

Список использованных источников

1. Azərbaycan etnoqrafiyası. 3 cildə. I cild. – Bakı: «Şərq-Qərb», 2007. – 544 səh.
2. İsmayılzadə Q. Arxeoloqun çöl gündəliyindən. – Bakı, 2009. – 205 s.
3. Страбон. География (в 17 кн.). – М., 1964. – 943 с. // Strabon. География (в 17 кн.). – М., 1964. – 943 с.
4. İsmayilov Q. Quruçay və Köndələnçay vadisində qədim mədəniyyət izləri. – Bakı: «Elm» nəşriyyatı, 1981. – 51 s.
5. Məmmədov T. M. Qafqaz Albaniyası ilk orta əsrlərdə. – Bakı: «Təhsil», 2006. – 400 s.
6. Qasımlı V. A. İlk orta əsrlərdə Naxçıvanda maldarlıq təsərrüfatı // Bakı Universitetinin xəbərləri №4. Humanitar elmlər seriyası. – 2010. – S.167–171.
7. Bünyadov Z. M. Azərbaycan VII–IX əsrlərdə. Azərbaycan Dövlət Nəşriyyatı, 1989. – 336 s.
8. Azərbaycan Tarixi: 7 cildə, II cild. – Bakı, 2007. – 605 s.

Aslanov E., dissertator, Institute of Archeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan (Azerbaijan, Baku), E.aslanov85@mail.ru

About the situation of herders in Kendelenskom and Quruchayskom areas of Azerbaijan in IV–XIII centuries

The article describes the situation of livestock farms located in areas of Kendelenskom and Quruchayskom of Azerbaijan in IV–XIII centuries. Carrying out research work in this field at the same time leads to the study of the history of that time, which is important. People's lives for a long time about the river basin on the one hand, on the other people's lives in different times under the yoke of foreigners have left an indelible mark on the formation of the economic value of the region. All this proves the historical necessity of the existence of regional livestock.

Keywords: livestock, livestock farms, archaeological monuments, places of residence, archeological research.

Асланов Е., дисертант, Институт археологии та этнографии Национальной академии наук Азербайджана (Азербайджан, Баку), E.aslanov85@mail.ru

Про становище скотарських господарств у Гуручайському і Кьонделенчайському регіонах Азербайджану в IV–XIII століттях

Викладається положення тваринницького господарства розташованого в Гуручайському і Кьонделенчайському регіонах Азербайджану в IV–XIII століттях. Проведення наукових робіт в цій області одночасно призводить і до вивчення історії того часу, що має велике значення. Життя людей з давніх часів біля басейну річок з одного боку, з іншого боку життя людей у різні часи під ярмом іноземців залишили незгладимий слід у формуванні господарської цінності регіону. Все це історично доводить про необхідність існування в регіоні тваринницьких господарств.

Ключові слова: тваринництво, тваринницькі господарства, пам'ятки археології, місця проживання, археологічні дослідження.

УДК 93/94:01

Shiraliyev R.,
PhD student at the Institute of History named
after A. A. Bakikhanov of ANAS
(Azerbaijan, Baku), rashad_875@rambler.ru

AT THE BEGINNING OF THE XVIII CENTURY
THE REINFORCING POLICY OF THE SAFAVID
IN THE AREA OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

The foreign policy of the last period of the Safavid State history was attentively followed in Soviet historical science. The Soviet historians characterized the historical stage from the second half of XVII century to 30's of the XVIII century as «Weakness and decline of the Safavid State».

Keywords: Safavid dynasty, Ottoman Empire, Russian Empire, turks, Caspian Sea.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Information of consolidating several areas of the Safavid State by Russia made an anxiety in Ottoman palace. In order to marching to Southern Caucasus the Ottoman party began preparation. A. Abdurrahmanov's opinion, the Western

Europe States (specially France and England) incited ottomans to bring troops into the Southern Caucasus [1, p. 33–35]. So, in 1722 the Ottoman State began the war in order to capture the areas of the Safavid State [2, p. 191].

