

University of Massachusetts Boston

ScholarWorks at UMass Boston

Graduate Masters Theses

Doctoral Dissertations and Masters Theses

8-31-2016

Security and Foreign Policy of Landlocked States

Samiullah Mahdi

University of Massachusetts Boston

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umb.edu/masters_theses



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mahdi, Samiullah, "Security and Foreign Policy of Landlocked States" (2016). *Graduate Masters Theses*. 399.

https://scholarworks.umb.edu/masters_theses/399

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Doctoral Dissertations and Masters Theses at ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact scholarworks@umb.edu.

SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF LANDLOCKED STATES

A Thesis Presented

by

SAMIULLAH MAHDI

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies,

University of Massachusetts Boston,

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August 2016

International Relations Program

© 2016 by Samiullah Mahdi
All rights reserved

SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF LANDLOCKED STATES

A Thesis Presented

by

SAMIULLAH MAHDI

Approved as to style and content by:

Luis F. Jimenez, Associate Professor
Chairperson of Committee

J. Samuel Barkin, Professor
Member

Joseph M. Brown, Assistant Professor
Member

Paul Kowert, Program Director
International Relations Program

Darren Kew, Chairperson
Department of Conflict Resolution, Human
Security and Global Governance

ABSTRACT

SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF LANDLOCKED STATES

August 2016

Samiullah Mahdi, B.A., Kabul University
M.A., University of Massachusetts Boston

Directed by Professor Luis Jimenez

Wealth and stability of the region have direct influence on the foreign policy and security of landlocked states. Landlocked states residing in poor and unstable neighborhoods, consequently, experience instability and have more limited foreign policy options compared to those landlocked states which are located in the rich and stable regions of the world. Besides those, two other factors, nationalism and the nature of export product, extensively influence foreign policy and security of some landlocked countries. However, they are exceptions to the rule. Wealth and stability of the neighborhood determine the direction and fate of landlocked countries foreign policies and security measures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PART I. INTRODUCTION	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PART II. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
A. PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH LANDLOCKED-NESS.....	10
1. Weak Defense Capabilities and Permanent Inferiority.....	10
2. Dual Vulnerability.....	11
3. Acting as Buffer State.....	12
4. High Cost of Transportation.....	13
5. Underdevelopment.....	14
B. VARIATION ACROSS STATES.....	15
PART III. INTRODUCTION OF THEORETICAL ACCOUNT	20
A. DEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	20
1. Foreign Policy.....	20
2. Security.....	20
B. INDEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	21
1. Region.....	21
2. Wealth of Regions.....	22
3. Stability.....	24
C. METHODOLOGY.....	25

D. CASES.....	26
1. Rich and Stable Regions.....	26
Switzerland.....	26
2. Rich and Unstable Regions.....	35
Armenia.....	35
3. Poor but Stable Regions.....	45
a. Bolivia.....	45
b. Botswana.....	56
4. Poor and Unstable Regions.....	63
a. Uzbekistan.....	63
b. Afghanistan.....	73
 PART IV. CONCLUSION.....	 91
 A. INTRODUCTION.....	 91
B. EMPIRICAL FINDING.....	92
C. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	95
D. POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....	95
E. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	96
F. CONCLUSION.....	97
 REFERENCES LIST.....	 98

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure 1. Western Europe map.....	28
Figure 2. Armenia and disputed Nagorno-Karabakh.....	37
Figure 3. The areas Bolivia lost to Chile in 1883.....	46
Figure 4. Southern Africa.....	58
Figure 5. Uzbekistan, Karshi-Khanabad airbase.....	67
Figure 6. The U.S. and NATO supply routes.....	86
Figure 7. Chabahar route.....	88

Abstract. Wealth and stability of the region have a direct influence on the foreign policy and security of landlocked states. Landlocked states residing in poor and unstable neighborhoods, consequently, experience instability and have more limited foreign policy options compared to those landlocked states which are located in the rich and stable regions of the world. Besides those, two other factors, nationalism and the nature of export product, extensively influence foreign policy and security of some landlocked countries. However, they are exceptions to the rule. Wealth and stability of the neighborhood determine the direction and fate of landlocked countries foreign policies and security measures.

Key words: *Landlocked states, foreign policy, security, power relation, wealth, stability*

Security and Foreign Policy of Landlocked States

PART I

INTRODUCTION

To what extent does landlocked-ness matter for a country's security? To what extent does being landlocked shapes a country's foreign policy? This thesis uses two factors commonly cited in the literature—regional stability and wealth—as independent variables to explore the ways in which these types of geographical contexts expand or constrain options for landlocked countries. It further analyzes how countries react to their environment and how, in turn, this leads to the development of strategies to diminish or curb any potential geographical disadvantages. In another words, this thesis aims to answer how wealth and stability of the region interact with foreign policy and security of landlocked states,

Besides wealth and stability, there are two other factors, nature of the main export product and nationalism, which to some extent determine landlocked countries' foreign and security policies towards their maritime neighbors and the whole region.

Answering these questions is important because landlocked-ness appears to be correlated with insecurity and lack of development. Currently, twenty of 54 low-income countries are landlocked and sixteen of these landlocked states are categorized as least developed countries which also suffer from insecurity (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 4). Of course, there are landlocked countries like Switzerland and Austria which suffer no real security problems and are high-income economies. Nonetheless, they tend to be the exceptions. Countries like Rwanda, Mali, Afghanistan, and Armenia, all landlocked, have faced lasting conflicts and insecurity which have played a role in severe security conditions of their respective regions. Lack of access to the sea places landlocked states in an inferior power relationship vis-à-vis their maritime neighbors (de Blij and Glassner, 1989, 389) for a number of reasons. First, it can make them dependent economically if trade in a country rests on the whim or capacity of its neighbors. Second, potential attacks, invasions or military turmoil in a maritime country disproportionately affect its landlocked neighbors because security alternatives are further reduced and their economic impacts are more pronounced.

Insular states are intrinsically more secure than continental or landlocked states (Mearsheimer, 2001, 25). Mearsheimer argues that "large bodies of water profoundly limit the power-projection capabilities of land forces" (Mearsheimer, 2001, 41) because it reduces the offensive capability of the opponent force by creating a natural defensive barrier for the country surrounded by large body of water. Emphasizing on the importance of land power and the stopping power of water, Mearsheimer believes that Sea-Power and Air-power do not determine the faith of wars, "Wars are won by big battalions, not by armadas in the air or on the sea. The strongest power is the state with

the strongest army" (Mearsheimer, 2001, 42). This argument shows another aspect in the security vulnerability of landlocked states. Thus, landlocked countries are weaker compared to their maritime counterparts and have fewer options when setting their foreign policies. The level of dependency on their transit neighbors, however, varies from one region to another.

The literature on the subject has posited two key variables behind potential variance across cases: stability and wealth. This is because landlocked countries that reside in neighborhoods that combine both of those characteristics, such as Switzerland, Austria, and Luxemburg, also tend to be stable and wealthy. In part, because there seems to be a spillover effect, and in part because richer neighborhoods are less likely to have conflict, or at least less likely to resolve their disputes via invasions or war. Therefore, the existing literature suggests that landlocked countries' foreign policies have three main characteristics: special policies towards the transit states (including concession towards the maritime neighbors), multi-directional foreign policies, "which entails refraining from joining exclusive alliance systems and maintaining cooperation with competing alliance systems" (Idan and Shaffer, 2001, 243) and promoting the transportation issue to the level of a priority in foreign policy (Mishra and Sing, 2008). The question which needs to be addressed here is whether this is the case for all landlocked countries? or whether there are some regional effects? If it varies, what are the variables in the regions that account for the foreign and security policies of landlocked countries in different regions?

As mentioned above, the location of a country matters in the power relation between a state and its neighbors, in most cases, putting landlocked countries in the inferior position. What are the causes of their insecurity? Which foreign policy

approaches make them stable and which policies cause instability? Answer to these questions may lead to solutions which would not only help the security of the landlocked countries but might also suggest policy adjustments that could help regional and global security.

In order to answer these questions, this thesis takes into consideration two main variables: stability and wealth of the region. These two variables divide all regions where the landlocked countries are located in four different categories: rich and stable, rich but instable, poor and stable, and finally poor and instable. Six countries from different regions are picked as measures for above four categories. The case studies are Switzerland as a representative of rich and stable regions, Armenia representing a relatively rich but instable region, Bolivia and Botswana examples from somewhat poor but stable regions, and finally. Afghanistan and Uzbekistan representing poor and instable regions.

PART II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Out of 42 landlocked countries, 32 are categorized as landlocked developing countries (LLDCs) and 16 of these are those with the least Human Development Achievement (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 4). Given these parameters, the existing body of scholarship on landlocked countries focuses mostly on the economic aspects regarding the relationship of landlocked countries with their maritime neighbors. In particular, the literature emphasizes the dependence of the former on the latter. This rich literature, however, ignores almost completely any aspect related to the foreign policy regarding their security of the countries in question. For instance, it is not clear that how landlocked countries respond to the regional factors which put constraints on their foreign policy and national security.

According to the existing literature, landlocked countries' dependency on their maritime neighbors, rests in four important areas: transportation infrastructure, stability, administrative procedures, and cross-border political relations. These factors make LLCs' dependency multi-dimensional. Based on the UNDP 2002 report, 9 out of 12 countries with lowest scores in Human Development are landlocked and no landlocked country, with the exception of European LLCs, is listed as 'high human development' (Faye, Macarthur, Sachs, Snow, 32, 2004).

Regarding development and economy, the current literature on landlocked countries stresses on the importance of the specific location in which a landlocked country is placed in. In other words, a landlocked country's neighborhood determines its

fortune in development because the countries in question are dependent on the transit routes of their maritime neighbors to access the international markets, use their infrastructure, and go through their customs and tariff processes (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 5). Thus, these factors make the neighborhood an important element in the growth of the landlocked countries. To illustrate this point, wealth and stability of the transit country have a direct effect on the level of transactions a landlocked country encounters with the international markets. Even if the transit country is wealthy and stable, the landlocked countries need to maintain a friendly relationship towards their maritime neighbors to win their goodwill. Thus, landlocked countries' need for their maritime neighbors' cooperation, forces landlocked countries to follow an especial foreign policy and show concession towards their maritime or transit neighbors (Idan and Shaffer, 2001).

The common theme in the development literature is the importance of landlocked countries' neighborhood. For instance, Dunne suggests that if Switzerland is a landlocked but a wealthy country, it is because the country is surrounded by a wealthy and stable neighborhood which has a thriving economy with modern infrastructures. In contrast, this is not the case for the landlocked countries which are surrounded by neighbors who have poor transportation system and in some cases suffering from insecurity (Dunne, 2014, 2). Hence, landlocked countries are not just affected by being dependent on their neighbors' transit routes, but also upon their security and infrastructure.

To overcome the landlocked status, there are three different practices that landlocked countries could adopt to secure access to the sea: river navigation, corridor or

a strip of land, and guaranteed transit lines. Navigable rivers as an alternative for landlocked states entered the international law debates in the 18th century. Navigable rivers were accepted as a gift by nature which shouldn't be limited by man's action. Rivers such as Danube, Rhine, Amazon, Rio de La Plata, The Congo, Niger, Shat el Arab, Mekong and many others are in this category. This right for landlocked states has been interrupted several times by maritime states. The bloodiest war in South American history, the Triple Alliance War in the 19th Century, for instance, had much to do with Argentina's and Brazil's blocking of the Rio de la Plata to Paraguayan commerce. Elsewhere, during World War II, Germany blocked navigation on the Danube. Although there are some protections by international law for legal freedom of navigation, it can still be denied easily by maritime states (Misra and Singh, 2008, 59-61). On the other hand, a landlocked country can benefit from this alternative only if it has navigable rivers. Many landlocked states in Central Asia, for instance, do not have a navigable river that empties into the open sea. Thus, navigable rivers can be an option only to a limited number of landlocked countries which have access to such rivers.

As mentioned, corridors are another window for the landlocked states to get access to the sea. Those landlocked states which can manage a cordial relationship with their maritime neighbors can have sovereignty over the piece of land as a corridor to get access to the sea. Or, states could get this alternative with coercive force. For instance, the Russian empire in the 18th century got such accesses to the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea by force. Landlocked states, however, due to weak state power and permanent inferiority (de Blij and Glassner, 1989) usually lack the ability to get a corridor by force. Another example can be Iraq which was provided a corridor in the

Persian Gulf. However, defense and security maintenance for corridors as an alternative is proven to be difficult (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 62). Thus, cordial relationship with the neighboring country, who agrees to give up a portion of its soil to its landlocked neighbor, is the prerequisite for getting access to corridors for landlocked states.

