
THE GREAT GAME, THE KHAZARS, AND THE END OF GEOPOLITICS

The time has come to adopt the principle of the benefit of the other

by Pierre Beaudry, 4/8/2019

INTRODUCTION

At the moment when Italy was joining the New Silk Road during the state visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping last month, it is fitting that the reader be reminded that the strategic and epistemological circumstances of today are similar to those of 1,200 years ago when, Charlemagne, Haroun al-Rashid, and King Bulan united their forces against religious geopolitics for the purpose of securing peace and development for mankind as a whole.

On March 17, 2019, President Donald Trump re-tweeted William Craddick's tweet: "Russiagate was designed in part to help the UK counter Russian influence by baiting the United States into taking a hard line against them. [It] leaves us all with a more dangerous world as a consequence. Just another episode of the Great Game."¹

¹ [Disobedient Media](#) After President Trump re-tweeted the Craddick message, the official British Foreign Office replied directly to the *Independent* newspaper that the Grandson of Winston Churchill, Conservative MP, Nicholas Soames, was not amused and that "This claim is completely false." [Trump Tweet on British Opens Spring Offensive Against the Coup](#)

The reference to the Great Game and to the British baiting America represents a call for discovering the real cause of and the true solution to the present world strategic danger. Humanity is at such a historical turning point that an open challenge to the geopolitical view of the world must be made world-wide against the British Empire's drive toward World War III. A solution must be found to end the conflict between the unipolar and multipolar views of the world.

Trump's re-tweet is a move in that direction because it is a reminder of how the Great Game gave us two World Wars and he wishes to avoid a third one. A return to such wars can be stopped if the world is made aware that what caused such evil goes back to a momentous axiomatic event which began to take place in Central Asia around 799 AD, a first and unique attempt at establishing an ecumenical peace and a mutual economic collaboration between East and West among Christianity, Islam, and Judaism.

The purpose of this report is to remind the reader that the defeat of the Great Game ideology is the precondition for stopping a potential World War III in the months ahead. It is the fight between the Clash of Civilizations popularized by Samuel Huntington and The World Land-Bridge proposed by Lyndon LaRouche which will decide the fate of mankind in the near future. Whoever wins that fight will decide the fate of humanity for all future to come.

1. THE RECENT STRATEGIC CONFLICTS OF THE GREAT GAME

My intention, here, is not to go through the history of Central Asia but to emphasize the epistemological characteristic of the Great Game conflict in that region of the world. The idea behind the Great Game is the idea of the "cold war", and historical evidence shows that the "cold war" is not an invention of the twentieth century. The idea behind the "cold war" is an imperialist control of sovereign nations. Throughout history, there have been many occasions where a third power has attempted to dominate two other rival powers by seeking to minimize their forces, their influence, or destroy them both by creating conflicts

between them. The idea is the well known tactic of “divide and conquer” which has been the favorite British game since time immemorial because, even though it always had friends and enemies, its only purpose was self-interest.

The Great Game² refers essentially to the wars of influence between the British Empire and the Russian Empire during the nineteenth century and the geopolitical conception behind it was devised by British Intelligence operative, Sir Halford John Mackinder, who postulated that whoever controlled Central Asia controlled the world.

During the past three decades, the Great Game ideology was made visible on the world stage by causing a series of European conflicts which took place in earnest after the breakdown of the Soviet Union, and especially with the dislocation of Eastern European countries. Those conflicts were initiated under the guise of “colored revolutions” and fake “wars of religion” by the British Oligarchy and their NATO neo-con allies. Their objective was to cause conditions of ungovernability on the borders of Russia from both Central Europe and Central Asia and to ensure that the Russian bear would constantly be on its guard and remain in its cave.

In the wake of the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the Great Game initiated a number of wars in and around Europe, notably, the South Ossetia War of 1991-92 and 2008, the Transnistria War of 1990-92, the Bosnia-Herzegovina War 1992-1995, the Abkhaz-Georgian conflict of 1998, the Kosovo War of 1998-99, the Russo-Georgian Crisis of 2008, the still ongoing 2014 Ukrainian Crisis, the so-called “velvet revolution” in the Armenia-Azerbaijani clashes of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflicts of 2017-18, and the Crimea crisis of 2018.