V. N. Leviatov commented that, in spring 1723 after entering Erzurum pasha troops to Cartly the areas of Georgia began to occupy by Ottoman Empire [3, p. 85]. On June 12–13, 1723 the Ottoman army seized Tbilisi without fighting [4, p. 97]. The Ottomans were interested in seizing the Coastal provinces.

Military activity of Ottoman Empire and longing for the Caspian coastal areas complicated the position of Russia in this region [5, p. 84]. Such progressing of events compeled Peter I to hurry. In order to outstripping the Ottomans he demanded general Matyushkin to set off for Baku with Safavid ambassador Ismail bey before fulfilling the preparation of war ships in Khazan and Nijny Novgorod [6, p. 57].

So, on July 1723 Russian Navy set out to Baku from Hashterkhan under the leadership of Matyushkin, and arrived in the sea walls of Baku Tower in July 6 [6, p. 58]. F. Aliyev mentioned that Matyushkin sent Ismayil bey and Nechayev for negotiations with Baku Soltan in the day of arrival to Baku Tower [6, p. 58]. After realizing the impossibility of putting up resistance, Baku noblemen agreed to surrender. Lately, moving along the Kur, Russian troops seized some towns very easily.

To capture Baku city «The best harbour along the coats of Shamakhi and Gilan» made Peter I very happy [7, p. 186]. Peter I bursted drum–fire for the glory of seizing Baku [6, p. 63]. Seizing Baku and Caspian Coastal provinces by Russians strained Ottoman–Russian relations rather fairly.

Russian party continued diplomatic negotiations with Safavid State in order to seize these areas both in military and from juridical standpoint. Paying attention to this matter A. Ebdurrahmanov indicated that «For the time being 1722 Russia began his diplomatic negotiations with Tahmasp II... On 21 August 1722, kuryer Chebotayev and consul Abraam met Tahmasp II» [1, p. 31].

Let's mention that, Shah Tahmasp II sent Ismail bey to Hashtarkhan with Chebotayev [1, p. 31]. Ismail bey's visit was completed to sign treaty between Russian Empire and the Safavid State in Sankt–Petersburg On 12 September 1723 [8, p. 60; 9, p. 27; 10, p. 64]. According to that treaty the Safavid State compromised to Russia the areas from Darband to Astrabad.

Peter I undertook an engagement to assist the Safavid Shah to struggle against Afgans and other rebels [3, p. 83; 9, p. 2]. But this treaty wasn't affirmed by the Safavid Shah [6, p. 31].

Russian official circles were taking several measures for reinforcing in occupied areas. One of the measures was about to increase the quantity of Christian people in these provinces. Russian historians indicated that, Peter I called Christians to move to these provinces voluntarily during his marching to the Caspian Coastal provinces (in some cases «christian» expression is used as fabricated «armenian» expression in soviet literature) [11, p. 16]. Soviet emperor gave instructions connected with removing Turks and Moslems from the Coastal provinces [5, p. 85].

To the end of 1723, Russia and the Ottoman Empires had been divided The Southern Caucasus entering to Azerbaijan. But Russia wasn't interested in the war with The Ottoman Empire so, on July 12, 1724 was signed a treaty in Istanbul [12, p. 23–24; 13; 6, p. 69; 10, p. 67]. According to this peace

treaty Ottoman Soltan recognized taking The Coastal provinces under Russia control, and Russian emperor recognized passing approximately all eastern parts of The Caucasus and the Southern Azerbaijan into Ottoman State [6, p. 69; 4, p. 30]. In Istanbul treaty it was specially paid attention to Shirvan. In the base of this treaty Shirvan was given the right of autonomy in internal affairs. The Ottoman Soltan was forbidden to keep troops in the borders of Shirvan. Only in exceptional cases, in agreement with Russia Ottoman troop could enter into Shirvan [6, p. 69].

Generally, in Soviet history science it was given a special importance to the results of Istanbul treaty in 1724. In some works (example, A. Abdurrahmanov's work – R. S.) this treaty is only appreciated as the victory of Russian diplomacy [1, p. 39]. But F. Afandiyeu indicated the great importance of 1724 Istanbul treaty both Russia and the Ottoman States «According to this treaty Russian and Turk troops' suppositional conflicts were prevented in Azerbaijan areas, Russia strengthened his position in the Caspian Sea, and severed Turk troops' exit to The Caspian Coast. Besides that, Istanbul treaty offered all facilities for further conquest of Turkey all Azerbaijan except the Safavid provinces, Coastal provinces and Shirvan» [6, p. 70].

