VV

by Vv Vv

Submission date: 12-May-2021 12:38PM (UTC-0400)
Submission ID: 1584492185
File name: Armenia_and_Turkey.edited.docx (66.35K)
Word count: 4648
Character count: 26838

Armenia's International Relations with Turkey

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Date

Armenia's International Relations with Turkey

International relations within two neighboring countries are essential for the nation's development because it makes them have mutual understanding in helping each other in economic activities. Similarly, the two nations need to have a foreign policy that will guide their activities along their borders. Nevertheless, with countries such as turkey and Armenia, there have been significant differences among the nations for several decades now. Although Turkey was among the initial nations to realize the independence of Armenia in 1991, their relations have been controlled with fight and tension (Kopeček, 2019). Nevertheless, in the 1990s, Armenia and Azerbaijan were also involved in a war in attaining Nagorno-Karabakh, which resulted in Turkey closing its borders with Armenia and stopped all diplomatic relations.

Moreover, the two countries have faced a substantial period of deadlock because Turkey sealing their border with Armenia did not pressure Armenia. Thus the insufficient diplomatic associations continued to deprive all the nations of the negotiation's opportunities. Also, the stalemate intensified joint misinterpretations and mainly positioned on Armenian diaspora energies to follow global identification of the activities of 1915 as genocide caused a self-protective Turkish to respond by perceiving the same scenario as genocide (Papazian, 2019). Nonetheless, in the same year between 1990 to 1995, Armenia was determined to seek two-way energy intended to start a common neighboring relation with Turkey. Therefore, Armenia began by initiating a series of meetings with diplomats from the two countries; this made the Turkey diplomats inspired by the vision of presidents Levon Ter Petrossian to enhance the relationship between the two countries. This paper will thus focus on understanding the historical changes of Armenia and Turkey relation, examining the present developments in their style of interaction and recommending reconciliation.

Research Question

Why do Armenia and Turkey have poor international relations? What are the present developments in the method of interaction?

Why the Question is Important

The significant question is guiding the research. Also, although Armenia and Turkey are currently improving their relations, it is essential to understand why the two countries have poor international relations by examining the historical changes of their disputes. Similarly, the question will help provide a big picture of the specific objectives of the research.

Background to Armenia and Turkey Disputes

Many individuals do not recognize where the conflict between Armenia and Turkey began. Therefore, for decades, the Turkish nation has a catastrophe experienced by the Armenian nation in world war I in the ottoman empire. Similarly, the Ottoman empire significantly engrained the problem of the two nations. Consequently, the history of the dispute between Turkey and Armenia can be drawn from the 19th century where Europe focused on going back to an imperialist development at the cost of the Ottoman empire. The capacity of the ottoman empire to attain the issues of the increasing west, and the incapability of the ottoman Armenians, to attain their economic and partisan ambitions within the Ottoman empire. Therefore, most of the Armenians had lost the identity of the homeland in the 11th century because they were living under the ottoman authority since the 16th century; hence the steadiness was engrossed on the Persian and then Russian empires took over again. Although the ottoman empire commenced a sequence of reforms at that specific intersection, they eventually did not manage to enhance the

rural and small urban areas in Armenia individuals or eliminate their unsatisfactory conditions within the ottoman nation subjugated by Muslim Turks.

Moreover, at the beginning of world war I, the condition worsened because more division appeared. The state was divided by the increased variations in the ideologies of nationalism. Therefore, while the reform-minded individuals in the union and progress committee interceded and created a constitutional authority in 1908, the empire was split because some military joined hands to perform a coup, making them take control in 1913. This resulted in the development of a risky partisan context because the proto-nationalist members in control majority came from the young Turks, which demarcated the conservation of their supremacy and the nations at all cost and was their significance and holy role. Also, the Young Turks began to perceive the Armenian political groups and leaders that required help on the reforms from powerful nations as a great danger to the ottoman empire.