In Central Asia, the same geopolitical ideology was directly involved in provoking the Tajikistani Civil War and the Uzbekistan massacres from 1992-1997, the Kyrgyzstan ethnic clashes of 2010-12, with the October 7, 2001 American invasion of Afghanistan following the September 11 attacks in 2001, a

² The name of the “Great Game” was coined originally from British Intelligence officer, Captain Arthur Conolly, and was popularized by Rudyard Kipling in his book, *Kim*. Karl Nesselrode, Russian Foreign Minister (1814-1856) used the expression “Tournament of Shadows” to describe the same geopolitical construct. The irony is that both expressions are fallacies of composition; the Great Game is a disguised term for taking advantage of the other.

war which is still going on to this day. *Operation Enduring Freedom* of October 7, 2001, the UK-US War in Afghanistan, demonstrated American President George W. Bush being entirely under the control of British war policy.

British agent of influence and National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, convinced President Jimmy Carter to sell the American people a new version of the Great Game. As a result, the United States adopted the unilateral geopolitical view of the British Great Game and entered into an indefinite war in Iraq in particular and in the entire South West Asia region more generally.

By the turn of the last century, the stage had been set to have the United States become the military muscle behind the British brain. The British-Saudi-FBI run attacks of September 11, 2001 became the means of consolidating the American commitment to a perpetual war in Southwest and Central Asia under British command.

2. HOW TO END THE BRITISH GEOPOLITICS OF THE GREAT GAME

It requires more than the United States pulling out of the Great Game scenarios to put an end to the British imperial design of geopolitical world control; it will require the United States joining the Chinese Belt-and-Road initiative.

Bringing the United States into the New Paradigm of world development will not be done exclusively from inside of the United States; it will require the intervention of other countries, most notably the intervention of one or more NATO countries such as Italy, France, and Turkey. As former French Presidential candidate, Jacques Cheminade said: "What remains to be done? For us, it's to be these voices that Lyn recalled for in his declaration about the 'Pearl Harbor Effect,' which happened in the United States after Pearl Harbor. When he was out in the street, and he noticed that all of a sudden, people were different. This has not yet

happened. But it's about to happen, if we act properly and if you work for this to happen.”³

The question is: Which of these NATO countries will be the first to resolve the geopolitical paradox of the *coincidence of opposites* by becoming an observer or a member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization SCO?⁴ This idea must raise many questions.

You might be wondering: How can a NATO member country also be an SCO member country? Isn't that a contradiction? What does it take to solve that contradiction? How can the conflicting ideologies of NATO and the SCO be made congruent? How do you abandon unilateralism and replace it by multilateralism? Those are the questions to be answered in the immediate period ahead. In other words, how can world leaders abandon, once and for all, the colonial rivalry that has pitted the British Empire against Imperial Russia since the Nineteenth Century so that mankind can have a chance to survive? How can such an axiomatic change take place?

France abandoned the British led Great Game after World War II, but when the French government sent troops to Afghanistan in 2008, they again started to play an associative role with the British. Because the Great Game involves specific regions of Europe and of Asia which extend geographically on the borders of Russia, from Poland through the Black Sea and the Caucasus to Central Asia, the political manipulation of these regions reflects the constant danger of war.

The way to understand the present geopolitical conflict requires an understanding of the fact that the modern form of the Great Game comes from the nineteenth century geopolitical confrontations between the British and the Russian Empires, but the conceptual origin of the Great Game goes back to an historical anomaly known as the Khazar Kingdom, which around 799 AD, converted as a whole to Judaism, and established a short period of ecumenical alliance among the

³ Morning Briefing for Sunday, March 31, 2019, page 10 of 36.

