

# ARMENIAN FOREIGN POLICY DURING LEVON TER-PETROSSIAN AND ROBERT KOCHARIAN PERIOD

**Reha YILMAZ**

Qafqaz University, PhD  
Baku / AZERBAIJAN  
yilmazereha@gmail.com

## SUMMARY

The three most important elements of geographical location which determine the foreign policy of any country are the actors in the economy and decision-making mechanism. In other word, a region with secure and rich natural resources is the first condition for a strong economy, stability in political structure and effective foreign policy. Moreover, human resources, economical structure, production relations could make effects on foreign policy in the sense of above-mentioned factors change from state to state.

When we have a look at the posture of Armenia in terms of these factors, it can be said easily that this small country is not so "lucky". However, especially in South Caucasus, it plays effective role. However much its structure does not produce policy, the regional politics Armenia wants is able to impact on the global powers. Therefore, it is important to find out this mysterious situation, to define its place in this new world politics and its future state. Because, the future of international projects in region in someway depends on Armenian factor.

In this research, the main impacts on Armenian foreign policy, the effects of these influences on regional political situation and foreseeing for the future will have been analyzed.

**Key words:** Armenian foreign policy, Levon Ter-Petrossian, Robert Kocharian.

## LEVON TER-PETROSYAN VE ROBERT KOÇARYAN DÖNEMİ ERMENİ DIŞ POLİTİKASI

### ÖZET

Bir ülkenin dış politikasına etki eden 3 önemli faktör mevcuttur. Ekonomi, karar verme mekanizması ve istikrarlı iç siyaset. Kafkasya bölgesinde de zengin doğal kaynakların üzerinde kurulu ekonomiler, dahili ve harici siyasette istikrarın oluşturulmasına büyük etki etmiştir ve etmektedir. İnsan kaynakları, ekonomik yapı, ve üretim ülkeden ülkeye değişse de dış politikanın oluşturulmasına doğrudan etki etmektedir.

Kafkasya'da bu konuda en fakir ve şanssız ülke Ermenistan'dır. Bununla birlikte Güney Kafkaslarda etkin bir siyaset yürütmekte, bölgeyi yakından ilgilendiren her türlü oluşuma doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak müdahalede bulunmaktadır. Buna karşın iç siyasetinde istediği istikrarı yakalayamamıştır. Bunda hiç şüphe yok ki, ülke içi ve dışı marjinal güçlerin ülke siyasetine tesirinin büyük etkisi vardır. Global güçlerin ülke üzerindeki mücadelesi de Ermenistan'ın dünya siyasetinde istediği yeri almasını engellemektedir. Zira, Ermenistan bölgedeki çatışmaların tarafı olarak global projelerden uzaklaştırılmış ve dolayısıyla ekonomik ve siyasi olarak küçülme yaşamıştır.

Bu çalışmada, bölgede önemli bir aktör olabileceken, sürekli küçülme yaşayan Ermenistan'ın Sovyetler Birliği'nden bağımsızlığını kazandıktan sonraki dış politikası ele alınmaktadır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Ermenistan dış politikası, Levon Ter Petrosyan, Robert Koçaryan.

## I. The Main Factors Define Armenian Foreign Policy

Armenia being "closed" country from a geographical standpoint, does not have a directly connection to the seas and important

commercial centers. Its relations with other countries are fulfilled under hard terms. The main parts of the roads and railways that connect Armenia to Iran and Commonwealth of Independent States pass from other countries, especially from

Azerbaijan. For that reason, there are serious problems in transportation with other countries. This problem has not finished yet<sup>1</sup>.

Naturally, the geopolitical features of Armenia has increased its fears, this fears has turned into paranoia and all the countries which do not adopt the claims and joint interests of Armenia was declared as an enemy. In consideration of geopolitical location, firstly including Russia and Armenian lobby, Armenia has felt into the influence of the other actors in the region. In this circumstance, most of the defense and foreign policy decisions of Armenia, left over its own preference, have given to the outside influence.<sup>2</sup>

The other factor that influences the foreign policy of Armenia is the economical structure of that country. Armenia being poor with natural resources is against the Persians, especially with the energy problem. Armenia, could not obtain sufficient resources from its strategic partner Russia through Azerbaijan and Georgia, met force to direct itself toward Iran which most probably is the only outlet for Armenia. However, in the relationship with Iran, Russian factor is more effective and it demonstrates a development according to the needs of Russia.<sup>3</sup>

Together with the economical decreasing of Armenia under its global powers, foreign investors do not think about investments in Armenia as lack of population, political instability, corruption, moral degradation, regional conflicts. These problems do not only influence foreign investors, but it also causes to give up trade by rich Armenians from all over the world.

