

THE NEW TENDENCIES IN CAUCASIAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN GEOPOLITICS

Javanshir Feyziyev Eyyub oglu

*PhD in Philosophy, Science doctoral student of the Institute of Philosophy of the
National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan, Member of the National Assembly (Parliament)
of the, Republic of Azerbaijan*
j.feyziyev@yandex.ru

Abstract

Demonstrating the alliance is considerably important in both construction activities of Caucasian and Central Asian states and in their efforts to solve the conflict issues keeping them under continuous pressure. This alliance is essential in neutralizing the attempts of hegemonic forces, which try to use confrontation existing in the region for their own interests. The Caucasian and Central Asia should understand this reality: not the external influence, but internally combined driving force should be the main transformative factor in this region of Eurasia. At the moment, geopolitical processes happening in the Caucasus and Central Asia lead to the strengthening of independent states of Eurasia and there is no doubt that these states will take the responsibility to develop this region without any external impact. Positive tendencies observed in the geopolitics of Caucasus and Central Asia create golden opportunities to the realization of the politico-economical potential of these states.

Key words: Caucasus, hegemonic forces, politico-economical potential, independent states of Eurasia

Two important segments of Eurasia -Caucasus and Central Asia

The Caucasus and Central Asia with inseparable from each other history and fate are forming the hot zone of Eurasian geopolitics. The Caucasus «crossing» the Europe through the western basin of the Caspian Sea and Central Asia through the eastern basin of Caspian Sea is considered as two main regional segments in the optimal system of coordination of Eurasian geopolitics. Being called in the scientific literature «Caspian basin region» and, belonging for long decades mainly to Turkic states, this «two-arch» geopolitical space is currently at the most decisive stage of its historical and political transformation that, perhaps, may lead to a turning point: Caucasus and Central Asia states either being under the influence of global powers have to be oppressed in their never-ending conflicts and obey the interests of the «winners» of rivalry for global domination or benefit all advantages of independent statehood and be a winner among the leading forces of world development as a sovereign subject of international community. Certainly, the aim of region states is the second perspective. The new tendencies in the Caucasus and Central Asia geopolitics should be understood and defined in this prospect.

However, the geopolitical developments taking place in the Caucasus and Central Asia indicate that achievement of such a successful prospect will not be that easy. Because the uncompromised interests clash over this rich with natural resources region and the “sparks” coming from this clash impact the region itself and disperse in a form of conflicts to the “fragile territories” of the region. All ethnopolitical conflicts going on due to various factors, and, even struggles for power within the states are provoked over these interests and deliberately are not prevented. The global powers functioning as “international arbitrators”,

never end any conflict, they just manipulate it in a certain way. Almost all the states of one of the main and most important part of the post-Soviet space the Caucasus and Central Asia region that gained independence in the early 90s were raised in the middle of such conflicts. Conflicts are similar with the trap laid at the feet of the sovereign states and all of them carry that risk to fall into this trap while moving towards independence. Therefore, the states of Caucasus and Central Asia have to demonstrate joint efforts not only in the independence building activities but also, they need to solve the problems creating tensions in the region in order to neutralize the intentions of hegemonic powers to abuse the confrontation in this space. The harsh and cruel reality for Caucasus and Central Asia is namely the following: The decisive transformative factor in this core region of Eurasia should be not the external powers but united internal driving powers. The observation of the geopolitical processes taking place in the Caucasus and Central Asia enables us to define those forces that would mobilize the internal development incentives in the Eurasia.