⁴ The Shanghai Cooperation Organization SCO is a Eurasian political, economic, and security alliance created on June 15, 2001 by the leaders of six Asiatic nations, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. India and Pakistan joined the SCO as full members on June 9, 2017. During the 2003-2010 period, the SCO has expanded its activities to include military cooperation, intelligence sharing, and counterterrorism.

Christian Emperor Charlemagne, King Bulan of Khazaria, and the Baghdad leader of Islam Haroun al Rashid.⁵ French historian Jacques Sapir made the following instructive statement about this unique and unusual political combination:

“The [Khazar] empire established by a Turkish-Mongolian people who had converted massively to Judaism, an event almost without equal in history, had established a buffer zone between the interests of Constantinople and Baghdad. Already local geopolitics had come to determine a more global geopolitics.”⁶

Such an acknowledgment is useful but it requires a much more in depth investigation into the nature of the human mind and into the reasons why such collaboration became historically necessary and how it could have become an instrument of peace capable of eradicating the ideology of geopolitics. What was required of Khazaria was more than simply to “establish a buffer” between two other religious ideologies; what was required was a solution to the paradox of the *unity of opposites* between the three religions of the Book. The new Kingdom had to apply the principle of the Peace of Westphalia centuries before such a peace had unified Europe.

⁵ See my reports : [CHARLEMAGNE AND HAROUN AL RASHID, PART I, THE CHARLEMAGNE ECUMENICAL REVOLUTION](#), and [THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWISH KHAZARS](#).

⁶ Jacques Piatigorsky (dir.) et Jacques Sapir (dir.), *Le Grand Jeu XIX siècle, Les enjeux géopolitiques de l'Asie centrale*, Éditions Autrement, coll. “Mémoires/Histoire”, Paris, 2009, p. 8. (Translation by Pierre Beaudry) See also : Jacques Sapir (dir.), Jacques Piatigorsky (dir.), [L'Empire Khazar, VIIe XIe siècle](#), Éditions Autrement, 2005, p. 5.

3. WHY THE KHAZAR EMPIRE CONVERTED TO JUDAISM



Expansion of the Khazars Empire from c. 650 to its peak in c. 850 AD. Nowadays the territory of that Empire is part of Western Russia, Eastern Ukraine, Western Kazakhstan, Northwest of Uzbekistan, and East of Turkey, of Georgia, of Armenia, and of Azerbaijan. Source Kevin A. Brook.

According to authors Jacques Sapir and Jacques Piatigorsky, the Emperor of the Khazars, King Bulan, adopted the Jewish faith⁷ around 799 for pragmatic and strategic reasons; that is, for the purpose of securing his kingdom with a religious ideology capable of meeting the cultural, judicial, military, and political

⁷ The story of this conversion has been reported by the great Jewish philosopher of the middle Ages, Judah Halevy in his book *The Khazari*, first published in Cordova in 1140.

requirements capable of competing with those of a Christian or Islamic society. In fact, it was the application of such a pragmatic principle which caused the project to fail. In the same book, Ukrainian historian, Alexei Terechtchenko gave similar lip service to this pragmatic principle:

“The Khazars could not avoid the adoption of monotheism because their pagan religion could not have provided the political and cultural unity they so necessarily required for the survival of the State. However, since the option of Christianity or Islam would have meant dependency toward either Byzantium or with regard to the Caliphate, which the Khazars did not obviously wish, they found the solution in the adoption of the oldest of the monotheist religions, Judaism, which was already quite wide-spread in the region.”⁸

The reasoning may appear to be credible because it is practical, but it is not strategically sound and epistemologically valid. Humanity as a whole was at stake and a unified principle was required to guarantee general peace. It must have been quite a paradoxical educational experience for a Rabbi, or a Jewish philosopher of the time, to provide the imperial staff of the Khazars with the required doctrinal knowledge in a climate where the Christian Emperors of Byzantium, Maurice and Heraclitus the First, had already instituted forced baptism on all pagan populations throughout the Islamic region of Iran and the region of present day Uzbekistan. How can this have been a practical decision when King Bulan had actually established an Islamic army to defend his Jewish Kingdom and had enlisted Islamic Judges to sit in his Supreme Court? As historian D. M. Dunlop quoted from Muslim historian Mas'udi:

“The predominant element in this country [Khazar] are the Muslims, because they form the royal army. They are known in this country as Arsiyah, and are immigrants from the neighborhood of Kwarizm. Long ago, after the appearance of Islam, there was war and pestilence in their territory, and they repaired to the Khazar King. They are strong and courageous and

⁸ Alexei Terechtchenko, *Que sait-on des Khazars ou état des lieux historiques d'un peuple oublié*, in Op. Cit., p. 48. Translated by P. B.

the Khazar king relies on them in his wars. They have continued to reside in his country on certain conditions, one being the open profession of their religion [Islam], with permission for mosques and the call to prayer. Further, the vizierate must belong to them. At present the vizier is one of them, Ahmad ibn Kuya. When the king of the Khazars is at war with the Muslims, they have a separate place in his army and do not fight the people of their own faith. They fight with him against all the unbelievers. At such times about 7,000 of them ride with the king, archers with breastplates, helmets and coats of mail. Some also are lancers, equipped and armed like the Muslim. They also have Muslim judge (qudat). The custom in the Khazar capital is to have seven judges. Of these, two are for the Muslims, two for the Khazars judging according to the Torah, two for those among them who are Christians judging according to the Gospel, and one for the Saqalibah, Rus and other pagans judging according to pagan law, i.e. on theoretical principles. [they do not worship God, nor do they have recourse to reason.] When a serious case is brought up, of which they have no knowledge, they come before the Muslim judges and plead there, obeying what the law of Islam lays down. None of the kings of the East in this quarter has a regularly provisioned army except the king of the Khazars. All the Muslims in those parts are known by the name of these people, the Arsiyah, and the Rus and Saqalibah, whom we have mentioned as pagans. They are the army and servitors of the king. In his city are many Muslims, merchants and craftsmen, beside the Arsiyah, who have come to his country because of his justice and the security which he offers. They have a cathedral mosque and a minaret which rises above the royal castle, and other mosques there besides, with schools where the children learn the Qur'an. If the Muslims and Christians there are agreed, the king cannot cope with them.”⁹

Whatever the pragmatic justification was for the adoption of Judaism by Khazar King Bulan, there is only one reason which is epistemologically viable.

⁹ D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1954, p. 206-207. Quoted from Mas'udi, *Muruj al-Dhahad*, (Meadows of Gold), Paris ed., II, 7-14. (Norman Golb and Omeljan Pritsak, *Op. Cit.*, p. 51) See my report: [KHAZAR KINGDOM, CHARLEMAGNE, AND HAROUN](#)

And one should not fail to reflect on this connection in order to evaluate the epistemological significance of the event. The conversion was an axiom busting moment because it introduced a paradigm shift in the minds of the Khazar ruling class through the paradoxical method of solving apparent contradictions among the three religions. The idea was to bring the ruling class of the Khazars to change their way of thinking about the excluded and the poor of Europe and of Asia, a method that had been successfully adopted by Charlemagne with his own ruling families only a few years earlier.¹⁰ This unique historical document reads as follows:

“The First among the foremost, He who is adorned with the diadem “Final and First,” who hears the whispered voice, and listens to utterance and tongue – may He guard them as the pupil (of one’s eye), and make them to dwell with Nahshon on high as at first – Men of truth, despisers of gain, doers of loving kindness and pursuers of charity, guardians of salvation whose bread is available to every wayfarer and passerby, Holy communities scattered to all (the world’s) corners: may it be the will of the Master of Peace to make them dwell as a crown of peace! Now, our dignitaries and masters, we, community of Kiev, (hereby) inform you of the troublesome affair of this (man) Mar Jacob ben R. Hanukkah, who is of the sons of [good people]. He was of the givers and not of the takers, until a cruel fate was decreed against him, in that his brother went on the road, and there came [brigands who slew him and took his money. Then came creditors who took captive this (man) Jacob, they put chains of iron on his neck and fetters about his legs. He stayed there an entire year [... and after-] wards we took him in surety; we paid out sixty [coins] and there ye[t...]remained forty coins; so we have sent him among the holy community that they might take pity on him. So now, O our masters, raise up your eyes to heaven and do as is your goodly custom, for you know how great is the virtue of charity. For charity saves (men) from death. Nor are we as warners but rather as those who remind; and to you will there be charity before the Lord your God. You shall eat (the) fruits (thereof) in this world, and the capital fund (of merit)