Due to daily and historical problems, decreasing of economical relations of Armenia to the lowest point with Turkey and Azerbaijan influenced negatively to the

economical crisis in Armenia. Because of Azerbaijan position in energy issues, Armenia uses completely "risky" resources and in the same way as a result of Turkey's embargo, Armenia has to export less qualified productions for expensive prices.<sup>4</sup>

"Weak economy" shows the first effect on the essential issue of foreign policy of "power concept". One of the main criteria of country's power is an economy which in the example of Armenia narrowed maneuver in foreign policy and decreased bargaining power. However, "weak economy" caused gaining power for radicals. Parties with radical nationalist programs have gained supporters by using these problems in an economy. Governments blamed foreign countries and groups for existed problems in economy; the problems in foreign policy was tried to use as "scapegoat". In fact, the existence of such threats is not certain. The measurements against threats and "potential threats" which existence even is discussable caused to converting that threats come into practice. This caused to creating or actualizing imagined or potential threats by Armenia. The "strategic cooperation" with Cyprus, Syria and Greece is a front again Turkey; the alliance with Russia and Iran is a reflection of making policy against Azerbaijan.

The government of Kocharian tried to use Diaspora because they were unsuccessful in attracting foreign investors to the economy of country. The organized group from different part of the world which is the member of rich Armenian Lobbies uses overtly their economical power for political interests. In addition, to the lack of economical variety and deepness, the Diaspora companies started to increase supporters and "people" in political decision making mechanism which causes accepting decisions for their interest. Armenian economy in some sense is gained by Diaspora under

the name of "Help" and "investment", these circumstances caused unrest of some groups in Armenia. For instance, the newspaper *Iravanuk* wrote about the threat gaining the economy by Diaspora with the support of law regulations. Armenian newspaper "Orran" attracted the attention to similar problem. Another Armenian newspaper "Hayastany Communist" defined this relation as "the attempt to increase income of some businessman in Armenian Lobby in Motherland".<sup>5</sup>

As above-mentioned, Armenia does not possess necessary resources and development trends (tendencies) in the economy, meanwhile it also could not provide the necessary opportunity for purchasing tolerable, peaceful and stable foreign policy which Armenia needs. As a result, Armenia becomes more open for foreign influences, with these influences Armenia entered to the process of radicalization very fast.<sup>6</sup> The main point is this intolerance prevents development in economy and make it depended on outside.

Especially, the population's factor that influences the Armenian foreign policy is worth to analyze apart. According to latest statistics, Armenia and Japan are countries with "lowest" increase in population. Instead of decreasing population, its population increase because of emigration. In last period, in the list of emigrant countries Armenia is in the second place after Russia with more than 1 million emigrants in Europe. The researches show that the emigrants settled permanently in these countries<sup>7</sup>. The desire to take families and relatives proves this thought.

In the first years of independence, the official statistics shows the population number is about 3,800 thousand, while in 2002 the population decreased till 3,200 thousand people. In addition, this figure

also included all tourists and non-citizen of Armenia, which number is very high, especially Russians. Armenian State Statistics Institute shows that the important part of this number is not settled in Armenia. Government wants to show the number high in order to hide the real situation. The results of researches which are done by five different embassies every four year in Armenia gives the alarm. According to them, the population of Armenia is between 850 thousand and 1,200 thousand people. In another word, the population of Armenia decreased four times, since gained independence with approximate population of 4 million.<sup>8</sup>

"The other most important problem like increasing of population is the "brain power". The biggest share has taken by the state and service sector. Armenians do not live in their country and spread all over the world. It prevents the powers of endurance of Armenia and makes easy to be under the foreign influences. Although the decreasing of population, the unchanging of annual national income shows the scale of problems. In these circumstances, the absence of stable and continuous population prevents the formation of class for possession the state. As above it mentioned, in addition the lack of population, probably the more important problem is brain drain. Mainly, this problem is seen in service and state sectors. The influence of this process on decision making mechanism is more than predicted because of high necessity in qualified and educated staff in foreign policy. Though this gap was tried to fulfill with Armenian Diaspora, it was impossible to find experienced diplomats and specialists in foreign policy with foreign language what led to the loss in international meetings. For instance, Armenian researcher Hratch Tchilingirian relates the hard defeat of Armenia in Lisbon OSCE Summit (1996) to

the missing of specialists in foreign policy and inexperience of existed ones.”<sup>9</sup>

“The foreign policy of Armenia is close touch with the political structure existed inside of the country. For as much as, Armenia can not secure stability up until now. In addition to the economical and social annoyance, Karabagh war and the excessive influence of the currents on government has aggravated independence even grater.”<sup>10</sup>

Especially, could not obtain democratic and stable structure, has broken the Armenians faith. So, this facilitated others to dominate the foreign politics of Armenia.