Internal development incentives

One of the three Caucasus countries- Azerbaijan and four out of five countries in Central Asia- Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Kyrgyzstan are Turkic states. All of them have earned the right to sovereignty following the collapse of USSR. Consequently, these states are peers based on the history of the restoration of their independence. However, the characteristics of the ethnopolitical geography in both western and eastern coasts of the Caspian Sea created by the Turkic states and empires are determined in a way that initially this territory have optimized the evolution of Turkic unity. Therefore, the most important idea created by this geopolitical space during the first steps towards independence was the idea of the Turkic community. It is not a coincidence that the Central Asia was named as “Turkistan” for centuries. Turan is the name for a wide space laying from Mongolia to Turkey including Turkistan used in Ethno-culturological meaning as well as in a more romantic spectrum. Almost all toponyms containing “Turkic” names were changed. Consequently, Turkistan was renamed as Middle Asia. All kinds of names would be relevant unless they carry a “Turk” component. If in the content of name of Caucasus there were a Turkic component, the ones who changed Ganja to “Kirovabad” (a city in Azerbaijan) explicitly would have change it too. The policy of Sovietization and Russification has changed the national and political structure and even the toponymic maps of the Caucasus and Central Asia (Turkistan) to make its geopolitical identity unrecognizable. The start of the independence era accelerates the urgency of deep reforms providing the full vision of the geopolitical identity of these two regions forming the heart of Eurasia. We think that the new geopolitical paradigm of Eurasia that may find the most realistic consolidation with the union of Turkic states is that Eurasia would not only play an important role in international politics due to its possibilities to introduce its natural resources to the world market but also for capacity to turn its strong regional policy to vanguard of international politics.

The analysis of the geopolitical developments taking place in the Caucasus and Central Asia proves that identifying this potential is explicitly necessary for the international community. It's getting more clear that it is not appropriate to consider the Caucasian and Central Asia states separated from the USSR either as “post-soviet” or “neo-soviet”- the new “versions” of Soviet Union. (Simons, 2008). In this sense “nationalism” is also an ideological phenomenon based on the identity of civilization, perceived at a high political level and serving to the strengthening of national statehood. The ideology of “westernization” that was popular in the early of XX century seems to be weaker than the necessity of modernization of independent Eurasian states. These states prefer their own ways of modernization instead of

“copying” the West. The West, in turn, realizes that it has failed in its attempts to assimilate the world and to some extent “own” in terms of politics, economics, and culture.

Nowadays the Eurasia is at the beginning of the self-proof era. In the modern period the concept of “strong state” has essentially changed as well: now those states that inject the policy liberal economics show the capacity of developing as the subjects increasing the maneuver opportunities of national states rather the ones “squeezed as a fist” in the hands of bureaucratic apparatus. The most relevant example of such transformation is the Eastern Asia states. They have changed beyond the recognition in comparison to the past 60 years: they’ve proved that their institutions of liberal governance are more flexible and versatile than in the Western countries (Fukuyama, 2010)– they are able to maintain themselves in the whole world, as well as, to bring themselves up differently in the world. Therefore, “the chances of powerful Asian states to influence the global development” is tremendously increasing (Pieter and Hazdra, 2004). Established in 1967 ASEAN bringing together 10 Asian member-states (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) bringing this region to the up stages of world development as well as, to a core component of Central Asia despite all the pressures, shows an example to the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The geopolitical configuration of the region

If one looks at the geopolitical construction of Eurasia will observe the following: at the Western Europe (Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and etc.) and Eastern Asia (Japan and China) only the developed countries are situated. Being “stuck” between Russia from north, Afghanistan and Iran from the south and expecting no serious motivation for independent development from its immediate neighbors, Central Asia and Caucasus need to rationally pursue specific self-confidence policy and to reach the progress level of Eurasia’s east and west platform. In such situation, the positive strategy of geopolitical relations demand the clear or hidden intervention of hegemons, not allowing of isolation policy, treating carefully the countries where instability and ideological fanaticism exist, and to deepen the cooperation with the developed countries of the eastern and western platforms. The independent countries of Caucasus and Central Asia are experiencing their hardest time which can potentially open a new stage of geopolitical relations both within themselves and with their neighbors. Azerbaijan which is the only Turkic country in the Caucasus is a place which is the cross line of all the geopolitical lines in Eurasia. Being the biggest country in the Caucasus for all its potentials Azerbaijan is a country to connect Turkey with the Central Asian states, that’s why it is a country establishing the unity of the Turkic countries. The only country destroying the internal unity of Caucasus by occupying Azerbaijani territories is Armenia. If there had been no Armenia fed by Russian Empire to ruin the geopolitical communion of the Caucasus countries, then the political, economic, and cultural life of the region would have gone differently.

In the context of Russian domination allegations.

As the whole policy of Russia toward its neighbors is based on dominance claims, undoubtedly, it is meant to fail. After the collapse of the USSR, considering itself as the “leader” of the region Russia is not willing to draw back from its historical outdated policy. While the US picked up Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Kazakhstan as its favorite countries along the geopolitical line from west to east, Russia responded the same way by expanding its influence borders to the Balkans, Caucasus, and Central Asia (Utkin, 2000). Its most favorite in the Caucasus is Armenia. Not only Azerbaijan but also world community understands without Russia’s military support, “dwarf” Armenia could never invade Azerbaijan’s lands.