So, according to Istanbul treaty much more parts of Safavid properties were distributed between Russia and the Ottoman Empires. From the end of 1724 to the beginning of 1725 the Ottoman troops captured The Southern Caucasus and much more of Azerbaijan, and till the end of 1725 approximately all Azerbaijan was captured [6, p. 74–78]. Shirvan which was ruling by Haji Davud was dependent on Ottomans Vassal. The western part of the Caspian Sea was captured by russians, and the areas of Kirman, Gandahar, Isphahan, and Shiraz was seized by Afghans. Shah Tahmasp II sway was recognized only in some regions of Mazandaran, Astrabad and The Southern Azerbaijan [6, p. 74].

One of the remarkable points in Soviet researchers' works is about the enlightenment of people's relation to invaders in captured Safavid areas. Some authors (A. Guliyev, F. Aliyev, G. Abdullayev and so on.) demonstrated ideological position, and at that time mentioned «Azerbaijan people inclination to russian». But some soviet historians rather objectively enlightened this problem. Example, N. A. Smirnov who criticized Russian czarist colonial policy indicated that, «large areas which belong to Caucasian people, then seizing natural resources, wild character of russian, armenian and other merchants' internal trade, defending slave trade—all these couldn't sympathize with czarist colonial policy» [14, p. 191]. Besides, showing Azerbaijanis aggressive attitude to Russians, V. Listsov tried to present them as ottoman worshippers. To his mind, the main part of population consisted of Turks and unofficial moslems in coastal provinces and this simplified Ottoman conquerers. Azeri turks inclined ottomans, and always made a danger for Russian aggressors [15, p. 150–151]. At the same time all these gave superiority to The Ottoman Empire both in the Southern Caucasus and in Azerbaijan. And let's mention that, the minority of Azeri turks were indecisive position. Some local noblemen depending on political situation demonstrated either Ottoman worshipper or Russian worshipper position. And it doesn't give any chance to investigator to think that «local people incline to invader state». There are sufficient information about people's offering either Ottoman or Russian military forces in original sources.

After Istanbul treaty in 1724, Russian and Ottoman empires fought for distributing neglected Safavid areas between themselves. V. N. Leviatov noted that, Turkey which carried on negotiation with Russia for distributing «Iran» tried to draw into relation with Afgan lord Ashraf in a secret way [3, p. 174]. On October 1727, there was signed a peace treaty between Ottoman soltan and Ashraf [1, p. 43; 16, p. 316]. According to this peace treaty Ottoman soltan maintained Tabriz, Ardabil, Hamadan, Sultania and Kirmanshah areas were under his control [1, p. 43]. But Ottomans refused to recognize Ashraf as «Iran shah» in order to confine Ottomans future conquests [1, p. 43]. Ashraf affirmed that he accepted vassal dependence from Ottoman Soltan [16, p. 316; 17, p. 202].

But Russian Empiror resolved to help Safavid Shah Tahmasp II [1, p. 41]. Russian lord built new towers, strengthened defence of significant coastal cities in the coastal provinces of Azerbaijan [1, p. 42]. But diplomatic negotiation was going on between Russia and the Ottoman Empires. On December 1727, a new treaty was signed between two sides concerning decisive determination of border lines in Azerbaijani territory [1, p. 43]. The separate regions of coastal provinces and their inlands (Cavad, Salyan, Bashbarmag, Shashpara, Rustov, Shabran and Mushkur) were given to Russia [1, p. 43]. Haji David who made plunderer aggression to the territories which were under Russian control, accused as «infailure» by Ottoman Soltan and was replaced for Surkhay Khan on May 1728 [1, p. 44]. In Soviet historical literature it's showed that Surkhay Khan made plunderer attacks to Guba and Darband regions [1, p. 44; 3, p. 97]. Russian command sent troops to Surkhay Khan for punishing at the end of 1728 and in 1729 [3, p. 97].

