

I Türkoloji qurultay - 100



UOT 94(479.24), UOT 94, 32:93/94

FARIDA ALLAHVERDIYEVA

Lecturer at Baku State University
faridaallahverdiyeva@gmail.com

**THE SCHOLARLY AND CULTURAL OBJECTIVES OF THE
1926 BAKU TURKOLOGICAL CONGRESS AND THEIR “PAN-TURKIST”
INTERPRETATION IN SUBSEQUENT SOVIET POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2708-065X/114/61-70>

The First Turkological Congress, held in Baku in 1926, represented one of the important stages in scholarly discussions concerning the linguistic, literary, educational, and cultural development of the Turkic peoples in the early twentieth century. On the eve of the centenary of the Congress, examining this event not only in terms of the development of Turkological scholarship but also within the context of the interaction between the national-cultural and political ideas of the period has acquired particular relevance. This article comparatively analyzes the scholarly and cultural objectives of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress and the “Pan-Turkist” interpretation subsequently constructed in Soviet political discourse with regard to the Congress and its participants.

The study examines the formation and changing meanings of the ideas of Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century, with particular attention to the methodological problems arising from the conflation of these concepts. At the same time, it explores the national-cultural activities of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals in the Russian Empire, debates surrounding language and alphabet reform, initiatives aimed at fostering cultural rapprochement among Turkic peoples, and their role in shaping the intellectual and political context of the 1926 Congress. Based on the Congress agenda, speeches, and adopted resolutions, the study establishes that its principal objectives were related to the development of Turkological scholarship, the discussion of language and alphabet issues, and the expansion of educational and cultural cooperation.

The article also examines the relationship between Turkism and the Islamic factor, analyzing the place of national and religious identities in the intellectual thought of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals of the period. It further investigates the use of the accusation of “Pan-Turkism” in political discourse and repressive practices, particularly during the 1930s. Accordingly, the study seeks to identify the differences between the Congress’s original scholarly and cultural agenda and its subsequent Soviet political interpretation. The research demonstrates that an assessment of the historical significance of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress requires distinguishing between the scholarly, national-cultural, and political contexts of the period in which it was held and the ideological interpretations subsequently attributed to the event.

Keywords: Baku Turkological Congress, Turkism, Pan-Turkism, Turanism, Islamic factor, Turkic-Muslim intellectuals, Soviet political discourse, national identity.

Introduction. The First Turkological Congress, held in Baku from 26 February to 6 March 1926, is regarded as one of the significant events in the history of the linguistic, literary, educational,

and cultural development of the Turkic peoples in the early twentieth century. By bringing together representatives of various Turkic peoples, linguists and Orientalists, educators, and intellectuals, the Congress not only provided a platform for the exchange of scholarly ideas, but also constituted an important intellectual space in which the complex national-cultural processes of the period were discussed. The choice of Baku as the venue for the Congress was not accidental. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Baku had become one of the major centers of Azerbaijani national-cultural and socio-political thought and was among the cities where contacts between various intellectual circles of the Turkic world were developing.

The centenary of the Baku Turkological Congress in 2026 provides an opportunity to bring this historical event back into scholarly circulation and to reconsider its objectives, outcomes, and subsequent interpretations in historiography. The centenary of the Congress is relevant not only for recalling a particular stage in the history of the development of Turkological scholarship, but also for examining the relationship between national identity, language, culture, and political ideology in the early twentieth century. In particular, the subsequent association of the Congress with political-ideological categories such as “Pan-Turkism” and “bourgeois nationalism” during the Soviet period demonstrates that its historical significance was interpreted differently in different periods.

The specific historical circumstances in which the Baku Turkological Congress was held did not allow its scholarly agenda to be completely separated from the political context. At the beginning of the twentieth century, processes of national-cultural awakening accelerated among the Muslim peoples of the Russian Empire, while issues of language, education, the press, and national identity became central concerns of intellectuals. The Jadidist and educational movement led by Ismail Bey Gaspirali, the idea of “unity in language, thought, and action,” reforms in Muslim schools, and the development of the press had a significant influence on the intellectual activities of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals. At the same time, the emergence of concepts such as Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism during this period, and their use with different meanings by different authors, makes it necessary to distinguish these ideas from one another.

