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Abstract

This thesis explores the Armenian diaspora’s behavior concerning the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide through lobbying within the US and EU. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to grasp a deepened understanding of diasporic lobbying, while focusing on the Armenian case, as a case enabling further scholarly deepening for the field of IR. In order to achieve an understanding of the Armenian diaspora, the appropriated behavior through lobbying and the trajectorial changes concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide, the paper puts forward historical process tracing, comparative research and qualitative content analysis. These methods are utilized as a means for tracing the events contributing to the construction of the diaspora. They also establish the lobby’s influence on ‘host-states’ and the understanding of internalized norms granting policy changes for the cause of recognizing the Armenian genocide, this is done through the concepts of identity, norms and recognition.
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1. Introduction

As a means to study the phenomena that is diaspora, it is important to understand how these ethnic groups act as political entities regarding the establishment and creation of lobbying. This, as argued by Baser & Swain (2008), is not an easy task within the field of International Relations (IR). But it is, arguably, essential as a growing influential body of non-state actors has, in the last couple of decades, emerged within world politics and global and domestic decision-making. This paper argues that non-state actors, like lobby groups, have been able to shift the world’s political field from the Westphalian state system to a broader, more inclusive world system.

Existing within this world system are approximately ten million Armenians scattered around the globe, with only one-third living inside of Armenia (Katanjian, 2004). As this diasporic scattering remains, employing a case study of the Armenian diaspora is crucial for the deepened understanding of the concept of diaspora, ethnic lobbying, and the influence it can contribute to world politics. The purpose of this paper is then the puzzling yet fascinating and relevant gap in previous research; how beneficial is the deepening of understanding of the Armenian diaspora and lobbying regarding international politics even though it has largely been neglected by IR scholars and decision-making powers?

By hypothesizing about the Armenian diaspora, its lobbying, and the influence it has on a so-called, ‘host-state’s’ political system, this paper will focus on deepening the understanding of ethnic diasporic lobbying pushing domestic politics from the local to the global. This will be done by analyzing two of the, arguably, most important world powers that comprises a grand number of the Armenian diaspora, the European Union (EU) and the United States (US). Hence why this paper puts the following research question on the front line; ‘what is the Armenian diaspora and what behavior does it appropriate in order to change the trajectory of recognition of the Armenian genocide, from the local to global, through lobbying within the US and EU?’

This paper will offer three key staples of literature concerning the concept of diaspora, ethnic lobbying, and its influence on decision-making and policies. This will be done in order to grasp what has been previously researched within the field of IR as a means to establish a deepened understanding of the topic and to enable filling existing gaps. (1) The first step will be to look into the question of diaspora and define it, as it is a contested concept that needs thought-out understanding. This will establish how the Armenian diaspora will be defined in this paper. (2) Thereafter, this paper will shift focus to ethnic lobbying and shed light on the influence it has on a ‘host-state’. (3) Once both diaspora and ethnic lobbying has been established, decision- and policymaking will be analyzed and understood to further grasp the outcomes contributed by
diasporic lobbying. These three key staples will be a continuous thread throughout the paper as they will lay the foundation for the conclusion.

From these three key staples, this paper will, through the methods section, outline Historical Process Tracing (HPT), Comparative Research (CR), and Content Analysis (CA). By doing a three-stepped methodology, this paper will gather, through HPT, a clear understanding of the Armenian diaspora and how it has fueled lobbying and the outcomes they want. This will let us compare, through CR, the Armenian and Israel lobby, as the latter has been well-studied and contributed substantially to lobby research, this to compare the successes and influences of the two lobbies. Once the influence the Armenian lobby possesses has been established, through CR, the outcomes will be in focus, through CA, where official resolutions and statements from the EU and US will add to answering the question put forward by this paper.

This paper, therefore, will analyze the case of the Armenian diaspora through a constructivist framework with contributions from recognition theory, where identity and norms will be the main focus. This will be used as a means to grasp the ideational and material forces that a diaspora entails and as a way to enable deepening of recognition. The literature review will act as a starting point, summarizing what has been previously stated by researchers about the three key staples put forward by this paper: (1) diaspora, (2) lobbying, and (3) the influence, will be conducted as a means to establish the current gaps that are in need of filling.
2. Literature Review

This literature review intends to investigate the three main components that construct the aim of this paper and, when combined, contribute to the deepening of understanding about diaspora. These three components are: (1) the concept of diaspora, (2) diasporic lobbying, and (3) the influence this entails. An in-depth understanding of the topic is important, considering “the concept of diaspora has so much to offer for analysis and research in various dimensions” (Baser & Swain, 2008: 12). This proves the importance of answering the research question put forward in this paper. Further justifying that there exists an understanding of the importance of analyzing diaspora as it can contribute to various dimensions to the field of IR even though there are gaps to be filled. In addition, this paper argues that by putting the Armenian case on the forefront it can be utilized as a tool for further understanding of this topic. In order to analyze the outcomes and contributions of ethnic lobbying, it is crucial to fathom and recognize the meaning of diaspora. The intentions being the crucial characteristics of the culture, norms, and ideals within a diaspora generating what actions are conceived necessary in order to accomplish outcomes through lobbying, being good or bad, for the intended goals. The following literature review puts forward a synopsis of previous research in order to grasp what ought to be done in the field. Subsequently, this paper argues for a deepened understanding through the theoretical framework of constructivism due to the ability to analyze the Armenian diasporic lobby on a cognitive ideational level. This will be delved into in the section succeeding the literature review.

2.1. The Concept of Diaspora

As implied by previous research, construing what diaspora encompasses is not an easy task, hence why the topic is considered controversial due to no agreeably accepted definition of it (Baser & Swain, 2008). This part of the literature review will focus on analyzing what definitions have previously been stated within the field of IR to allow an understanding, argumentation, and definition of diaspora on its own. As stated by Ashraf (2005: 35) “etymologically, the term diaspora has been derived from Greek” suggesting that the term essentially means ‘scattering’ or ‘dispersion’. With the understanding of the term, it is crucial to grasp that diaspora, as a concept, cannot be explained through a one-word dimension but has multidimensional manners to it and exists in various ways, e.g. activistic or pacifistic. This is justified by the various definitions of diaspora existing in current IR literature.

(1) The definition put forward by Carment & Bercuson (2008) about the reality of distinction between present-day diasporas and ‘ethnic migrants’ in light of modernization of electronic technology, i.e. telecommunications, has granted diasporic connectivity with the ‘homeland’. This
is arguably undeniable to a certain extent. This due to modernization allowing this kind of connectivity between the diasporic group and the ‘homeland’. Nevertheless, this view includes the absence of a two-dimensional understanding that this paper argues, later on, is crucial in defining diaspora.

(2) Reis’ (2004) understanding is that three different types of diasporas occur, those being the modern one (concerning colonial diasporas e.g. slaves), the contemporary one (comprehending the globalized postcolonial world’s diasporic aftereffect), and the classical one. Reis (2004) seems to acknowledge the importance of understanding different types of diasporas but this through categorization. This paper seeks to move away from categorization as it enables the topic to be analyzed as distinctive categories and not as a whole with diverse groups.

(3) Berns-McGown’s (2007/2008: 8) argument is that diaspora “is best defined as a space of connections – connections in two dimensions, to be precise”. This argumentation provides a clear definition of what diaspora entails. It establishes the necessary preparations for investigating cases within the topic and lays foundation for further scholarly deepening. This paper therefore argues for a definition of diaspora as the existence of a group of people with a dual shared identity that is derived from the ‘homeland’ and integrated into the ‘host-state’ that changes over time through various processes. This integrational dual shared identity occurs as a two-dimensional phenomenon through processes in the ‘host-state’ changing the trajectory of the diaspora. This paper will therefore utilize the argument put forward by Berns-McGown (2007/2008) as the foundation for understanding the Armenian diaspora.