V. N. Leviatov came to an interesting conclusion concerning to the last period of Haji David and Surkhay Khan's activities: Davud and Surkhay khan couldn't achieve political independence. The political position of the same period was so that it was possible to achieve this aim. When the struggle was being gone against Iran tyranny, Haji Davud and Surkhay khan's activities were about fighting for freedom, and sometimes later they began to act subsidiary role of turk plunderer and exploiters after being turk pashas and executors of invader plans of Turkey.

The position of the Safavid State was very hard, but the judge society didn't want to accept it, and fought for liberating lost lands. Soviet investigators mentioned that, «people forced against invaders in different places of the country» [1, p. 51–52; 18, p. 57; 3, p. 94; 19, p. 66–78]. I. P. Petrushevskiy noted that, the struggle was strengthened against Ottoman and Afgan occupation after establishing movement centre in Mazandaran [16, p. 316]. Soon, the noble commander Nadirgulu khan led this movement. His first duty was to put an end to Afgan's domination in the country.

But in Soviet historical literature it is informed that there weren't few rivals of Nadir khan among Safavid noblemen. His main rival was considered Fatali khan Gajar. Fatali khan who had a chance to influence to Shah Tahmasp II began his military march to Khorasan in 1726 in order to strengthen his own position [20, p. 93]. The next powerful rival of Nadir was considered Malik Mahmud Sistanly who declared himself as an independent ruler in Khorasan. Nadir khan (belonged to «gizilbash afshar» family that was moved by Shah Ismail), was leading other feudal troop there. The main struggle for Khorasan was between Nadirgulu khan and Malik Mahmud [18, p. 59].

Soviet historians mentioned that, Nadir khan with his military troop were under control of Shah when Tahmasp II came to Khorasan in order to struggle against Fatali khan Gajar and Malik Mahmud in 1726 [18, p. 59]. Nadir khan was nominated the chief commander of the Armed forces of the Safavid State after the death of Fatali khan by order of the shah. Nadir khan either defeated Malik Mahmud and restored Khorasan to the Safavid dynasty [18, p. 60].

I. P. Petrushevskiy mentioned that, Nadir adopted the name «Tahmaspgulu khan» and took the control of all fields of the state management [16, p. 316]. He defeated Afgans twice in 1729. Although Ottomans afgans ruler helped Ashraf, Nadir khan defeated him again. After this defeat Ashraf was compulsive to leave Ispahan. Nadir's troops were chasing Ashraf and he was defeated near Fars once more again. Ashraf was killed when he forced to run [18, p. 60–61; 16, p. 317].

Let's note that after two weeks when afgans left Ispahan Shah Tahmasp II solemnly entered the capital and Nadir crowned Shah with Safavid crown [18, p. 61].

Soviet authors showed Nadir shah as an able commander and besides they also mentioned his successes depended on mass of people's support [16, p. 317]. Soviet historians noted that, Nadir and Tahmasp's troops considerably extended by the help of volunteer warriors [18, p. 61]. The new rebellions took place in some cities against afgan occupation [18, p. 61]. The local people organized attacks against backward afgan forces [18, p. 61–62].

In Soviet historical literature it's shown that Nadir khan began the intensive war with Ottomans in Azerbaijan and the western provinces of the Safavid State after banishing Afgans from the country [18, p. 63]. In 1730, Nadir khan's forces got back Hamadan, Kirman and the Southern Azerbaijan from Ottomans [16, p. 317].

Nadir khan's military successes gradually increased his authority. This case began to make Shah Tahmasp II to worry about it. While Nadir khan was busy to suppress the rebellion with Afgans in Khorasan, Tahmasp II came to a decision personally to battle with Ottomans. He was seeking to increase his authority by this way. But Tahmasp II military operations against Ottomans were failed. Being defeated near Irevan Tahmasp's forces turned back sparcely towards Tebriz in 1731 [1, p. 35]. On September 1731, Safavid forces sustained a hard defeat near Hamadan. During that time Shah lost about 38 000 warriors [21, p. 58]. Tahmasp II was obliged to sign a peace treaty with Ottomans. It's remained «Kirmanshah peace» treaty in historical literature, and according to this treaty, Ottomans could hold the Southern Caucasus areas in the Northern part of Araz river [16, p. 317].