While the idea of Turkism developed primarily around issues of language, culture, historical memory, and national identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the concept of Pan-Turkism was used in various political and intellectual contexts to express a broader political dimension of the idea of unity among the Turkic peoples. Turanism, meanwhile, was associated with broader conceptions of geographical and cultural unity and acquired different meanings in different periods. Presenting these concepts as synonyms for one another may lead to an oversimplification of the diversity of ideas characteristic of the period. Therefore, in studying the 1926 Congress, it is particularly important to distinguish the concrete activities of its participants and the views they expressed from the political terminology that emerged in subsequent periods.

Another important aspect of the issue concerns the relationship between Turkism and Islam. In the social and cultural life of the Turkic-Muslim peoples living in the Russian Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century, Islam functioned not only as a system of religious belief, but also as an important component of social and cultural identity. At the same time, with the development of national consciousness, the role of language and ethnic affiliation in defining identity also increased. Thus, the relationship between Turkic and Islamic identities was neither uniform nor unchanging; different intellectuals and political-intellectual movements approached this relationship in different ways. From this perspective, the 1926 Turkological Congress can be examined not only within the framework of linguistic and alphabet-related issues, but also in the context of the interaction between national, cultural, and religious identities.

One of the important issues addressed by the Congress was the development of Turkic languages and writing systems. Questions concerning the alphabet, the simplification of language, the development of terminology, and the expansion of educational and publishing opportunities had practical significance for intellectuals from various Turkic peoples. At the same time, discussions concerning a common language and alphabet brought the idea of strengthening cultural ties among the Turkic peoples to the forefront. It was precisely this aspect that could acquire a particular ideological

meaning in subsequent Soviet political discourse. As initiatives aimed at scholarly and cultural rapprochement were equated with the idea of political unity, the activities of some Congress participants were subsequently interpreted within the context of “Pan-Turkism”.

The central scholarly problem here is to avoid treating the objectives expressed at the Congress itself and subsequent political interpretations as one and the same phenomenon. An examination of the agenda of the Congress held in 1926 and the issues discussed demonstrates that questions of linguistics, the alphabet, education, terminology, the study of Turkic languages, and cultural cooperation occupied a significant place. However, the changes that took place in Soviet national policy from the late 1920s, and particularly in the 1930s, led to a tightening of attitudes toward national-cultural activities, and initiatives that had been possible within certain limits during the preceding period came to be assessed differently under the subsequent political circumstances.

This change was also reflected in the meaning of the concept of “Pan-Turkism” within political discourse. Whereas various initiatives concerning the linguistic and cultural rapprochement of the Turkic peoples had existed during the earlier period, in the subsequent Soviet political environment “Pan-Turkism” increasingly came to be presented as a category associated with political threat and nationalism. As a result, there arose a need to examine separately the relationship between the scholarly, educational, and national-cultural activities of individual intellectuals and the political accusations directed against them at a later stage. From this perspective, rather than establishing a direct and simplified cause-and-effect relationship between the 1926 Congress and the repressive policies of the 1930s, it is more appropriate to examine comparatively the political and ideological conditions of these two periods.

Another factor determining the relevance of the topic is its different presentation in historiography under the influence of various ideological approaches. In Soviet historiography, attitudes toward Turkism and Pan-Turkism were largely shaped within the official ideological framework of the period. In subsequent periods, however, the Baku Turkological Congress came to be regarded as an important event in the scholarly and cultural cooperation of the Turkic peoples. One of the important tasks for contemporary research is not to mechanically accept the assessments of different periods, but to compare the primary sources of the Congress, the speeches of its participants, the adopted resolutions, and subsequent political documents.

In this regard, the main objective of the study is to identify the differences between the scholarly and cultural objectives of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress and the “Pan-Turkist” meaning attributed to the Congress and its participants in subsequent Soviet political discourse. To achieve this objective, the study first examines the formation and characteristics of the ideas of Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; considers the national-cultural activities of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals in the Russian Empire; and identifies the scholarly and political context in which the 1926 Congress was convened. Subsequently, the Congress’s approach to questions of language, alphabet, education, and cultural cooperation is analyzed on the basis of its agenda and major discussions.