As the definition of diaspora has been established, this paper seeks to fathom the broader understanding of diaspora within IR. Diasporic groups vary substantially when considering how they operate within their ‘host-states’. This as a result of how they act towards their ‘homelands’ through diverse aspects, e.g. religion, economy, politics, conflicts etc. As stated by Hilbrenner et al. (2008) when analyzing the concept of ‘Diaspora Nationalism’ is the emphasis on the element of the historiographical and political program existing. This entailing the connection existing within diasporic groups amongst history and politics. This concept is therefore beneficial in understanding the case of the Armenian diaspora as it is situated between historical events and the political present. As the Armenian diaspora has been constructed out of historical events, the diasporic group has established an active and dynamic strong political desire within the ‘host-states’ towards the ‘homeland’. This concept is hence required as it analyzes and adds to the study of diaspora in the sense of multilayered importance. It can be further analyzed through the factor that diasporic groups are mobile and can achieve mimicking characteristics determined by the social structures it upholds when being engulfed by a ‘host-state’s’ social structure. This due to the relationship these
groups incorporate through broaden activism and participation in their ‘host-state’s’ political mechanisms and processes (Kim, 2016). “Understanding patterns of diaspora mobilization could add new insights into established literatures on ethnic lobbying in foreign policy” (Koinova, 2013: 44). By adding on to what Koinova (2013) argues for with what has previously been stated by Hilbrenner et al. (2008) this paper seeks to look at the patterns that the concept of ‘Diaspora Nationalism’ contributes to grasping diasporic mobilization and operationalization through lobbying in connection to foreign policy.

As decision-makers pay increasingly more attention to diasporic groups and ethnic lobbying on the political field (Shain & Barth, 2003), this paper argues that it is important to understand diasporas on a deeper level by investigating how they came to be. This has to be done in order to fathom and gather information on why, what, and for whom they work as political entities. As understood by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) about the Israel lobby is the religious aspect. Religion has great importance in the creation of the Armenian diaspora as it is central to the ‘homeland’s’ identity and this significant staple, which is amplified by cultural heritage, has to be considered due to the clash of cultures residing in the ‘host-state’ (Féron, 2017). Additionally, the Armenian diasporic group pushes politics in their ‘host-states’ to support the Republic of Armenia concerning e.g. conflicts and decision-making within their ‘homeland’. This shows a sense of solidarity and kinship towards Armenia through lobbying (Baser & Swain, 2008).

As a final part in understanding diaspora this paper will delve into what has previously been researched about solidarity and kinship, as it is crucial when analyzing a diaspora’s relation to the ‘homeland’. Huntington (1993) argues that a so-called kin-country syndrome exists where one nation assembles their own civilization in support towards another nation’s civilization, this due to engagement in war. As it is a valid argumentation for the case of the Armenian diaspora due to the aspect of the Nagorno-Karabakh war between Armenia and Azerbaijan, this paper will not employ this view as it engages in state-centrism where a nation is the main power and focuses on the material reality where ideational forces are mostly excluded. Another view suitable for the understanding of diaspora is Hardt & Negri’s (2004) argument of the ‘multitude’ as an active social subject who shares characteristics and upon this act in a certain way. Cox’s (1981) view on social forces being the representation of the world order and transcends official state boundaries, meaning that these social forces exist beyond and not limited to the state, contributes too. As an understanding of civil society being based on social forces and social subjects both Hardt & Negri’s (2004) and Cox’s (1981) views will be employed when analyzing the relation between the Armenian diaspora and the ‘homeland’ of Armenia as it includes ideational and material forces.
2.2. Ethnic Lobbying and Lobby Groups

After establishing a definition and understanding of diaspora it is fair to conclude that this paper defines diasporic groups, i.e. the Armenian diaspora etc., as a two-dimensional, multilayered phenomenon concerning dual shared identities in regards to a ‘homeland’ and ‘host-state’. This by then adding the concept of ‘Diaspora Nationalism’ as a means to combine history and politics in understanding diasporic groups establishing ethnic lobbying. Thenceforth, lobbying in favor of the ‘homeland’ through the respective ‘host-states’.

Since lobbying has become one of the main aspects in understanding non-state actors throughout our political processes and within the field of IR, it is necessary to fathom and “to recognize clearly the undesirable role played by lobby power in our present day political system” (Sen, 1994: 2139). This arguably due to the political environment constantly changing and actors’ roles continually requiring further investigation as it is important to seek knowledge on a broader stage rather than a narrow one.

A controversial yet essential and influential piece of work concerning ethnic lobbying is Mearsheimer & Walt’s (2007) argument concerning the Israel lobby. It is crucial to review the Israel lobby argument in order to grasp a greater understanding of ethnic lobbying. This due to the understanding that both the Israel and Armenian lobby groups push politics and policies within their ‘host-states’ in favor of their ‘homelands’ whom both are located in unstable geostrategic regions, for their ‘host-states’, the Caucasus region and the Middle East respectively. As understood by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) an ethnic lobby group has immense impact on a ‘host-state’s’ foreign policy, in their argument the Israel lobby pushing the US towards a more pro-Israel trend related to the kin-country syndrome by Huntington (1993). “The lobby’s political power is important… because it has a significant influence on American foreign policy, especially in the Middle East” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 6). This proves that ethnic lobbying influences policies more substantial than just their ‘homeland’ but also the region where the ‘homeland’ is located. As argued by this paper through comparing the two nations of Israel and Armenia which both, as stated earlier, are situated in unstable geostrategic regions therefore benefits the US’ foreign policy. Even though the Israel lobby argument has been seen as a controversial piece it is a force to recon with when analyzing ethnic lobbying. Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) collected their data, in order to analyze the Israel lobby, from official documents and other sources such as newspapers, books, reports, transcripts and interviews but acknowledges that it can lack in outcome as official records become available for scholars. A beneficial aspect from the argument about the Israel lobby is the takeaway that when investigating ethnic lobbying we tend to study it in a sense of the lobby group lobbying for what is imagined in the ‘homeland’s’ best interest.
To be able to achieve the goals in question for an ethnic lobby group, such as the Armenian lobby, any political influence is critical, whether through governmental or communal levels. As the Armenian diasporic lobby is constituted as a socially advanced diaspora with its distinctive goals being to assert themselves politically within a ‘host-state’, this type of understanding, about the influence on various levels, benefits the field of IR. This as a further argumentation built on what has been stated by Kotanjian (2004) about the goal of the Armenian lobby being concerned by the broader, rather than the narrow, boundaries of diaspora which is convenient for this paper. As an ethnic lobby group is outlined by coherence and described as a collective, it is essential to acknowledge these processes and movements within the group as foundations for lobbying. But as argued by Fukuyama (2001) each individual lobby group is concerned with these processes on various levels. Arguably, by then analyzing one diasporic lobby group at a time, and a deeper understanding of it, will further improve the knowledge that is contributed to the field of IR. Therefore, it is important to analyze a particular case due to the establishment that ethnic lobby groups’ goals vary tremendously as the dual shared identity that constitutes them is relied on diverse cultural exchanges.

Thus, this paper seeks to shed light on the goals of the Armenian lobby. Mearsheimer & Walt (2007: 11) briefly addressed this by stating that “Armenian Americans have pushed Washington to acknowledge the 1915 genocide and, more recently, to limit U.S. relations with Azerbaijan”. When tackling the issues concerning diaspora, as an ethnic lobby group, the Armenian lobby strives to push for pro-Armenian US partnership. Through this they are able to participate within the ‘host-state’s’ democracy and political processes encouraging the push for economic progress and advancement of the ‘homeland’ (Kotanjian, 2004). This paper seeks to dive deeper into this view of the Armenian lobby as it is a crucial aspect in generating conclusive statements and outcomes.

2.3. Influence and Foreign Policy
After reviewing previous research about diaspora and the influence ethnic lobbying has on our political systems it is crucial to fathom the contributions this type of lobbying possesses on a ‘host-state’s’ foreign policy. This type of influence can change the trajectory of foreign policy, from a local to global political perspective. Thereafter, affecting the diasporic group’s ‘home-region’ and ‘homeland’. Here, as argued by Rubenzer (2008), and what this paper seeks to accomplish through an analysis on the Armenian lobby’s influence on foreign policy, is the deepening of understanding concerning ethnic lobbying contributing to the study of foreign policy. “As more diasporic interest
groups attempt to influence U.S. foreign policy understanding the various paths to ethnic influence will continue to play an important role” (Rubenzer, 2008: 184).

A predominant number of smaller nations located in unstable regions are seeking the support of influential lobbying establishing foreign policies in favor of them. As a way to sustain and secure the kinship and support by societal groups it is important for a ‘homeland’s’ government to implement certain valuable trading relations with the group in question (Beach, 2012; Rosencrance, 1986; Mansfield and Pollins, 2001). Arguably then, for the case of Armenia, where the nation situates in an unstable region both politically and economically, it is in the Armenian governments’ best interest to uphold the relations between the nation and diasporic lobby group as a means to strengthen the position of the lobby’s ‘host-state’ and therefore lean towards a more pro-Armenian position. This paper also argues that by maintaining the relations between the ‘homeland’ and lobby group will increase the activism and support from the diasporic lobby which then can lead to policy change in the ‘host-state’ towards the ‘homeland’.