A transit facility is the third alternative a landlocked state can have. This alternative is based on the principle that recognizes the access to the sea as a "right" for landlocked states. International laws accepted in conferences such as Barcelona in 1921 and the U.N Conference on the law of the sea in 1958 emphasize this right. Even assuming maritime states are willing to provide these openings to their landlocked neighbors, transit routes can be easily closed by the transit country due to security and political concerns. Thus, maritime neighbors can use the closure of the transit facilities as a pressure tool against the landlocked state (Mishra and Singh, 2008:65). In such situations, landlocked states have few or no foreign policy options to use as a bargaining power against their maritime or transit neighbor. Among all these three options, guaranteed transit by using transit facilities of the maritime neighbor has been the most successful one so far (Glassner and Blij, 1989, 390). However, the success of granted transit depends on the goodwill of the transit state.

Those studies which are focused on the foreign policy and national security implications of not having access to the sea, similar to the development studies, emphasize the importance of location and neighborhood. Literature looking at being landlocked from a foreign policy and national security point of view suggests that landlocked countries inherit inferior geographical position vis-à-vis their maritime neighbors (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 55). Similar to the development literature, Mishra

and Singh suggest that there is no direct relation between being landlocked and insecurity. They propose that security of landlocked countries depends on the level of power the neighboring countries maintain. For instance, if a landlocked country is located among relatively weak states, the foreign policy of the landlocked state will not be affected by its location. Countries such as Uzbekistan, Mali, Chad, Central African Republic, and Uganda are in the neighborhoods of weak states. On the contrary, if a landlocked country is located among powerful states, like Armenia between Turkey, Iran, and Russia, they can sustain stability only if “[a country] practices proper diplomacy or the buffer function [is] non-functional”. Countries like Switzerland, Bolivia, and Paraguay are in this category” (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 56-57).

There are four important factors impacting landlocked states’ foreign and security policies: 1- inferior geographical location; 2- shelter belt or buffer states; 3- fewer foreign policy options; 4- weak national power and weak bargaining power; Thus, there are three main features of landlocked countries’ foreign policies: multi-vector strategic orientations; special policies towards their transit states, including significant concession; and investment in infrastructures in their port states. Although, these three features may vary from case to case, Idan and Shafer conclude that landlocked countries’ special policy, with concession, towards their maritime neighbors is visible in all cases (Idan and Shafer, 2001, 243). This conclusion doesn’t explain some countries’ foreign policies towards their transit neighbors. For instance, Afghanistan and Bolivia, as landlocked states, do not follow concession in their foreign policies towards their closest maritime neighbors, Pakistan in the case of Afghanistan (Hassan, 1964, 48) and Chile in the case of Bolivia. It seems that some other factors, which are important in determining the

landlocked countries' foreign policies, have been underestimated in this conclusion. To address this gap in the existing literature, cases studied in this thesis show that that factor is *aggression based on nationalism* against the maritime neighbor. This issue will be explained in more details later.

The effect of the region on LLC is the baseline for development and foreign policy studies of landlocked countries. All cited works gave a particular importance to the surroundings of landlocked countries. As argued above, being surrounded by poor and unstable region is one of the main reasons of being underdeveloped besides not having access to the sea. However, being in a neighborhood of powerful and stable states doesn't guarantee national strength for the landlocked countries either. In contrary, it puts the landlocked country in a more inferior position in relation to its maritime neighbors. The existing literature doesn't provide an explanation of how landlocked countries in different regions behave towards their transit countries. Besides being landlocked, what are other regional factors that influence foreign and security policies of landlocked states. In the existing body of scholarship landlocked countries are considered as neutral or reactive rather than proactive in regards to their maritime neighbors. Is that really the case?

A. Problems associated with landlocked-ness

Here are some of the main problems associated with the landlocked status of states such as weak defense capability and permanent inferiority, dual vulnerability, acting as shatter belt or buffer state of the region, the high cost of transportation, and underdevelopment.

1. Weak Defense Capability and Permanent Inferiority

Literature looking at being landlocked from foreign policy and national security points of view suggests that Landlocked countries inherit inferior geographical position in relation to their maritime neighbors (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 55). No access to the sea relegates a nation to the level of permanent inferiority. In the international relations arena, regional and global powers' attitudes towards LLCs make the latter 'shelter belt' or 'buffer state'. These two are the only role LLCs can play in the international relations (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 55). LLCs have no other choice but to adopt yielding strategies towards their transit or coastal neighbors. This power relation is visible comparing the foreign policy options of LLCs and their maritime neighbors (Idan and Shafer, 2001, 264). Glassner believes that "boundaries" and occasionally "existence" of landlocked states are decided by more major powers in the neighborhood (Glassner, 1970, 15). Landlocked states are considered militarily weak even in comparison to 'middle-rank powers. Furthermore, LLCs suffer from feeble bargaining power against their transit neighbors. Instead of power, LLCs have to use persuasive strategies towards their maritime neighbors. Thus, LLCs are constrained to keep their coastal neighbors happy in order to secure smooth access to the ports of the coastal neighbors (Glassner and Blij, 1989, 388-89).

2. Dual vulnerability

Dual vulnerability means that landlocked states are vulnerable to their own landlocked status as well as on the well-being of the transit neighbors (Mishra and Sing, 2008, 56). Landlocked countries are heavily dependent on their neighbors' infrastructure, cross-border political relations; neighbor's peace and stability; and administrative procedures (Faye, McArthur, Sachs, and Snow, 2004, 31). For instance, the poor

infrastructure of a maritime or transit neighbor affects landlocked state's trade and prosperity because landlocked states have no choice but to transport goods through the maritime neighbor. The same is true about political instability and severe security in the transit neighbor. Thus, landlocked states' prosperity is not only dependent on the stability and good infrastructures of their own but also on the well-being of the maritime or transit neighbor.

3. Acting as Buffer State

Mishra and Singh argue that landlocked states cannot achieve status higher than "shatter-belt" or "buffer state" in international relations arena. Such states have to either remain neutral or to align with larger powers in the neighborhood to maintain security. Otherwise, they will be annexed to the regional powers or will lose stability (Mishra and Singh, 2008, 56). Diehl and Hansel define shatter-belt as a geographic location which is troubled by regional and international competitions. Shatter-belt regions are usually not within the spheres of major powers, however, more than one major power have "equal footing" in the area competing each other's influence. Shatter-belt areas are twice more prone to war compared to other areas of the world. Their wars are lengthier with a higher level of severity and interstate wars are more likely to happen in the shatter-belts. Shatter-belts have three major characteristics: first, shatter-belt states are weak; second, the regions are fragmented; and finally, extensive foreign military and economic involvement or intervention are visible in shatter-belt areas (Diehl, and Hensel, 1994, 2, 7, 12, 23).

Glassner (1970, 10) believes that landlocked states are in action buffer states. Glassner, in his other work with de Blij (1989, 127, 236) argues that although

“buffer states can benefit from the intermediary role in trade, transportation, and communications, but are also subject to buffering from both sides”. They believe that buffer states are “areas of weakness” and are created to form a *neutralist bloc* and prevent conflict between stronger areas.

Shatter-belt effect and buffer-zone keep landlocked states under constant pressure applied by their neighborhood and major international powers interested in the region. These pressures push landlocked states, in the shatter-belts, to follow multi-vector foreign policies.

4. High Cost of Transport

Landlocked developing countries (LLDCs), compared to other developing countries, pay two times more for securing services for their exports. The amount that landlocked developing countries spend on export services is almost three times higher than any given developed country. This problem reduces landlocked countries' chance for competition in the international markets (UN-OHRLLS, 2015). United Nations' Secretary-General's report on landlocked developing countries for the U.N. 2015 General Assembly indicates that: Owing to their long distances from the sea, LLDCs face disproportionately high transport and transaction costs, which intensify their comparative disadvantages relative to other developing countries”. LLDCs, on average, spend 40 days to export, while maritime developing countries spend only 22 days. LLDCs in 2014 paid \$3,443 for import and \$4,343 for export compared to maritime developing countries who pay \$1,301 for import and \$1,559 for export (UN Secretary General Report, 2015, 2).

Collier (2006) believes that the amount a landlocked country pays for transportation costs depends on how sophisticated its maritime neighbor's transport

infrastructure is and thus landlocked countries are hostages to their neighbors. He attributes Switzerland's development to the neighborhood it is surrounded by and Uganda's underdevelopment to being dependent upon the transportation routes of Kenya, an underdeveloped neighbor. While Germany and Italy not only provide modern transportation routes for Switzerland but also supply their markets, Kenya doesn't provide a reliable transportation infrastructure and at the same time, it doesn't have a thriving market which Uganda could benefit exporting to (Collier, 2006, 55).

Some scholars have argued that distance by itself cannot explain why landlocked countries are poorer than inland parts of countries like China or Russia. They believe that besides distance, the cross-border issues and passing through another sovereign nation's soil is considered a key blocking factor for the prosperity of landlocked countries (Faye, McArthur, Sachs, Snow, 2004, 32). Thus, the neighborhood determines the price a landlocked country should pay for trade and transport. If a landlocked country is located in a thriving neighborhood, like Western Europe, it not only will have the opportunity to use its neighbors' infrastructure to export goods through them but also to trade with them. Therefore, in the case of poor neighborhoods, landlocked country is a hostage of underdevelopment of its transit or maritime neighbors.

5. Underdevelopment

Historical observation of Adam Smith in 1776 showed that "inland" parts of Africa and Asia were the least developed regions of the world at that time. Smith attributed this problem to the remoteness and geographical barriers for trade (Faye, McArthur, Sachs, and Snow, 2004, 32). Over two centuries later, destiny for landlocked states is not much changed. Landlocked developing countries are among the poorest in

the world. From 31 landlocked developing countries, 16 are among least developed countries of the world. Only European landlocked countries are considered as developed economies. While most of the non-European landlocked countries are located in poor regions of the world, European landlocked countries are located in rich neighborhoods with which they do a major part of their trade and seaborne trade account for a small portion of their export incomes (UN-OHRLLS, 2015). According to UN-OHRLLS report dependency on very few commodities for export and distance from world markets are among the reasons of landlocked countries under-development.

Landlocked countries are among the poorest countries in the world and 3 out of 5 poorest countries are landlocked. The average GDP per capita of landlocked countries is 32 percent of the global average and \$1,700 lower than transit developing countries (UN Secretary General Report, 2015, 3). Collier suggests that 38 percent of people living in the *bottom-billion* are from landlocked developing countries (Collier, 2006, 54).

The level of emphasizing the importance of location is equally visible in Adam Smith (1776) and UN-OHRLLS argument about the underdevelopment of landlocked countries of certain regions of the world. Thus, it can be argued that while landlocked countries are generally underdeveloped compared to their maritime neighbors, location can exacerbate the geographical handicap of these countries. This is true of all non-European landlocked countries compared to their European counterparts.

B. Variation across states

All landlocked countries face the previously mentioned shortcomings to some extent, but not all respond to it in the same way, which in turn mitigates some of

these problems. To what extent does that happen because of the regional context they are interacting with? Looking at the cases studied in this thesis reveals that not all landlocked countries are responding to these inadequacies in the same way. The first variation is the level of development of the region which can be translated as the level of wealth of the region. There is a big difference between landlocked countries located in the poor and underdeveloped regions and those which are located in the rich and developed regions. All European landlocked countries are examples for this argument.

The second variation across countries and regions is the stability of the region wherein a landlocked country is located. Armenia can be a good instance of a country which is not suffering from internal instability, however, it suffers from instability in the region. Armenia is dependent on two major routes: Georgia and Iran. While Iranian route is more stable, Georgian route is not very much reliable due to the enmity between Russia and Georgia. The Georgian-Russian War in 2008 fully cut Armenia's access to the Russian market and transportation system. Uzbekistan has a similar fate. Although the most cost efficient way for Uzbekistan to export goods to the European markets is through Afghanistan, instability in Afghanistan, however, deprives Uzbekistan from this luxury.