Another direction of the study concerns the manner in which the Congress was presented in subsequent Soviet political discourse. Within this framework, the study examines changes over time in the content of the accusation of “Pan-Turkism,” the transformation of national-cultural activities into political categories, and their relationship with the repressive policies of the 1930s. Thus, the study is not limited to a description of the events of 1926, but also seeks to reveal how this event was subsequently reinterpreted in political memory and historiography.

The scholarly novelty of the article lies in the comparative analysis of the scholarly and cultural agenda of the Baku Turkological Congress and its subsequent Soviet political interpretation. The study takes into account the methodological problems arising from the conflation of Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism and substantiates the importance of avoiding the mechanical application of political concepts belonging to different historical periods when assessing the Congress. At the same time, attention is given to the role of the Islamic factor in the national and cultural thought of Turkic-

Muslim intellectuals, thereby addressing the issue of the relationship between national and religious identities.

The source base of the study consists of the materials of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress, the papers and speeches delivered at the Congress, the resolutions adopted, the Azerbaijani, Turkish, and Soviet press of the period, as well as Soviet political and administrative documents. In addition, the study draws on research conducted in Azerbaijani, Turkish, Russian, and Western historiography concerning Turkism, Pan-Turkism, Turanism, Jadidism, and Turkic-Muslim national movements. Comparing sources of different types makes it possible to determine more objectively the differences between the initial objectives of the Congress and its subsequent ideological interpretation.

Thus, the study of the history of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress is significant not only for examining a stage in the development of Turkological scholarship, but also for understanding the relationship between national identity, language, culture, Islam, and political ideology in the early twentieth century. Examining the difference between the nature of the Congress as a scholarly and cultural event within its historical context and the ideological meaning attributed to it in subsequent Soviet political discourse makes it possible both to preserve the historical objectivity of the event and to determine more accurately the meanings acquired by the concept of "Pan-Turkism" at different historical stages.

The Intellectual Formation of Turkism and Pan-Turkism in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries constituted a period of significant change in perceptions of national identity in the political and cultural history of the Turkic peoples. The spread of nationalist ideas in Europe, the strengthening of national consciousness among various peoples living within empires, and the development of the press also influenced the intellectual environment of the Turkic-Muslim peoples living in the Russian Empire. As a result of these processes, issues of language, education, national history, cultural self-awareness, and social solidarity began to occupy an increasingly important place in the activities of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals. However, the emergence of Turkism during this period cannot be explained solely in terms of the idea of political unity. In its early stage, Turkism often manifested itself in connection with enlightenment, linguistic and cultural reforms, the modernization of education, and the development of national consciousness [11, s.235].

The activities of Ismail Bey Gaspiralı were of particular significance in this process. A Crimean Tatar intellectual, Gaspiralı associated the modernization of Muslim societies with the renewal of education, the establishment of new-method schools, and the development of the press. The newspaper *Tercüman*, which he began publishing in 1883, became one of the important means of intellectual exchange among various Turkic-Muslim regions of the Russian Empire. Although Gaspiralı's principle of "unity in language, thought, and action" influenced the subsequent development of Turkist thought, it would be inappropriate to automatically equate the original meaning of this principle with the idea of establishing a unified political state. In this context, linguistic and cultural rapprochement, enlightenment, and the modernization of Muslim societies were of particular importance [5, s.319].

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Turkist ideas developed along different lines among the Turkic-Muslim intellectuals of the Russian Empire. In the Azerbaijani context, intellectuals such as Ali Bey Hüseyinzade, Ahmad Bey Ağaoğlu, and, at a later stage, Mahammad Amin Rasulzade discussed issues of national identity, language, Islam, modernization, and political organization in an interconnected manner. In the Ottoman Empire, meanwhile, the theoretical foundations of Turkism were developed in a more systematic manner in the works of thinkers such as Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp. Akçura's 1904 essay *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* ("Three Ways of Policy") was of particular importance in the Ottoman political thought of the period for its comparison of the approaches of Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism [6, s.170].

Thus, Turkism that emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can be understood not as a unified and unchanging ideological movement, but as a multifaceted process that acquired different meanings in various intellectual and political contexts. It is precisely this diversity

that makes it necessary to distinguish Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism from one another in subsequent analysis.