Even if Armenians were willing to free the lands, Russia would never let it come true in order not to lose “Armenian factor”, in order to use it against neighboring countries. According to an international survey, Armenian population is the second nation in the world who considers themselves as unfortunate. This is the real example how staying under Russian dominance can destroy a country. Now, as a result of Azerbaijan’s serious attempts Armenia is isolated from the regional projects and exists in a great need of external aid. Logically, winners are strong, but why the winner-aggressorkeeping Azerbaijani lands under invasion is in so miserable situation?! In general, is there any other country except Armenia which shelters Russia that much and sees Russia as a support? Even if yes, is it possible to expect any guarantee for its development?! Although it has that big land, Russia - losing its status of “The last state of Europe. The first state of Asia” (Graham, 2010), gradually – is becoming in need of support of others rather than support others because of its endless claims. Its “Eurasian Union” doctrine is nothing else except empire’s death agony. If we look at the ratio of global powers, we see that after the collapse of Warsaw agreement, end of Cold War (1947-1990) none of the Russian allies is in power to influence the global politics. Who are those allies? Armenia which isolated itself because of his aggressiveness and lost its de-facto independence, Northern Korea that talks in “wolf language” with Asian neighbors, Libya and Syria with their dictatorship regimes fighting against their nations (former dethroned, latter is on dethroning stage), fundamentalist Iran who violates national-cultural rights of half of his nation – Azerbaijani Turks. “Vertical geopolitical array” diplomacy (Darabadi, 2002, p.164) created by Russia in Moscow – Yerevan – Tehran line is losing its importance. By mobilizing its influence means in Caspian region Iran defines its strategic perspective as “a continental type regional state which pursues policy anti-American, anti-Atlantic” and its side with Russia overlaps exactly in this direction. At the same time, due to Southern Azerbaijan factor, tandem consisting of Iran – Russia is becoming possible (Darabadi, 2002, p.165). On the background all of these the process of making actual Turkic States Union worries Russia and Iran. They view this perspective as their total loose of the regional reputation and influence. The military response of Russia to struggle for its territorial integrity of Georgia in Caucasus and despite the occupation of Karabagh region of Azerbaijan by Armenia, strengthening military bases in Armenia, moreover signing an agreement on military alliance with this puppet-state show that this “post-empire” state (Trenin, 2011, p.17) does not give up on pursuing a policy which prevents regional independent development. The possibility of provision of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan and Georgia as a result of their empowerment can deepen new directions in Caucasus geopolitics. The crossing interests of these two Caucasian countries in ongoing global economic projects and the perspective of carrying out transformative progressive functions of international politics are the beginning of the end of Russian hegemonic politics and Armenian invasion at all.

In general, the universal course of the attitude of Russia towards Caucasian Republics is quite controversial, one-sided, impulsive, changeable and lacking any kind of positive dynamics. The processes going on currently clearly indicate that Russia’s policy in the Caucasus carried out in the name of geopolitical balance failed in the long term. Georgia’s very important political step towards the integration into Europe- the decision of visa liberalization with the EU countries can be evaluated as a heavy blow to the efforts of Russia to isolate this region. Meanwhile, the foreign policy carried out by Azerbaijan to deepen cooperation with the European institutions as a core part of integration to the word community fails the idea of the absence of alternatives to the Russian dominance in the Caucasus. In this regard, the clear political line of Azerbaijan and Georgia as equal subjects of the international community based on their national interests, as well as, compatible with

each other is an attractive political platform that brings constructiveness to the rules of the political game in the Caucasian region.