Afghanistan itself is an example of being the victim of domestic and regional instability. Afghanistan is not only affected by its own ongoing lack of stability but also by instability in the neighborhood. Afghanistan uses three main routes for international imports and exports: Pakistan, Iran, and Post-Soviet Central Asian countries. Country's main export route, however, is Pakistan. International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) and American troops used the Pakistani route for sending military supplies

to Afghanistan. This route has been closed several times due to the high level of insecurity in the Pakistani soil (Monish, 2012, 3).

The third variation is the nature of a landlocked country's exporting goods. The nature of export determines the level of landlocked country's dependence on its neighbors and the entire region. For instance, Botswana is located in a relatively poor neighborhood, nonetheless, it has a thriving economy and is an exception among all non-European landlocked countries which has secured upper-middle income economy status. Most scholars and international organizations attribute Botswana's success to the country's diamond industry. Because of the nature of its export, diamond, which is light in weight and precious in price, it can be exported by air transportation. Thus, Botswana is able to avoid the underdeveloped infrastructure of most of its neighbors and not to pay high transportation costs. However, Botswana is an exception among landlocked countries and thus, the nature of export cannot be considered as a determining factor for other landlocked countries.

On the contrary, countries exporting agricultural products such as cotton, in the case of Uzbekistan, and natural resources such gas and oil, in the case of Bolivia, cannot avoid their neighborhood transportation facilities. Uzbekistan, a doubly landlocked country, has to use railways or roads of its neighbors for exporting cotton. While the route to the Indian Ocean through Afghanistan is the closest port for Uzbekistan, it cannot use it due to Afghanistan's underdeveloped infrastructure and long-lasting conflict. Uzbekistan has to use Kazakhstan routes which are costlier due to the distance. Bolivia, to some extent, faces the same problem as Uzbekistan. While the country's main export is natural gas, it cannot export gas to Northern America or Europe

through the closest port in Chile. It has to export its precious product to the neighboring countries with a cheaper price.

And the fourth variation which influences foreign policies and security policies of most landlocked countries studied in this thesis is *nationalism*. Foreign policies and security measures of countries such as Bolivia, Armenia, and Afghanistan are affected by a high tendency of nationalism against their certain maritime neighbors. Although these tendencies root back in the history, these countries are still affected by it. Armenia's hostile relations with Turkey is based on the historical dispute over the mass killing of Armenian ethnics during the World War I by Ottoman military. Armenia's international quest for recognition of 1915 mass killings as genocide continues to be the main reason for its belligerent relations with Turkey. Bolivia has a similar attitude towards Chile due to a historical dispute over losing its coastline in the war of Pacific during 1879–1883. Similarly, Afghanistan's dispute with Pakistan over the lands beyond the Durand line, which was signed between Afghanistan's King and British Empire in 1893, is one of the reasons behind aggressive relations between these two neighbors depriving Afghanistan from a stable access to the closest ports in Pakistan.

In contrast to these three cases (Bolivia, Armenia, and Afghanistan), Uzbekistan has chosen a different path for its foreign policy towards its main transit neighbor, Kazakhstan. Although it had historical territorial dispute with all its Central Asian neighbors, Uzbekistan resolved its disputes with Kazakhstan with showing enormous concession. This is mainly due to Uzbekistan leadership's early understanding and recognition of the importance of Kazakh transportation route for the country's economic development.

While stability and wealth of the region are two main determining factors of the wellbeing and foreign and security policies of almost all landlocked countries, nature of exporting product and nationalism can also be counted as important factors in some cases. However, in the wealthier and stable regions nationalism and the nature of product do not seem to be a problem to the extent which prevents a cordial relation with the main transit neighbor. While these two factors need to be studied in more details, it seems like the likelihood of these two factors to influence a landlocked country's foreign policy and security measures is dependent on the regional factors of wealth and stability.

PART III

THEORETICAL ACCOUNT

After providing definition for the two dependent variables, foreign policy and security, independent variables, wealth and stability, will be explained.

A. Dependent variables

1. Foreign Policy

A general definition of foreign policy suggests that, “It is the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations... It is, in short, the focal point of an actor’s external relations” (Hill, 2003, 3, 5). Within this broad definition of foreign policy, the concentration of this thesis is on the external relations of landlocked states and how that is affected by regional factors.

2. Security

National security means safeguarding a nation with armed forces and intelligence from external threats such as attacks or intelligence influxes. It encompasses national defense and protection of geopolitical and economic interests (Holmes, 23). However, under the bigger umbrella of national security, this thesis focuses on the political security which is more about protecting the sovereignty, political system, and safety of a society. As foreign policy and security policies are closely related and reinforcing each other, in this thesis both are considered as two dependent variables in order to see how they are influenced by wealth and stability, both independent variables, of their respective regions.

B. Independent variables

As discussed, landlocked countries' prosperity and development are dependent on their neighborhood. Meaning, if a region is developed and stable, the landlocked country located in that region may benefit from the level of development and stability. In contrast, instability and underdevelopment of a region intensify the geographical handicap of the landlocked country more than maritime countries. Thus, because of the dual vulnerability nature of landlocked countries dependency on the wellbeing of the region, this thesis considers wealth and stability of the region as independent variables which influence the foreign policy and security of a landlocked country.

To define wealth and stability of regions, as independent variables, it is crucial to explain what the meaning of region is and how regional groupings are defined in this thesis. Thus, first, meaning of region and its limits are explained and next two independent variables are defined.

1. Region

Regional groupings in this thesis are based on the UN M.49 which is used by the United Nations for statistical purposes. In some cases, other academic groupings are used as well. However, this thesis focuses on the countries which a case study landlocked country shares borders with. In some cases, the influence and interests of major powers of the region or global powers on the landlocked country are measured as well. For instance, Armenia and Uzbekistan do not share borders with Russia or the

United States, however, they are influenced by policies of these two major powers in their respective regions.

According to the UN M.49, Afghanistan is in Southern Asia alongside with Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Uzbekistan is categorized as a Central Asian country with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan. Switzerland is considered a Western European country and Bolivia is a Southern American country. Botswana, another landlocked country of our consideration, is in the Southern Africa region with Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and Malawi. Armenia, based on the UN M.49, is considered as part of Western Asia alongside seventeen other countries including Israel and Saudi Arabia. Due to the large size of this categorization, this thesis will study Armenia as part of the Southern Caucasus region. Armenia with its two neighbors, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, make this region. The term Southern Caucasus, as a sub-region, is used by several academic studies and organizations such as the World Bank. While considering the regional influences on the Armenian security and foreign policy, Iranian, Turkish, and Russian roles, in the region will be studied too.

2. Wealth of Regions

The World Bank categorizations based on GNI per capita are used to distinguish between rich and poor regions studied in this research. According to the World Bank, countries with \$1,045 or less per capita are categorized as low-income and countries with \$1,046 to 4,125 per capita are classified as lower-middle income. Those with \$4,125 or above are upper-middle income, and countries with \$12,736 per capita or more are classified as high-income economies. Based on this classification, Afghanistan

is a low-income country in a poor neighborhood. All eight countries of the Southern Asian region, with the exception of Maldives, are either among low-income or lower-middle-income economies. Uzbekistan, a lower-middle income economy itself, is surrounded by Afghanistan, a low-income country, in the South, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, both lower-middle income economies in the East, and Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan, both upper-middle income in the West and the North respectively. Because the majority of the countries in this region are lower-middle income or low-income economies, this thesis considers Central Asia as a poor region.

Armenia, another case study of this thesis, is a lower-middle income landlocked country surrounded by Georgia, another lower-middle income, and Azerbaijan an upper-middle income country. However, the South Caucasus region is in the neighborhood of rich economies such as Russia, a high-income country, and Turkey and Iran both upper-middle income countries. Given the size of the region, which is comparatively small, and level of transactions with the neighbors of the region, South Caucasus is categorized as a rich region in this thesis.

Botswana alongside ten other countries make up the region known as Southern Africa: The Republic of South Africa plus Angola, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. From these eleven countries four (Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Mozambique, and Malawi) are low-income, three (Zambia, Swaziland, and Lesotho) are lower-middle incomes, and four (Botswana, South Africa, Namibia, and Angola) are upper-middle income economies. As the majority is with the low-income and lower-middle income, the Southern African region is considered as a poor region in this thesis.

Bolivia is a lower-middle income country, but the neighborhood is rich. There are four high-income economies in that region (Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela), six upper-middle incomes (Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Suriname, Peru), and two lower-middle incomes (Bolivia and Guyana).

And finally, Switzerland, a high-income landlocked country itself, is in the Western Europe surrounded by seven other high-income countries. Western Europe is considered a rich region in this thesis.

3. Stability

In this thesis, regions with ongoing conflicts are considered unstable. The South Asian region is challenged by three enduring conflicts with different levels of intensity. The Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan, which is categorized as critical level of conflict, Islamic militancy and Tahrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) in Pakistan as significant conflict, and the Kashmir conflict, between India and Pakistan, which is another significant level of conflict in the region are the sources of instability in South Asia (Council on Foreign Relations, 1 February 2016).

Three out of five Central Asian countries, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan are facing different levels of militant conflicts. The Islamic militancy in the Ferghana valley, which contains parts of all these three neighbors, and recruitments for the ISIS are major concerns for all states of the region. This region, besides the Islamic radicalism, suffers from weak governance and high levels of corruption (International Crisis Group, January 2015). All countries in the region are landlocked including Uzbekistan which is one of only two doubly landlocked countries in the world. Besides

internal sources of instability, Central Asia is severely affected by long-lasting instability in Afghanistan and periodic conflicts in the Southern Caucasus region.

The Southern Caucasus region is also considered as an unstable region due to the conflict between Russia and Georgia, and constant hostility between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh. At the same time, South Caucasus is also affected by the anti-Russian Islamic militancy in the Northern Caucasus region (Council on Foreign Relations, 1 February 2016).

According to the Council on Foreign Relations' global conflict tracker, there are no ongoing conflicts, of any level of severity, in Western Europe, Southern America, and Southern Africa. Thus, these three regions and landlocked countries representing those regions (Switzerland, Botswana, and Bolivia), are considered as stable neighborhoods.

C. Methodology

Wealth and stability of the regions are two variables which this thesis assumes may affect the security and foreign policy of landlocked countries. In order to answer the research question, regions, where landlocked countries are located, will be divided into four categories of rich and stable, rich but unstable, poor and stable, and poor and unstable.

Unstable

Stable

<i>Rich</i>	South Caucasus Armenia	Western Europe Switzerland
<i>Poor</i>	Central, South, and South East Asia Afghanistan, Uzbekistan	Latin America and Southern Africa Bolivia, Botswana

Foreign policy papers of respected countries, statements by heads of states and policy makers, and documents issued by the United Nations, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) are the primary sources for this research. Also, secondary sources like scholarly books and articles will be utilized.

Thus, a comparative study of these countries, tracing their foreign policies and how they are influenced by wealth and stability of their respective regions which determine the power relation in the region will be conducted. At the end, cases studies will be compared to each other and the conclusion will be drawn based on inductive reasoning.

D. Cases

1. Rich and Stable Regions

Switzerland

Switzerland, is the only representative of high-income landlocked countries in this thesis. This country is located in a rich and stable neighborhood. Switzerland, a small but rich country in the Western Europe, has been lucky enough to avoid falling in the trap of two World Wars in its neighborhood and managed to stay away from dwindling into the

power spheres of the United States or the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The country's foreign policy makers believe that "neutrality" as a tool has helped Switzerland not to get involved in the regional and international conflicts, maintain its security and independence, and expand its economic thrive (FDFA). The current status of Switzerland does not look like any other landlocked country outside Europe, however, this country's history is not much different from other landlocked countries. Thus, it is an example of the importance of the neighborhood a landlocked country is located in.

While modern Switzerland does not resemble any characteristics of other landlocked countries, especially of those out of the Western Europe, some similarities can be found between its history and some current landlocked countries situation. For instance, Switzerland suffered from bloody civil war in the 15th century and was used to be an aggressor to the neighborhood in the early 16th century. After defeat in a war against France, the "Eternal Peace" treaty was signed in 1516 according to which the Swiss was supposed to provide mercenaries for French wars. Although, Switzerland didn't engage in any war on its own account for more than two and half centuries, its mercenaries were involved in conflicts around Europe on behalf of others. At the same time Switzerland bleed from long-lasting civil wars based on religion like the rest of Europe did at the time. France continued to interfere in domestic politics of Switzerland and inflamed the religious wars there (Cronin, 2013, 59). This is another characteristic of a weak state in the neighborhood of major powers. Resembles Armenia, Afghanistan, and Bolivia to some extent.