“In addition, the governments became the alliance of “dark powers” what supported the terror and violence culture. It is not easy for society to survive where the majority of heroes are terrorists and supported terror. So, in short independence history of Armenia, there was many political crimes and attacks. The armed attack on Arkadi Gukasian the president of so called Nagorno-Karabagh Republic in the centre of city in 24 March 2000, he realization of which suspected by Tashnak Party and attack on parliament in 1999 attracts the attention. Both attacks finished “bloody”, in first one “president” Gukasian’s driver and bodyguards were injured, in second one the Prime-Minister of Armenia and many parliamentarians were killed again by Armenian bullets.”<sup>11</sup>

“Day by day, these conditions take the country into chaos and it is natural result of tolerance toward terror and violence which was shown in the past. Also, the democratic culture is not developed in the country and it is main issue what supports the radicalism. Despite problems almost in every issue, the opposition is still weak and to influence the most effective government is seen in weapon what shows the gover-

nance of violence culture on society. Decreasing the atmosphere of flexibility and pragmatism is openly shows the influence on foreign policy. Armenia has not possessed the strong leaders who could change the fate of country. This issue comes from being “nation without state” for a long time. Mainly in neighborhood countries and generally in all over the world Armenian politicians have great experience in creating of terror for two centuries, but they are very insufficient, especially, in the fields of foreign policy where the state tradition necessary. For that reason, Ter-Petrosian and Kocharian government have to get help from Diaspora in foreign policy since the independence of country. The insufficient number of specialists in foreign policy made it impossible to send representatives to some diplomatic corps.”<sup>12</sup>

“In respect of the leader’s personality, Robert Kocharian, was seen as a president in the future, especially in the first years was unsuccessful in governing. Kocharian wanted to reflect the same tension of Karabagh battles to Armenian foreign policy. Before the elections “in the case of winning elections, we will have some new things, new stresses in relations with Turkey” Kocharian’s words showed himself as unsuccessful manager. He proved this view with his other actions. With unbalanced speech and actions, Kocharian tensed the country; he also was unsuccessful in the development of democracy, law state and human rights.”<sup>13</sup>

It is easy to say that Kocharian is not realist and pragmatist, especially his implications of not recognizing Turkey’s territorial integrity, making priority the genocide issue of Armenian foreign policy and not attempting for cooperation made time late for reestablishing of relations. The formation of religion and nationalism is “Pan

Armenian" ideology that really has strong influence on Armenian foreign policy. Considering the history, the Church has perceived Armenian nationalism as only way of its existence, and comparing with other factors religious contributions are much stronger in Armenian nationalism. Here some factors as the difference of Armenian churches from other Christian churches, as well as the worldly isolation from Christianity have significant role. Gregorian branches of Christianity belong to only Armenians and related with the single nation.<sup>14</sup> Today the Armenian Church continues to have power on social life and government bodies. The reason of this can be seen, approximately in all kinds of meetings and assemblages of the Gregorian monks and their significance to these meetings. It affects foreign policy and from some aspects the church continues to control Armenian foreign policy<sup>15</sup>. For instance, in the Karabagh war the crosses drawn on tanks and flounders of Armenians to get support of Western countries are the signs of religion's effect on state.

If to analyze today's Armenian nationalism, it can be seen the existence of nationalism based on the religious roots. In the period of the first independent Armenia, the persistently wishes on Turkish land made to be without a decision and helpless. Putting all power of military against Turkey and because of big flow which made economical crisis in Armenia and this crisis brought the end of independent Armenia. In other words, Tashnak party fanatics with their insensible goals again made Armenians light-handed.

Looking at the Armenian nationalism during the Soviet Period, it is seen "progression with control". Making Armenians closer to Moscow, especially in the first periods of the USSR, they tried to attach importance on Armenian culture, and gave chances to

develop. From the other side they tried not to make nationalism without control. In the period of security problems, Armenian nationalists were oppressed inside, in abroad left Armenian nationalists kept up agitation. If we scrutinize Armenian nationalism in the Soviet period from foreign relations points, it is seen that the agitation of Armenian nationalism against Turks by the foreign policy made problems which have no solution even today. As in the Stalin example, the Soviet Union used the historical incomprehensibilities as a means of foreign policy against Turkey, for fulfilling this Armenian nationalism was used. The obvious use of Stalin's strategy after some period was used secretly. It can be said not only the inner dynamics of Armenian nationalism, but also the result of other causes made them to direct against Turks. And this inevitably affected the perception of foreign policy of Armenian nationalism and the use of it.