Goksel (2010) claimed that the restrictions of the dispute among the Armenian and the Turks also seemed to be delineated between 1915 to 1917 when world war I happened. Therefore, the same source added that it is during this time when the Turkish ottoman administration arranged the transportation of Armenians as well as massacre nearly one million individuals from Armenia because of Anatolia, which was their ancestral soil. Furthermore, the administration defended their actions and the elimination of apparent risks against the ottoman empire. Lowery & Freedman (2016) argued that according to the fatalities, the foreigner eyewitnesses, statements presented and the western consular reports, the world community o scholars has ultimately recognized and labeled the event Armenian genocide.

The Turkey republic had continued the ruling where the ottoman empire had stopped. Nevertheless, they have not accepted the evaluations to the day. They have emphasized the

events that happened because of the Armenian individuals' subversive behavior against the Ottoman soldiers shielding the nation. Henceforth, despite the Turkish government refuses to accept that the previous goal was to massacre the Armenians, it is rational for the events o to be considered the ongoing accusations of the victims for their consequent obliteration.

The denial of the intentions to the events of mass killings of the Armenians by the Turkish government resulted in significant influences. The victim's anticipation that the misconduct done to them should be identified. On the other hand, the Turkish administration countered the perception hence placing their persecution by the immense supremacies between the historic view. Nevertheless, Karasu et al. (2020) emphasized substituting their oppression by the great supremacies with the persecution of the Armenians that they are informed to be responsible for. Therefore, the Turkish administration counter-opinion results to what occurred to the Armenians to be inappropriate, irritating and should not be accepted.

Although the two nations have varying opinions on what happened, they have been forced to spend a lot proving that what happened is based on what they view and know. For example, all countries' consequences are felt because the Turkish administration is spending immensely for the past years in making relentless partisan and military concerns to protect and withstand their claims. The claims should be protected both domestically and in the development of historical research and presentation of information on the activities where the institutional textbooks and the public books continue to be ignorant of Ottoman history activities.

Moreover, Armenian were challenged by the Turkish administration renunciation, although the diaspora was negatively affected. Also, Armenia had to agonize from the trauma of genocide and the succeeding displacement, nevertheless, because of the rejection of the event by the Turkish administration, Armenia could not manage to mourn and ultimately heal, but the

country had to persevere, staying with the pain and continue to anguish since 1915 to today (Lowery & Freedman, 2016). This has again resulted in an increase in annoyance and hatred against the Turkish government. Although the Armenia diaspora is also facing the challenge of attaining justice, they are also undergoing the consequences of spending a lot of money to prove that what happened to them was genocide.

Similarly, more events happened among the people of Armenia and Turkey because the past activities have made them develop significant stereotypes. For instance, because the genocide event happened in the past three generations, history has not been forgotten, creating a line between individuals, making them have certain characteristics. On the side of individuals, most Armenians and Turks identify each other in different methods, which links them to the historical events that make the identity to be associated with genocide. For example, the Armenian maintain on utilizing the word “Turks demand its rejection” because they want the Turkish to identify the genocide event, which is currently a belief in the social groups and authority legalization (Lowery & Freedman, 2016). Similarly, significant efforts are focused and genocide identification rather than concentrating on the country's social, partisan and economic events. On the other hand, the Turkish are security-minded. Their struggle against genocide identification occurs as a substantial measurement of the sustained and unceasingly encouraged “Sevres syndrome," which is the anxiety of the world determined to dismember Turkey (Papazian, 2019). Consequently, the militaristic thoughts and exploitive policies direct the nation at the expense of other self-governing expansions.

Some countries are using genocide to polarize the relations of Armenia and Turkey because they do not want the two countries to relate well. Similarly, several nations are still utilizing genocide identification to their benefits and ensure their agenda is achieved. For

example, another nation can use genocide identification to insert pressure on Turkey, especially when it was applied to be involved in the European Union and force Turkey to engage in battles in the middle east (Karasu et al., 2020). Nonetheless, other nations that do not want the two countries to normalize their relations can use the genocide to intensify their separation. It unlucky that the Turkey policymakers have sustained the global involvement in the fight against genocide identification has contributed to the increased fear and exploitive policies. Therefore, through such damaging affairs, Armenia and Turkey need to have reconciliation and normalize their relations.