Switzerland is the only case in this thesis that issues like transportation and concession towards neighboring countries are not found in its foreign policy papers. The

FDFA defines the objectives of Swiss foreign policy, based on the Federal Constitution, as to safeguard Switzerland's interests, independence, well-being and security. The FDFA attributes the country's foreign policy success in the areas such as peace building, prevention of conflicts and extremism, and advocating for a just international order to its permanent neutrality (FDFA, Foreign policy strategy and implementation 2016, 1). Its long-lasting neutrality explains the geopolitical role of this landlocked country as a buffer state among more powerful states.



Figure 1. Western Europe, Source: Geoatlas

Economic success. According to the World Bank data, Switzerland's population is 8.190 million and its size of GDP was \$701.0 billion in 2014. This country is among top three economies based on GDP per capita \$88,120 in 2013. According to the CIA World Factbook (2015) Switzerland's economy is 72.6 percent based on services, 26.7 percent on industries and only 0.8 percent on agriculture products. "The fate of the Swiss

economy is tightly linked to that of its neighbors in the euro zone, which purchases half of Swiss exports”. According to Switzerland's Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), although it is not a member of European Union, country's most important trading partners are the EU countries (FDFA, Foreign policy strategy and Implementation, 2016, 2). Switzerland’s largest export partners are Germany (18.3 percent), the United States (13 percent), France (7.3 percent), United Kingdom (5 percent), and China (4.1 percent). The Country’s import partners are Germany (28 percent), Italy (9.7 percent), and France (8.1 percent) (CIA World Factbook, 2014). The role of the nature of export products is visible here. As mentioned, less than 1 percent of the country’s economy is dependent on agriculture products. Being mostly a services economy and exporting to the wealthy neighbors are the two main reasons behind this landlocked country’s economic flourish.

Neutrality as foreign policy. Here is how land-lockedness determines Swiss' foreign policy. It has to be neutral to escape the domination of powerful neighbors. "Neutrality was an important mean of self-preservation in a territory surrounded by major powers". It is true that neutrality has become part of Switzerland's national identity and as Morris and White argue it is the most important reason behind the neglecting European Union membership, however, Switzerland became neutral in 1515 to balance power in the neighborhood (Morris and White, 2011, 107-108).

FDFA defines neutrality as when a power does not take sides in a war. Switzerland's neutrality is self-determined, permanent and armed" (FDFA, Swiss Neutrality, 2). The FDFA claims that external neutrality of the Confederation enhances internal cohesion because Switzerland is a multicultural country, taking sides with any

European powers in the continent may cause internal crisis. Thus, the Federal Constitution sees neutrality as a tool for protecting the independence of the country.

The FDFA describes the difference between law of neutrality and policy of neutrality as the first referring to the provisions international law which a neutral state should adhere when an armed conflict occurs between two or many other states. The policy of neutrality, in contrast, refers to those actions which a neutral state takes to ensure the credibility and effectiveness of its neutrality. Such action may be above and beyond the legal obligations of a neutral state defined in the international law (FDFA, *The Essence of Swiss Neutrality*, 2016, 1).

At the end of the Thirty Years' War in 1648 Switzerland decided to create a federal army of 360,000 men to protect its neutrality (Cronin, 2013, 59). One and half century later, after going under French occupation for 16 years, the Paris Agreement in 20 November 1815 recognized Switzerland's permanent neutrality granting its territorial integrity. The Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Portugal, and France were the signatories of this treaty. In 1907 The Hague Conventions introduced the rights and duties of neutral states (FDFA). Switzerland has maintained neutrality since then.

Cronin believes that a country should have four characteristics in order to succeed its neutrality: legitimation-either by Church or by more than one power-, challenging geography- which makes it difficult to occupy-, no strategic importance or not worth to sacrifice, but some economic value that major powers think worth the agreement (Cronin, 2013, 58). Apparently, Switzerland has all of these characteristics.

Besides these characteristics, was there any other reason why neutrality worked out well for this landlocked country and not for Belgium and Luxembourg? Switzerland

is in between two historic foes: Germany and France. Switzerland is repeatedly endangered by enmity among these two giant neighbors. To understand why neutrality worked for Switzerland and not for other European counterparts, Cronin argues that Belgium (1839) and Luxembourg (1867) also declared neutrality, however, both were deprived from having strong armed forces and their neutralities were guaranteed by great powers of the time. The Swiss neutrality, in contrast, had three qualities: being permanent, armed, and self-determined (FDFA, The Essence of Swiss Neutrality, 2016, 1). These distinctive features of Switzerland's neutrality enabled the country to maintain its neutrality during difficult times for centuries.

Switzerland's neutrality was *recognized* by international treaties and *supported* by its capable army. Switzerland didn't rely solely on the good will of its neighbors. Germany, for example, examined the possibility of invading France through Switzerland and not through Belgium (Stovall, 1922, 200). Switzerland had developed strong armed forces which made difficult for the aggressors to occupy this mountainous country. Luxembourg and Belgium both were defenseless and didn't have the topography to effectively resist foreign invasions. Thus, it was easy for Germany to occupy both countries at the wake of the World War I (Cronin, 2013, 60-61).

Despite the fact that none of belligerents invaded Switzerland during the World War I, its airspace sovereignty was violated by both side in a number of occasions. British airplanes were the first to violate Switzerland's space territory and German planes did the same. However, both offenders apologized each time after the violation. It doesn't mean that this landlocked country was not affected by the war. It was dependent on both sides of the war for importing supplies and exporting its productions (Stovall, 1922, 197-98).

Here dual-vulnerability on the neighborhood, as a characteristic of landlocked states, is visible in the case of Switzerland too. It was not only vulnerable because of its dependency on the transit routes of its neighbors but also on their wellbeing. Because their markets were, and still are, most important import and export partners of the country.

Switzerland's neutrality policy has changed over the course of history. For instance, since the end of the Cold War and the collapse of bipolarity, Switzerland has shown more interest in participating in international sanctions and non-military measures enforced by the UN Security Council. Switzerland policy makers believe that after the end of the Cold War the nature of security threats against the country's interests has changed as the conflicts in the international arena show more tendency towards intra-state conflicts. Therefore, Switzerland has participated militarily in a number of occasions to help international peace. Swiss' forces presence in Bosnia since 1996, in Kosovo since 1999, and in Afghanistan since 2003 are examples of this change in Switzerland's foreign policy. Switzerland believes that contributing to the mentioned international missions are not against the law of neutrality because the UN Security Council issued resolutions demanded international security assistance for these cases. Thus, the existence of the UN Security Council resolution changes the nature of conflicts from international *to measure to enforce resolutions of the Security Council*. In contrast to the above examples, Switzerland didn't participate in the 2003 US led war against Iraq because in the absence of a resolution by the Security Council, Swiss will not participate in any conflict (FDFA, The Essence of Swiss Neutrality, 2016, 2).

On the contrary, during the Cold War Switzerland didn't participate in military measures or economic sanctions against other states. Between the two World Wars, however, Switzerland, as a member of the League of Nations, participated in economic sanctions against those countries which contravened the international law (FDFA, The Essence of Swiss Neutrality, 2016, 2).

Conclusion. Switzerland does not suffer from most characteristics which trap other landlocked countries. For example, Bolivia suffers from historical dispute with its closest neighbor, Chile, and the neighborhood does not provide a very promising market which could dispense it from the need to export its goods to other regions of the world. Armenia faces blocked from two sides due to the historical dispute with Turkey and Azerbaijan and at the same time it suffers from instability in the region. These problems have limited its access to the sea and has no options but to show concession towards countries like Iran and Russia. In the cases of Uzbekistan, it suffers from instability in the neighborhood and being doubly landlocked and one of the most far countries from any sea port. This situation has left Uzbekistan with only one option: Kazakhstan. Afghanistan suffers from long-lasting internal conflict as well as regional instability and border dispute with its closest neighbor, Pakistan.

All these four countries are affected by regional power struggles among major powers of their respective regions. These countries face all identical weaknesses of landlocked countries such as weak defense capabilities, dual-vulnerability, playing the role of buffer states, underdevelopment and high-cost of transit. In contrast to these four, Botswana is an exception due to the nature of its export which is not dependent on the transportation routes of its neighboring countries. Nevertheless, as mentioned in the

previous chapters, economists predict that, as Botswana's diamond industry declines, it is going to be more dependent on the neighborhood and thus more affected by regional factors.

Switzerland does not suffer from most of above challenges. That's mainly because it is located in a rich and stable location. Even during the times when Europe experienced two World Wars, Switzerland, thanks to its armed neutrality, managed to not be burned in the war. However, one cannot conclude that Switzerland didn't suffer from the spillover of the war and didn't face the symptoms of dual-vulnerability. Its economy was, and still is, dependent on its neighborhood and all of its major trade partners were in war. During the war it couldn't have a safe and sovereign access to the sea. Nevertheless, but neutrality enabled it to stay away from the war.

Some other landlocked countries also have experienced neutrality as a foreign policy option. For instance, Botswana, during 1960s and 1970s, chose to have *ad hoc* neutrality in the case of liberty struggles in the Southern African region, especially towards its giant neighbor, Republic of South Africa. Because its diamond industry was not developed yet and it was dependent on the South Africa's transit facilities. Afghanistan was a member of non-aligned states and managed to avoid taking sides during the World War II. Its neutral foreign policy from 1929 to 1979 helped the country to maintain its independence and security during half of the Cold War.

The question that if neutrality is going to be the solution for landlocked countries' foreign policy is not addressed in the existing body of literature as a specific case for landlocked countries. This question needs to be examined by scholars. In the case of Switzerland, neutrality helped the country during two World Wars and the entire Cold

War to stay safe, however, during peace time, stability and wealth of the Western Europe region are the two factors behind the thrive of Switzerland.

2. Rich and Unstable Regions

Armenia

Armenia is a lower-middle economy with \$11.64 billion GDP and \$4,020 GNI per capita (The World Bank, 2014). One third of Armenia's 3.006 million population live under poverty line (CIA World Factbook, 2015). However, three South Caucasus states—Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Armenia—are encircled by three major powers, Russia, Turkey, and Iran which are relatively rich. There is no comparison between military and economic capacities of the South Caucasus states and the neighboring powers.

Geography exacerbates their vulnerability. Two of them, Armenia and Azerbaijan, do not have territorial access to the sea and all three struggle with territorial disputes, ethnic conflicts, and undefined borders (Shaffer, 2010, 52). Mentioned regional factors have influenced the foreign policy options of Armenia Furthermore, the unending conflicts in the region have afforded Russia and other regional powers strong leverage to influence and shape the direction of the foreign policies of the South Caucasus states and in particular Armenia. The region that this landlocked states is located is considered an unstable but rich in this thesis.

Armenia faces a historical conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh region with Azerbaijan which caused an inter-state war between these two neighbors in 1990s. At the same time, Armenia faces blockade by Turkey due to another historical dispute over mass killings of Armenians by the Ottoman empire in 1915. Besides having conflict with two immediate neighbors, Armenia also is affected by Georgian-Russian conflict. Thus, the

landlocked Armenia suffers from rivalries between major powers in the region, poverty, and instability in the neighborhood. These factors influence this country's foreign and security policies.

Armenia, a former part of the Ottoman empire, gained independence on May 28, 1918 as a consequence of World War I. Given the precariousness of their status, Armenian leaders thought that independence could only be sustained through external support, and thus, looked to cultivate a relationship with Western Allied Powers. They were right to be worried, their independent status barely lasted. In 1920 the Russian Bolsheviks took over the newly established country (Mirzoyan, 2010, 10) and annexed it to the Soviet Union. Only the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 returned the possibility of independence. In this way, the entire history of the country from the 20th century on--its creation as an independent state in 1918, its annexation to the Soviet Union in 1920, and her regained independence in 1991, were all the result of power struggles between regional, and to some extent, international powers. This reality is evident in the current foreign policy and security issues of Armenia.



Figure 2. Armenia and disputed Nagorno-Karabakh Source: *The Economist*

Foreign policy problems. In Armenia's National Security Strategy (NSS, 2007) the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and Azerbaijan's probable aggression, as well as Turkish-Azeri blockade against Armenia, are considered the two main national security threats. The first was a territorial dispute with Azerbaijan which began in 1993. The second stemmed from the historical hostility with Turkey over the killings of Armenian ethnics by the Ottoman military during the World War I in 1915. Armenia, mainly under pressure of Armenian diaspora, pursues international recognition of the killings as genocide (Mirzoyan, 2010, 1). As a result, Armenia faces blockade by both neighbors. Azerbaijan has blockaded Armenian access to the Caspian Sea. Turkey has blockaded the routes to the Black Sea and Mediterranean markets.