In order to establish the structure that serves the foundation of foreign policy making, it is no surprise that through governmental structures and its decision-making powers we allow the implementation of foreign policies and thereafter reverse them into actions (Hermann & Hermann, 1989). As stated by Hermann & Hermann (1989) it is clear that the structural forces of governments allow the creational change of foreign policies. This by then arguing for the possibility of creational change of foreign policy.

This paper seeks to acknowledge that through a nation’s political structures being decided by the structural forces of a government and by then being integrated into this system, lobbying has great opportunities to influence the decision-making powers that constructs foreign policies. Later on, in the analysis section of this paper, we will delve into if- and then how the Armenian lobby is situated in this very dynamic political structure and if that produces outcomes in favor of the ‘homeland’, Armenia, and the Caucasus region from the ‘host-state’. “In spite of significant insight in the past several decades, the systemic study of ethnic minority influence on U.S. foreign policy remains an incomplete enterprise” (Rubenzer, 2011: 105). The analysis of the influence of ethnic lobbying will contribute to the field of IR in the sense of deepened understanding about foreign policy due to the gap that exist in current literature as argued by Rubenzer (2011).
3. Theoretical Approach

After analyzing what previous research has established and contributed to the field of IR concerning diaspora, ethnic lobbying, and its influence on foreign policy it is essential to provide the theoretical approach that will be utilized. Both Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) and Huntington (1993) have been focused on the material reality, resulting in a letdown of ideational forces. While this paper understands that states can be influential actors it also argues for an approach more similar to Cox (1981) and Hardt & Negri (2004) where the social subjects and forces are influential, adding the dimension of civil society.

As concerned by previous diaspora research the concept of identity has been put on the forefront. Especially the concept of shared identity, culture and ideals. Therefore, by conducting an analysis on the Armenian diaspora, this paper seeks to acknowledge the importance of understanding both the material forces and ideational factors constructing them through the theoretical framework of constructivism with contributions from recognition theory. As constructivism is concerned with the social dimensions and through norms, language, rules etc. manifests this (Fierke, 2016) and as a diaspora is a socially interactive group that is created through these types of ideational factors, the constructivist framework is suited to be utilized in this case. Then adding what has been previously stated by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007), in the literature review of this paper, about the Armenian lobby being in pursuance of recognition of the Armenian genocide the issue of recognition emerges. This then shedding light on employing recognition theory as an underlying thread of this paper’s constructivist approach. “We let other people know who we believe we are, and they let us know whether or not our account is reasonable. In this way, our stories about ourselves are, or are not, recognized” (Ringmar, 2012: 6).

By analyzing diaspora through the constructivist concept of identity this paper will gather a groundwork enabling this kind of research as identities being “social and thus are always formed in relationship to others” (Barnett, 2017: 147), they therefore shape the interests of a diasporic group. The Armenian diaspora is guided by the component of knowledge, the cultural factors, i.e. concepts, symbols, rules and categories and the material factors, such as technological advantages. This, as argued by constructivist thinking, contributes to how the individual beings within a society construct and depict the world that they live within (Barnett, 2017).

To be able to analyze the Armenian diaspora contributing to lobbying concerning foreign policy, this paper seeks to inspect the effects of social facts on politics. This will not simply be done by analyzing material factors but primarily ideational ones. Before doing this, we have to establish one of the research problems concerning constructivism, i.e. defining identity (Finnemore & Sikkink, 2001). Since there is no agreed definition on what constitutes identity, this is crucial to
establish for the deepened understanding of the case of the Armenian diaspora. This as “claiming what we see is there misses something important, because the interpretation changes the experience itself” (Peltonen, 2016: 84). With the concept of identity being a well contested concept and various definitions existing, it is crucial to establish what identity is in accordance with the case study in focus. Argued by Deutsch et al. (1957) identity is a sort of ‘we-feeling’ where self-image and interests play a role in creating an identity. Deutsch et al.’s (1957) argument lays the foundation for Wendt (1992) and Jepperson et al. (1996) who argue that shared interests are the basis for a shared identity being able to bloom. “An actor cannot know what it wants unless it knows what it is” (Wendt, 1999: 231). This paper therefore acknowledges that identity is created through shared interests and that this is applicable in the case of the Armenian diaspora due to common goals of recognition and pro-Armenian interests intertwined with historical aspects.

The understanding of norms, as part of the concept of identity, contributes to the field of IR as a ‘hard-to-explain’ phenomena where concerns expect “norms as shared assessments” where we have to “…raise the question of how many actors must share the assessment before we call it a norm” (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998: 892). When assessing this criterion to the case of the Armenian diaspora, this paper will allow the investigation of the cultural identity that has contributed to the commonly understood shared identity within the group. This as a means to establish and fathom how norms convey and assign behavior.

To establish the norms contributed to the creation of the Armenian diaspora, this paper seeks to analyze the case through a three-stage process put forward by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998). These three stages are as follows: (1) norm emergence, (2) norm cascade, and (3) internalization. Stage 1, the stage of norm emergence, focuses on the root and appearance of norms. This by investigating two of the arguably most important factors in norm emergence i.e. “norm entrepreneurs and organizational platforms from which entrepreneurs act” (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998: 896). This paper will therefore employ Historical Process Tracing as a method in order to establish the first stage of norm emergence, this to find the historical root of the Armenian diaspora. Stage 2 then continues with norm cascade which appears after a so-called ‘tipping point’ where there has been little to no normative change before and then a different dynamic occurs. Empirical studies suggest that here is where the change of norms is rather concerned with the influence of norms through the international and transnational landscape instead of domestic politics (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998). When these two stages have occurred the enabling of stage 3 is possible where internalization is achievable. This stage is focused on understanding that after the stage of norm cascade has occurred, norms has become widely accepted and therefore internalized by actors. This producing norm/s as relatively automatic, powerful and hard to detect.
Finnemore & Sikkink (1998) outline this three-staged process in a summarized understanding in figure 1. This will be done as means of understanding the Armenian diaspora through “microfoundations for norm-based behavior” as it “…might be improved by paying more attention to studies in psychology” (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998: 916).

![Figure 1. Finnemore & Sikkink (1998: 896)](image)

When then the understanding of norms creating a community, in this case the Armenian diaspora, has been established through internalization it is essential to grasp the importance of advocacy networks, as put forward by Keck & Sikkink (2002) to the constructivist framework. As argued by Kotanjian (2004) that approximately 10 million individuals around the world in around 50 different nations views themselves as Armenians and being part of the Armenian diaspora. Furthermore, contributing to an existence of a politically active, well-educated Armenian global network. Through an understanding of advocacy networks, we will gather information on the essential factors, i.e. the social, cultural, and political, that constitutes norms laying a foundation for the, so-called, “formal institutional processes of regional integration” (Keck & Sikkink, 2002: 90). These processes of integration contributed by norms can facilitate a greater understanding of the processes concerning the Armenian diaspora on an international dimension, not only within one ‘host-state’. By then focusing on the international dimension that is granted through a transnational/international advocacy network we delve into the argument for the influence these networks have on changing the stance governments/other actors have into a more pro-cause position in favor of the network’s stance. I.e. that these networks can influence a greater width of actors than the targeted actors in question (Keck & Sikkink, 2002).

By then understanding how this paper will go about a constructivist approach the underlying thread of recognition theory comes in play due to the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide that surrounds the Armenian diasporic lobby. “Recognition theory argues that individuals reach their fullest potential through discursive and agonistic engagement with each other” meaning that “…it is through recognition of others that we ourselves become fully human” (Lang, 2015: 189). Arguably, by then utilizing the constructivist recognition theory we are able to enable the important staple of individuality within the Armenian diaspora leading to the diaspora’s past
traumas being the focus of recognition. “If we probe our brains for evidence of our identities we will necessarily be disappointed” (Ringmar, 2012: 5) due to the requirement of a counterparts recognition. As a lobby pushes for recognition policies within the ‘host-state’, it can recognize the goals of the lobbying and hence contribute to reassuring the humanity, and/or personality of the group/individuals in question.