The Distinct Meanings of Turanism and Pan-Turkism. Although the concepts of Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism are sometimes used interchangeably in historiography, their historical origins and meanings are not identical. The roots of the concept of “Turan” can be traced back to ancient Iranian literary and historical traditions, where it initially referred to a particular geographical and mythological conception. In the nineteenth century, as theories concerning linguistic and ethnic affinities spread in Europe, the concept of “Turan” acquired new meanings and, in the subsequent period, came to express broader conceptions of unity in certain Turkist and nationalist circles. Therefore, from a methodological perspective, it would be inaccurate to equate Turanism exclusively with the political Turkism of the early twentieth century.

The term Pan-Turkism, in particular, became increasingly widespread in connection with the emergence of political and ideological dimensions to ideas of unity among the Turkic peoples in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, the concept itself was not used in an identical sense by different authors. Some studies present Pan-Turkism as a project of political unity and irredentism, whereas other approaches also take into account its cultural and language-based forms of unity. In his analysis of the history of Pan-Turkism, Jacob M. Landau specifically emphasizes the changing meanings of the concept from the late nineteenth century through different stages of the twentieth century and demonstrates the limitations of explaining its evolution solely within the framework of a unified political project [6, s.470].

From this perspective, in analyzing the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress, it would be inappropriate to proceed from the assumption that the concepts of “Turkism,” “Pan-Turkism,” and “Turanism” had identical meanings. The existence of views expressed at the Congress concerning the linguistic and cultural rapprochement of the Turkic peoples does not, in itself, demonstrate that the event constituted a political Pan-Turkist project. Rather, it is necessary to examine separately the purposes for which these views were advanced under the specific historical circumstances of the period and how they were subsequently reinterpreted in political discourse.

This terminological distinction constitutes one of the main methodological foundations of the article. In subsequent Soviet political discourse, “Pan-Turkism” was used predominantly as a category of political accusation, and, as a result, national-cultural and linguistic initiatives from the preceding period could also be presented within the framework of this category.

The National-Cultural Activities of Turkic-Muslim Intellectuals in the Russian Empire. The national-cultural processes that emerged among the Turkic-Muslim peoples of the Russian Empire from the late nineteenth century onward were not limited to the dissemination of political ideas. Enlightenment, the establishment of new-method schools, the development of the press, women’s education, the simplification of language, and the social modernization of Muslim societies constituted the main areas of intellectual activity. Jadidism was one of the important components of this process and developed in different forms across various Turkic-Muslim regions [5, s.319-333].

In the Azerbaijani context, this process unfolded within the broader framework of the Russian Empire. The intellectual and press environment that emerged in Baku, Tiflis, and other cities created platforms for discussions of the Turkic language, education, national history, and Islam. In the activities of intellectuals such as Ali Bey Hüseynzade and Ahmad Bey Ağaoğlu, the interrelationship between Turkic identity, Islam, and modernization occupied an important place. From this perspective, the formation of Azerbaijani Turkism should be examined both within the political environment of the Russian Empire and in the context of its connections with the Ottoman intellectual world.

An important characteristic of the activities of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals in the Russian Empire was that they did not share a uniform ideological position. Some intellectuals placed greater emphasis on Islamic solidarity, others on Turkic linguistic and cultural unity, while another group prioritized modernization and national political organization. This diversity makes it problematic to generalize the activities of these intellectuals under a single political category such as “Pan-Turkism” in the subsequent period.

The press played a particularly important role in these processes. Tercüman, the Azerbaijani press, and other Turkic-Muslim publications enabled intellectuals from different regions to establish contacts with one another. Thus, the national-cultural networks that emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries played an important role in preparing the intellectual and social foundation of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress..

The Political and Scholarly Context of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress. The holding of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress coincided with a period during the first decade of Soviet rule when the approach to the national question was relatively complex. Within the framework of Soviet national policy in the 1920s, certain opportunities were created for the development of local languages, national cadres, and cultural institutions. At the same time, this policy was implemented under the broader political and ideological control of the Soviet state. Therefore, it is insufficient to explain the environment in which the Congress was held solely in terms of national-cultural revival or solely in terms of Sovietization; the interaction between these two processes must also be taken into account.