Therefore, NSS aims to introduce two main policies to reduce the negative affect of those two threats. To balance these threats Armenia has increased her dependence on the partnership with Russia, utilizing Georgian routes for transit as well as Iranian routes to connect with the international markets. At the same time, Armenia seeks to have a close relationship with other international players such as European Union, United States, and NATO (Galstyan, 2013, 1). Armenia, in order to not become too dependent on any of her partners, utilizes multi-directional foreign policy. She tries to balance her relations on the one hand between Russia and the NATO, and on the other between Iran and the United States.

As discussed, a complex layer of regional and international factors shapes Armenia's national security and foreign policy. It is not only affected by the antagonism in country's relations with Turkey and Azerbaijan and instability in the region, but also by regional and international rivalries over dominance in the region. For instance, the Georgian-Russian war 2008, the struggle between Iran and Turkey, as well as rivalries between Russia and the United States are examples of the forces influencing Armenia. These forces have influenced and shaped Armenia's security and foreign policies for decades. The Nagorno-Karabakh dispute with Azerbaijan and the historical hostility with Turkey over the mass killings in 1915 continue to be the two major security problems for Armenia.

Nagorno-Karabakh Dispute. The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, which involves two of three states in the South Caucasus, is considered the main obstacle against regional integration and has blocked the inter-regional communication routes (Shahnazaryan, 2006, 357). The roots of the conflict are historical. It began because the Bolshevik

government in 1921 decided to include the Nagorno-Karabakh and Nakhichevan regions within the borders of the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan despite having a population that was predominantly Armenian ethnics. This decision planted the seeds of a latent conflict between Azeri and Armenian republics to be out broken by the fall of the Soviet Union. On July 12, 1988 the NKAO (the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast) declared Nagorno-Karabakh's separation from Azerbaijan and in December 10 1991 declared de facto independence. While the Armenian government declared that the Nagorno-Karabakh is not a dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan but rather between Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh, however, the fact that many Armenians were fighting alongside Nagorno-Karabakh army vastly complicated the situation. The war ended in 1994 after Russian intervention when Armenia captured Nagorno-Karabakh and some surrounding areas-about 20 percent of the Azeri territory- including the Lachin corridor which connects the Armenian territory to Nagorno-Karabakh (Mirzoyan, 2010, 11-12). Since then, the status quo has remained unaltered and Armenia faces blockade by Azerbaijan and has lost her access to the Caspian Sea through Azeri routes.

The reasons behind reluctance in Armenian government to seek a solution for this conflict, Shahnazaryan argues, are rooted in the Moscow and Tehran's influence over Yerevan. He argues that normalization of relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan is not in the interest of Russia. At the same time, because normalization in Armenian and Azeri relations may eventually resolve the problems between Armenia and Turkey, Iran does not see it in her interest either (Shahnazaryan, 2006, 358). Thus the destiny of stability and prosperity of the poorer and smaller countries of the region, Armenia and Azerbaijan, is decided by the larger powers in the neighborhood.

Armenia is facing blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan and does not have territorial contingency to Russia, the country's largest partner. The Georgian transit route to Russia is unstable after the Russian-Georgian 2008 war. The only stable transit option for Armenia is Iran (Shaffer, 2010, 63). The closure of Tbilisi-Sukhumi railway and international economic sanctions on Iran are reflected in the country's National Security document in 2007 as national security threat.

Armenian simultaneous membership in the CSTO and Individual Cooperation Action Plan (IPAP) with NATO (Shanazaryan, 2006, 355, 356) shows country's multidirectional foreign policy. However, IPAP does not have the strength of a full NATO membership. This is in contrast with the situation of Georgia and Azerbaijan.

Turkey: Historic enmity over 1915 genocide. Armenia campaigns for international recognition of Armenian ethnic mass killings during the World War I by Ottoman military, as genocide. Turkey has refused to recognize it and Armenian government has been under growing pressure by Armenian diaspora to raise the issue in the international platforms. The Turkish alliance with Azerbaijan during the Nagorno-Karabakh war and the blockade of the border since then has intensified Armenia's physical and psychological isolation (Mirzoyan, 2010, 65). Despite several attempts to resolve the problem, the genocide issue remains as main obstacle in Turkey-Armenia bilateral relations.

During the Georgian-Russian conflict in 2008, Armenia lost one of her two routes to the international markets. Thus, the era of "Football Diplomacy" began. In an unprecedented gesture, Turkish then president Abdullah Gul accepted an invitation by Armenian president to watch the football match between Turkey and Armenian national

team in Armenia. This event triggered hope for a breakthrough in the historically hostile relationship between these two neighbors (Aras and Ozbay, 2008, 1). Football diplomacy, eventually, didn't work out and the land border between Turkey and Armenia remained blocked. Nevertheless, Armenia tried to show concession towards Turkey after it lost its transportation route to Russia due to Georgia-Russia war. This is an example of how foreign policies of landlocked countries are determined by need to have access to the international markets and ports.

Regional Rivalries. Besides the ongoing hostility in Armenia's relations with Turkey and Azerbaijan, another factor which affects Armenian national security and foreign policy is the regional and international rivalries in the region. Security threats to the Armenian national interests are imposed by both the power dynamics of the region as well as instability in the South Caucasus. Armenia is caught up in between powers such as Russia, Turkey, Iran, and American security interests in the region. Thus, Armenian foreign policy options and security measures are determined by the interactions between its powerful neighbors and great powers like Russia and the United States.

Armenia is located in the critical juncture of three major regional powers, Iran, Turkey, and Russia. These three countries have ruled Armenia in different periods of history. Their attitude towards Armenia still remains autocratic. The political history of Armenia is shaped by the rivalries between these powers. For instance, Armenian nationalism for liberation of Turkish Armenia from Muslim rule was formed as a consequence of rivalry between the Ottoman and Russian Empires during late 19th and early 20th centuries. This rivalry, which started in the second half of nineteenth century, after the alignment between Armenians and the Russian Empire during the World War I,

caused the Armenian massacre by Ottoman army in 1915 (Mirzoyan, 2010, 9, 10). The memory of that massacre remains to cause continuous hostility in the relations of Turkey and Armenia to the day.

Georgia. While being caught in between two foes, Turkey and Azerbaijan, Georgia remains as a vital corridor for Armenia to transport goods to Russia and the Black Sea. Unfortunately, Georgia is far from stable, and this variable plays a significant role threatening Armenia's national security and shaping its foreign policy. Armenia was affected the most by the after-shocks of the Russian-Georgian war in 2008. Because Armenia does not have a direct access to the sea Armenia has no other choice but to utilize Georgian transportation routes to access Russian markets. This war obliterated/diminished/severely hampered? Armenian foreign trade by closing the only open transportation route it had to the North (Galstyan, 2013, 1).

Russia. Shahnazaryan argues that Russia benefits from unresolved regional conflicts, weak legitimacy of the Armenian and Azeri governments, presence of Russian military bases in the region, and problems in Armenian-Turkish relations. He argues that because settlement of the conflicts is not in the interest of the neighboring powers, Russia and Iran, both, do not see formation of stable democracies desirable for their interests in the region (Shahnazaryan, 2006, 360). Thus, the foreign policies and domestic politics of these countries, especially Armenia, is formed under the influence of the neighboring powers.

Since the independence in 1991, Armenian politics has been influenced by the notion that Russia's support for Armenia is indispensable. The leaders of the country see Russia as the only force which helps the country to sustain stability against the pressures

from Turkey and Azerbaijan. Thus, Armenia became a member of the Russian led organizations such as Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization as well as accepting to host Russian military basis in Armenia since 1995. Russian military presence, after amendment of the 1995 treaty in 2010, is going to be for 49 years instead of 25 years. These (CSTO) (Grigoryan, 2014, 98-99).

In turn, Russia has used the fact that Armenian does not have territorial access to the sea as a leverage to influence Armenian foreign policy to not join rival organizations such as EU Association Agreement and stay within the Customs Union. Russia has threatened stopping Armenian exports, blocking money transfers through Russian banks, and not delivering security supports if war on Nagorno-Karabakh breaks out. These pressures put Armenia in a situation that not only lost the opportunity to join EU Association Agreement but also to followed Russia in cases such as the annexation of Crimea to Russia and in 2014 voted against the UN resolution which declared the Crimea referendum invalid. The later one caused strong antagonism in the European Union against Armenia, causing further isolation of the country (Grigoryan, 2014, 106-107).

The Armenian-Russian relation has been based on two factors: first, the Russian support to Armenia, and second, the geopolitics of the region. The first factor has positioned Russia as power which historically has provided protection for Armenia (Mirzoyan, 2010, 53). The examples of such protection can be traced back to the days when the Russian empire was supporting the Armenian ethnic struggle against the Ottoman empire and the war in Nagorno-Karabakh and the support Armenia receives from Russia to balance Turkey's pressure.

The second factor, however, has caused a dilemma in the relations between Armenia and Russia and the new realities in the geopolitics of the region. Under the umbrella of cooperation with Russia, Armenia has not been able to utilize more options in her foreign policy unlike her neighbors, Georgia and Azerbaijan, do and has remained heavily dependent on Russia.

Iran. Armenia's relationship with Islamic Republic of Iran, unlike her relations with her three other neighbors, mainly Turkey and Azerbaijan, has been cordial without any disputes over borders or ethnic conflicts. Since the independence of Armenia in 1991, economic ties between both countries have increased steadily and in 2010 it reached \$1 billion (Maniquet and Racimora, 2013, 4-8). Armenia has a special relationship with Iran and considers Iran as the balancer power against Turkey and Azerbaijan and a permanent alternative. Armenia uses this alliance with Iran to overcome the economic blockade by Azerbaijan and Turkey. At the same time this relationship allows Yerevan to not become solely dependent on her relations with Moscow. Iran is the fourth largest exporter to Armenia with 6.5 percent share and the third importer from Armenia with 9.8 percent share (Maniquet and Racimora, 2013, 4- 14).

There is a consensus in the Armenian political arena on the good relationship with Iran, because, as Mirzoyan argues, the Iranians do not impose her will on the Armenian internal politics and foreign policy (Mirzoyan, 2010, 107-108). However, Shahnazaryan believes that Iran does not see normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations in her interests and does influence Armenian foreign policy to prevent such a development in Turkey-Armenia relationship. In this view, a Tehran-Moscow axis does impact the political calculations in Yerevan not to seek settlement in the hostility with Turkey and at

the same time not to join the pro-West axis which includes Azerbaijan and Georgia (Shahnazaryan, 2006, 358). It is obvious that Armenia's dependency on Iranian routes enables Iran to influence Armenia's security decisions and foreign policy. A stronger presence in the Caucasus enables Iran to Weaken Azerbaijan in the hydrocarbon resources market in the Caspian Sea and to oppose Turkey and Israel's policies in the region (Maniquet and Racimora, 2013, 3).

Conclusion. Armenia is affected by the instability in the region as well as by the ongoing rivalries between major powers. Examining the reasons behind foreign policy behavior of Armenia shows that regional factors such as power dynamics between Turkey and Iran, Russia and the United States, as well as intra-regional relations between Armenian and its two South Caucasian neighbors, are results of the fact that this landlocked country is located in an unstable region with powerful neighbors. The rivalries between bigger powers dictate the foreign policy options of Armenia. National security threats are also identified by how those threats might impact Armenia's access to the sea and international markets.

3. Poor but Stable Regions

Bolivia and Botswana, in this thesis, represent Be regions. First Bolivia is studied, and then, Botswana.

a. Bolivia

Bolivia, as established in the parameters laid out in a previous chapter, is located in a stable but relatively poor neighborhood. Bolivia is ranked among lower-middle income economies with \$33 billion GDP size and \$2,870 GNI. The size of its population is 10.56 million (the World Bank, 2015). Resources such as oil and natural gas cover half of the country's exports income. Bolivia's main export partners are Brazil and Argentina. Despite being a natural resource rich country, Bolivia is still one of the least developed countries in South America with 45 percent of its population below poverty line (CIA, 2015). For Bolivia, sovereign access to the sea is considered as the key reducing trade cost and catch the development ladder (Dominguez, 2003, 19).