At first, Armenian researchers prefer the factor of Russia on the subject of Armenian foreign policy and safety and always carry out their evaluating relating to Russia. One of the greatest reasons of this is that the myth of "Salutary Russia" has been situated in the consciousness of Armenians. Even to the mind of Armenians, the existence of Russia in this area is the guaranty of peace and stability in South Caucasus<sup>16</sup>.

As a result of high treason to the Ottoman Empire in WWI, Armenians spread to all worlds and made their Diaspora. After being independent this factor became the common goal of Armenians. The obvious influence of Diaspora in foreign policy can be seen in Turkey. This topic is going to be discussed in Armenia and Turkey relations.

The second big impact of the increasing in firm standing influence of Armenian Diaspora is in Karabagh policy. In last years Kocharian was submitted to see solution in

peace, but Armenian Diaspora is acting contrary. Diaspora never wants to give the corridor between Karabagh and Armenia back to Azerbaijan. In last conference they declared the population of Armenians in Karabagh as 250.000 (but today it is lower than 150.000), for this factor by means of Pan-Armenia Fund they sentenced 350.000.000 USA Dollars economical support for them.<sup>17</sup> The strange decision of meeting was in that they called "Rescue of Karabagh as the most important step of Armenians in modern history".<sup>18</sup> This expression again proves that in Karabagh problem it will be hard to come to any conclusion.

Another harm of Armenian Diaspora in foreign policy can be seen in the countries where Armenians are minority, like in Georgia. The unreal goals made Georgia be confused and this confusion continues. Having "active" minority of Armenians, Georgia tries to be close to Azerbaijan, Turkey and Western countries, thus the two of Armenia and Russia become great threat to them.<sup>19</sup>

Finally Kocharian against to last government always seeks support of Diaspora mainly in all sectors, and by this way he solved both problems in inner and strengthened the power on foreign policy. But Radical Armenian Diaspora doesn't think about it reinforces its power on Armenia. This period can make Armenian government to lose power on Armenia. Especially, in economical sectors we can find some signs of it. In addition to this Armenian Diaspora that doesn't stay in Armenia can't understand the condition of Armenia. And this leads to dreamer and impossible politics to impose the state and foreign policy for government.<sup>20</sup> The development in Turkey and Karabagh policy is in this direction. Kocharian, like Ter-Petrosyan but in different sector started the period which maybe can not be stopped.

Ter-Petrosyan was rumbled under the Karabagh policy, and became the victim of the condition he made. Now Kocharian entrusts Armenia to Diaspora for the just short time advantages. To come back from this condition can be very hard.<sup>21</sup>

## II. THE STAGES OF ARMENIAN FOREIGN POLICY

### A. Ter-Petrosian Period

After the independence of Armenia, Levon Ter-Petrosian came to power. Petrosian's foreign policy was based on "having good relations of Armenia with region countries". Ter-Petrosian was aware that for the development of Armenia they should establish close relations with region countries and particularly with Turkey and Iran they had to. Since this case was considered prior condition for the aids which would be sent by Western countries to Armenia.

Armenia's new government could see the falsity of its foreign policy based on Russia which lost its influence on foreign policy after the economic collapse and consequently its former power in Caucasus. In the same way, it had also recognized the necessity of stand apart from Russia, in order to preserve and strengthen its independence. The other issue which Petrosian's government considered as a problem was the oppressive attempts of radical Armenian lobby on government.

In this perspective, Ter-Petrosian's government had given importance to the relations with Turkey. Since Turkey was perceived as "the most important gate for Armenia that would give access to the West". Ter-Petrosian's government that was conscious of Turkey's susceptibilities to "genocide allegations" and "territory demand" had tried not to bring these issues to the foreground, albeit the reaction of chauvinist Armenians and lobby<sup>22</sup>.

In spite of all these “good intention” and historical efforts for reconciliation, Turkey-Armenia relations couldn't develop as it was desired. The periodical problems such as Karabagh conflict played a great role in this issue. The primary factor, however, was Armenian chauvinism and disproportion of the target and power of certain Armenian nationalists. For instance, it was hard for some extreme Armenians to determine the borderlines of Armenia. This case doesn't only concern the borders with Turkey: For these groups, Armenia's borders should extend to southern Georgia, western Azerbaijan, and southern Russia and a little more toward Turkey. The biggest part is reckoned to be taken from Turkey. This part starts from several eastern Anatolia provinces and extends to entire eastern and south-eastern Anatolia provinces and certain western Black Sea provinces and eastern Mediterranean region. From the beginning, Turkey in response to those demands set forth the abnegation of Armenia's borders drawn on the grounds of written agreements<sup>23</sup>.