¹⁰ See my report: [CHARLEMAGNE'S ECONOMICS OF 'AGAPE'](#).

shall be yours perpetually in the world to come. Only be strong and of good courage, and do not put our words behind your backs; and may the Omnipresent bless you and build Jerusalem in your days and redeem you. Amen? Amen? Amen?”¹¹

This may be the first time in history that the personal principle of *agape* had been officially adopted as a principle of state government and this Khazar Kiev Letter attests to the fact that such an agapic principle was one of the founding principles of their religious doctrine.

However, the adoption of such a principle of compassion toward the poor of the world to be fulfilled by community could not have taken place all at once and without some major opposition on the part of the Khazar, Islamic, and Christian ruling families (oligarchies). The evolution of this axiom busting ecumenical arrangement lasted about 70 years and only a short time-line of events can today give an account of what took place during that crucial paradigm shift period. According to the present state of published historical records, the following series of event is all that remains of that political axiomatic change.

In 730, the Khazars had inflicted a major military defeat on the Muslims near Ardabil in Iran and had conquered Arabic territory as far west as Mosul in Iraq. They were moving dangerously close to Damascus, the Syrian capital of the Caliphate, when the Muslims managed to rebuild their forces sufficiently to capture Constantinople.

The Khazars were then held back and were soon forced to retreat behind the Caucasus. It was after that crucial Muslim victory that the heir to the throne of the Byzantine Roman Empire,¹² the son of Leo III, Constantine V, married the Khazar Princess, Tzitzak. As a result, the grandson of Lon III, Leo IV “the Khazar”, consolidated an alliance between the Byzantium Empire and the Khazar Empire.

¹¹ [*The Kievan Letter*](#) is signed by 11 Jewish officials of the city of Kiev, some of them possibly related with the Radhanite trade company, according to historian Pritsak.

¹² The real name of the Byzantium Empire is the Roman Empire. The term “Byzantium” was used purely to differentiate the Roman Empire of the East from the West.

The following short time-line reflects the main events of this epistemological paradigm shift.

732 AD, Leo III the Isaurian marries his son Constantine (future Emperor Constantine V) with the daughter of Bihar, Khagan of the Khazars, princess Tzitzak, who was baptized as a Christian Orthodox under the name of Irene. This had the effect of transforming the Eastern Roman Empire into an ecumenical empire.

775 to 780, the Khazar son of Constantine V and of Tzitzak-Irene, Leo IV dubbed “the Khazar,” becomes Emperor and consolidates the friendship between the two other empires.

797, Tzitzak-Irene launches a coup against her own son and takes power from 797 until 802.

800, Charlemagne is crowned Roman Emperor by Pope Leo III and is ready to add the Western Roman Empire to the ecumenical combination already established.

802, Charlemagne proposes marriage to Tzitzak-Irene in order to unify the three empires (Western Roman, Orthodox Roman, and Khazar) with the blessings of Harun al-Rashid in Baghdad, but the project fails when a coup against Tzitzak-Irene succeeded in deposing her. Charlemagne and the Caliphate of Baghdad, Harun al-Rashid (786-809) remained nevertheless allies and used Jewish diplomats and Radanite merchants to communicate with each other.¹³ Haroun makes Charlemagne the protector of the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The failure to secure the Jewish Khazar Empire with Islam and Christianity at that time was the most significant defeat of the ecumenical-humanist faction in history.¹⁴

This time-line of events taking place from 732 until 802 marks the historical period in which a New Paradigm of peace and collaboration among nations of the three religions of the Book was taking form, but was also sabotaged by an alliance of the geopolitical fanatics among the three religions.

