions of governance, both of which influence the lives of individuals on a massive scale.

At the heart of these disciplines is the recognition that individuals are members of multiple organizations, whether formal or informal, that define much of their experiences. These organizations—ranging from small businesses and social clubs to larger entities such as governments, political parties, and interest groups—play a fundamental role in shaping our personal and collective identities. Even entities like states and political parties are, in essence, organizations. Though they differ from typical organizations in their scale, power, and societal impact, they follow similar organizational principles, as Kaufman [1] highlights.

This concept is particularly relevant when analyzing the historical relationship between Turkey and Azerbaijan during the Soviet era, which is the focal point of this study. Through an exploration of archive records and policies, this research sheds light on the interactions between the two nations, particularly their solidarity and cooperation during times of conflict.

A key source for this study is Betül Aslan's *Brotherly Help (Kardeş Kömeği)*, which provides a detailed examination of Azerbaijan's aid to the Ottoman state during the Balkan Wars through the Baku Muslim Society. This account is essential for understanding the long-standing ties between Azerbaijan and the Ottoman Empire. Aslan's work illustrates the nature of solidarity between the two nations, which continued during the First World War. The support of Azerbaijani Turks to the Ottoman Empire is further explored through the personal memories of figures like Fahrettin Erdoğan, shedding light on the significant contributions of Azerbaijan to the Ottoman war effort.

In this context, the political and organizational connections between Azerbaijan and Turkey during the Soviet era were not merely academic but were rooted in real-world cooperation and mutual aid. These historical ties exemplify how political and organizational frameworks transcend borders, as states and their people navigate shared struggles, build solidarity, and provide aid in times of need. This ongoing relationship reflects the enduring significance of organizational theory and political theory in understanding how states, organizations, and individuals interact to shape history.

**Acknowledgments:** None

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Financial support:** None

**Ethics statement:** None

## References

1. Kaufman H. Organization Theory and Political Theory, *The American Political Science Review*. 1964;58(1):5-14.
2. Şemseddinov A. Turkey and the Soviet Union Relations in the years of War of Independence, *KratkiyeSoobşeniya*; 1964.
3. ACSPTHAR. Ministry of Finance of Azerbaijan. Fund: 277, List: 2, Connection: 2, Protection Unit: 71, Box: 3; 1920.
4. Sander O. *Turkey's Foreign Policy*. London: İmge Publications; 1998.
5. Soysal I. *Turkey's Political Teraties, Vol I, (1920-1945)*, Ankara: Turkish History Institution; 1989.
6. <http://www.archimac.org/Organizations/DAGM.spml>; (Turkey/National Archives in Ankara); July 16, 2005.
7. Aslan B. *Turkey and Azerbaijan Relations and Ibrahim Ebilov (1920-1923)*, Istanbul: Kaynak Publications; 2004.
8. <http://www.avsam.org>; (Official Web Page of the Center for Eurasian Strategic Studies); December 25, 2004.
9. Akyol T. *Azerbaijan, Soviets and Beyond*, Burak Publications, 2. Edition, Istanbul. Armeniya S. (1975). Qodivelikoy. O. V., (1941-1945). Erevan; 1994.
10. Aslan S. Mustafa Kemal-M. Frunze Talks. Summit in Turkish-Soviet Relations. Istanbul: Kaynak Publications; 2002.
11. Atemova K, Mendikulova Z, Takibayev M, Issabekova G. Possibilities of using Turkish thinkers' heritage in formation of future teachers' professional identity. *Entomol Appl Sci Lett*, 2018;5(4):56-67.
12. Kıray E. *Economic Structure and External Debt in the Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: İletişim Publications; 2008.
13. Mircan S. Historical Development in the Economic and Financial Affairs of the Soviet Union and Turkey, Uludag University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Finance Journal, Bursa; 2001.
14. *Hurriyet Newspaper.*, 13.08.2001.
15. Zoxrabbekov A. *StranaOqney (Russian: Land of Fire)*. Baku :Gençlik Publications; 1987.

16. Kurbanlı A. TURAN-SAM. Magazine; 2009. Available at: [www.turansam.org](http://www.turansam.org).
17. Armeniyaza S. 60 Let. Erevan, izd. AN Arm. SSR; 1970.
18. Djuzeppe B. İstoriyaSovetskoqoSoyuza. Moskva, iz. Mejdunarodnıetnoşenie, T.II; 1994. p. 162.
19. Xomozuri Q. SoçialnıePotryaseniya v SudbaxNarodov. M., İntelekt; 1997.
20. Pjikov AX. Ottepel (1963-1964). Arxiv. Moskva: Olmo Pres; 2002.