In the period of Ter-Petrosian, Karabagh problem was one of the factors that directly influenced the foreign policy<sup>24</sup>. In this period, therefore a private committee was established. The main goal of Karabagh committee was the unification of territories of Armenia and Karabagh. Another feature of this committee is being anti-communist. While committee was maintaining its activities, the crowded protesters came together in Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, calling to war. Contrary to the national revival among Armenians, Azerbaijan faced serious internal conflicts which caused the beginning of serious casualties in front-line. Russia stands behind the scenes of these assaults<sup>25</sup>. After the Soviet period, Moscow “educates” Azeri Turks with Armenians, due to development of Elchibey's Pan-Turkic policy in Azerbaijan.

Armenian leaders supported by Russia and Iran considered territorial expansion as a privileged goal, instead of laying a foundation of the state economy and politics and the clash intensified in Karabagh<sup>26</sup>. Not only Karabagh region, but also Azerbaijani lands between Karabagh and Armenia were invaded by Armenians. Invading Karabagh and its around, on May 1992, Armenians attacked Nakhchivan part of the Azerbaijan where almost no Armenian lived in. They were obliged to withdraw due to the reaction of Turkey to which Nakhchivan was guaranteed according to Kars and Moscow treaties. As a result of this act of aggression, 20 percent of Azerbaijani lands were occupied by Armenian forces. The invasion which was indisputably a violation of international law was not accepted by any country, so Armenia legally faced with difficult situation because of its occupation. If we summarize the effects of Karabagh aggressions on Armenia's foreign policy, these clashes delayed Armenia's stability, debilitated the groups who imposed realistic and far-sighted approaches to the events. As a result of these collisions, the country felt itself in “continual war” situation and the radicals increased their influence over administration. While the people who sought peace and stability were met with the accusation of “treason” and “collaboration”, the economic degradation reached a critical limit<sup>27</sup>.

In Ter-Petrosian period two important principles of extremism and harshness in Armenian foreign policy are the Russian efforts to keep its control region and diasporas “Armenian organizations” desire for being arbiter of Armenia's foreign policy. These two prime movers which couldn't get desired performance from Ter-Petrosian administration, caused trouble increase among people by taking advantage of social and economic problems. In this

process, the roles of the Tashnaks and Russia particularly are remarkable. Ter-Petrosian's foreign policy advisor Libaridian claimed that Ter-Petrosian was overthrown by the Tashnak-Russia co-operation and these pairs had arranged the presidency of Kocharian just before Ter-Petrosian being overthrown<sup>28</sup>.

It can be said that Ter-Petrosian and Armenia in his period were unsuccessful especially in foreign policy. At first glance the invasions which seemed a success, in fact can be regarded as a failure. Since these occupations caused the degradation of economic and political structure of the country, and seizure of majority by extremists. The reasons of this failure can be summarized as follows:

1. Not deciphering and executing the foreign policy arbiters on time and correctly;
2. Imbalance between facilities and goals;
3. Co-operation with extremist groups;
4. Karabagh conflict;
5. Russian factor;
6. Diaspora;
7. The Tashnak Party;
8. Economic and social problems;
9. Deficiency of Executive power.

### **B. Robert Kocharian's Period.**

During Kocharian's time foreign policy has been directed to attacker policy rather than logical applications, because the previous government had been accepted passive and unsatisfactory. There is a compulsion in Kocharian's foreign policy "Attacker and active foreign policy against Turkey and Azerbaijan". According to the features of foreign policy Kocharian and his group's duty was to make the "War party" more active.<sup>29</sup>

As a result of this policy coming to the government Kocharian has made serious

changes in foreign policy and pursued parallel policies for to get encouragement from the Diaspora. At first started the policy about accepting the occupied lands of Azerbaijan, then getting the encouragement from the Diaspora pursued on attacker foreign policy against Turkey. The policy that Kocharian has pursued against Turkey have three main aims; 1.The pretensions about the genocide 2. Looking for the unions against Turkey (Greek, Iranian, Saurian and Cyprus) 3. To bring to the discussion the borders of Turkey.