Literature Review

Karasu & Uluğ (2020) conducted research to understand where the tension began to build in the relations between Armenia and Turkey. Therefore, the author stated that the Nagorno Karabagh battle between Armenia and Azerbaijan has intensified since the Armenian majority assembly of the reserve uttered their purposes in 1988 to withdraw from Azerbaijan. Nevertheless, the increased tension converted to a full flown military conflict between 1991 and 1992. Also, Kopeček (2019) added that Armenian services inhabited more districts than Karabagh in Azerbaijan appropriately, particularly in Kelbajar in 1993. Furthermore, the same source claimed that Turkey was categorical to stop the ongoing conversations with Armenia to create good relations. Thus, the train moving every week in the soviet period from Gyumri to Kars in Turkey was stationary. This resulted in Turkey closing the border with Armenia because they needed to make sure there is fairness by leveraging the projections of a free border as an incentive for Armenia to attain a conciliation at the talks to resolve the Karabagh battle with Azerbaijan (Karadeniz, 2019). Despite the end of hostilities being signed among the countries

Azerbaijan and Armenia in 1994, several efforts provide by the OSCE Minsk group to solve the issue have not attained its outcome.

Another research by Goksel (2010) focused on explaining the root of the poor international relations between Turkey and Armenia. Therefore, the study found that although the border was inaccessible between Armenia and Turkey, significant issues revolved around the history of the two nations. This historic event made the normalization of the relations extremely hard because it comprised conflicting accounts of how Armenians were taken out of Anatolia. The union and progress of the Ottoman Empire were responsible for removing the Armenians from Anatolia hence making the history of being conflicting among Armenia and Turkey (Papazian, 2019). Also, another challenging problem between the nation is if the exterminations and transportations that happened to the Armenians in 191 can be called genocide, this has resulted in a substantial emotional and partisan problem. Consequently, the search for a global genocide identification campaign is mostly regarded as an antagonistic act in Turkey.

Grigoryan et al. (2019) added that the dispute between Armenia and Turkey is identifying Turkey's border. The announcement of the independence of the Armenia republic emphasized that the nation of Armenia concentrates on the sustenance of the role of attaining global realization of the 1915 genocide in Ottoman Turkey and Western Armenia to confuse the bilateral associations. Similarly, Goksel (2010) suggested that the conventional Turkish view used the phrase "western Armenia" to denote Eastern Anatolia; this indicated the territorial prerogatives. Nevertheless, Armenia has not legitimately articulated territorial entitlements from Turkey because the Armenian legislators have a cost in overtly identifying the shared border with Turkey since the prospects in the Armenian community concerning their historical land.

However, the direct and indirect participation of the Armenian diaspora Turkey-Armenia association has reduced the bilateral association and made it more intricate.

While international relation is essential in developing the countries because they can transact peacefully without conflict, Turkey and Armenia have made efforts to change their battle in their history. Terzyan (2018) agreed with other authors that the Armenia and Turkey relations have been poor for the past decades because of three things. The first thing is their history, including the chase for genocide identification by Armenia members and the Turkish energies to stop the recognition. Another reason is the inhabitation of Azerbaijan soil by Armenia and Turkey backing up Azerbaijan to stop the situation from becoming a fait accompli (Terzyan, 2018).

The last issue that brings a poor global relation between the two countries is identifying Turkey's borders by Armenia (Grigoryan et al., 2019). All these mentioned three problems are intertwined together by Azerbaijan, Turkey, the United States of America and Armenia in the historic events with energies placed to stop the entangled stalemate in approaches that will support their interests. For instance, Ankara wants its interest to be sustained especially having a tactical position and capacity to open the border with Armenia; similarly, Baku has interests in having relations with Turkey hence investing their efforts and resources and Yerevan uses the resources to the diaspora and Azerbaijan districts that are already inhabited. Furthermore, Washington emerges in the attention of identifying the genocide of 1915 every year.