The decision to hold the Congress in Baku was also related to the geographical and intellectual position of the Azerbaijan SSR. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Baku had been one of the important cultural centers in which Turkic-Muslim intellectuals were active. The city's connections with Russia, the Caucasus, Iran, the Ottoman Empire/Turkey, and Central Asia had made it one of the spaces where various intellectual currents intersected.

The inclusion of the study of Turkic languages, alphabet reform, linguistics, terminology, literature, education, and other scholarly and cultural issues on the Congress agenda demonstrates its significance for the institutional development of Turkological scholarship. At the same time, the fact that the event was held under Soviet rule made it impossible to consider it entirely outside the political context. The organization and activities of the Congress should therefore be approached from scholarly, national-cultural, and state-policy perspectives alike.

For this reason, in determining the historical nature of the Congress, it is important to distinguish the context of 1926, in which it was held, from the political circumstances of the subsequent 1930s. The differences in the assessments given to the same event at different political stages are precisely related to these changing contexts..

Language, Alphabet, and the Cultural Rapprochement of the Turkic Peoples at the Congress. One of the main characteristics of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress was the extensive discussion of questions concerning language and writing. The issue of the alphabet was not merely technical in nature. The writing system was directly connected with education, literacy, the development of books and the press, the formation of scholarly terminology, and opportunities for communication among different Turkic peoples. From this perspective, the prominent place given to the alphabet issue on the Congress agenda can be associated with the modernization and educational needs of the period.

The mutual affinity of the Turkic languages and their study also constituted one of the scholarly directions of the Congress. The study of the linguistic characteristics of different Turkic peoples contributed to the development of broader Turkological research. At the same time, discussions concerning common terminology and writing systems also brought the idea of cultural rapprochement to the forefront. However, when determining the specific meaning of this rapprochement, it is necessary to distinguish scholarly and cultural cooperation from the idea of political unity.

The Congress's discussions on language and alphabet were also significant from the perspective of subsequent Soviet national policy. The changes introduced in the writing systems of the Turkic languages beginning in the late 1920s, followed later by the transition of the alphabets of various Turkic peoples to Cyrillic scripts, also demonstrated the political and administrative dimensions of language policy. In this regard, the discussions of the 1926 Congress provide important material for a comparative study of subsequent language policies.

Thus, the discussion of language and alphabet issues at the Congress had scholarly, educational, and cultural-unity dimensions. It was precisely this multilayered character that created the conditions for the Congress to be interpreted in different ways in subsequent periods.

The “Pan-Turkism” Discourse Regarding the Congress. The association of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress with “Pan-Turkism” in subsequent historiography and political discourse constitutes one of the central problems addressed in this article. The important issue here is to distinguish between the scholarly and cultural initiatives that existed at the time when the Congress was held and the subsequent political assessment of the event. In Soviet political discourse, the evaluation of certain forms of national ideas within the categories of “bourgeois nationalism” and “Pan-Turkism” became particularly stringent in the late 1920s and during the 1930s.

The fact that some of the Congress participants expressed views concerning the linguistic and cultural development of the Turkic peoples does not, in itself, demonstrate that all of them supported a unified Pan-Turkist political program. Rather, it is necessary to distinguish between the ideological positions of the participants and to analyze their earlier activities and specific statements separately. In this regard, it is necessary to distinguish between the use of the concept of “Pan-Turkist” as a subsequent political accusation and its intellectual meaning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The presentation of “Pan-Turkism” as a dangerous political orientation in Soviet political discourse developed in parallel with changing attitudes toward national-cultural activities. The policy of developing national languages and cultures, which had been supported to a certain extent during the earlier period, was subsequently replaced by more centralized mechanisms of control. Under these circumstances, ideas concerning linguistic and cultural rapprochement among the Turkic peoples could also be assessed through the prism of political threat.

From this perspective, when examining the discourse of “Pan-Turkism” concerning the Congress, the central question should not be formulated as “Was the Congress Pan-Turkist?”, but rather as how and at what historical stage the scholarly and cultural activities of the Congress came to be associated with the political category of “Pan-Turkism.” Such an approach makes it possible to examine the history of the event without equating the Congress itself with subsequent political accusations.