Besides underdevelopment and poverty, Bolivia suffers from



Figure 3. The areas Bolivia lost to Chile in 1883. Source: *The Economist*

identity-based conflicts between Andean indigenous population and an elite group, descendants of the Spanish conquistadors. A clear example of this pattern is 2008 unrests in Santa Cruz city in the eastern part of the country. The economic and political elite stood against the reform policies of President Evo Morales and stopped the gas export to Argentina and Brazil (Bluestone, 2009, 69).

Bolivia's main foreign policy problem is its historical demand to regain its coastline which was lost to Chile in the war of Pacific (1879–1883). Bolivia and Peru both lost significant parts of their land which had rich nitrate mines. This loss was far

more severe for Bolivia, however, because beyond a sizable chunk of territory, it also lost access to the sea (Van Der Ree, 2010, 213). Thus, the country's foreign policy is shaped almost entirely by its landlocked status and issues related to the regional balance of power. Because Bolivia is one the poorest countries in the region with a relatively underdeveloped transportation system, poverty in the region is not as critical constraint, as its own infrastructure underdevelopment.

Regional power dynamics. Boundary disputes in Latin America have been the main source of inter-state conflicts in the last four decades. Among these we can include the 1969 war between El Salvador and Honduras, the 1982 skirmish between Argentina and the United Kingdom, the 1995 combat between Ecuador and Peru, the 1987 clashes between Colombia and Venezuela, the 1978 hostilities between Chile and Argentina, and the ongoing unresolved dispute between Chile, Peru, and Bolivia (Dominguez, 2003, 18). Dominguez argues that despite the territorial feuds between South American countries inherited from the colonial Spanish and British rule era, there have been considerably less armed inter-state conflicts. According to his argument, regional balance of power, relative isolation from the center of the world power dynamics, and sense of belonging to one larger cultural, and possibly political, community are important in war containment in Latin America. He believes that these three factors are the core for peace in the region which have made the inter-state wars rare and short lived and at the same time keeps the whole area far from international wars (Dominguez, 2003, 21-22, 36).

In addition, Dominguez contends that when states give priority to development, territorial disputes become secondary and easy to settle. In contrast, if states prioritize their boundary and territorial disputes over development, it is more likely to have more

conflicts over territory. Thus, the grand strategy of states matters the most (Dominguez, 2003, 7). This observation can be applied to other cases such as Uzbekistan, Armenia, and Afghanistan. Uzbekistan understood the importance of access to the global markets via Kazakhstan, therefore, settled its territorial disputes quickly. In contrast, Armenia didn't prioritize development over historical territorial Nagorno-Karabakh dispute with Azerbaijan.

Chile. Bolivia lost its coastline as a result of the Pacific War against Chile in 1884, however, according to the treaty which ended the war, "Bolivia got access to the Chilean port of Arica via road and railway" (Armstrong, 2010, 3). Still, Chile has deciding power over Bolivia's transportations through its soil which forces Bolivia to trade with Brazil and Argentina. Unfortunately for the country, its exports are not appealing in these two countries (Armstrong, 2010, 3).

Being geographically central located Bolivia has benefited from its location and is not much affected by the transit routes of the neighboring countries (Sachs and others, 2010, 44). Nonetheless, the historical tension with the closest maritime neighbor, Chile, has cost delays in gas exports via Chilean ports (Sachs and others, 46). Although the regional environment and neighboring countries' infrastructures are adequate, domestic underdevelopment of Bolivia and Paraguay prevent both countries from taking advantage of their neighbor's infrastructure capacity. While Bolivia has not been much affected by instability in the region, it has definitely been affected by relatively hostile relations with its neighbors. For instance, although it was in Bolivia's interest to export natural gas to the United States through Chilean ports, domestic politics in Bolivia triggered large-scale protests in 2003 against using Chilean ports due to the historical enmity. That crisis

eventually ousted Bolivian President Sanchez de Lozada (Van Der Ree, 2010, 213). In 2001 Bolivian civil society and opposition parties boldly condemned the negotiations between the Bolivian government and Chile over exporting gas via Chilean territory. The protests mobilized by the civil society caused 60 deaths and eventually ousted president Sanchez de Lozada in 2003. The new government held a referendum and Bolivians voted against exporting gas through Chilean territory. Bolivian new president Carlos Mesa (2003-2005) offered gas to Chile if Chile guaranteed sovereign access for Bolivia to the sea. However, he couldn't complete his term, due to domestic splits. The next president Evo Morales (2006-present) started a trust-building dialogue with Chile (Wehner, 2011, 37). However, president Morales came to power using a nationalistic rhetoric which was mainly directed against Chile, he managed to reduce anti-Chilean sentiments in Bolivia with reopening the negotiations (Van Der Ree, 2009, 219). This started a new era in the relationship between two countries.

Morales, a leftist President, created a new domestic foe to replace Chile in internal discourse--the liberal market and the elite who supported it. This socialistic approach, simultaneously, reduced the enmity against Chile and increased the regional support for the Bolivian question for access to the sea. Countries like Venezuela, Uruguay, and Ecuador- all with strong left movements, have supported Bolivia, a socialist partner, against neoliberal Chile. Thus, President Morales was able to invite his Chilean counterpart to his inauguration ceremony in 2006 and, be invited in turn to Chilean president's Michelle Bachelet inauguration without much of a political cost. Indeed, it was the first time these two countries attended each other's inaugurations in over 50

years. During 2006-2007 period the leaders of Bolivia and Chile met each other nine times (Wehner, 2011, 43-44).

The Day of the Sea was usually utilized as a chance to express anti-Chilean statements, a way to unify the nation behind the demand for sovereign access to the sea. However, president Morales, in 2008, used the day to stress on improvements in the two neighbors' relations: "What we have to say with all sincerity is that we have established an important basis for developing mutual trust from pueblo to pueblo and from government to government with our neighbour brother, the Republic of Chile. I understand that to solve any issue, be it national, familial or international, with our neighbors, mutual trust is the most important aspect. Trust between the social forces of Bolivia and Chile, trust between the military forces of Bolivia and those of Chile. We acknowledged that last year, for the first time in history, Chile's army paid tribute to Mr. Eduardo Abaroa. These are important steps and clear signs that these two countries want to solve a historical problem, the issue of the sea" (Wehner, 2011, 46-47).

As a result of the trust building process that began with the inauguration of Evo Morales' presidency, Bolivia got the right to import from Iquique harbor ports of Chile since 2008. Bolivia, however, still demands a sovereign outlet to the sea from Chile. At the same time, Wehner argues that the decline in president Morales' popularity in Bolivia has forced him to re-initiate anti-Chilean narrative in the domestic discourse which eventually affects country's foreign policy stance. Such stances include president Morales' willingness to present the Bolivian case to the International Court at The Hague. Chile's reaction to such demand has always been that it is not negotiable (Wehner, 2011, 48). The most recent development on the issue is that the Bolivian legal team of maritime

advisers has submitted Bolivia's lawsuit to the International Court of Justice at The Hague demanding that "Chile has an obligation to negotiate an agreement that grants Bolivia a sovereign access to the Pacific Ocean" (Bolivian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). This is an illustration on the securitization of the access to the sea issue in Bolivia's domestic politics. Although the trust building process which started in 2006 is not completely stopped, however, it can be reversed as the strong enmity sentiment amongst publics towards the other country still exist and politicians may get tempted to utilize it to gain popular support, as it has happened in the history of these neighbors.

Landlocked-ness forces Bolivia to trade mainly with its immediate neighbors. For instance, Brazil is Bolivia's largest export market which receives 42 percent of Bolivian exports (Armstrong, 2010, 3). Bolivian exports to Chile in 2002 amounted \$23 million while Chilean exports to Bolivia was \$14 million in the same year. The extreme imbalance in trade between Chile and Bolivia, in the favor of Chile, is attributed to the fact that Bolivia has lost its coastline to Chile and now Bolivia has no other option but to be exploited by its immediate neighbors including Chile (Van Der Ree, 2010, 214).

Although Bolivia signed a treaty in 1904 with Chile accepting the status quo of the border between two countries, the hope for re-achieving the lost coastline didn't disappear from Bolivian nationalistic discourse. In 1978, it caused breaking diplomatic relations between these two countries. In 2004 when the 100 anniversary of the peace treaty was close, this discourse regained momentum (Van De Ree, 2010, 216). A similar peace treaty was signed between Chile and Peru in 1929 and another in 1950 to settle the conflict over maritime demarcation between the two neighbors. Still, Peru has not been

satisfied by those treaties. In 2005, for instance, Peru introduced a new proposal which would allow Peru to gain control over 40,000 square kilometers of sea.

Chile's reaction to these territorial claims by its northern neighbors has been emphasizing that there is not an unsettled issue over territory with Bolivia and Peru. Chile argues that both issues, with Bolivia and Peru, were settled in 1904 and 1929 within bilateral treaties framework. President Ricardo Lagos of Chile, in 2014 said that "There exist no pending issues of sovereignty... This matter has been resolved in treaty we have signed over a century ago" (Van Der Ree, 2010, 216-17). Chile has constructed a legalistic position for itself. As far as the Chileans are concerned, there is nothing to negotiate, the matter is settled law.

Latin American leaders have not welcomed Chile's legalistic argument, especially concerning Bolivia's claim for access to the sea. Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela have shown support of Bolivia. The late Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez, for instance, openly expressed his wish to 'take a swim in the Bolivian sea' (Van Der Ree, 2010, 216-17). Bolivia has responded to Chile's legalistic approach with appealing to the Latin American summit in 2004. In the same year, Peru appealed to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague (Van Der Ree, 2010, 217).

Besides the historical desire for regaining territorial access to the Pacific Ocean, Bolivians think that access to the sea would enable them to reduce their trade dependency on Brazil and other neighbors by exporting oil and gas to other nations in the Pacific. Bolivia has higher amounts of oil and natural gas reserves compared to Chile and Peru. However, it cannot compete with them in extraction and export, due to the landlockedness (Armstrong, 2010, 4).

Bolivia finds itself in a difficult position because it not only should convince Chile to give a portion of disputed land to Bolivia, but also should encourage Peru to not to oppose such an agreement. Thus, Bolivia is affected by the spillover of the problem between Peru and Chile. Peru has offered a 1.4 square mile patch of sand that Bolivia will lease from Peru for 99 years. This offer was a diplomatic act by Peru to get closer to Bolivia and pressure Chile in the regional and international arenas to give up some territory (Armstrong, 2010, 7). President Morales during signing the deal with Peruvian president Alan García, said “This opens the door for Bolivians to have an international port, to the use of the ocean for global trade and for Bolivian products to have better access to global markets... Bolivia, sooner or later, will return to the sea” (Carroll, 2010). However, Bolivia can use this port as duty free space and will not have sovereign authority over it. This situation doesn’t satisfy Bolivian territorial claims against Chile.

Argentina. Bolivia's has enormous natural gas reserves—second only to Venezuela in South America. In 1958, Bolivia wanted to build a pipeline to export gas to Brazil but that project didn't succeed due to Brazil's economic shortcomings. Thus, Bolivia's ambitious project to build the first continental pipeline was delayed until 1972 when it built the pipeline with Argentina to export natural gas to the later (Stone, 2011, 63).

Besides Argentina's domestic need for gas consumption, Buenos Aires was interested in having more influence and form alliance with Bolivia for regional geopolitical rivalries, especially against Chile (Stone, 2001, 64). These issues underline another aspect of the geopolitics of the region where Bolivia is located. Brazil was unhappy with the level of influence Argentina was enjoying by exploring and importing

Bolivian gas. Thus, Brazil entered the race and signed a contract of 2.5 bcm per year in 1974 and then increased to 4.1 bcm per year in 1978. Public opinion did not support these contracts, however, as the promises of the deal with Argentina were not delivered and their lives were not changed. In that way, populist politicians who were not happy from the deal with Brazil, forced the government to stop exporting gas to Brazil. Argentina, which had no competitors, continued to import Bolivian gas with low price until the end of the 1980s and didn't renew the contract in 1990s. Argentina, after exploring its own natural gas in the 1990s, started exporting gas to Chile. In 2000, it completely stopped importing gas from Bolivia. Bolivia, desperate for a new market, approached Brazil again and the new pipeline began to construct in 1997 (Stone, 2011, 66-68). Landlocked-ness was squeezing Bolivia from all sides. Given that exporting to other continents would require passing through Chile or Peru's territories, it had to either to export underpriced gas to its giant neighbors—Brazil and Argentina—or not to export at all. Under these circumstances, president Sanchez of Bolivia decided to export gas through Chile because the Peruvian route would cost between \$300 to \$600 million more than Chilean route (Stone, 2011, 66). But as previously discussed, this decision led to widespread protests which eventually ousted president Sanchez.