Outlines of some policies of West in the Eurasia and regional challenges. Zbigniew Brzezinski who researched the strategic tendencies of Western geopolitics in the Eurasia in conceptual scale considering the Eurasia as an amorphous system, always prone to fragmentation, a region that cannot find incentives for integration, doesn't believe that "geopolitical pluralism" would be possible in this continent. Reviewing the attempts of Russia, China, India, Iran and other Eurasian states to create a coalition in any configuration against the US policy, he comes up with a conclusion that in fact establishment of such an alliance is not possible due to contradictions between these states themselves: however, the United States should efficiently take advantage of existing contradictions between those states and neutralize the "collation attempts" and other maneuvers by cooperating with Europe and allying the NATO. Apparently, Zbigniew Brzezinski assesses the role of Eurasian states in the establishment of "Trans-Eurasian security system" under the leadership of the United States as just the means (Brzezinski, 2016). However, it is obvious that the determination of Eurasian and its core part- Caucasus and Central Asia geopolitics based again on the interests of a hegemonic state would eliminate neither the contradictions and conflicts in the region nor would lead to stimulation of the processes that benefit the development of the region.

The deputy Director of US Atlantic Council's Energy Center, as well as, the author of valuable ideas regarding Caucasus and Central Asia Alexandros Peterson is trying to debate the key positions of classic Western geopolitics again in the framework of modern foreign policy in his book "The World Island: Eurasian Geopolitics and the Fate of the West". In regard with this, he presents "Geopolitical Strategy for the Twenty-First-Century Eurasia" (Peterson 2011, pp. 112-145): this strategy coordinates the policy of Western and Eurasian countries in all parameters; considers necessary the participation of West in the highest level in the reconstruction of "Eurasian geo-economics". Carefully reviewing one by one the specific political agenda to be established with Russia, Turkey, China, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Mongolia, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, the author concludes that West can only provide its dominance in Eurasia in case if the policy established with all countries of this region complies with the "universal Eurasian policy"; due to the fact that majority of the states in Eurasia not "pro-Western" orientated, they tend to incline themselves more with Russia or China, therefore, "the democratization of these states is the guarantee of the Western policy action there" (Peterson, 2011, pp. 119-122).

Alexandros Peterson referring to the ideas of such representatives of western geopolitics such as Halford Mackinder, George Kennan, and Jozef Pilsudski and deriving from the "real character" of processes in Eurasia comes to conclusion: "all the small states of Eurasia from Georgia to Mongolia should be strengthened with the support of West to establish geopolitical balance between them and the region's largest states with domination pretense. "The Twenty-First-Century Geopolitical Strategy for Eurasia advocates for greater Western involvement in Eurasia than ever before. It argues that Western involvement and integration is not only possible but strategically imperative, not just in the Black Sea region, but also around the Caspian and Central/Inner Asia. The strategy departs from the traditional emphasis placed on the future of Ukraine and its schismatic domestic politics. Rather, it links Western efforts in Europe, Russia, Afghanistan, China, and Iran into a strategic whole to form an overarching purpose for Western institutions and governments. It is neither hopelessly isolationist nor vaingloriously imperialistic. It is aggressively realistic, informed by geographic constants and the urgent need for the West to renew itself in its own defense.

In short, it is a wise strategy – something sorely lacking in the Western attitude towards Eurasia today... The fate of the West has been and will be determined by events on the World Island. Western governments, peoples, and institutions must, therefore, organize their still-preponderant energies and resources to engage vigorously and with long-lasting determinations in the geopolitics of Eurasia.” (Peterson 2011, pp.144-145, 161). Certainly, one may consider this approach more “careful and pragmatic step” comparing to the pro-Western approach clearly avowing the “imperialistic pretensions”.

The development of the political processes in the Caucasus and Central Asia dictate that the approach of West should fundamentally change. This change needs foremost to happen in sense of noticing the new realities of post-soviet space: West shouldn't view the new and independent states of Caucasus and Central Asia as being under the “sphere of influence” of Russian Federation and still not enough powerful to integrate into the international community. Certainly, as always, US takes the most radical alternative to the conservative approach: It tries to get Russia away fully from the Central Asia through isolation. Washington consistently carries out its plans to set up giant military bases in this region. Washington continues to gain an advantage in the struggle between the US and Russia over the influence in the Central Asia.