The Islamic Factor: The Relationship Between Turkic and Religious Identity. The relationship between national and religious identities in the worldview of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals constituted one of the important issues from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. For the Turkic-Muslim population of the Russian Empire, Islam was not only a religious faith, but also an important element of social and cultural life and one of the sources of solidarity among different communities. At the same time, as national ideas developed, language, ethnic affiliation, and historical memory increasingly emerged as key components of identity.

From this perspective, it would be inappropriate to present the relationship between Turkism and Islamism either as one of confrontation or as complete identity. Different intellectuals sought to reconcile these two forms of identity in different ways. Ali Bey Hüseynzade’s formula of “Turkification, Islamization, and Modernization” is one of the important examples in Azerbaijani and, more broadly, Turkic-Muslim intellectual history in which these three directions were presented as mutually complementary components. In subsequent periods, however, the development of national statehood, secularization, and the influence of Soviet ideology altered the content of these relationships.

Taking the Islamic factor into consideration separately in the analysis of the 1926 Turkological Congress is important because a significant part of the social and intellectual environment in which the Congress emerged had been shaped by the activities of earlier generations of Turkic-Muslim intellectuals. Nevertheless, the place occupied by religious issues in the Congress’s specific agenda needs to be determined separately on the basis of primary sources. A distinction should be made between the presence of the Islamic factor in the broader historical context and its specific place on the Congress’s agenda.

This approach also prevents the relationship of Turkism and Pan-Turkism with Islam from being presented as a single, uniform model. The interaction between national and religious identities changed at different historical stages, while Soviet atheistic policies introduced a new political framework into this relationship.

Conclusion: *The Place of the Baku Congress in the History of Turkological Scholarship and National Identity.* The 1926 Baku Turkological Congress was one of the important scholarly platforms at which issues concerning the linguistic, literary, educational, and cultural development of the Turkic peoples were discussed at an international level in the early twentieth century. The prominent place occupied by questions of language and alphabet on the Congress agenda was one of the principal factors determining its role in the development of Turkological scholarship. At the same time, the gathering of representatives of different Turkic peoples on a common scholarly platform constituted an important indication of the processes of national-cultural rapprochement taking place during the period.

The study demonstrates that distinguishing between the concepts of Turkism, Pan-Turkism, and Turanism is an important methodological prerequisite for determining the historical nature of the Congress. Bringing all forms of national-cultural activity that expanded among Turkic-Muslim intellectuals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries under a single political category of Pan-Turkism may oversimplify the ideological diversity of the period.

The subsequent association of the Congress with “Pan-Turkism” in Soviet political discourse should, in turn, be examined as a separate historical process. In particular, the changing attitude toward the activities of national intellectuals during the 1930s and the use of accusations of “Pan-Turkism” within mechanisms of political persecution indicate that there was a certain distance between the scholarly and cultural activities of 1926 and their subsequent political interpretation. Therefore, assessing the history of the Congress outside the context of the period in which it was held and solely on the basis of subsequent political accusations would constitute a methodologically limited approach.

The significance of the Baku Turkological Congress can also be assessed from the perspective of the formation of national identity. The joint discussion of questions concerning language, history, culture, and education represented a scholarly expression of processes related to the development of the national and cultural self-awareness of the Turkic peoples. The Islamic factor, meanwhile, makes it possible to consider that these processes developed within the broader Turkic-Muslim intellectual environment. Nevertheless, the place occupied by religious issues on the specific agenda of the Congress should be determined separately through an analysis of primary sources.

Thus, the centenary of the 1926 Baku Turkological Congress provides an opportunity to reconsider not only its role in the history of Turkological scholarship, but also its place in the history of national identity, language, culture, and political ideology in the twentieth century. Examining the distinction between the scholarly and cultural objectives of the Congress and the “Pan-Turkist” meaning subsequently attributed to it in Soviet political discourse makes it possible to demonstrate how the event acquired different meanings at different historical stages.