Significant developments have been made towards improving the interaction between Armenia and Turkey. Karasu et al. (2020) claimed that after Turkey was awarded the European Union status in 1999, it has focused on momentous democratization steps. Similarly, the enhanced liberty is witnessed by the logical debate concerning the Armenians. These

developments make more people consider disregarding the historic events of the Armenians in Anatolia because Turkey is focused on improving the legal and social ground of their actions. For instance, in the conference concerning the Ottoman Armenian empire on problems relating to democracy and scientific accountability held in 2005, the discussion revolved around the destiny of the Armenians, especially at the end of the Ottoman state with previously unconceivable sincerity (Köse, 2019).

Another event that triggered the relation between Turkey and Armenia is the murder of Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink in 2007. Although the person that performed the assassination was a young boy seventeen years of age was arrested, Dink had a significant influence which made him have the capacity to inform individuals on the necessity for change in Turkey and this made him more transformational and liked by many people including the regular Turks (Goksel, 2010). Furthermore, before the death of Dunk, he had been beleaguered by nationalist circles for several years. He was getting death intimidations and arraigned under article three hundred and one of the Turkish disciplinary code. Therefore, the death of Dunk resulted in demonstrations at his Agos newspaper to mourn him and the protest comprised approximately one hundred thousand Turks with banners written we are all Armenians (Goksel, 2010).

The Turkish government makes more interaction developments to end the battle between the two countries (Goksel, 2010). For example, one of the decisive developments that controlled the debate on the two countries was the signature movement hurled by Cengiz Aktar accompanied by other liberal Turkish scholars in 2008. They argued that their morality does not allow them to ignore the sensitivity of the indicated to the renunciation of the immense disaster that the Ottoman Armenians were exposed to in 1915. Similarly, they discard the injustice and,

in their part, Cengiz understood the emotions and pain the Armenians passed through and hence he asks for forgiveness from them (Goksel, 2010). This increased the development of good relations and interaction between Turkey and Armenia, promoting a certain prejudiced and common view and understanding of the two countries.

Significant Developments in Improving the International Relations

Although the relations between Armenia and Turkey have been bad for the past several decades, significant developments are made to change the situation. Nevertheless, for reconciliation to occur, previous activities need to be changed and changed to expressions by the opponents and ensure the event is part of their historical activities using the past examination of the societal actors engaged in the battle. Therefore, as Köse (2019) stated, the disagreement between the two states comprises four sets of societal factors, including the Turkey administration, Armenia as a country, Turkish citizens, and the Armenian diaspora.

Turkey citizens and Armenia administration relation is critical. The historical considerations of Turkey citizens and Armenia have been in existence for several decades now. Therefore, it will be sufficient to argue that all governments that have controlled Armenia from 1991 have not positioned any preconditions for the development standard interaction between the two nations while declining to talk about the genocide and the accountability of the young Turk administration (Papazian, 2019). Nevertheless, the previous government with president Levon Ter-Petrossian believed that the dispute on the past was unfathomable and subtle to be established in the official conversation. On the other hand, president Robert Kocharian's government had a different view because they legitimately elevated the problem as a concern. Thus talks are placed without creating a requirement for the standardization of the association.

More presidents are working on debugging historical events and getting the right information. Therefore, the Turkish nations developed a policy of more rejection and reasoning. At the same time, there has been an evasion of the problem or to place talks about the issue. Also, prime minister Tayyip Erdoğan's has suggested creating a commission of autonomous specialists to examine past events. This strategy seems to provide results that can enhance the international relationships among the two nations. However, the Turkish representatives have also emphasized allowing historians to deal with history. Correspondingly, the Turkish government has also ensured they make the history presented as dangerous work. Although the historians are working to ensure they produce the best results, the Turkish administration has focused on handling the historical research and replication procedure instead of providing the essential resources to enhance historians' work.

Moreover, the commission of specialists can be a suitable track to solve the battle. However, it cannot change the prevailing role of the social scientist. Therefore, it is apparent that most of the arrangements to the directives will also be part of the focus of the powerful discussions as a runup to conceivable talks within the commission on events and gradations on a choice that has inferences for the strategy. Similarly, the prime minister's suggestions are convenient and reliable if they were confident about disturbing issues. For instance, the arrangement of the commission will be established by a person with acquittances of the existing grant and not by the administration. Also, another way is the Turkish administration not to restrict the operations of the commission. Also, the nation was prepared to take the summation of the commission despite the assumption that was against Turkey's plan on the subject. Finally, is the Turkish nation elevated all legitimate and government hindrances to the schoolwork and conversation of the individuals in Turkey and the Turkish intellectuals.