As constructivism is concerned with the ideational forces, it is an essential approach in understanding diaspora and ethnic lobbying and will contribute to the conscious side of politics created by the individuals that constructs society. The three stages of norm emergence, norm cascade, and internalization by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998) will help in facing the constructed truth of the Armenian diaspora. It is concerned with the creation of norms as a part of the concept of identity and will be utilized in order to grasp the goals and outcomes being fought for by this lobby group. Hence why, the notion provided by recognition theory is well suited for this case as it is concerned with the issue of recognition and needs a counterpart to recognize their struggles as a way to reclaim and feel fully human with their own identity. The three concepts of norms, identity, and recognition relates to each other as cognitive aspects in politics where the three goes hand-in-hand as norms are part of identity and identity has to be recognized by a counterpart.
4. Methodology

The aim of this paper is to examine the Armenian diaspora in regard to lobbying and policymaking concerning Armenia and the recognition of the Armenian genocide. To be able to understand the aim/s and outcome/s of a certain diasporic lobby group we have to acknowledge the importance of analyzing methods that has been utilized in previous research. This to provide and establish an operative foundation that can be appropriated into the analysis of the Armenian diaspora. These methods are therefore important to grasp in initiating the conduction of the analysis. By doing so we are able to assess what ought to be done for enabling deeper understanding of diasporic lobbying within the field of IR. As understood by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) about the Israel lobby, it is important to fathom the historical aspects of a diasporic group while also recognize its present position through Comparative Research. Even though this was done through the theory of realism, it is still an influential piece of work within the field of ethnic lobbying and therefore important to employ. The methodology utilized by previous research has comprehended the art and importance of textual analysis in one shape or another with immense success. Therefore, the methods used in the analysis of this paper will be conducted through three methods, all being concerned with texts. (1) Historical Process Tracing (HPT), this as a means to establish what the diaspora entails, the identity, and norms, in order to understand the stance and behaviors appropriated by the Armenian diaspora. (2) Comparative Research (CR), a study to establish the importance the Armenian lobby holds in comparison to the Israel lobby. Here the work of Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) on the Israel lobby will be compared to findings concerning the Armenian lobby as a way to inform about similarities and differences. And (3) Content Analysis (CA), a qualitative study that will focus on the issue of recognition by analyzing the outcomes put forward in policy-making due to the impact of the Armenian lobby on the recognition of the Armenian genocide. By following this three-stepped methodological structure we will be able to go from the narrow to the broad understanding of diasporic lobbying and its influence. This will have a beneficial deepening of the topic and repeatability with similar cases within the field of IR and will be able to bring an understanding of diaspora, lobbying, influence, and the issue of recognition.

4.1. Historical Process Tracing

As a fundamental starting point to this paper’s analysis is the understanding that HPT brings by taking into account the historical aspects of the Armenian diasporic group. It is important to deepen the knowledge of a particular diaspora due to the relevance it has when conducting research about the present-day position of the diaspora. This is done by looking at the Armenian diaspora
and when, where, and how it came to be to further understand why and what behaviors this particular diasporic group appropriates in order to achieve the outcomes they strive for. When analyzing historical events as means for the formation of diasporas with shared identity, striving and requiring the safety for the 'us', it acts accordingly to the blueprint presented by constructivism. As constructivism argues for human interaction being “shaped by ideational factors, not simply material ones” (Finnemore & Sikkink, 2001: 391).

HPT studies a set of changes throughout history that identifies and establishes a historical event and the impact it has had on these set of changes, this by analyzing it as a plausible contributor (Halperin & Heath, 2012). As understood and contributed by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) about the American-Armenian lobby and their advocacy for the acknowledgement of the Armenian genocide, is a result of historical contributions. Therefore, the first part of the analysis where HPT is applied will focus on understanding the Armenian genocide and the set of changes that has affected the behavior of the Armenian diaspora. This due to the importance of establishing a fundamental understanding of how and when a diaspora comes to be and how it can become a diasporic lobby group.

As a way to conduct this research this paper will introduce texts about historical events, i.e. texts about the Armenian genocide, in order to articulate the making of the diaspora and lobby group. The data collection for HPT will include books, articles, journals and news about historical events concerning the topic in question. A critical aspect of this is that the authors are secondary sources and therefore has not experienced and gone through the events by themselves and relies on data they have collected. But due to the events of the Armenian genocide being executed over 100 years ago, the experiences of the events exist mainly as secondary sources and traumas passed on by generations.

4.2. Comparative Research

When it is established how the Armenian diasporic lobby came to be through HPT, the analysis will further investigate the importance of diasporic lobby groups through CR. We have then moved from the narrow understanding of the Armenian diaspora, that HPT provides, to the logical framework of the analysis. This will enable the influence the behavior of the Armenian diaspora has and, from that, show how the lobby group works. Here it will focus on a Most Similar System Design (MSSD) by comparing two of the clear-cut traditional, religious and older diasporic lobby groups, i.e. the Armenian and Israel lobbies, to each other. As constructivist understanding of diaspora being contributed by the idea of an ethnic group including a shared identity, culture, norms, and ideals, the two lobbies will be comparable due to being similar in these ways. The two
lobbies also have an interest in the idea of the ‘homeland’. This being similar in the course that both Armenia and Israel, as ‘homelands’, are positioned in unstable geostrategic regions. The distinction being that the importance of ethnic lobbying varies for the two nations where Armenia, where lobbying is an absolute, will be compared to the argument of Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) about Israel, where lobbying is not an absolute. Even though this is the case, the two ‘homelands’ are both situated in dynamic political positions on the world’s political spectrum. The Armenian and Israel lobbying is contributed and dictated by past traumas from previous generations that sustain demands in the contemporary world. Not only do they differ in the argumentation of lobbying being an absolute for the ‘homeland’ from the ‘host-state’ but also in the crucial respect of being overlooked by IR scholars and international decision-makers. This in the respect that the case of Armenia has predominantly been shoved to the side of analysis while there has been much more effort put into the case of Israel. This as, MSSD as a study of CR “is based on selecting countries that share… important characteristics, but differ in one crucial respect” (Halperin & Heath, 2012: 210).

In previous research CR has been conducted in relation to lobbying by, e.g., Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) and Rubenzer (2008) by the study of qualitative comparative analysis. By then comparing the Armenian lobby to the Israel one, this paper seeks to grasp the importance of researching ethnic lobbying and what influences and outcomes they have on the global political field. By conducting a CR analysis based on the work of Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) of the Israel lobby compared to the Armenian lobby, the data is concerned with textual contributions. This through analyzing the Israel lobby by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) and the Armenian lobby, mostly, by Contreras (2017) through MSSD. By doing so this paper focuses on analyzing a very narrow collection of data and therefore can cause limitations. This can be both a disadvantage but also an advantage as it lets the focus be contained to an in-depth understanding of what is sought for but could also introduce controversial argumentations by analyzing Mearsheimer & Walt (2007). This as the Israel lobby argument has been considered, by some, controversial. Arguably, conducting this type of CR will allow for the repeatability of this methodology in similar cases concerning diaspora and ethnic lobbying.

4.3. Content Analysis

As stated earlier, most of the previous research about diaspora and lobbying includes some type of textual analysis. Hence why the importance of textual analysis is highlighted prominently in this paper. The HPT bringing the importance of historical understanding of the Armenian diasporic lobby group while contributing to the narrow knowledge of the topic. Continuing to CR
introducing the logical framework of the analysis through analyzing and comparing the Armenian and Israel lobbies through the study of MSSD. Once CR has established how the Armenian diasporic lobbying has an importance on a ‘host-state’s’ political system it is crucial to analyze how this type of lobbying influences politics from the local to global. This will be done through a qualitative CA where the analysis will seek to investigate the Armenian lobby’s influence and in what way it changes the trajectory of policies concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide, by investigating the change of trajectory in policymaking by the US and EU. Why the US and EU will be in the spotlight and not Russia, who is the greatest ally of Armenia, is due to just that. The US and EU are both, arguably, important actors for Armenia and the Caucasus region but they are not as much involved as Russia already is. The interest then lays in understanding how two out of the four, arguably most important actors towards the Caucasus (Russia, Turkey, the US and the EU), acts when the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide is put on the table.

By introducing the study of CA this paper will be able to go from the narrow to the broad understanding of the importance of ethnic lobbying while focusing on the local to global political field. This will be possible through analyzing the data determined by a coding protocol contributed by Riffe et al. (2019), found in the appendix of this paper. As stated by Halperin & Heath (2012: 310), “content analysis is concerned with the study of the text itself, rather than with the broad context within which it was produced”. Hence why the CA will contribute the most crucial aspects in regards to answer the puzzling research question that this paper puts on the forefront.

This will be done by analyzing official resolutions and other official statements presented by the US House of Representatives, the US Senate, the President of the US and various EU units concerning the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide. The difficulty with this will be that the EU has various member states with different processes of recognition and different ideas about the Armenian genocide. But as this is the case with the EU so is the case with the US, where the different states can recognize by themselves. This paper therefore will analyze the issue of recognition from a higher power view, i.e. on the US’ governmental level and the EU as a supranational body.