From the first day of govern Kocharian and his foreign policy group began to bring up the pretensions about genocide, also agitated the Diaspora Armenians. Kocharian got the main support from Diaspora Armenians while emphasizing that to recognize the pretensions about genocide is among the most important marks of foreign policy. He has repeated these wishes again in the conference of Armenian Diaspora which took place in 1999. During this speech Kocharian repeated these words "Genocide is not only the fight of Diaspora, but also the fight of all Armenians as a state and nation."<sup>30</sup>

The main aim of Kocharian's policy is to get encouragement from other countries about the genocide pretensions using this encouragement to make Turkey to accept the genocide, after paving the political and psychological way to apply to the international courts and also to use all of these for to recognize the problem without doubt Kocharian's government and also other Armenian groups have some expectations in practice on accepting the pretensions about<sup>31</sup>. The requires of indemnity and also the desires about land which will come after the accepting are only two of these. But there are short period's marks under the situation of genocide pretensions on the foundation of Armenian policy by

Kocharian. Kocharian's main aim was to make Turkey to fall under the pressure of the western countries using the pretension about the genocide and to get opportunity for the economic relations from Azerbaijan, Karabagh and Turkey and the activities for the recognition of genocide which takes place especially in western countries opposite to each other<sup>32</sup>. Besides the genocide considering Turkey as a guilty for the Armenian's economic problems, Armenia often complain Turkey to the western countries for the economic embargo that Turkey laid on Armenia<sup>33</sup>.

Until today could put in motion American Diaspora and also his supporters in western world with this way, also gave a moral encouragement that was active. As a result of this encouragement, new company has been started which can not be compared with Ter-Petrosian's period and the pressures on Turkey about genocide has increased very much. Especially, the decision about the recognition in different European countries (France, Holland, Germany, and Belgium) shows that Kocharian began to achieve his goals. Destroyed relationships between Turkey and these countries shows that Kocharian's hopes began to justify, but as the genocide pretensions became urgent and Armenians supported these pretensions. Turkey's attitudes have become harder and the efforts about developing the dialogs and relationships had been lost. The raising of the entry visa for the Armenian, discussions about to open the borders, the hard repetition of the Armenians requirements being not acceptable, putting aside the countries which accepted the genocide pretensions show that Kocharian's attacker foreign policy is not capable of working.

It is possible to see from the last news that the main aim of Kocharian's this policy is not to recognize this genocide. Kocharian

who avoid from the suggestion about founding an international common history committee, to investigate the truth by the historians and to bring each side to an agreement shows his main aim. The problems which Turkey wants to give an interpretations are prevented by the Armenian Diaspora for not to allowing the world public opinion to know about it.

One of the bases of Kocharian's foreign policy which he has pursued against Turkey is to use Turkey's enemies. According to this strategy which moves fast after Kocharian's coming to the government, Armenia wants to increase with the countries which Turkey considered them competitor. The most attractive countries in this problem are Greek, Cyprus, Iran and Syria. It is also valuable to use Russia in this strategy. Without doubt it is impossible for a country like Armenia to realize such a block independently, so the willing of other countries had a great role. Independently it is not satisfactory; Russia and Greek's active participation is very remarkable. Not having another serious alternative in their foreign policy because of the attitudes of western countries, Iran and Syria try to evaluate the business proposals that come from other countries.<sup>34</sup> As a result of it, Armenia has spread out its relations with Iran, Syria, South Cyprus and Greek to every sphere from economy to defense. It is often said by the Armenians that this relations "do not take any aim about another third country", yet in the most of the meetings about "the threat of Turkey" many people are openly mention it. Especially, they have relations with Greek and Cyprus about the genocide pretensions while Armenian side defending in the word that Romanians were exposed to genocide by Turkish people, Romanians also support them.<sup>35</sup> The last example of this was the announcement of 19th May as the anniversary of Romanians genocide in Armenia.<sup>36</sup>

As a result of this closed relations between Turkey, Syria and Iran, the second period in Greek relations and the most important one –to enter into the alliance with Russia made useless Armenians' policy, the only exception is Cyprus. The political cooperation with Cyprus bring new load to Armenian's foreign policy which has in any case bad relations with Turkey.

The demands about the lands are one part of Kocharian's government strategy which tries to oppress Turkey and with this way make them to come to an agreement. The government which tries not to speak about that in an official channels has said their wishes from the first day in an official way. Armenians still use the word "The Western Armenia" for the eastern part of Turkey in Armenia and also in Diaspora and speak like "The occupied lands of Armenia" about those lands, but this policy had failed in a short time. Armenia which broke the international laws occupying 20% of Azerbaijan lands got into difficulties. Seeing that this policy will be unsuccessful Kocharian said in his speech quiet openly by the use of CNN Turkish that they do not demands the lands from Turkey, because of these words Kocharian has been criticized by some parties in Armenia and also by the Armenians who live in USA, even this accident was resulted with Kocharian's removing from Diaspora, because of the relations with Diaspora and other groups, it seems difficult for Kocharian's government to remove from these targets<sup>37</sup>. In another words, about there is a discrepancy between Kocharian's words about lands and his execution, it is the main reason of Turkey to be unfaithful.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the factors that determine the Armenia's foreign policy can be divided into two main groups; extremely limited

facilities, and awfully pretentious and offensive goals incompatible with these facilities. The impossibility of achieving goal with limited facilities is obvious. Up-to-the-present experience has already verified this fixation.