In 2012 the Americans had begun to hold negotiations with Uzbekistan government in order to strengthen US military power in this country. Russia still favors improving the ties with Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan which it considers as its “satellites” and keeps remaining the main geopolitical rival of the US in this region. The achievement of Russia to carry out the post-Karimov (December 2016) phase according to its own scenario is a proof to it. Interestingly, Kyrgyzstan being a member of the Eurasian Economic Union(EAEU) since 2015 calling an “alternative policy” avows its willingness, in turn, to cooperate with the US. The talks between Washington and Tashkent are held for the purpose of establishment of “Center for Operative Reaction” belonging to the US and Uzbekistan. In fact, this center has been turned into US military base since 2014. Initially, this center had been designed to control emergency cases that may occur in this region. The technical base of the center had been formed at the expense of military equipment of NATO in Afghanistan. After a certain period, this technique should be fully put at the disposal of Uzbekistan. The active diplomacy of this process clearly indicates that, actually, all of this is about the US to build a giant military base in the Central Asia.

The US-orientated and the Europe-orientated dichotomy of western geopolitics which itself is clear in the radical political course of former and moderate political course of other. To what extend the interests of US cross or clash with the interests of Europe in the Eurasia is currently discussed. Rahul Peter Das, the professor of German University Martin Luther considers that “the United States of America is intensifying its activities in Asia, and this nearly inevitably results in a weakening of its commitment to Europe. Europe, therefore, will more and more be left to its own resources in terms of its potential and it means of influencing global events. If Europe is not able to confront these challenges with effective measures, then it will be faced with the danger of marginalization in the sphere of political power” (Das 2004, p.1) because the processes in the Eurasia influence the global political space more and more and even a little change in the balance of power exposes to a modification the balancing factor in interstate relations.

Mainly, nowadays the careful observance of not only the West but in general of whole international politics of the geopolitical structuralism in the Eurasia and identifying of the dominant geo-strategical tendencies is important because Eurasia's confidence in self-potential is inevitably growing. Currently, 75% of the world's population lives in the Eurasia.

Eurasia accounts for the vast majority of world's natural resources. The world's six states with the most powerful economy and military budget after the US (as well as nuclear powers), states with the largest territory and population in the planet are situated in the Eurasia. It is very obvious that if there wouldn't be divisive, conflicting, expansionist intervention of outside forces, this region could use its potential even more and reach to a new level of development. As long as the development process of the Eurasian geopolitics continues self-transformation of leading humanist tendencies of international politics, it becomes more obvious that such one-sided tendencies of creating blocks or domination are wrong and harmful.

Rationalization of these trends and an increasingly positive approach of the West to the fundamental problems of the Eurasia gains positive qualifications. In particular, the Caucasus and Central Asia's "new generation" of post-Soviet states aim to strengthen their independence, to revive the national economy by not using "towing policy", democratization unflinching determination to carry out the activities - the attitude of the West, of course, requires an adequate attitude. According to a number of political analysts, if the United States and the European Union are interested in the development of the Western world, then they should be interested in the development of the Asian world as a whole: The West should not see it as the center of the underdeveloped young states in its "low-floor" but rather accept it to be an equal partner. Now, such approach both in the East and the West appears in the full basis in new argumentation. Indeed, even if a hundred years ago, only four of the West (Britain, France, the United States, Germany) and only one state in Eurasia (Russia) was the owner of a planetary scale, but today the ratio has changed significantly in favor of Eurasia. A number of Eurasian states which did not attract the attention half a century ago, now appeared in front of so-platform of the political system. Therefore, it is necessary for West to have multilateral and pluralist policy with new Eurasian states and raise the cooperation to the high level with individual states and create among them a combination of conciliatory policy (Kinzer 2010). The relations with the Turkic states (Azerbaijan in the Caucasus and Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan of the Central Asia) creating the geopolitical integrity of the Eurasiaon such a wide range of regional platformare of special importance.

One of the most important initiatives that will create possibilities of multilateral cooperation and start a new positive phase is the Eastern Partnership Programme. This project, adopted in May 2009, envisages the cooperation platform between the European Union and seven euro-Asian countries (Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia and Belarus) envisages the development of cooperation platform (Korosteleva 2012). Thomas Simons who served as the US ambassador to Poland and Pakistan, a well-aware of Eurasia's political, economic and cultural potential specialist who spares great attention to the development prospects of this region comes up with an idea of establishment of western policy in Eurasia on new grounds in his book "Eurasia's New Frontiers Young USA, Old Societies, Open Futures. "Developing the paradigm of that "Today's Eurasia is not the Soviet Union" (Simons, 2008, p.7), the American diplomat shows that by supporting the self-confirmation policy of Eurasia the West gives a strong impetus to the dynamics of international relations: if to show such support then the United States will get real successful results in their policy not from focusing on Russia, but from its support to young sovereign states in Eurasia: "To work effectively with Eurasia's states, however, the United States needs to treat them as responsible and capable participants in an international society living by twenty-first-century standards. But that also means we too must act like a responsible twenty-first-century state: a change for the better that we can easily afford to make... Things

can change in Eurasia, and we can help” (Simons 2008, p.12-14).