After conducting the analysis through the three methodological approaches of HPT, CR, and CA there will be a story told about the importance of understanding the Armenian diasporic lobby group and the political influence it encompasses. The findings and outcomes throughout the three methodological approaches will be combined and then serve as the foundation in order to justify the result/s of the analysis that contributes to the answer of this paper’s research question. With all the contributing components, this will give a rationale for the conclusion of the paper.
5. Analysis

In order to answer the research question, put forward by this paper; what is the Armenian diaspora and what behavior does it appropriate in order to change the trajectory of recognition of the Armenian genocide, from the local to global, through lobbying within the US and EU? This paper seeks to conduct an analysis focused on establishing what event/s accelerated the Armenian diaspora and its lobbying through the method of HPT. Thereafter, once the question of diaspora has been answered, the focus will shift towards the current concerns about the Armenian lobby and the power it possesses, this through a comparative study comparing the Armenian and Israel lobbies in the US. To then answer the question put forward by this paper, the final part of the analysis will analyze the influence utilized by the Armenian lobby as a means to grasp the trajectorial effects, meaning the policies concerning recognition, from the US and EU towards the Republic of Armenia and the Caucasus region of recognition of the Armenian genocide.

This analysis will, on a fundamental level, utilize the constructivist framework and the contributions by recognition theory, as put forward earlier in the theory section. This regarding the construction of a shared identity by analyzing it with the understanding of ideational and material forces by using the toolkit presented by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998) of the three stages (1) norm emergence, (2) norm cascade, and (3) internalization in combination with the understanding that recognition being dependent on a counterpart. Arguably, the constructivist approach will lead to a deeper understanding of the Armenian diaspora as a cognitive political entity and thereafter grasping the importance of recognition as part of lobbying for an outcome in connection to a counterpart, in this case the ‘host-state’.

5.1. An Understanding of Diaspora: The Armenian Genocide

Armenians have a long and rich history that is filled with European and Middle Eastern influences through historical occupations of their ‘homeland’. If our quest is to analyze the Armenian diaspora and how it behaves in order to achieve their sought-out goals through lobbying, we have to understand the event/s that directly affected the scattering of Armenians globally and established the norms, identity, and the issue of recognition. This paper argues that to establish an understanding of the Armenian diaspora we have to analyze the Armenian genocide. As, argued by Chernobrov & Wilmers (2020), the genocide can be understood as a defining event in the development of the Armenian diaspora. This being characterized by the language used by Armenians transferring the information about horrific events and injustices of recognition from generation to generation.
A little more than a 100 years ago the Armenian community was under Ottoman rule and consisted as a third of the population of Anatolia. This changed when Muslim migrants settled in the region and increasingly altered the Anatolian demographic percentagewise, decreasing the Armenian community’s position in the region. This demographical change was caused as an aftermath of both the Balkan crisis and the Russian-Ottoman war. This pushed for the ‘Armenian question’ to be considered by the Ottoman Turks forcing the creation of displacement and, in some cases, destruction of the Armenian community who believed in a unified ‘homeland’. Being part of the Ottoman Empire and with the Ottoman reality of fear of disaster striking the empire combined with the Ottoman understanding of cleansing the empire from the ethnic Christian minorities, e.g. the Armenians, Greeks and Assyrians, in order to avoid failure, the Armenian community was situated in a vulnerable position (Lattanzi & Pistoia, 2018).

These events of, arguably, ethnic cleansing was contributed by an increased radicalized Turkish nationalism that led to the 24th of April 1915, otherwise known as ‘Red Sunday’, commonly recognized as the beginning of the Armenian genocide. This was a start of even further mistreatment by the Ottomans towards the Armenian community, in such ways as humiliation, starvation and systematical killings. Other methods to scatter and decrease the Armenian community was the use of sexual abuse by Ottomans causing psychological traumas and prejudices within the community and also forcing Islamification upon members of the community, if they did not consent discriminatory action could be taken. But the most significant method used by the Ottomans in order to cleans the empire from Armenians was to eradicate their leadership as a way to further establish the destruction of the Armenian community (Lattanzi & Pistoia, 2018). As this type of oppression and genocidal ideas and actions, established by the Ottoman Empire, was going on for some years, mostly during 1915-1916, it is understandable “that what happened in 1915-1916 was indeed genocide” (Lattanzi & Pistoia, 2018: 22). Arguably, the Ottoman Turks tried to destroy the identity and therefore the community of Armenians. This as a way of decreased recognition of the group, establishing a counterpart that did not recognize and view the Armenians as part of humanity. As argued by Ringmar (2012) a counterpart is the need for someone’s recognition.

As Armenians were gradually pushed out of the Ottoman Empire from Anatolia to the Syrian desert (BBC, 2019), the diasporic group was on the horizon. This leading to the HPT understanding that the historical event of the Armenian genocide established a set of changes contributing to the construction of the Armenian diaspora. As this diasporic group was scattered around the Middle East and Caucasus region, in different nations, a dual shared identity occurred. The dual shared identity was created through integrational processes in the new ‘host-states’, being dual in the sense
that the Armenian community lived on but incorporated a new element to the identity, i.e. the ‘host-state’s’ one.

In today’s political climate, Turkey as the descendants of the Ottomans, denies that a genocide ever occurred. As the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide has become a controversial subject of politics, the Armenian community has established it as a fundamental staple in their identity. And as the Armenian diaspora has been scattered in multiple nations around the globe, the new generation of Armenians have established a transnational advocacy network, who is mostly focused on perceiving that the past is part of the present where the past traumas of the genocide contribute to a shared global Armenian diasporic identity (Chernobrov & Wilmers, 2020). This identity is caused, not only by the issue of recognition of the genocide, but also by a shared fear and hope that prevails, as in philosophical terms, argued in this analysis, being ‘the most substantial emotions’ an individual can have. The Armenian diaspora has had immense success in gathering support for the ‘homeland’ as the world has become more globalized, and the technological advances has made it possible for contemporary Armenians to connect digitally and establish what needs to be done in order to lobby for Armenia (Tölöyan & Papazian, 2014).

The Armenian genocide’s contribution to the Armenian diaspora, in the sense of identity and norms, is, arguably, proof of norm emergence. This being the first stage of the toolkit presented by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998). Furthermore, in order to enable the coming section of the analysis, with the American-Armenian lobby in focus, it is crucial to understand that the Armenian diaspora established lobbying in the US as a result of the US Immigration Act of 1965. This, therefore, created opportunities for the Armenian diaspora to advance to and within the US (Bolsanjian, 2018).

5.2. A Comparative Study: The Armenian and Israel Lobbies

As it is established what fueled the Armenian diaspora to become a diaspora, from being located in one region as a community to having to face the horrific events of the Armenian genocide by the Ottoman Empire leading to the scattering of the group, the next step is to analyze the Armenian lobby. This will be done by gathering data concerning the lobby group, how they work and what they want, contributed by the findings in the previous section concerning the Armenian genocide with the work of Contreras (2017) about the Armenian lobby. Afterwards, when the Armenian lobby has been analyzed, we will analyze the Israel lobby argument from the work of Mearsheimer & Walt (2007). This will be done through the three stages of (1) norm emergence, (2) norm cascade, and (3) internalization as a means to normalize a comparative study between the two. By doing so we will thereafter be able to compare and contrast the two lobby groups in order to establish the
power and influence they have. This will be done through MSSD where the Armenian and Israel lobbies both are concerned with their respective ‘homelands’, Armenia and Israel, that both are located in unstable geostrategic regions, the Caucasus and the Middle East. Also, with both being religious ethnic groups lobbying in favor for what they believe is in their ‘homelands’ best interest but differs in the respect that they want different outcomes. This as, previously stated in the methodology section, that MSSD “is based on selecting countries that share… important characteristics, but differ in one crucial respect” (Halperin & Heath, 2012: 210), but in this case exchanging countries to lobby groups.

5.2.1. The Armenian Lobby

As produced in earlier section of the analysis the Armenian lobby has been established through the transnational goal for the Armenian diaspora, that is the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide. As “the Armenians focus on the Caucasus” (Cameron, 2005: 88) and while “in the eyes of activist Armenians” seeing “…little difference between the Armenian genocide of 1915 and the current struggle for independence in Nagorno-Karabakh” (Contreras, 2017: 55) it is important for the lobby to focus on these issues.