Brazil. Brazil initiated a mid-range political institution under the Union of South American States (UNASUR) to pursue a joined security agenda to face mutual security threats such as organized crime and violent non-state actors. This new regional order would enable Brazil to lead the region and exclude the United States from regional power dynamics. Brazil's growing economy—now one of the 10 largest economies in the world—made this possible, while United States' efforts to the end of the Cold War to build a

hemispheric security forum which would unite the Latin America and the United States, didn't pay off. Similarly, Venezuelan former president Hugo Chavez efforts to create new regional security order under "Bolivarian alliance" of states to balance United States' power in the region didn't succeed (Trinkunas, 2013, 83).

Trinkunas argue that the United States has lost influence over regional security issues in the last decade. The fact that South America was not much affected by the global financial crisis enabled states like Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela to lead the region towards new agendas which does not give much room to the United States. Brazil, as a regional major power, took the lead in solving Bolivia's separatism crisis in 2008. The UNASUR and the South American Defense Council (CDS) platforms to manage this crisis and used its political and economic leverage (Trinkunas, 2013,84- 90). Therefore, Brazil has been executing a more active foreign policy in the region and has stand alongside Bolivia including supporting Bolivian cause against Chile. On the other hand, the fact that 29.8 percent of Bolivian exports go to Brazil (CIA, World Factbook, 2016) gives Brazil leverage over Bolivia. Bolivia does not have enough trading partners to balance its trade with Brazil.

Conclusion. Bolivia, although rich with natural resources, suffers from underdevelopment. This underdevelopment impacts country's security and foreign policy. Landlocked-ness not only has deprived Bolivia from easy access to international markets but also has caused a historical enmity towards its closest neighbor, Chile. This hatred has triggered a popular anti-Chilean nationalism which is ready to prioritize historical disputes over country's development. Politicians and leaders have used this sentiment to securitize the dispute with Chile and build a domestic support for their agendas. In a

number of occasions, this populist narrative overthrew governments who tried to find a solution for the dispute.

But on the other hand, it is also true that not having sovereign access to the sea is the reason why Bolivia is poorer than Chile or Peru, although, these two neighbors do not have as much natural resources as Bolivia does. However, Chile and Peru are better off mainly because they have free access to the sea and thus to the international markets. Bolivia has got few trade options and constrained to do business with few immediate neighbors, mainly with Brazil and Argentina. This creates a vicious cycle. Bolivia is poorer than it would otherwise be because it is landlocked and because it is landlocked, it cannot find a development strategy to take advantage even of the relative stability and development of its immediate neighbors.

Bolivia is among those landlocked countries which are located in stable but relatively poor neighborhoods. Bolivia's foreign policy is more affected by its landlocked status, domestic poverty and underdevelopment. Unlike, Idan and Shaffer's (2011) argument about concession in landlocked states' foreign policies towards their maritime neighbors, Bolivia has a hostile relationship with Chile, Bolivia's closest transport route to the Sea. Thus, it can be argued that besides trade and transportation, there are other factors which affect Landlocked states' foreign policies, like nationalism and national identity. This factor will be examined later in more details in Afghanistan's case.

b. Botswana

Botswana is considered a development success story. In half a century, it managed to jump from a low-income country with \$70 GDP per capita in 1966 to \$3000 in 2000 and \$7240 in 2015 (The World Bank, 2015). In 1960s, Botswana was considered a

"hostage" of South Africa, because it was heavily dependent on that country's transportation routes and had few trading partners (Neimann, 1993, 1). Thanks to the diamond export industry, Botswana has seen a steady GDP growth of 5 percent annually in the last decade, placing the country amongst the upper-middle-income economies (The World Bank, Overview, 2015), a rare status for non-European Landlocked states. This chapter examines how diamond industry reduced Botswana's dependence on its neighborhood and shaped Botswana's foreign policy and security measures in the past 6 decades.

An Exceptional Landlocked State. Botswana is an exceptional case among landlocked countries in the sense that it has a higher human development level compared to its neighbors. This is the case mainly because the maritime neighbors- Angola and Mozambique- are drowned in long-lasting civil wars while Botswana enjoys domestic stability and relatively strong infrastructure and is not dependent on the transit routes of either of those countries. Instead, Botswana's economy is heavily dependent on the export of diamonds—the precious stones account for 84% of the country's exports—a commodity which has high value and is light in weight and thus can be transported as plane cargo. This happy state of affairs means that the Botswanan economy is not hostage to the vicissitudes of its maritime neighbors. (Faye, McArthur, Sachs, and Snow, 2004, 44-55).

Chowdhury and Erdenebileg (2006) attribute Botswana's economic success to its good governance, good relations with the maritime neighbors, especially South Africa, and good regional transit transport agreement (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 59). Collier believes that Botswana did well economically because it developed a good

management for its natural resources, especially diamonds. Botswana was fortunate enough to be resource rich and equally fortunate not to fall in resource trap (Collier, 2007, 73).



Figure 4. Southern Africa

The above notwithstanding, Botswana's economy has been shocked by fluctuations in the global markets and declining demand in rich countries to buy diamonds in recent years. At the same time, non-mining sector growth has declined from 9.4 percent in 2011 to 4.3 percent in 2014 (The World Bank, Overview, 2015). Although Botswana has faced enormous success since independence, it has not diversified its economy and remains over-dependent on the diamond as single-export. One of the results of over dependence on diamonds export is the low employment rate (Taylor and Mokhawa, 2003, 263) and this issue has caused an increasing income inequality in

Botswana. In other words, although widely successful, the particular configuration of circumstances behind its prosperity might not be sustainable in the long run.

Like many other single-export dependent countries, Botswana faces problems when demand for its diamonds in the international markets declines. The World Bank's estimations show that Botswana's diamond production has already reached its maximum level. Although, the industry might remain stable for another generation, being so dependent on a single-export the concomitant decline in the global markets for diamonds poses serious questions about the future of the country's economy if it is not diversified. The problem is that as Botswana's reliance on diamonds export declines, other types of exports would increase the country's dependence on the neighborhood's transit routes for export and consequently would become more affected by the instability in the region.

Besides being a single-export economy, another problem Botswana faces is the global campaign against "conflict-diamonds". Several international NGOs under Kimberley Process -a joint governments, industry and civil society initiative to stem the flow of conflict diamonds – rough diamonds used by rebel movements to finance wars against legitimate governments (Kimberly process, 2016)- stand against the diamonds which come from conflict areas in Africa. Although Botswana has been a supporter of this campaign, still, it is concerned that international consumers may refuse to buy any kind of diamonds under the psychological affects this campaign. That would be a disaster for Botswana.

Botswana had a two-fold foreign policy on the anti-conflict campaign. While it has favored international restrictions on conflict-diamonds, it has also emphasized that Botswana's diamonds are conflict free. Hence, president Mogae launched the “diamond

for development” campaign in 2001 in London illustrating the importance of diamonds in Botswana’s wellbeing especially offering free school education for its citizens.

Botswana's position was supported by South Africa and Namibia, because of their own diamonds industries. The diamonds for development campaign, however, triggered a reaction from international NGO’s to question Botswana’s claim that its diamonds are conflict free. They found out that Botswana has been violent against the indigenous people of San who lived in the area of diamond mines. Members of this indigenous ethnic group were forced out of their inherited homes. This aroused an international movement by NGO’s against Botswana’s diamond industry. Botswana was close to facing an international boycott (Mokhawa, and Taylor, 2003, 271-72). This is another example of the vulnerability of a landlocked country which dependent on single-export.

Foreign Policy. During the apartheid rule in South Africa, Botswana's foreign policy had two main considerations that sometimes worked at cross purposes: first, not to give an excuse to the Republic of South Africa to invade Botswana or intervene in its domestic affairs. And second, to avoid any action which appeared to legitimize the apartheid system in South Africa. Botswana would avoid taking sides in international organizations such as the U.N. when the question of apartheid in South Africa was concerned. Seretse Khama, Botswana's then president, once said that " [a]s a consequence of Botswana's geographical situation, we face unusual and onerous handicaps.... Whilst Botswana accepts that we are part of the Southern African economic complex and that the harsh fact of history and geography cannot be obliterated, for obvious reasons, we have to maintain normal friendly relations with South Africa” (Neimann, 1993, 2-3). President

Khama's statement illustrates clearly that landlocked-ness and being neighbors with a major regional power, can have a large influence on a country's foreign policy choices.

Nonetheless, as Botswana got more affected by the instability in the region during the 1970s, it altered its foreign policy towards supporting the struggle against White minority rule in Southern African states including the Republic of South Africa. As a result of the instability in the region, Botswana was hosting 30,000 refugees from its neighbors including South Africa. Thus, Botswana, alongside Tanzania, Zambia, and Mozambique, formed the Frontline States in 1974 to support the liberation movements in the region. However, the member countries agreed that, unlike others, Botswana would not provide safe havens for the liberation fighters and would not participate in the sanctions against Rhodesia, present day Zimbabwe.

President Khama's position on the struggle against white minority rule in the region changed with time. In reaction to South Africa's unwillingness for the negotiations during the 1970s, president Khama, in contrast to his early remarks, said that "Africa will have no other choice but to give full support to the freedom struggle... We have a moral obligation to insist on the restoration of human rights in the countries surrounding us; for the absence of peace in these countries is a threat to our own peace, without which we cannot survive. Therefore, if I speak the way I do it is because of my country's geopolitical situation" (Neimann, 1993, 4). It is interesting that president Khama used the geopolitical location of Botswana as an excuse earlier in the 1960s to not to participate in any action which would irritate South Africa, but in 1976 he used the same logic to justify his stance against the white minority rule in Southern African states.

From the mid-1970s on when Angola and Mozambique achieved independence, the balance of power in Southern African region turned against the Republic of South Africa and the "white coalition" was defeated in Rhodesia. By then western powers such as the United States and Britain were reluctant to continue to support the apartheid regime in South Africa (Niemann, 1993, 11). All of this was happening when Botswana's diamond industry started its boom. In 1975, Botswana managed to broker a contract with De Beers company which was based on equal 50/50 percent share for Botswana and De Beers overall mines in the country, a marked contrast with the past when De Beers enjoyed 85 percent share in Botswana's mining industry (Taylor and Mokhawa, 2003, 263). Diamonds were light and profitable enough to export to Europe by air transportation. Meaning, Botswana was not dependent on South Africa's transportation routes for export trade or on its markets to sell diamonds (Neimann, 1993, 11). Hence, all these factors enabled Botswana to utilize a foreign policy independent of South Africa.

Geopolitical changes such as the liberation of Angola and Mozambique altered the balance of power in Southern Africa against the apartheid regime in South Africa. This change in power dynamics, increase in Botswana's diamonds exports, and the extent Botswana was affected by the conflict in the region can explain the foreign policy shifts of this landlocked country.

Conclusion. Botswana's case shows that thanks to the diamonds export, this country is not much affected by instability in the region or the poor infrastructure in the maritime neighbors. This is exactly in contrast with the situation of other landlocked countries studied in this thesis. For instance, Bolivia is affected by the historical border disputes and power dynamics between major actors of the region. These factors restrict

Bolivia's exports to major international markets. Armenia is affected not only by historical enmity with Azerbaijan and Turkey but also by instability in Georgia which causes blocking Armenia's proximity to the Russian markets and its transportation routes. Similarly, Uzbekistan, as discussed, is affected by the conflicts in the neighborhood and has no other option but to show concession towards Kazakhstan and Russia. Bolivia, Armenia, and Uzbekistan are affected by the power dynamics in their respective regions mainly because their exports need land transportation. In the case of Armenia and Uzbekistan, they are not only affected by being landlocked and surrounded by poor neighbors but also because their neighbors are unstable.

On the contrary, in the case of Botswana, instability in the maritime neighbors does not affect its international trade, and thus, dual vulnerability is not applicable in this case. Therefore, Botswana's foreign policy and security measures are not influenced by its landlocked status. However, looking into the history of this landlocked country, one can argue that diamond mines will not last forever while geography is not going away. Thus, It is probable that in future, similar to the time when Botswana didn't enjoy the luxury of diamonds industry, the country's foreign policy and security get affected by the realities of the its neighborhood. Similar to other landlocked states.