Let's note that, Safavid shah signed peace treaty with Russia in 1732 [22, p. 151–152]. It's noted in Russian literature, after Peter I death, (1725) Russian official circles met with difficulties to hold troops on coastal provinces so they voluntarily agreed to give back partly areas to Safavid shah on condition that not to allow Ottomans to enter these areas [22, p. 150; 16, p. 317]. For that reason, the government sent the famous diplomatist of Russia Shafirov to Rasht city according to the treaty which was signed in Rasht the Coastal provinces till Kur river were given to the Safavid State [22, p. 151–152]. In this treaty it was considered to give Coastal provinces back to Safavid shah after banishing Ottomans from the Southern Caucasus.

«Kirmanshah peace» treaty that was signed with Ottoman soltan stroke Tahmasp's authority. I. P. Petrushevskiy

mentioned that, «He called the treaty which was signed by Nadir shah with Turkey «disgraceful» and didn't accept it. He invited khan, noblemen..., and achieved to overthrow Tahmasp II and declared Tahmasp's eight monthed son Abbas III as a shah (He was considered a shah from 1732 to 1736 – R. Sh). The real power was under Nadir's control» [16, p. 317]. So, on August 1732, Nadir shah overthrew Tahmasp II as the result of struggle for authority [23, p. 9].

After this event Nadir shah began his new military operations against Ottomans. In 1732–1735 Nadir shah's forces took much more parts of the Southern Caucasus from Ottomans. I. P. Petrushevskiy mentioned that, Nadir shah used support of Russian engineers and artillerymen during the blockade of Ganja. It simplified Nadir shah to demand Russia to empty Coastal provinces (Baku and Darband cities). Empress Ann Ivanova (1730–1740) agreed with that demand on condition that, not to sign separate peace treaty and to continue the war against the Ottoman State being union with Nadir shah. On March 1735 the new treaty was signed with Russia in Ganja: Russia guidance refused Coastal provinces. So, according to the treaties which signed in Rasht and Ganja Russian people left the Coastal provinces that they occupied. And instead of that Russian people were allowed to open council in Rasht and duty-free right in the areas of the Safavid State [24, p. 53].

But soon, the liability of not to sign the separate peace treaty with Ottomans which was considered in Ganja treaty was crossed out by Nadir shah. Thus, he signed a peace treaty with Ottoman guidance in Erzurum in 1736.

According to that treaty Ottoman side gave back Safavid areas which captured until 1722 [16, p. 317–318].

It's shown in Soviet historical literature that after the last events, Safavid dynasty lost not only real political power, but also their authority among feudal noblemen [16, p. 319]. Nadir's ascendancy increased as «Saviour of the country». Taking an opportunity of the suitable condition Nadir became arrogant to take the throne into his own hand. For that reason, he gathered military congress on January–March 1736 [16, p. 319]. Although of some noblemen and confessor's dissatisfaction in that congress Nadir was elected «Shah». Overthrewed the last Safavid shah Abbas III was sent to Khorasan to his father. Later, father and son were killed there [16, p. 319–320]. So, having more than 230 years history the Safavid State was launched into history.

So, it seems that the foreign policy of the last period of the Safavid State history was attentively followed in Soviet historical science. The Soviet historians characterized the historical stage from the second half of XVII century to 30's of the XVIII century as «Weakness and decline of the Safavid State». In Soviet historical literature it's mentioned that in 20's of the XVIII century the considerable areas of the Safavid State was seized by Ottoman, Russian and afgan forces. Soviet historians indicated that in result of Nadir khan's successful military operations the large area of the former Safavid State was free from invaders, but in his initiative result of the Safavid dynasty power and existence of the Safavid State was put an end.

References

1. Abdurahmanov Q. B. Azerbaijan vo vzaimootnosheniyakh Turtsii, Rossii i Irana v pervoy polovine XVIII v. – Baku: Izd-vo AN Azerb. SSR, 1964. – 99 s.
2. Meyer M. S. Osmanskaya imperiya (cherti strukturnoego krizisa). – Moskva: Nauka, 1991. – 261 s.