¹³ See my reports in [*History Book I: The Charlemagne Ecumenical Principle*](#).

¹⁴ Encyclopedia Britannica muddied the waters by identifying Irene (752-803) as being of Greek origins.

A similar New Paradigm change which has been in the making for over fifty years is about to be instituted today with the LaRouche New Land-Bridge policy of reviving a New Silk Road through the peaceful efforts of the Shanghai Collaboration Organization (SCO). Will this new attempt at establishing a world-wide ecumenical-humanist world order succeed or will it fail like the previous Charlemagne project? That's the question which we must answer in the coming period ahead. For the second time in history, the world is experiencing today a Charlemagne-LaRouche moment which may not have a third chance.

The first attempt (732-802) was the first time in history that the three religions of the Book had been politically unified under a single peace and compassionate economic and political arrangement. Now, the second attempt has just been introduced into the European community via Italy with the current visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping. The question is: what will the leadership of the three religions of the Book do in order to facilitate the success of this New Paradigm? How will the other world leaders react?

The underlying assumption, here, is that if there are potential clashes among the three great religions of the Book, there must also be the possibility of an ecumenical peace among them; such that one is able to eliminate the differences between the other two. In other words, the clashes among ideologies must also be the terrain where all oppositions can be resolved. For Russian historian Vasili V. Grigoriev, Russia had found in the Khazar Empire an ideal society which decided to adopt the principle of the *benefit of the other*:

"The Khazar people were an unusual phenomenon for medieval times. Surrounded by savage and nomadic tribes, they had all the advantages of the developed countries: structured government, vast and prosperous trading, and a permanent army. At the time, when great fanaticism and deep ignorance contested their dominion over Western Europe, the Khazar state was famous for its justice and tolerance. People persecuted for their faiths flocked into Khazaria from everywhere. As a glistening star it shone brightly on the

gloomy horizon of Europe, and faded away without leaving any traces of existence."¹⁵

The tragic consequence of this noble action, however, is that the Khazar people became one of the great forgotten peoples of history. Why was such a unique moment of history obliterated? What danger does the memory of this people represent for the powers that be? Again, the answers to these questions may be found in a higher geometry, which Nicholas of Cusa provided in his method of solving paradoxes by finding the way to solve the *coincidence of opposites*.

The challenge that the Khazars had taken was to accept the role of being a Judaic ecumenical interlocutor between Christianity and Islam, a role of *congruence between two opposites* who were not true opposites but who fought against each other as if they were. Why not solve this apparent paradox now and forever before mankind does something so evil that it will have left behind no one to remember its extinction?

Blacking the Khazars out of history was meant to promulgate the lie that there could never be any unity between East and West. That is also the challenge of today, when the world is ready and willing to adopt a New Peace of Westphalia. The irony is that in order to succeed, we may all need to become Khazars; we may all need to take the risk of becoming forgotten people.

4. SOME HOPES FROM THE SCO

Whenever something fundamental about the future of mankind has to be discovered, the secret is always located in *what is not there*. Therefore, what needs to be uncovered is the reason why there has been so little information known about the Khazars and why they have been so completely eradicated from the historical records as a whole. The reason is because they represented a solution to the

¹⁵ Vasili V. Grigoriev, [*O dvoystvennosti verkhovnoy vlasti u khazarov*](#)" (1835), reprinted in his 1876 compilation book *Rossiia i Aziya* See also Alexei Terechtchenko, *L'etrange relation de Staline et des Khazars*, in [*L'Empire Khazar*](#), p. 81.

warmongering geopolitical ideology of imperialism and they were projecting a light toward cooperation among all of the peoples of the world based on the common aims of mankind. Such is the paradigm shift that we must concentrate on.