The most important failing side of Armenian foreign policy can be said to be Armenian government's insufficient control over its foreign policy, that's not being properly independent: Armenian lobby organizations, Karabagh's and Georgia's Armenians, Russia, the oppression and inducement created by ideological and chauvinist groups impede Armenian administration to determine and execute its foreign policy comparative with its own realities. Armenian chairmen have also determined this case, yet they were either late in this fixation, or couldn't find power to change the present situation in favor of themselves. As a result of this, chauvinists have controlled Armenian foreign policy, and attempts to achieve unachievable goals kept Armenia's isolation and problems with region countries increased.

Suchlike problems occurred in Armenia-Turkey relations as well. Armenia which couldn't determine its own strength, aims, friends and enemies exactly, couldn't even comprehend the reality of Turkey completely. However, the prosperity and independence of Armenia depend on the reliable relations with Turkey. Instead of this, to declare more than 100 million nations those surround 2 million-populated country as enemy against it is not realistic as well as not for its own interest.

Though Armenia has made itself to remain outside the integration process for 15 years, it is not late for it to enjoy this process. In order to attend to this process: Armenia must withdraw unquestioningly from its invaded lands of Azerbaijan leaving its

imperialist policy, must review its military and political relations with Russia, must acknowledge 102<sup>nd</sup> Russian military base located in its country as a threat for region security and must demand to remove this base, mustn't support the separatist activities of Armenians living in Javakheti region of Georgia, must recognize the territorial integrity of all neighboring countries, must quit the propaganda of so-called Armenian Genocide against Turkey, must give a constructive form to its foreign policy and then execute.

#### LITERATURE

1. Sedat Laçiner, Ermenistan Dış Politikasını Belirleyen Temel Faktörler, <http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/makale.php?id=39>, 11.01.2009.
2. Laçiner, "Armenia's Jewish Scepticism and Its Impact on Armenia – Israel Relations", Ermeni Araştırmaları dergisi / Armenian Studies journal, Vol.: 1, No. 4, December 2001-January-February 2002, ss. 296–335
3. Peter Magdashian, "Armenia: Economic Division Widens", IWPR, Institute for War & Peace Reporting, CRS No. 106, 20 November 2001
4. E. Candoyan, Obshiy analiz i perspektivi razvitiya bankovskoy sistemi Armenii, [http://www.express.am/19\\_03/banks.html](http://www.express.am/19_03/banks.html), 12.12.2007.
5. Vache Sarkisian, RFE / RL Armenia Report, 21 May 2002.
6. Nazmi Gul, "'The Dance with Devil': Armenia and Nuclear Energy", Strategic Analysis, Vol.:2, No: 17, July 2001, pp. 33- 39
7. "Armenia Takes Second Place After Russia On The Number Of People Who Want To Receive Accommodation In Western Europe Countries", ARKA News Agency (Armenia), 30 May 2002.
8. AGOS, Newspaper, İstanbul, 22.02.2002.
9. Hratch Tchilingirian, "Armenia's Foreign Relations", Armenian News Network / Groong, 1997, [www.grrong.com/ro/ro-19971006.html](http://www.grrong.com/ro/ro-19971006.html)
10. Tchilingirian, ibid., [www.grrong.com/ro/ro-19971006.html](http://www.grrong.com/ro/ro-19971006.html)
11. Nazım Cafersoy, "Dağlık Karabağ 'Cumhurbaşkanı'na Saldırının Değerlendirilmesi", Stratejik Analiz, Vol. 1 (1), May 2000, p. 19–23.
12. Sibel Yeşilmen, "Gizli Flört'te Yeni Başlangıç", Diplomasi Yazıları, No. 1, June 1998, p. 28.
13. Zaur Şiriyev, Ermenistan'ın Ulusal Güvenlik Strateji Belgesi ve Dış Politika Yansımaları, [http://www.harvardrgp.org/static/files/273/national\\_security\\_armenia\\_01\\_15\\_2007.pdf](http://www.harvardrgp.org/static/files/273/national_security_armenia_01_15_2007.pdf), 21.12.2007.
14. Sedat Laçiner, Ermeni Kimlik Bunalımı Ve Güç Politikalarının Bir Ürünü Olarak Ermeni Sorunu, 2023 Journal, 15 April 2002, N. 12, p. 56-61
15. Hrant Dink, "Armenia – Escape from Diaspora (6) Protections", AGOS Newspaper, 19 April 2002.
16. V. Panfilova, Armenia Made an Attempt on Policy of Russia, [http://www.ng.ru/courier/2007-09-10/15\\_armenia.html](http://www.ng.ru/courier/2007-09-10/15_armenia.html)
17. Ara Martirosian, "Aiming To Boost Economy", AZG Newspaper, 29 May 2002.
18. Armen Zakarian ve Hrach Melkumian, "Armenia – Diaspora Conference Ends in Yerevan", RFE / RL Armenian Report, 28 May 2002.
19. Kamil Ağacan, "Brotherly States: Azerbaijan – Georgia Relations", Avrasya Journal, Azerbaijan Special Issue, Vol. 7 (1), Spring 2001, p. 319-336.
20. Joseph R.Masih and Robert O.Krikorian, Armenia at the Crossroads, Harwood Academic publishers, 1999, p.49.
21. Lev M. Freinkman, Role of the Diasporas in Transition Economies: Lessons From Armenia, Washington, 2000, p. 6.
22. Ara Sarafian, "The New Thinking Revisited, Gerard Liberidian Speaks at Princeton University", Armenian Forum, May 9, 1998.
23. Unal Çevikoz, "New Balances of International Relations", Meetings, N: 48, August-September 2001, p. 11.
24. Read Concerning Karabakh Problem. Vefaddin İbayev, Armenia- Azerbaijan Conflict on Nagorno - Karabakh in the Human Rights Context, Baku, ELM Publishing House, 2001; Michael P. Croissant, The Armenia-Azerbaijan Conflict, Causes and Implications, London, Praeger, 1998 ; Kamer Kasım, "The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict from its Inception to the Peace Process", Armenian Studies (Ankara), Vol. 1, N. 2, June-July-August 2001, p. 170–185.
25. Abdollah Ramezanzadeh, 'Iran's Role As Mediator in The Nagorno-Karabakh Crisis', Bruno Coppieters(ed.), Contested Borders in the Caucasus, Lancaster, Gazelle Book Services Ltd., 1999.
26. Look at for information, Gerard J.Libaridian, Ermenilerin Devletleşme Sınavı (The Challenge of Statehood, Armenian Political Thinking Since Independence), İstanbul, İletisim, 2000.