3. Leviatov V. N. Ocherki iz istorii Azerbajjana v XVIII veke. – Baku: Izd-vo AN Azerb. SSR, 1948. – 227 s.

4. Markova O. P. Rossiya, Zakavkazye i mejdunarodniye otnošeniya v XVIII v. – Moskva: Izd-vo «Nauka», 1966. – 323 s.

5. Alizade O. XVIII esrin birinji yarisinda Sefevi-Osmanli munasibetleri. – Baki: Elm, 2009. – 208 s.

6. Aliyev F. M. Antiiranskiye vistupleniya i borba protiv turetskoy okkupatsii v Azerbajjane v pervoy polovine XVIII v. – Baku: Izd-vo «Elm», 1975. – 230 s.

7. Tarle Y. V. Russkiy flot i vneshnyaya politika Petra I // Sobraniye sochineniy v 12 t-h. – Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR. – T.12. – S.115–202.

8. Atayev Kh. A. Torqovo-ekonomicheskiye svyazi Irana s Rossiyei v XVIII–XIX vv. – Moskva: Nauka, 1991. – 392 s.

9. Novaya istoriya Irana (khrestomatiya). – Moskva: Izd-vo «Nauka», 1988. – 328 s.

10. Satovov N. A. Severniy Kavkaz v russko-iranskikh i russko-turetskikh otnošeniakh v XVIII v. – Moskva: Nauka, 1991. – 224 s.

11. Kinyapina N. S., Bliyei M. M., Deqoyev V. V. Kavkaz i Srednyaya Aziya vo vnesney politike Rossii. – Moskva: Izd-vo MQU, 1984. – 328 s.

12. Aliyev F. XVIII esrin birinji yarisinda Azerbajjanda tijaret. – Baki: Azerb. SSR EA–nin neshriyyati, 1964. – 123 s.

13. Huseyn I. Sefevli dovruna Iran. T.e.n. alimlik derecesini almaq uchun teqdim olunmuş dissertasiya. – Baki: 2005. – 168 s.

14. Smirnov N. A. Politika Rossii na Kavkaze v XVI–XIX vekax. – Moskva: Izd-vo sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy literaturi, 1958. – 244 s.

15. Listov V. P. Persidskiy poxod Petra I (1722–1723 qq.). – Moskva: Izd-vo MQU, 1951. – 245 s.

16. Piqulevskaya V. V., Yakubovskiy A. Y., Petrushevskiy I. P., Stroyeva L. V., Belenitskiy A. M. Istoriya Irana s drevneyshix vremen do kontsa 18 veka. – Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1958. – 391 s.

17. Istoriya Irana / Otv. red. Ivanov M. S. – Moskva: Izd-vo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1977. – 488 s.

18. Arunova M. R., Ashrafyan K. Z. Qosudarstvo Nadir–shaha Ashrafa. – Moskva: Izd-vo Vostochnoy literaturi, 1958. – 284 s.

19. Paychadze Q. Q. Russko–qruzinskiye politicheskiye otnošeniya v pervoy polovine XVIII v. – Tbilisi: Sabchota Sakartvelo, 1970. – 280 s.

20. Miklukho–Maklay N. D. «Zapiski» S. Avramova // Ucheniye zapiski LQU. SVN. – 1952. – №128. – Vipusk 3. – S.88–103

21. Abraam Yerevantsi. Istoriya voyn 1721–1736 qq. – Yerevan: Izd-vo Arm. FANA, 1939. – 93 s.

22. Aliyev F. M. Azerbajjano–russkiye otnošeniya (XV–XIX vv.). Chast 1. – Baku: Izd-vo «Elm», 1985. – 174 s.

23. Ter–Avetisyan S. V. Poxodi Tamas–Kuli–khana (Nadir shah) i izbiraniye yeqo shahom v opisaniy Akopa Shemakhetsi. – Tiflis: Izd-vo Instituta Kavkazovedeniya AN SSSR, 1932. – 17 s.

24. Mamedova Q. N. O popitke peremesheniya tsentra konsulskoy rezidentsii v qorod Baku v pervoy polovine XVIII veka / Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Azerbajjanskoy SSR. Seriya istorii, filosofii i prava. – Baku, 1980. – №2. – S.52–58.