By connecting the disappearance of the Khazars with the Great Game geopolitical scenarios, Jacques Sapir was able to see and show how the present conflicts between NATO and the SCO could be resolved, but he failed to show how one can put an end to geopolitics. According to Sapir, the 2001 creation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) represented a major strategic innovation in world affairs not only because it was the first strategic organization to be created in the world after the end of the cold war, but also because it represented a first attempt at establishing an economic and military security for Asia. However, the new institution was not created to be in opposition to NATO.



Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit in 2014 in Dushanbe, Tajikistan.

In reality, the creation of the SCO was an attempt by Russia and China to break away from the idea of geopolitics and to replace the exclusive and unipolar

paradigm with an all-inclusive multipolar collaboration among the nations of central Asia. The objective of the SCO is to define new boundary conditions of national borders based on respect of sovereignty as opposed to geopolitics; that is, with the purpose of eliminating the sources of conflict among rim-land nations instead of increasing the tension among them; thus, a return to the idea of the Peace of Westphalia.

The British and their NATO allies never imagined that such cooperation could ever be possible among the six founding members of the SCO: The Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, and Tajikistan. The role played by Russia's President Putin and Chinese President Xi Jinping has been exemplary of the new paradigm, especially following the multipolar approach that Russian politician and diplomat, Yevgeny Primakov, recommended in his book, *Le Monde après le 11 septembre et l'invasion de l'Iraq*, Presse de la Renaissance, Paris, 2003. The policy was not only valid for the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) but also for the Shanghai Six of the SCO.

Aside from LaRouche, no American politician has yet understood and appreciated to what extent, President Vladimir Putin has attempted to change the foreign policy of Russia toward the United States by breaking with the Great Game. The President of Russia allowed the United States to bring its military hardware next to the border of Russia and gave the Americans the right to put troupes on the ground and planes on the runways of the former USSR in Kirghizstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan for the purpose of attacking the Taliban of Afghanistan. This was a moment of axiomatic change that most strategic analysts missed. Primakov wrote: "Under the circumstance, Vladimir Putin accepted to take a significant and well-founded calculated risk. The presence of American Bases so close to Russian territory and inside of ex-Soviet Union Republics alarmed a considerable portion of Russian opinion and the majority of political advisors of our country."¹⁶ Primakov saw Putin's move not only as a means of stopping terrorism worldwide but also as a means of changing the way people were thinking

¹⁶ Yevgeny Primakov, *Le Monde après le 11 septembre et l'invasion de l'Iraq*, Presse de la Renaissance, Paris, 2003, p. 145.

inside of Russia. He saw an opportunity for peace with the West. However, such a rapprochement of Eastern and Western civilizations necessarily required the exclusion of British geopolitics.

5. FINDING A SOLUTION TO THE US-RUSSIA CONFRONTATION

Today, the principal players involved in the Great Game include the British, the United States, Russia, China, Turkey, and Iran. According to Sapir, during the winter of 2007-2008, France missed an opportunity to put an end to this Great Game geopolitical scenario and bring about a lasting peace in the world. He reported: “A well-conceived political independence between France and Russia could have established a bridge between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization [SCO] which would have been a true peace factor.”¹⁷ The point to understand is how the British divide forces into opposite factions in order to inflame a conflict. Cheminade gave a good example of how such a *unity of opposites* can be achieved in Europe at this time. He said:

“Because they fear that they can't fully control Europe, and they have to divide in order to rule; so they come, one on one side, the other on the other side, to create an effect where unity would be impossible. And unity means, for Europe to work with China and to join the New Silk Road, but not to be antagonistic with the United States and not to be antagonistic with Trump. And what Bannon and Obama, on each side try to do, [is to tell the French and the Germans] ‘you're either with China or with the United States,’ -- the fake United States.