Despite the proposal addressing the four issues, there were concerns about the nonappearance of political interaction between Turkey and Armenia, mainly associated with the battle in Nagorno Karabakh (Askerov, 2020). Furthermore, another concern was based on the subtle challenge of the identification by Armenia to the current borders as ultimate rather than the problem of gratitude of the genocide. Even though several Turkish representatives had irregularly have denoted Armenian's universal campaign for the realization as an impediment to the standardization of the associations between Armenia and Turkey. Therefore, resolution between Armenia and Turkey is vital when understanding is required, although it is not the most appropriate one.

Another societal actor is the Armenian citizens and the Turkey nation. A resolution needs to be reached among these characters because Armenia was not self-governing until the attainment of independence in 1991. This resulted in the nation being surrounded by the soviet foreign rules; therefore, the Armenian individuals were epitomized by the Armenian diaspora that was very vigorous in Europe, the United States and the Middle East. Although diaspora was not a nation by itself, the partisan legal policy was conventionally used in the battle against the Turkish nation from the start to the present. However, this battle made other countries realize the Armenian genocide and take other nations in creating the precondition for Turkey to realize genocide in their working with Turkey. For example, in the scenario where Turkey needed to join the European Union, they had to agree on recognizing the genocide event. Consequently, the partisan policy remains active, although it was unsuccessful in achieving the required outcomes, especially in altering the Turkish strategies.

Also, between 1970 and 1980, several individuals from the Armenia diaspora have used the illegal partisan policy of eliminating Turkish representatives and bombing the Turkish

administration structures to seemingly acquire international consideration to the Turkish nation's misconduct force identification. Therefore, the disparaging policy did not yield the projected outcome and differentiated the Turkish administration leaders that shifted from identification and resolution.

Another technique was presented after the start of the Armenian nation in 1990. Therefore, the Ter-Petrossian government selected to demote the disagreement over genocide identification to a historical debate (Papazian, 2019). This made them not consider it a requirement for starting the associations with Turkey, to the humiliation of the Armenian individuals; however, it mostly focused on the diaspora. Nonetheless, the strategy was estimated to alter the standings of the discussion and allow the nation to explain other substantial alternatives in the implementation that would then comfort the identification. Also, the development of the Nagorno Karabakh battle prohibited the previous growth of the policies. When the Turkish prime minister Tayyip lately employed similar techniques, the Armenia president Kocharian did not agree to the conditions. Therefore, this makes the technique produce limited results.

The last societal factor is between the Armenian individuals and those of Turkey. It is vital for the citizens of the two countries to associate together and work n fulfilling their lives. Therefore, the present phase indicates the participation of the talk's energies in various formats between individuals. Although more progress is not done using the official method, all the approaches are essential considering the deadlock in the country-to-country relations and the corporate industry is the primary concern. Since 1993, Armenia and Turkey administration has inspired entrepreneurs to evaluate the regions of collaboration and trade (Ekmekcioglu, 2020). Previously, before the independence and the perception of the strategies of the former

government, the greatest ingenious suggestion started from the Turkish entrepreneur and businessmen as well as an American-Armenian real estate tycoon and humanitarian to reconstruct the Turkish port of Trabzon as an entrance to Armenia.

The suggestion did not work because of the lack of an optimistic summation in the talks between Armenia and Turkey to develop a political association and the deafening oppositions created by some quarters in the two nations. Similarly, in the same model, connections are created between the local administrations of Gyumri and Kars (Askerov, 2020). Besides, with the sustenance of the residents that recognized the joint paybacks of the free borders and trade, the energies were delayed here because of the lack of stabilization of associations. Nevertheless, regardless of the entrepreneurs' catastrophes, connections between the entrepreneurs have persisted, hence generating the small-scale traders in Georgia. Also, the overall ideas were dignified within the Turkish Armenia business council that has persisted in being vigorous in encouraging the value of business and trade associations. Also, the method was avoided in the previous and emphasized the present.