The changeable and fixed features of West’s Eurasian policy, in fact, is related to the complicated nature of modern international politics. The fixed features show that the conservative “realpolitik” still didn’t step back from the doctrine of domination while the changeable features show that the liberal positions bring the democratic development to the significant level among the important factors of world progress.

The transformation of the international system in a progressive direction increases the level of development of bilateral relations between the West and young Eurasian states and guarantees the consolidation of powers to bring positive changes in this sense.

Guarantees of geopolitical security

26 years ago Central Asia seemed as a “black hole” in the middle of the world in global coordinates of geopolitics. However, by solving complicated problems of independent state building and at the same time by solving certain ethnic conflicts politically and economically strengthening Central Asian republics showed they were able to pass resolutely this hard historic stage of independence. These countries having some typical characteristics as traditional societies enjoy the natural process of modernization on the basis of the national freedom. The main purpose of the governments in those countries is to ensure national unity of the nation and political-economic independence of state fully; to take part in more promising regional and global projects, and by these to find a worthy place in the world. The main geopolitical aim of Central Asia with over 4 million square km territory and approximately 65 million habitants, currently is focused on the establishment of the “common ground” of relations that benefits all the countries inside and outside of the region. Along with the common regional features, all these countries have their own historically formed socio-culturological difference, agriculture and production culture. The contradictions occurring within the process of transformation of the ethnopolitical system to national statehood system sometimes creates a ground for ethnic conflicts. However, despite all this, there is no doubt that the Central Asia will manage to develop the independence of the young republics with ancient history. This, in turn, indicates that rising the politico-economic relations to the higher level within and outside of the region is the foundation of the geopolitical security of Central Asia.

In current geopolitical situation four Turkic Central Asian countries – Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan, and at the same time, Tajikistan try to mobilize their internal potential in the same direction by taking main responsibility of regional stability and development; to prioritize cooperation of global powers, but not their conflicts. Russia, China, Iran and Pakistan who found configuration alongside Central Asian borders make efforts to influence to the region and get all possible means of cooperation. (Mandelbaum, 1994; Olcott, 1996). Russia, owing more powerful influence to the region with previous inertia, demonstrates domination claims more stubbornly here than in Caucasus. Russia views Central Asia as a polygon of transforming CIS to Euroasian Union. The United States of America wants to extinguish Central Asia from Russian influence sphere, to turn it to an arena of global projects and to see it in its “influence zone”. Of course, operations done by the US together with NATO in Afghanistan keeps the neighboring region under the stress. Even though Western “International Security Assistance Force” could not succeed fully and spent billions of dollars in this dramatic point of Eurasia, the West is persistent to control and neutralize ethnic, religious, political conflicts here. In order to gain a foothold in the “heart” of Eurasia a part of the US Military Forces have been moved from Pacific Command to Central Asia Command (Sengupta, 2009, p.57).

For Central Asia to resist against situation of being enclosed to Western penetration area and turning to “Fight against Terrorism” arena of West Alliance is important as much as escaping from Russian “Eurasian Union” trap. “Islamic Fundamentalism” wave coming from Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan are also a serious threat to Central Asia. Radical Islamists (such as “Hizb-ut-Tahrir” Islamic party) try to find a support in traditional Islamic societies for themselves by creating groups similar to “Taliban” movement (Brauer, 2004, p.40)

As the second and third economic powerful countries China and Japan which become important components of Eurasian global geopolitics initiate to achieve their objectives of activating their consumer and production market in this area, benefit maximum from Central Asian natural resources by pursuing a more moderate policy in comparison the US, Russia and other interested parties. Surely, this version of international economic cooperation suits better to the interests of Central Asia. In this sense, projects to transport of natural resources of region countries to west by Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan, to east – Atlantic Ocean market through China, to south – Indian Ocean economic zone through Afghanistan, Pakistan and India can be a major comeback for processes of connecting Central Asian economy to the world economic system

The analysis in the research and statistical data collection named “Central Asia and Caucasus: At the Crossroads of Eurasia in the 21st century” also proves that, indeed, this region has broad and inexhaustible potential of opportunities for high development (Herman and Linn, 2011). Defining economic and political perspectives correctly entails realizing those opportunities. Hence, the republics of Central Asia should participate actively in the process of building interstate cooperation in the wide Eurasian space.