The issue put on the forefront by the Armenian lobby is the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide and while being considered as one of the strongest ethnic diasporic lobbies within the ‘host-state’ of the US, the Armenian lobby is a clear legal lobby group within the American political system (Contreras, 2017). The Armenian lobby is not only promoted and supported by the Armenian-Americans but also by the Armenian government as it is crucial for the national security strategy of Armenia to maintain a support in other states that is in favor of them (Contreras, 2017). By doing so they are both able to maintain the ideational and material forces from the diaspora in other states but also to maintain an important geostrategic position in the Caucasus region and internally in the Republic of Armenia. This understanding of the Armenian diaspora being mainly concerned with the Armenian genocide highlights, as understood by analyzing the Armenian genocide, norm emergence within the group and its conscious individuals.

When Armenians were able to immigrate to the US and established lobbying in the new ‘host-state’ the creation of the Armenian Assembly of America (ANCA) became a tipping point for the diaspora. This tipping point changed the dynamic and instead of only focusing on domestic politics the focus turned to a more international/transnational field. The ANCA is considered as the most influential lobby group in favor of Armenia. This assembly asks and/or pressures current candidates, people who seeks to enter elections, as a means for future support once being elected. This is done through exchanges of recommendations and funding for political campaigns.
(Contreras, 2017). Arguably, by doing so, they establish influence that internalizes the norms exercised by the Armenian diaspora. This internalization of norms spreads throughout the Armenian diaspora within the ‘host-state’ of the US. As Armenian-Americans support the ‘homeland’ through demanding action from the US government for their causes (Collard, 2020). This stays true to the claim that “the Armenian lobby expects all ethnic Armenians to be loyal to Armenia, regardless of their citizenship or where they live” (Contreras, 2017: 132) and is a success story for the Armenian lobby. Arguably, the Armenian lobby plays on emotional factors, being part of individuals’ cognitive behavior, of the shared norms and identity that the diaspora entails and further internalizes a common goal of recognition of Armenians and the Armenian genocide. The lobby group’s play on emotional factors is not limited to the diaspora but also propelled on candidates that can realize their goals, this through ideational forces merging with material ones, e.g. funding for campaigns.

But with successes for the lobby comes difficulties. First and foremost, they are not well-represented on the higher levels of the US’ political system and lobbies better on individual state levels, therefore it can be a hardship for the Armenian lobby to actualize their goals on governmental respects (Contreras, 2017). This then proposing, through the internalization of norms and by using ideational and material forces, they push for the recognition onto political candidates, on state levels, that thereafter can influence the decision-making on governmental levels. Secondly, with the US being a NATO ally with Turkey results in limitations for the Armenian lobby (Cameron, 2005) especially concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide as Turkey openly denies it ever occurring. Thirdly, with Azerbaijani lobbying, being supported by Turkey and US oil companies, emerging as an opposing force to the Armenian lobby (Cameron, 2015) also adds worry to the aspect of recognition as Azerbaijan, just like Turkey, denies a genocide ever occurring and additionally inhibits the conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh. But even due to these three aspects existing “both ANCA and the Assembly have registered considerable success” (Cameron, 2005: 93) and through cognitive, ideational and material forces fashion a support within a ‘host-state’ for the ‘homeland’ that is an absolute for the survival of Armenia.

5.2.2. The Israel Lobby

In order to grasp the influence the Armenian lobby possesses on US decision-making, this analysis seeks to compare it to the Israel lobby argument put forward by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007). This as the Israel lobby is a wealthy and well-organized lobby group, being considered as the most successful ethnic lobby group within the US political system. This paper, therefore, argues that the Israel lobby argument can be utilized as the basis for understanding and comparing ethnic lobbying.
Before analyzing the Israel lobby argument, it is important to state that Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) comprehend that the wording of Israel lobby is used as a convenient description regarding to the individuals/organizations producing this group and that it does not include all Jewish Americans. “The bulk of the lobby is comprised of Jewish Americans who are deeply committed to making sure that U.S. foreign policy advances what they believe to be Israel’s interests” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 115).

As the struggles for maintaining a Jewish ‘homeland’ the emergence of norms was constituted through the Zionist movement. The Zionist movement does not only include Jewish Zionists but also Christian ones, establishing a further support for Israel (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007) as a state from other ideational forces than the Jewish one. This paper argues that these forces use emotional elements in order to get the outcomes they want, this can be, as stated by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007: 128), through “portraying Israel as beleaguered and vulnerable and issuing dire warnings about continued or growing anti-Semitism”. The main focus concerned by the Israel lobby is therefore the support for the ‘homeland’, i.e. Israel, and the recognition of it with Jerusalem as its capital.

The Israel lobby was not always successful as Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) argue. Imaginably, the tipping point for the Zionist norms was after the 6-day war in 1967 where the outcomes for the lobby grew in influential, wealthy and size-wise ways. This changed the normative dynamic for the Israel lobby in the US and the influence of norms spread from the domestic to international level as the US started adopting policies in favor of Israel. Nowadays Israel “receives on average about $3 billion in direct foreign assistance each year, an amount that is roughly one-sixth of America’s direct foreign assistance budget and equal to about 2 percent of Israel’s GDR” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 26). This proving the significance ethnic lobbying bring about and how a strong shared identity and norms can be constructed as a means of recognition and support for the ‘homeland’.

The internalization of the Zionist norms was established as the US-Israel relations grew stronger. This shows, as not only Jewish Americans strive for lobbying in a pro-Israel direction but also other groups, such as the Christian Zionists. The Israel lobby has had an easy establishment within the American political system as they do not have powerful and influential opponents that strive for the US to take a route away from the direction of pro-Israel (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007). It is important though to recognize that these opponents exist but compared to the Israel lobby are not as integrated and influential in the US political system.

Jewish Americans have constructed an impressive range of organizations who work in favor of the ‘homeland’ Israel. “Key organizations include AIPAC, the American Jewish Congress, ZOA,
the Israel Policy Forum (IPF), the American Jewish Committee, the ADL, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, Americans for a Safe Israel, American Friends of Likud, Mercaz-USA, Hadassah, and many others” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 116). The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) is a success story for the Israel lobby. This due to AIPAC’s ability in funding political campaigns and financial support in exchange for a pro-Israel favoritism which is rewarding for US legislators and congressional candidates and has influence directly on governmental levels (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007).

An important aspect to bring up concerning the argument about the Israel lobby is that they lobby for what they believe is in Israel’s best interests, as stated earlier, but due to their lobbying puts constrains on the ‘homeland’ and ‘host-state’ as the Israeli and US “interests have never been identical” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 355). This establishing that, nowadays, the Israel lobby is not an absolute for the ‘homeland’ and that the shared identity and norms, in this case, can sometimes differ.

5.2.3. A Comparative Study

After analyzing what the Armenian and Israel lobbies entail, this analysis seeks to compare and contrast the two lobby groups. This will be done in accordance with the data produced in the sections about the lobbies concerning their influence within the US political system. By doing so we will be able to come to a conclusion about the importance the Armenian diasporic lobby seizes. The comparative study will include (1) the comparison of the three stages put forward by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998) of norm emergence, norm cascade, and internalization in regard to the two lobbies. (2) The similarities and differences between ANCA and AIPAC. (3) The aspect of gathering support through internalizing the goals sought for as norms in respective diasporic group.

After conducting a comparative study between the two lobbies, through these three comparative aspects, this paper argues that due to the Israel lobby’s importance and influence on politics we can argue for a result on the Armenian lobby. Furthermore, by allowing this type of comparative study we will enable similar cases comparing the Israel lobby argument by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) with other ethnic lobbies in order to establish their importance and influence on politics.

When it comes to norm emergence, norm cascade, and internalization the Armenian and Israel lobbies both encompasses similarities even though it considers different contributions. The similarities concerning norm emergence surrounds the identity and norms built on the notion of recognition. Here they differ as the Armenian diaspora is constructed by the understanding of recognition of the Armenian genocide and the Jewish diaspora being constructed by the strive for recognition of the ‘homeland’ and Jerusalem as capital through the Zionist movement. When then
comparing the twos’ tipping points and norm cascades we can see considerable distinctions as the creation of the Armenian lobby contributed to changing the dynamic of norms from a domestic to international level while the Israel lobby’s change happened due to the 6-day war where the US took more interest in adopting policies in favor of Israel. Lastly, the internalization for the two lobbies is both understood as norms being internalized through demanding a pro-‘homeland’ direction from the US and respective diaspora.

As established earlier, by analyzing both lobbies, the ANCA, being part of the Armenian lobby, and AIPAC, being part of the Israel lobby, both being considered the most successful and influential entities within respective lobby group. Both ANCA and AIPAC is similar in the way that they both are pushing for decision-making in favor of their corresponding ‘homeland’ through appropriating behavior such as funding political candidates in order to found ideational and material exchanges for further engagement in politics. They vary on the respect that the Armenian lobby is concerned with the hardships of functioning on individual state levels within the US and not as much on governmental levels (Contreras, 2017). This, while the Israel lobby, as stated by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007), functions on a higher political level within the US political system and therefore, argued by this paper, enables easier access for integration of norms in politics.