Conclusion and Recommendation

International relations play a critical role in the nation's achievement because it allows many states to focus on the association with other countries. therefore, international relation concentrates on understanding the exceptional associations that occur between several countries and cultures. Furthermore, the associations can affect all the global partisan, economics and security as well as leadership. Moreover, international relations can help in encouraging effective trade strategies between countries and inspire travel-associated business and immigration and deliver opportunities to individuals, which helps improve their lives.

Armenia and Turkey have experienced significant relations among themselves because of the historic events that have not reconciled for decades. These historic events have resulted in the two nations having poor international relations. Therefore, several events have resulted in significant effects on their relations and suffer consequences of the same. The first reason for the poor relation between Turkey and Armenia is that the two countries have a history of searching for genocide identification by Armenian individuals and the Turkish nations energies to stop the situation. Therefore, although Turkey is against recognizing the massacre that happened in Anatolia, historians and scholars need to be given appropriate resources to have a concluding discussion.

Another issue resulting in poor international relations between Armenia and Turkey is the inhabitation of Azerbaijan soil by Armenia and Turkey's helping Azerbaijan stop the activity from spinning into collaboration and realizing the Turkey's borders with Armenia. Therefore, all the three challenges revolve around Turkey, the United States, Armenia and Azerbaijan, which ensures they achieve their interest. For example, Baku influences its energy resources and improves its connection with Turkey. Similarly, this conflict of interest in making the international relation between Armenia and Turkey continue because some countries are using the recognition of genocide to seal deals with Turkey.

Despite immense developments made to change the situations happening in the present, proper reconciliation is needed to change the past events. However, Turkey needs to play a significant role in changing the situation because they will need to resolve their historic events because of their democratization procedure. Besides, Turkey has already initiated suitable steps to enhance their ability to bring peace among the two countries by joining the European Union and being part of the modern nations that can work on their previous mistakes and free their

lives. Also, through Turkey accepting the situation they are in, there will be no reason to put more effort into protecting a defenseless historical event with Armenia as well as accept that Armenia is their neighbour.

References

Askerov, A. (2020). The Nagorno Karabakh Conflict. *Post-Soviet Conflicts: The Thirty Years' Crisis*, *55*.

Ekmekcioglu, L. (2020). *Recovering Armenia*. Stanford University Press.

Goksel, D. N. (2010). THE RUBIK'S CUBE OF TURKEY-ARMENIA RELATIONS. *Revista UNISCI*, (23), 193-205.

Grigoryan, A., Khachatryan, K., & Ter-Matevosyan, V. (2019). Armenia-Turkey border opening: what determines the attitude of Armenians?. *Caucasus Survey*, *7*(1), 25-43.

Karasu, M., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2020). Researching Turkish-Armenian relations in Turkey, Armenia, and the Armenian Diaspora: The challenges and opportunities of Turkish researchers in the field. In *Researching Peace, Conflict, and Power in the Field* (pp. 63-83). Springer, Cham.

Karadeniz, R. F. (2019). SECOND TRACK DIPLOMACY IN TURKEY-ARMENIA RELATIONS: A VIEW FROM TURKEY. *International Journal of Turcologia*, *14*(27).

Kopeček, V. (2019). The Nagorno-Karabakh Republic and the Republic of Armenia: Who instrumentalizes whom?. In the *De Facto States in Eurasia* (pp. 208-224). Routledge.

Köse, T. (2019). Armenia and Turkey: An overview of relations and prospects for normalization.

Lowery, Z., & Freedman, J. (2016). *Genocide in Armenia*. The Rosen Publishing Group, Inc.

Papazian, S. (2019). The Cost of Memorializing: Analyzing Armenian Genocide Memorials and Commemorations in the Republic of Armenia and the Diaspora. *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, *7*(1), 55-86.

Terzyan, A. (2018). Identity conflicts? the sense of ‘victimhood and the enemy images of Turkey and Azerbaijan in the foreign policy discourse of Armenia. *Slovenská politologická revue*, *18*(2), 155-175.

VV

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%	0%	0%	0%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	anadolukultur.org Internet Source	<1%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		