“Turkic Consensus”

Undoubtedly, the entire logic of Eurasian geopolitical development including Caucasus and Central Asia is about organizing and structuring the continental Turkic geopolitical system. This geopolitical space, consisting of six Turkic republics, inevitably proceeds towards realizing that logic after the collapsing of Soviet Union. From Turkey to Kazakhstan all Turkic societies clearly realize that representation in any regional or international organization cannot be as significant as the union of Turkic states. There is no research devoted to the issues of Eurasian geopolitics that the initiatives towards such organization have not been assessed or the approach to its perspective has been agnostic. In one of these fundamental researches “Heartlands of Eurasia: The Geopolitics of Political Space” by Anita Sengupta, the author affirms that the superiority of “Turkic segment” in the regional “meta-historical” and “meta-geographical” development and further processes lead to consolidation of a continental Turkic geopolitical system. The author mentions: “common social, cultural, and civilizational heritage among the Turkic people” plays such an important role that this factor shapes the main national idea of intellectual elites of these societies and the consolidation of Turkic states is understood on basis of this civilization (Sengupta, 2009, pp. 75-96, 108-109, 129-141). The author of “World Island: Eurasian geopolitics and destiny of the West” Alexandros Peterson as an ultimate outcome of his research also comes to such a conclusion that Turkic nations who had control over Eurasia's “inland” since Hun epoch, are capable of taking the main responsibility for the development of the region also in the modern time. The theorist sees the consensus context of “XXI century Geopolitical Strategy for Eurasia” with Western and Eurasian interests on the “Turkic platform”. He especially highlights the position of Azerbaijan as “Eurasia's gate to Asia” (“Azerbaijan is indeed the gateway to the Asian part of Eurasia”) (Peterson, 2011, p.146-160).

Hugh Pope who has been to all Turkic states of Caucasus and Central Asia, published a

worthwhile research named "Sons of the Conquerors: The Rise of the Turkic World" studying Turkic nations' life and thought styles for many years in 20 states of the world, currently working as the chief of Istanbul news bureau at the worldwide famous "Wall Street Journal" writes explaining the main purpose of his research: "My argument is that Turkic people can no longer be treated as marginal players on the edge of Europe and the Middle East or crushed subjects of remote parts of the Russian and Chinese domain, or distant allies have taken for granted by the Europe Union and the United States. They are becoming noteworthy peoples and prosperous states in their own right, and are developing numerous new connections between each other" (Pope 2005, p.18-19).

As mentioned, Turkic world is appraised as indeed locomotive of internal development incentives of Eurasia. The consolidation of the geopolitical system created by Turkic states in the "heartland" (Mackinder) of Eurasia is compatible with the interests of the other regional states (even Russia). "Turkic Consensus" of Eurasia is such an agreement among the states in this region that optimum condition is provided for the development of each state on this common platform. The absolute superiority of the "Turkic Consensus" constructed on the unanimity over national, regional and global levels is about that there is no opportunity of the dominance of any political subject. Usually, in amorphous geopolitical spaces where strong and weak states, stable and unstable systems, progressive and stagnant economies, democratic and non-democratic societies live together claims from "inside" and "outside" for dominance and hegemony get heavily triggered. Therefore, "Turkic Consensus" of Eurasia must try to gradually eliminate this dissonance situation in the region as a necessary stage. In the atmosphere of the geopolitical security of Eurasia eminent and different level partnership relations are possible from Japan to Britain, from Russia to India. In such a situation the polarization of different states with opposite interests, attempts toward alignment leading to political-military confrontations is minimized. Therefore, nowadays from Turkey to Kazakhstan with the logic and prescience of their mature political cultures all Turkic states unambiguously perform as the supporter and leader of the tendencies that will ensure the security of Eurasia.