“So, our duty is to explain that the people of the United States and the people of China have a community of interest, and if each European nation wants to be something useful, it has to create the conditions where these

¹⁷. Sapir, Op. Cit. p.

would work together. Not to try to find leverage in China against the United States, or leverage with Trump against China: It should be a unity within Europe to develop these capacities to uplift our people and our nations for the future. And this is key.”¹⁸

Today, this diplomatic function may be a unique historical opportunity for Turkey.¹⁹ Will Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan jump at the historical opportunity of restoring the ancient Byzantium role of peace maker? If Turkey were to join the military alliance of the SCO, the first line of defense of NATO may be viewed by some Americans as being put in jeopardy while some Russians may see the presence of Turkey inside of the SCO as a NATO Trojan Horse; not a very comfortable position to be in if the choice is, either or. But what if the choice lies in a third's ability to find the congruence between two other opposite forces? In a very insightful article published in China-US Focus, Chinese Honorary Fellow, PLA Academy of Military Science, Zhou Bo, had this to say about the Turkish option:

“If SCO accepts Turkey as a NATO member state, it would be as bold and creative as Deng Xiaoping's “one country, two systems” defining the relationship between the mainland China and HK [Hong Kong]. It could serve to improve the NATO-Russian relationship; further promote SCO economic integration; and add strength in counteracting terrorism, separatism and extremism, the primary goals of SCO.” [...]

“Should this happen, Turkey, like the Bosphorus Bridge in Istanbul linking Asia and Europe, would happily find itself in a unique position to bridge the largest alliance and the largest non-alliance in the world.”²⁰

¹⁸ Morning Briefing for March 31, 2019, p. 15 of 36. See the video of Jacques Cheminade's addresses the Manhattan Project Town Hall March 30 (Transcript of opening remarks in the lead) Full two hour discussion posted at <https://youtu.be/mgwdgUt567M>: [THE COMING EURASIAN WORLD OF LYNDON LAROUCHE.](#)

¹⁹ Zhou Bo, [COULD TURKEY SERVE AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN NATO AND SCO?](#) Dec. 19, 2016.

²⁰ Zhou Bo, *Ibidem*. In his most recent publication, Zhou Bo investigated the nature of the failing “liberal international order.”

The political gamble that President Putin made when he let the United States intervene against terrorism in Afghanistan was a calculated move in that direction: one world, two options. It was not understood at all by the British, nor by the Americans, and it was not perceived either by European governments as a peace offering. No one realized, or wanted to know that Putin had deliberately sacrificed its Great Game interests for the purpose of achieving world peace; no one wanted to accept the fact that Russia was seeking a peace alliance with the United States, at the exception of Lyndon LaRouche.

Obviously, the American government's response under George W. Bush was completely inadequate and the world lost a crucial opportunity when President Bush rejected the Russian handshake. Outside of the LaRouche movement, the American population did not realize that the decision to reject the proposed multipolar action from Russia had been made in London.

To this day, American officials have remained blind to the Russian offer. After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, Russian Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov showed how Russia was extending a hand of collaboration to the United States. He ended his book by stating:

“If the United States decide to adapt themselves to the very real perspective of a multipolar world, if they abandon the principle whereby they have to be the only ones who can bring solutions to the great questions of stability and security in the world, and are, alone, responsible for establishing unilaterally the rules of conduct of Nations on the international scene, then, Russia could enter into a loyal partnership with them.”²¹

²¹ Yevgeny Primakov, *Le Monde après le 11 septembre et l'invasion de l'Iraq*, Presse de la Renaissance, Paris, 2003, p. 271.

CONCLUSION

It has become clear that the military and political failure of the American intervention in Afghanistan points to a more profound question of not being able to solve problems and divergences among conflicting forces. In fact, the presence of a unipolar state of mind precludes any ability to solve world problems short of brute force, especially within a world that has already chosen the multipolar dialogue.

In that sense, the United States is endangering its own survival because it doesn't realize how far behind it is with respect to other nations. The most fearful danger, here, is the naïve fundamentalist doctrine of the neo-cons when its belief structures are projected against similar religious fundamentalism of Islam and Judaism. Thus, we have now come full circle back to understanding why the Khazars had been obliterated.

FIN