REFERENCES

1. Bennigsen, Alexandre; Broxup, Marie. *The Islamic Threat to the Soviet State*. London, 2011, 182 p.
2. Hirsch, Francine. “Toward an Empire of Nations: Border-Making and the Formation of Soviet National Identities.” *The Russian Review*, Vol. 59, No. 2, 2000, p. 201.
3. Hüseynova, Mahirə. *Birinci Türkoloji Qurultayın ən yeni dövr türkoloji təfəkkürün inkişafında rolu*. Baku: Müəllim, 2026, 498 p.
4. Xəlilov, Buludxan. *Türkologiyanın tarixi: XX əsrin 20–30-cu illəri*. Baku, 2016, 235 p.
5. Khalid, Adeeb. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011, 335 p.
6. Landau, Jacob M. *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*. London, 1995, 275 p.
7. Menzel, Theodor. *1926 Bakü 1. Türkoloji Kongresi*. Translated by Doç. Dr. Bekir Direkci. Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2017.
8. Nərimanoğlu, K. V. “1926-Bakü Türkoloji Kurultayı Üzerine.” In *1926 Bakü Türkoloji Kurultayı Tutanaklar (26 Şubat–6 Mart 1926)*. Translated by Prof. Dr. Mustafa Öner. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2008.
9. Qayıbov, S. I. “Bakü Türkoloji Kurultayı Bildirilerinin Satır Aralarında Halk Bilimi Meseleleri” // *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları (HÜTAD)*, No.19, 2013, pp.207–220.

10. Sartori, Paolo. "What Went Wrong? The Failure of Soviet Policy on Shari'a Courts in Turkestan, 1917–1923." *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 50, Nos. 3–4, 2010, pp. 400–401.
11. Zenkovsky, Serge A. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2020, 345 p.
12. İsmail Bey Gasprinskii (Gaspıralı): *The Discourse of Modernism and the Russians*. In *The Tatars of Crimea: Return to the Homeland*. Duke University Press, 1998. 397 p.

FƏRİDƏ ALLAHVERDİYEVƏ
Bakı Dövlət Universitetinin müəllimi

1926-CI İL BAKI TÜRKOLÖJİ QURULTAYININ ELMI-MƏDƏNİ MƏQSƏDLƏRİ VƏ ONLARIN SONRAKİ SOVET SİYASİ DİSKURSUNDA "PANTÜRKİST" İNTERPRETASIYASI

1926-cı ildə Bakıda keçirilmiş I Türkoloji Qurultay XX əsrin əvvəllərində türk xalqlarının dil, ədəbiyyat, təhsil və mədəni inkişafı ilə bağlı elmi müzakirələrin mühüm mərhələlərindən biri olmuşdur. Qurultayın 100 illiyi ərəfəsində onun yalnız türkoloji elmin inkişafı baxımından deyil, həm də dövrün milli-mədəni və siyasi ideyalarının qarşılıqlı münasibəti kontekstində araşdırılması xüsusi aktuallıq kəsb edir. Məqalədə 1926-cı il Bakı Türkoloji Qurultayının elmi-mədəni məqsədləri ilə sonrakı Sovet siyasi diskursunda Qurultaya və onun iştirakçılarına münasibətdə formalaşdırılan "Pantürkizm" interpretasiyası müqayisəli şəkildə təhlil edilir.

Tədqiqatda XIX əsrin sonu – XX əsrin əvvəllərində türkçülük, Pantürkizm və Turançılıq ideyalarının formalaşması və məzmun dəyişiklikləri nəzərdən keçirilir, bu anlayışların eyniləşdirilməsinin yaratdığı metodoloji problemlərə diqqət yetirilir. Eyni zamanda Rusiya imperiyasında türk-müsəlman ziyahılarının milli-mədəni fəaliyyəti, dil və əlifba məsələləri, türk xalqları arasında mədəni yaxınlaşma təşəbbüsləri və onların 1926-cı il Qurultayının ideya-siyasi fonunun formalaşmasındakı rolu araşdırılır. Qurultayın gündəliyi, çıxışları və qəbul olunmuş qərarlar əsasında onun əsas məqsədlərinin türkoloji elmin inkişafı, dil və əlifba məsələlərinin müzakirəsi, təhsil və mədəni əməkdaşlığın genişləndirilməsi ilə bağlı olduğu müəyyənləşdirilir.