Another consideration differing the two lobbies is the lack of influential opponents that AIPAC has in the US and thus being able to steer the political route towards a pro-Israel direction. ANCA, on the other hand, as stated by Cameron (2005) is faced with the US being an ally to Turkey and vice versa through NATO but also their performance being “inhibited by the emerging counter power of Azerbaijan’s lobbies” (Cameron, 2005: 93). This resulting, unlike for the case of the Israel lobby, a rougher road to norm integration by the Armenian lobby to the US political system.

It is then interesting to compare the two lobbies’ behavior in attracting support to their causes, this as it is crucial for an ethnic lobby to gather support from their diaspora as a means to internalize their norms from a domestic to international level through the ‘host-state’. One of the behaviors appropriated by both lobbies, and as stated earlier concerning ANCA and AIPAC, is the pressure the two put on political candidates through exchanges of recommendations and funding for political campaigns, this both being argued by Contreras (2017) about the Armenian lobby and Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) about the Israel lobby. Arguably, both lobbies behave in similar crucial ways in establishing support, this being done through playing on emotional factors, as part of individuals’ cognitive behavior, of the shared norms and identity that the diaspora entails. This shows as the Armenian lobby anticipates ethnic Armenians to show support and loyalty towards Armenia as it is an unsecure state (Contreras, 2017) just like the Israel lobby through portraying Israel as an unsecure state that is in need of constant support and loyalty (Mearsheimer & Walt,
2007). This, in both cases, is not limited to the diaspora in question but also, as previously mentioned, pushed onto political candidates through ideational and material forces.

As concluding marks to the comparative study between the Armenian and Israel lobbies, it is clear that they both behave in similar ways even though they are concerned with different goals and causes. This proves that the tactics used for attracting support works for ethnic lobby groups, no matter what influence they have on the political field, being on individual state levels or governmental levels. What is important to understand about the most crucial aspect of differences between the two lobbies is the influence they have on the US political system. This as a means to fathom why some ethnic lobby groups encounters greater success when internalizing their norms, as part of their identity, within a political system. Nevertheless, the Armenian lobby, in comparison to the Israel lobby, proves possession of immense political influence and power. This will be further established in the following section concerning the Armenian diaspora’s influence on the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide through lobbying within the EU and US.

5.3. The Armenian Diaspora’s Influence

As the Armenian lobby is mainly concerned with the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide and after establishing the opportunities that the lobby group achieves through appropriation of certain behaviors, it is arguably crucial to fathom the influence it has on the issue of recognition. This will be done by analyzing resolutions and statements concerning the Armenian genocide, as it is on the forefront of the lobby group’s framework, from the EU and US. This as the EU is an important regional actor for Armenia and includes all the member states’ stances on the issue of recognition. And through lobbying within the US, being one of the great powers of the world, the opportunity of recognition will have effects on world politics. Recognition of the Armenian genocide affirms that the genocide is recognized as a crime against a group of people. This kind of recognition shows comprehension of the UN (2008) convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, where it states that under international law genocide is viewed as a crime. Therefore, to further establish the influence the Armenian lobby possesses, and widen the approach beyond the US, will enable the answer of recognition put forward by this paper.

5.3.1. The Issue of Recognition: The EU

The European Commission (2021) and its cooperative relation with the Republic of Armenia is concerned with the so-called EU-Armenia Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement (CEPA). This partnership was signed in Brussels during the Eastern Partnership Summit in 2017, as Armenia is acknowledged in the European Neighborhood Policy and Eastern Partnership. The
signed agreement of CEPA grants a framework comprehending the importance of maintaining a partnership, between the two actors, improving and benefiting the Armenian citizens. Even though this partnership provides data concerning the Armenian relation with the EU, it still does not establish any commenting on the recognition of the Armenian genocide but gives us a further glimpse into how the lobby and EU works.

The European Parliament (2005) officially stated the Armenian genocide as a genocide under the resolution concerning negotiations with Turkey to become a member state. As an applicational nation, such as Turkey, has to fulfill criteria in order to become a member state of the EU, Turkey has a list to fulfill before being accepted into the European community. When, and if, Turkey joins the EU will arguably put strains on the partnership and relation between Armenia and the EU as Turkey is seen as the Ottoman enemy that denies the Armenian genocide yet to this day. As part of the resolution put forward by the European Parliament (2005) concerning negotiations about Turkish membership to the union, they call on Turkey to recognize the Armenian genocide. This as an essential part for Turkish participation within the union. Here the EU somewhat recognizes the Armenian genocide as a genocide even though it was directed towards Turkey as a reason for ending the denial of the horrific events, but nonetheless a recognition.

The European Movement (2015) being concerned with the EU, establishes a resolution regarding the Armenian genocide. This organization believes, as their framework states, in the assumptions about respect for human rights, liberty, solidarity, and peace and therefore condemns violations and crimes against humanity, e.g. genocide and genocidal denial. The European Movement (2015) recognizes the events of 1915 as organized crimes against the Armenian community by the Ottomans as genocide due to the definition on genocide by the UN Convention concerning crime of genocide. According to the European Movement (2015), this definition has been accepted by the European Parliament, in 1987 and 2015, and the Council of Europe, in 2001. The European Movement (2015), as an organization, encourages the EU and its member states to stand for European values and therefore recognize the genocide and push Turkey for recognition for the belief of recognition enabling reconciliation between Armenia and Turkey. Here the European Movement (2005), arguably, acts as a lobby in favor of the Armenian diaspora and the recognition of the Armenian genocide, proving the fact of internalization of norms and transnational advocacy.

The issue of recognition within the EU is surrounded by, as a supranational body with member states, different states having different stances on the issue and is therefore challenging to come to a proper conclusion. This forcing limitations on the Armenian lobby within these individual member states to reach the outcome of recognition of the Armenian genocide. Arguably,
verifying that the transnational advocacy network does not present the same success as its counterpart in the US, as analyzed in previous section of the analysis and will further be explored in coming section.

5.3.2. The Issue of Recognition: The US

The issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide for the US will be analyzed through three stages. (1) The House of Representatives, (2) the Senate, and (3) the President of the United States. This to acknowledge the importance of the Armenian diaspora lobbying on domestic to international levels of the US political system. An aspect important to state is that the US Department of State (2020) is devoted to sustaining and strengthening democratic institutions and economic growth within Armenia while, at the same time, strengthening this with Western institutions. This they do through treaties and agreements concerning trade and investment.

With Turkey being a NATO ally to the US, it is controversial for the US to recognize the mass killings of Armenians as a genocide. It is not only controversial due to Turkey being an ally, but it would also ignore the fact that the Turkish-American relations would become more constrained. But even though this is politically clear, the US House of Representatives voted vigorously in favor of the recognition of the Armenian genocide, no longer seeing it as a mass killing (BBC, 2019). Being one part of the powerful political entity of the US political system, the House of Representatives’ recognition of the Armenian genocide has a great influence on the rest of the US political system. Additionally, the recognition of the Armenian genocide by the House of Representatives to become an official policy, both houses of Congress have to approve the resolution and thereafter it has to be signed by the US President (BBC, 2019). The behavior of the Armenian lobby within the US, as earlier stated, lobbying on individual state levels pushes this type of trajectorial change of recognition from state to governmental levels.

The resolution of S.Res.150 declares the understanding that the Senate has about the Armenian genocide stating, on a basic level, the US approach towards the issue of recognition should be to commemorate the Armenian genocide. This through officially recognizing the Armenian genocide as a genocide and nothing less (Congress, 2019). This resolution does not only just recognize the Armenian genocide but tries to refuse association for the US government with any denying of any genocide, this including the Armenian genocide, and the reassurance of public and educational understanding of the horrific events committed by the Ottoman Empire (Congress, 2019). This continues the argument about the Armenian lobby’s behavior influencing political candidates contributing further establishment of the causes dear to the diaspora.
Lastly, before delving into the discussion section concerning the findings of the analysis, will be to analyze Joe Biden’s, the current US President’s, statement on the recognition of the Armenian genocide. Biden released a statement on the 24th of April 2021, otherwise known as ‘Red Sunday’ for Armenians, stating that “today, as we mourn what was lost, let us also turn our eyes to the future – toward the world that we wish to build for our children… the American people honor all those Armenians who perished in the genocide that began 106 years ago today” (White House, 2021). This, after Biden being previously opposed the recognition of the Armenian genocide put forward by Republican John McCain, additionally being Vice President to President Barack Obama who, as the Senator for genocide recognition, promised the Armenians a recognition but once becoming the President avoided the term of genocide during his years in the Oval Office (Contreras, 2017).