Ширалієв Р., докторант, Інститут історії Національної академії наук Азербайджану (Азербайджан, Баку), rashad_875@rambler.ru

Посилення державної політики Сефевідів на території Європейських держав на початку XVIII століття

Зовнішня політика Сефевідів була предметом дослідження радянських істориків. Радянські історики період з другої половини XVII ст. – 30-і рр. XVIII століття характеризують ослабленням і падінням Сефевідської держави.

Ключові слова: Династія Сефевідів, Османська Імперія, Російська Імперія, турки, Каспійське море.

Ширалієв Р., докторант, Інститут історії Національної академії наук Азербайджану (Азербайджан, Баку), rashad_875@rambler.ru

Усиление государственной политики Сефевидов на территории Европейских государств в начале XVIII века

Внешняя политика Сефевидов была предметом исследования советских историков. Советские историки период со второй половины XVII в. – 30-е гг. XVIII века характеризуют ослаблением и падением Сефевидского государства.

Ключевые слова: Династия Сефевидов, Османская Империя, Русская Империя, турки, Каспийское море.

* * *

УДК 94

Aliyev R. B.,
employee, Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University
(Azerbaijan, Baku), rauf_aliyev_83@mail.ru

JOINT ACTIVITY OF AZERBAIJANI AND TURKISH DIASPORA

Humanity is stepping to a new period of the history. At the end of XX century, economic, political, social and cultural steps in the direction of the development and expansion of Turkish states that have gained independence after the collapse of Soviet Union boosted strengthening of Turkic peoples. Dynamic development of Azerbaijan–Turkey relations is a bright manifestation of this process.

Sayings of two great personalities of Turkish world – Great Leader Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's «Azerbaijan's joy is our joy, Azerbaijan's grief is our grief» and National Leader Heydar Aliyev's «We are one nation and two states», defined the basic principles of our political, economic and cultural cooperation expressing deep historical roots of our mutual relations.

Reliable and tested strategic alliance of our states made it necessary for cooperation between Azerbaijani and Turkish diaspora organizations and their establishment in the level of modern requirements.

Different forces conducting anti-Turkish policy tried to separate our brother people from each-other and isolate us from a magnificent historical and cultural heritage for many years. However, it has not been reachable by anyone to break the invincible will of Turkish people and undermine the Turkish spirit that has played a unique role in the history of civilization.

Keywords: Turkic peoples, a single diaspora, lobby, cooperation, union, one nation.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Humanity is stepping to a new period of the history. At the end of XX century, economic, political, social and cultural steps in the direction of the development and expansion of Turkish states that have gained independence after the collapse of Soviet Union boosted strengthening of Turkic peoples. Dynamic development of Azerbaijan–Turkey relations is a bright manifestation of this process.

The current level of relations between two countries created a reliable foundation for strengthening relations between Azerbaijani and Turkish diaspora. Azerbaijani and Turkish communities based on this foundation, organized joint activities at many countries and it was necessitated to develop a single concept in order the realities of modern world to create a foundation for the development of relations between our diasporas for the development in all fields and ensure the implementation of this cooperation in a systematic, consistent and purposeful manner.

Sayings of two great personalities of Turkish world – Great Leader Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's «Azerbaijan's joy is our joy, Azerbaijan's grief is our grief» and National Leader Heydar Aliyev's «We are one nation and two states», defined the basic principles of our political, economic and cultural cooperation expressing deep historical roots of our mutual relations.

Reliable and tested strategic alliance of our states made it necessary for cooperation between Azerbaijani and Turkish diaspora organizations and their establishment in the level of modern requirements.

Cooperation between Azerbaijani and Turkish diaspora organizations emerges as a logical result of common national interests of two brother people, interests of Azerbaijan and Turkey, ethnic origin, language, culture and historical proximity of our people [2, p. 10].

The basis of the tradition of implementing Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Congress of Turkic States and Communities was laid since 1993 for the purposes of development of relations between Turkic peoples. The necessity of intensification of joint efforts in the direction of ensuring peace and security using effective potential of Turkish world emerging from historical, cultural and geographical