In this regard intensiveness of Turkic states catches attentions and is evaluated positively. In the eve of the new geopolitical reality of Eurasia the rise of the role of the Turkic states strengthens the reliance for the necessity of regional consensus and in this context creates a foundation to realize the idea of the Union of Turkic states. Graham Fuller and Bulent Araz in their specific research devoted this topic links Turkey's targets to revive its Eurasian geopolitics with the demand of modern international politics and comes to such conclusion that this strengthened position will improve the relations with each state of the region (Fuller, 2010; Araz, 2002). The official position of the Republic of Turkey has been conceptualized in the book of "Strategic depth: Turkey's international position" by Ahmet Davutoglu former minister of foreign affairs of the state: The main goal of Turkey is to bring the relations with its neighbors to the "zero problems" level (meaning to solve all problems) and then to lower the relations between the neighbors themselves to the "zero problems" level (Davutoglu, 2001, p. 2170-281). If the Turkic world is an "Asian arrow", its motion axis is Turkey. Indeed, Turkey today with its closest ally Azerbaijan in both Caucasus and Central Asia-oriented politics coordinates very successful actions, actualizes decisive approaches towards Eurasia' regional problems. New geopolitical order established by the political, economic and cultural platform of the Turkic states in Eurasia offers "open space" to everybody in the perspectives of regional development, makes the potential partnership of the states with intentions of peace and cooperation, deepens mutual trust and confidence, the positive tendencies which block the trends towards marginalization and polarization.

Conclusion

Our analysis of the key trends in the Caucasus and Central Asia geopolitics shows that Eurasia has earned its geopolitical integrity only with the integrity of the Turkic world. In a wider geopolitical space, Asia and Europe as different «components» of civilization united and exposed by Turks are building certain relationships in their single mega-system of civilization. If Eurasia - Europe (Western and Eastern Europe), the Middle East, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Southeast Asia consists of political regions, then Turkic states create a common geopolitical space for all of them. Except for Turkic states, no any other states are capable of creating, affording and functioning of the geopolitical coordination of the region. Turkic states have earned this non-shareable reality, capacity and ability of functioning based on natural geographical factors as a result of long historical and political processes. The logical sequence of the political events happening in the end of XX century that resulted in the establishment of independent Turkic states shows that the relations among Caucasus and Central Asian Republics which are directly related to that event is a tendency bringing together the whole characteristics of modernity, all positive aspects of universalization, the directions of globalism that will benefit the states of the region.

In general, it is impossible to imagine the Eurasia, as well as, particularly, Caucasus and Central Asia without Turkic states (Roy, 2007). If any states are willing to ignore these political entities of Eurasia, exclude them from the processes, just lift up a certain work or implement a project through the «resources and tools» function, they are deeply mistaken. The consistent geopolitical movement of Turkic states in Eurasia is quietly competent and strong to prevent the dangerous maneuvers. Because the aims of Turkic states expressed in their joint efforts are giving an impetus to the relations between Caucasus and Central Asia and develops the current relations in a more wide scale and comprehensive way.

The growing role of Turkic states in world politics in XXI century allows them to benefit from geopolitical position motivated by Eurasia's historical and political factors. Therefore, considering prospects of Eurasia, Western strategists, and political leaders, plan global communication systems linking the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean over the Turkic world that has no claims of domination, which guarantee international cooperation, peace and security in the region. A significant portion of the implementation of these projects in optimal power delivery will drive all countries of the region to an entirely new direction. The opportunity, the Union of Turkic states could provide for the development of relations and the geopolitical and geostrategic opportunities are the safest and best opportunities for Eurasia as a whole. Trans-Eurasian communications projects (oil, gas, transport and etc.) are implemented in parallels with the process of consolidation of the Turkic states and coordination of the activities carried out to create grounds for that. The advantageousness of the geopolitical configuration established by sovereign Turkic republics between themselves and with their neighboring states and the prominence of the role played by them in the Eurasian space in the framework of regional geopolitical relations ensures the strengthening of international political, economic and cultural system and the incomparable development of international life. This new trend of geopolitical order created by the political, economic and cultural platform of Caucasian and Central Asian states in the Eurasia generates an «open challenge» for everyone in prospects of regional development, makes possible the potential congeniality of the goodwill and cooperation intending states, deepens mutual trust and faith, the positive tendencies preventing from marginalization and polarization.

XXI . , . 2010, :
. (in Russian).