As the highest political position within the US recognizing the Armenian genocide demonstrates ethnic lobbying, no matter the political level, having great influence on the US political system. However, it can be speculated that this recognition was only partly contributed by the Armenian lobby influencing on state level further impacting the governmental levels, even the highest political position within the US. This, along with the understanding of a clear message from the US to Turkey, as relations between the two NATO-members recently has worsened as Turkey has improved relations with Russia (Tass, 2021).

5.4. Discussion

As a conclusion to the findings of the analysis, this paper will conduct a discussion relating back to previous literature in order to answer the research question put forward by this paper; ‘what is the Armenian diaspora and what behavior does it appropriate in order to change the trajectory of recognition of the Armenian genocide, from the local to global, through lobbying within the US and EU?’

The understanding of the Armenian genocide being the driving force in constructing the Armenian diaspora is clear as the study of HPT has provided a fundamental historical event explaining the reasonings of why and how it came to be. Therefore, the Armenian genocide created the Armenian diaspora, and its identity was shaped due to the scattering of the Armenian community. As argued by this paper and based on the argument about diaspora put forward by Berns-McGown (2007/2008), diaspora can confidently be explained as the existence of a group of people with a dual shared identity, from the ‘homeland’ to the ‘host-state’.

Additionally, the Armenian genocide produced norm emergence as the identity was solidified, this was done through the shared interest of recognition. The issue of recognition of the
Armenian genocide for the diaspora emerged, being explained through the concept of Diaspora Nationalism, as stated by Hilbrenner et al. (2008) being concerned with the existing connections between history and politics. This answers the first part of the research question regarding what the Armenian diaspora is.

Adding onto the fact that, as Ringmar (2012) states, a counterpart is in need for someone’s recognition, therefore contributing to the establishment of the Armenian lobbying. The CR through MSSD then, by comparing the Armenian and Israel lobbies, proves the importance of internalization of one’s norms within political systems in order for the influence needed for change of policies. Even though the findings show two lobbies with internalization on different levels of the US political system, it still provides an understanding of the essential behaviors utilized and appropriated by ethnic lobbying in order to achieve the goals concerned by respective lobby group.

This comparative study presents an answer to the question of the appropriated behaviors operating throughout the Armenian lobby as a means for trajectorial change from the local to global about recognition. These behaviors are exercised by the lobbies through cognitive, ideational and material forces concerning political influence, through internalization of norms, in exchange of funding political candidates and playing on emotional factors of the shared norms and identity, especially on historical factors, e.g. the Armenian genocide. This establishes crucial behaviors adopted by the Armenian and Israel lobbies, proving the possession of immense political influence and power. This further proved by Mearsheimer & Walt (2007) arguing for political power for lobbies being important for the sought outcomes.

Something we have to acknowledge is the beneficial takeaway from the Israel lobby argument that when investigating ethnic lobbying we tend to study it in a sense of lobbying for what is in the ‘homeland’s’ best interest. At the same time, it is interesting to examine how ethnic lobbying might have the capability to be contra productive to the interests of the ‘homeland’. The findings in the analysis suggest that the Armenian lobby, in contrast to the Israel lobby, is an absolute for the Republic of Armenia and therefore lobbies in the imagined best interests of the ‘homeland’, in this case, is not contra productive.

Lastly, the findings contributed by CA, through analyzing official resolutions and statements establishes an answer to the question about trajectorial change concerning the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide. This instituting the notion of requiring a counterpart’s recognition in order for our identities to be part of humanity (Ringmar, 2012; Lang, 2015). These findings show a transnational advocacy network as part of the Armenian diaspora due to its political involvement within multiple political systems, in this paper the EU and US, transcending official state boundaries as social forces. Arguably, the findings concerning the lobby within the EU suggest
limitations as member states differ regarding the recognition and therefore challenges a proper resolution even though, as a supranational body, it has recognized the genocide, nevertheless making lobbying for the cause less successful than in the US. This, as the US, through the power of the Armenian lobby, has recognized the genocide on various state and governmental levels, reaching as far as current President Joe Biden who holds the highest political position within the US political system. It is then clear that structural forces of governments allow the creational change of policies, as argued by Hermann & Hermann (1989).
6. Conclusion

This paper has enabled the comprehensive research concerning ethnic lobbying by analyzing the Armenian diaspora’s ability to appropriate behaviors in order to lobby for the issue of recognition of the Armenian diaspora. Introducing the general puzzle of how beneficial a deepened understanding of the Armenian diaspora and lobbying regarding international politics is as it has, previously, been largely neglected by IR scholars and decision-making powers. As a means to then gain a better understanding of the Armenian diaspora’s influence on politics, this paper puts forward the following research question; ‘what is the Armenian diaspora and what behavior does it appropriate in order to change the trajectory of recognition of the Armenian genocide, from the local to global, through lobbying within the US and EU?’

Firstly, this paper delved into existing literature about the concept of diaspora, ethnic lobbying, and its influence concerning policymaking. This further setting the stage for what gaps needed to be filled. As the previous literature was analyzed it was evidential that there exists a lack of deepened understanding of ethnic lobbies and diasporas beyond the Israel lobby, within the field of IR. As lobby groups, and generally non-state actors, have had increased success on the political stage, critically it is then crucial to deepen our understanding of these, especially the cases that has been largely overlooked, like the Armenian case.

Through the constructivist approach’s toolkit concerning norm emergence, norm cascade and internalization, put forward by Finnemore & Sikkink (1998), with the concepts of identity, norms and recognition intertwined. This gathered the necessary fundaments to actualize an analysis on the Armenian diaspora, as it is concerned with norms constructed by an identity that was solidified through the Armenian genocide and further pushes the issue of recognition of the genocide as their most prominent goal. By then analyzing the topic through the three methods of HPT, CR and CA, contributed to findings concerning the question put forward by the paper. This made it clear that the Armenian diaspora is diaspora created through the existence of a group of people with a dual shared identity, from the ‘homeland’ to the ‘host-state’, both in historical and current respects, i.e. the Armenian genocide and the issue of recognition of it. Furthermore, it established the understanding of the Armenian lobby appropriating behaviors in order to realize the sought goals of recognition, this through emotional, cognitive, ideational and material forces and behaviors, as part of internalization of norms. Thereafter, proving that these appropriated behaviors influence policy- and decision-making from the local to global, partly through transnational advocacy networks crossing state boundaries. As to achieve recognition we need a counterpart, in this case the ‘host-state’, to accept us into humanity.
As a concluding statement, this paper acknowledges that further developments concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide can change the outcomes and findings provided in the analysis. This, as the Armenian diaspora continues to lobby for the recognition of the Armenian genocide, on different political stages and within different political systems. Even though future changes might occur, the findings and outcomes of this paper provide a foundation for further scholarly deepening regarding the Armenian diaspora.
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8. Appendix

Coding Protocol

Introduction:
This protocol will address the importance of resolutions and statements made by the European Union (EU) and the United States (US), concerning the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide. This protocol intends to address the characteristics of all resolutions and statements provided and the unit/member submitting them. The content of the resolutions and statements will be utilized through examining and evaluating, the texts themselves, in regard to the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide to which extent the discourse concerning recognition influences proper resolutions and statements.

Processing Procedures:
The study deals with official resolutions and statements regarding the issue of recognition of the Armenian genocide from the EU and US. These reports (resolutions and statements) were sampled in the way provided by purposive sampling approach, as stated in the methodology of this paper. This resulted in six reports being analyzed.

A resolution or statement will not be eligible for analyze for stated (below) reason:
1. The resolution/statement does not discuss, and therefore do not provide, data concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide.

A resolution or statement may be considered for analyze for stated (below) reason:
1. It partially discusses the Armenian genocide as a genocide but does not exclusively recognize it as such.

Various variables:
V1: Recognition
This looks into the resolutions and statements, concerning the Armenian genocide, put forward by:
1. the European Parliament
2. the European Movement
3. the European Union
4. the US House of Representatives
5. the US Senate
6. the President of the United States.

V2: Political Importance
This specifies the importance of the resolutions/statements depending on the different political positions producing the reports.

In the EU:
1. the European Union
2. the European Parliament
3. the European Movement

In the US:
1. the President of the United States
2. the US Senate
3. the US House of Representatives