Məqalədə həmçinin türkçülük və İslam amilinin qarşılıqlı münasibəti nəzərdən keçirilərək, milli və dini identikliyin dövrün türk-müsəlman ziyahılarının düşüncəsində tutduğu yer təhlil olunur. Sonrakı mərhələdə, xüsusilə 1930-cu illərdə, "Pantürkizm" ittihamının siyasi diskursda və repressiya praktikasında istifadəsi araşdırılır. Bununla da Qurultayın ilkin elmi-mədəni gündəliyi ilə onun sonrakı Sovet siyasi interpretasiyası arasındakı fərqlərin müəyyənləşdirilməsi məqsədi qarşıya qoyulur. Tədqiqat göstərir ki, 1926-cı il Bakı Türkoloji Qurultayının tarixi mahiyyətinin qiymətləndirilməsi üçün onun keçirildiyi dövrün elmi, milli-mədəni və siyasi kontekstlərini, eləcə də sonrakı dövrlərdə hadisəyə verilmiş ideoloji şərhləri bir-birindən fərqləndirmək zəruridir.

Açar sözlər: Bakı Türkoloji Qurultayı, türkçülük, Pantürkizm, Turançılıq, İslam amili, türk-müsəlman ziyahıları, Sovet siyasi diskursu, milli kimlik.

ФАРИДА АЛЛАХВЕРДИЕВА
Преподаватель Бакинского Государственного Университета

НАУЧНО-КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ЦЕЛИ БАКИНСКОГО ТЮРКОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО СЪЕЗДА 1926 ГОДА И ИХ «ПАНТЮРКИСТСКАЯ» ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ В ПОСЛЕДУЮЩЕМ СОВЕТСКОМ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Первый Тюркологический съезд, состоявшийся в Баку в 1926 году, стал одним из важных этапов научных дискуссий, связанных с языковым, литературным, образовательным и культурным развитием тюркских народов в начале XX века. В преддверии 100-летия Съезда осо-

бую актуальность приобретает его изучение не только с точки зрения развития тюркологической науки, но и в контексте взаимосвязи национально-культурных и политических идей рассматриваемого периода. В статье в сравнительном аспекте анализируются научно-культурные цели Бакинского тюркологического съезда 1926 года и «пантюркистская» интерпретация, сформировавшаяся в последующем советском политическом дискурсе в отношении Съезда и его участников.

В исследовании рассматриваются формирование и изменения содержания идей тюркизма, пантюркизма и туранизма с конца XIX – начала XX века, а также уделяется внимание методологическим проблемам, возникающим вследствие отождествления данных понятий. Наряду с этим исследуются национально-культурная деятельность тюрко-мусульманской интеллигенции в Российской империи, вопросы языка и алфавита, инициативы по культурному сближению тюркских народов и их роль в формировании идейно-политического контекста Бакинского съезда 1926 года. На основе повестки дня Съезда, выступлений его участников и принятых решений определяется, что его основные цели были связаны с развитием тюркологической науки, обсуждением вопросов языка и алфавита, а также расширением образовательного и культурного сотрудничества.

В статье также рассматривается взаимосвязь тюркизма и исламского фактора, анализируется место национальной и религиозной идентичности в мировоззрении тюрко-мусульманской интеллигенции рассматриваемого периода. На последующем этапе, особенно в 1930-е годы, исследуется использование обвинений в «пантюркизме» в политическом дискурсе и репрессивной практике. Тем самым ставится задача выявить различия между первоначальной научно-культурной повесткой Съезда и его последующей советской политической интерпретацией. Исследование показывает, что для определения исторического значения Бакинского тюркологического съезда 1926 года необходимо разграничивать научный, национально-культурный и политический контексты периода его проведения, а также идеологические интерпретации, сформировавшиеся в последующие периоды.

Ключевые слова: Бакинский тюркологический съезд, тюркизм, пантюркизм, туранизм, исламский фактор, тюрко-мусульманская интеллигенция, советский политический дискурс, национальная идентичность.

*Məqalənin çapa qəbul olunma tarixi: 02 oktyabr 2026-cı il.
Redaksiya heyətinin qərarı ilə nəşr edilib.*