27. O. Nuri Aras, Bilal Dedeyev, Reha Yilmaz, Vefadin Ibayev, *The Karabakh War: Political, Juridical and Economical Analysis*, Baku, Caucasus Research Institution Publish, 2008, p.68.
28. Hakob Çakıryan, "Jiyayr Libarityan: 'Tashnaks' Support for Kocharyan is Dangerous for Armenia", *AZG Newspaper, Armenian Daily*, 1 May 2002
29. Alexandre Grigorian, "Lisbon – Istanbul: From Defensive Policy to Diplomatic Offensive?", *The Armenian Center for National and International Studies, Articles*, <http://acnis.am/articles/lisbon.htm>, 03.12.2008.
30. Groong Research & Analysis Group, "Efforts For Genocide Recognition Intensify", *Armenian News Network / Groong*, 10 November 2000, <http://groong.usc.edu/ro/ro-20001110.html>.
31. Salpi Haroutinian Ghazarian, "Breaking The Wall Of Silence", *Armenian International Magazine (AIM)*, March 1999.
32. Ross Vartian, "Turkish, Azerbaijani Blockades of Armenia and Karabakh Waste U.S. Tax Dollars", *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, January – February, 1995, p. 28-29.
33. Groong Research & Analysis Group, "Efforts For Genocide Recognition Intensify", *Armenian News Network/Groong*, 10 November 2000, <http://groong.usc.edu/ro/ro-20001110.html>.
34. "Armenian, Greek and Iranian Foreign Ministers to Discuss Cooperation Enlargement", *Asbarez*, 7 March, 2001.
35. "Iranian Secretary of National Security Council Arrives in Armenia", *Asbarez*, 16 July 2001; Hrach Melkumian, "Iran's Defence Chief Hopes for Closer Ties with Armenia", *RFE / RL Armenia Report*, 4 March, 2002; "Iran, Armenia Reconfirm Close Ties", *Asbarez*, 19 July, 2001; "Kocharian Visit Said to Boost Iran – Armenia Ties", *Asbarez*, 6 July, 2001; "Kocharian Says Iran One of Armenia's Principal Trade Partner", *Asbarez*, 13 May, 2001; "Defense Minister, Iranian Ambassador Discuss Relations", *Asbarez*, 1 August, 2001; "Iranian Role In Karabakh Peace Process Welcomed", *Asbarez*, 23 July, 2001.
36. "Armenia to Commemorate Greek Genocide Memorial Day", *PanArmenian News*, 14 May, 2002.
37. Boyojian, David B., "The Pan-Turkish Superhighway And Other Wrong Turns", *Asbarez*, 18 May, 2001.