4. Poor and Unstable Regions

a. Uzbekistan, the doubly landlocked

Uzbekistan is one of only two doubly landlocked states in the world. The region where this country is located is unstable and poor with relatively weak states. Uzbekistan neighbors are Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan. All landlocked states themselves. None of these neighbors are rich or a major power.

Nonetheless, instability in the region and extra-regional power struggles disproportionately shape the country's security measures and foreign policy. Thus, in this thesis' two by two table theoretical framework, the region which Uzbekistan is located falls under the category of unstable and poor regions.

Being doubly landlocked makes transit more difficult for Uzbekistan, because, it has to pass through, at least, two other countries to reach to the sea. Uzbekistan inherited relatively good transportation infrastructures from the Soviet Union, however, conflicts in Afghanistan and Tajikistan have posed the threat to Uzbekistan's security and caused restrictions on her transportation routes (Idan and Shaffer, 2011, 259-260).

Uzbekistan produces enough oil to meet its domestic consumption, but it is not sufficient for export. The country's economy is dependent mainly on agricultural products; cotton being the main export. Thus, roads and railways are the main means of transportation. Idan and Shaffer believe that landlocked-ness has three main constraints on Uzbekistan's foreign policy: leader's foreign policy decisions are influenced by the fact that the country is landlocked; transportation is a foreign policy priority; and it has a special policy towards Russia and Kazakhstan due to heavy dependency on Russian markets and Kazakhstan's transit routes (Idan and Shaffer, 2011, 260).

Idan and Shaffer quote Uzbek president Islam Karimov's speech from 1998: "World experience testifies, and Uzbekistan is another proof, that a country having no direct access to international waters significantly suffers in international economics. This is why we continue to seek new solutions to the problem of providing our exports with an

effective transportation system and obtaining access to international waters” (Idan and Shaffer, 2011, 260).

Similarly, Uzbekistan ministry of Foreign Affairs declares that: “The geographic isolation of Central Asia causes serious problems for our countries. In this respect, Uzbekistan will continue its efforts towards “disenclavization” of Central Asia by creating alternative transport and communication corridors” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2008). These quotes are examples of the level of importance of transportation and access to the sea for Uzbekistan’s foreign policy.

Uzbekistan’s population of 30.7 million comprises 40 percent of Central Asia's inhabitants. The IMF considers Uzbekistan as rich in natural resources such as uranium, copper, gold, and natural gas and the sixth largest producer of cotton in the world and agriculture makes about 18 percent of country's GDP (IMF Country Report No. 13/278, 2013, 5). Uzbekistan is considered a lower middle-income country with \$2,036.7 (2014) GDP per capita. This figure is lower than Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan which are classified as upper-middle income economies. Nonetheless, Uzbekistan's GDP per capita is larger than her three other neighbors: Afghanistan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan (The World Bank, 2016). The country's leadership aims to gain upper-middle income status by 2030 (IMF Country Report No. 13/278, 2013, 5).

Russia, Kazakhstan, and China are major export destinations for Uzbekistan, with the first of the three having the distinction of being an enormous source of remittances, and thus a country with disproportionate economic leverage over the Uzbekis. The Central Asian country’s export market share has been falling in recent years. Exports are focused almost exclusively around various commodities—gas, gold, cotton and metals—

and agricultural products, which together amount to about 85 percent of exports. The geographic concentration of exports has been rising, with Russia, China, and Turkey being the three largest export destinations in 2011. (IMF 20). According to CIA Uzbekistan's major export partners are China 21.2 percent, Kazakhstan 15.9 percent, Turkey 15.8 percent, Russia 14.7 percent, Bangladesh, and 9.5 percent, Kyrgyzstan 4 percent. And the main import partners are Russia 20.7 percent, China 16.6 percent, South Korea 16.4 percent, Kazakhstan 12.5 percent, Germany 4.6 percent, Turkey 4.2 percent, Ukraine 4 percent (CIA Factbook, 2012, 803).

Between Russia and United States. Uzbekistan's dependency on Russia stems almost entirely from the fact that the country is landlocked with few other transit options. The 1990s conflicts in Tajikistan and decades of war in Afghanistan have deprived Uzbekistan from access to Pakistani and Indian ports. Indeed, Russia is not only Uzbekistan's biggest commercial partner, but almost all of Uzbek exports to Europe go through its northern neighbor. Thus, Russia is the largest market for Uzbekistan's exports as well as the main transit route. Another factor is that during the Soviet period, Uzbekistan was designed to function as the transportation hub for Central Asia, connecting the region's transportation system to Russia, and thus its infrastructure is very much a legacy of that period, as it continues that role to this day (Idan and Shaffer, 261). These facts give Russia leverage to influence Uzbekistan's security and foreign policy limiting the country's foreign policy options when Russia's interests are under question.

Uzbekistan tried a number of times to alter her foreign policy in other directions in order to get closer to the United States and find allies in the West. For instance, after the 9/11 attacks Uzbekistan gave Karshi-Khanabad air base to the United States to use for

military supplies in the war in Afghanistan. Uzbekistan gave the facility to the United States to contribute in the war against terror without demanding money for it. This facility was considered very valuable in the early stages of war against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. The United States then-Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld called Uzbekistan a “stalwart” partner. The friendship went on to become Strategic Partnership in 2002 (Gealson, 2006, 52).



Figure 5. Uzbekistan, Karshi-Khanabad airbase Source: BBC

However, the United States’ approach to this partnership was based on encouraging Uzbekistan to bring about reforms in governance, human rights, and freedom of expression and holding free elections. Uzbekistan, in contrast, perceived these conditions as a way to interfere in its internal affairs. The State Department’s evaluation in July 2004 showed that Uzbekistan was not fulfilling her commitments under the 2002

Strategic Partnership (Gealson, 2006, 57). The United States liberal approach towards this strategic partnership was the last thing the Uzbek authoritarian president would accept. Thus, disagreement on how to interpret the strategic partnership gave Russia an opportunity to fill the expanding vacuum.

Another incident which ruined the strategic partnership and encouraged Uzbekistan to expel American forces out of Karshi-Khanabad airbase was stance the Americans and Europeans took on the Andijan massacre. In May 2005, Uzbek military forces cracked down on armed opposition killing hundreds of people in Andijan, a city in the Northeast of the country. The United States joined the European Union and international organizations demanding an independent inquiry about the crackdown. President Karimov rejected any independent inquiry proposed by the U.S. and Europe calling it foreign interference. Instead, he created a commission of eight countries including China, India, Iran, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz republic, Pakistan, Russia, and Tajikistan (Starr, 2005, 7). As a result, Uzbekistan changed its position on the Karshi-Khanabad airbase and expelled the American forces out of the country in 2005 (Idan and Shaffer, 262). Uzbekistan didn't end its strategic partnership with the United States which was started weeks after the 9/11 attacks, however, it has increased the level of security cooperation with Russia (Gleason, 2006, 49). This rapid change in Uzbekistan's foreign policy becomes understandable when American liberal foreign policy approach towards Uzbekistan and the Russian pressure on the country is taken into account.

Meanwhile, Russia did not show negative impulses against American Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan in the first stages, and even cooperated to the certain extent. Nonetheless, in 2003, Russia announced that American troops should leave former

Soviet republics after the completion of their mission in Afghanistan. At the same time, Russia increased its security and economic partnerships with Central Asian countries including Uzbekistan. Russia was encouraging Central Asian countries to provide their military airbases for Russian troops (Gleason, 2006, 52).

In May 2005, Uzbekistan withdrew from GUUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Moldova), an organization which was perceived by Moscow as an anti-Russian body, regional security cooperation organization. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in July said that the Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan -American and the Coalition forces operation against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda- had succeeded and thus all American troops should withdraw from their bases in Central Asia. Under these circumstances, Uzbekistan framed the decision to expel American troops as a Central Asian consensus. However, it was only Uzbekistan who expelled American troops while Kyrgyz Republic didn't concede with the SCO's decision (Gleason, 2006, 49-50). Nevertheless, Uzbekistan did not completely end her partnership with the United States and continues to receive military aids from U.S. For instance, in 2015, Uzbekistan received hundreds of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles from the Department of Defense. In June 2014, Pentagon said that, "As the U.S. military footprint decreases in Afghanistan, regional partners, such as Pakistan and Uzbekistan, will take on increasing responsibility for preventing al Qaeda from reconstituting its safe haven and operational base in South and Central Asia, but also to counter terrorist groups that pose a threat to regional stability" (United States Department of Defense, June, 2014, 8). This example illustrates on Uzbekistan's complicated multi-victor foreign policy.

Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan is the second most important country in Uzbekistan's foreign policy. Kazakhstan is the only transit way which Uzbekistan's exports go to Russia and then to Europe. Thus, Uzbekistan shows concession and a special foreign policy approach to making sure that the relations with that country remain cordial. For instance, despite five hundred disputed locations on the Uzbek-Kazakh border, Uzbekistan has shown the desire to solve the problem and after presidential-level negotiations a delimitation process to solve the conflict began. This is in sharp contrast to Uzbekistan's attitude towards its borders with other neighbors (Idan and Shaffer, 2011, 262).

In the first years of independence, Uzbekistan tried to diminish its cultural, security, and economic dependence of the country on Russia and the inheritance of the Soviet Union. President Islam Karimov sought to increase his foreign policy options by attempting to strengthen ties with countries outside the former Soviet Union umbrella. Karimov was pursuing the most independent foreign policy from Russia, compared to his other Central Asian counterparts. Indeed, even when the Taliban ruled Afghanistan and the Islamic movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), an Uzbek affiliate of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban, posed an extending threat against the country's security, Uzbekistan refused to accept Russian offers to secure borders with Afghanistan by setting Russian troops in Uzbekistan (Gealson, 2006, 55). The fact that Uzbekistan accepted to cooperate with the United States in the war on terrorism in Afghanistan was another example that Uzbekistan wanted to counterbalance Russian influence by seeking ties with the United States. However, the geopolitical realities of the region and being doubly landlocked deprived Uzbekistan from the luxury to follow an independent foreign policy.

In addition, the instability in Uzbekistan's neighboring countries, namely Tajikistan and Afghanistan, was another factor which made Uzbekistan more dependent on Russian transit through Kazakhstan. If the region was stable and Afghanistan could provide security and transit facility from her border to with Uzbekistan in the North to Pakistan's border in the South, Uzbekistan could have one more vital transportation route. This route is closer to the sea and eventually less costly compared to the current Russian routes. As Chowdhury and Erdenebileg (2006, 24) document, the closest port to Uzbekistan's capital city is located 4300km away. According to Uzbekistan's ministry of Foreign Affairs website, stability in Afghanistan is a priority for Uzbekistan:

“As a result, of the counter-terrorism campaign led by the U.S. threats to Central Asian security coming from this region have largely decreased. A positive tendency towards stability in Central Asia can be observed. Taking the side of new Afghan leader Hamid Karzai, Uzbekistan will further help Afghan people in their return to peaceful existence. Inviting Afghanistan to the

Central Asian Cooperation Organization we were trying to involve this indispensable part of Central Asia into regional processes. This will have its positive effects on post-conflict rehabilitation of Afghanistan. Trans-afghan route is one of the most prospective projects leading to sea communications of India” (Objectives of Uzbekistan's foreign policy course, 2010, 3).

Conclusion. Uzbekistan is the most populated country in Central Asia and none of its neighbors are considered a major regional power. Based on the World Bank classifications no country in the region is categorized as a rich economy. Only Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan are upper-middle income economies while Tajikistan and

Kyrgyz republic are classified as lower-middle income. Afghanistan, another immediate neighbor, is a low-income economy (The World Bank, 2016). Thus, Uzbekistan is not much influenced by the intra-regional power struggle. However, the country is affected by extra-regional major powers' rivalries over influence in the region and instability in the neighborhood. Therefore, instability and poverty of the region directly affect Uzbekistan's foreign policy. This tendency is visibly in its concession towards Kazakhstan and lack of certainty to *bandwagon* with other powers rather than Russia.

Even after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia continues to be the dominant military and economic power in Central Asia. Hence, Uzbekistan, Unlike Armenia, is not much influenced by intra-regional power dynamics. Uzbekistan's security and foreign policies are more affected by two main factors: First, the fact that country is doubly landlocked and doesn't have any other viable transportation route to the sea besides the Kazakhstan-Russia transit way. Second, instability in Afghanistan does not allow Uzbekistan to access the Pakistani ports which are much closer to Tashkent and consequently could be much cheaper compared to the Russian ports.

Therefore, mentioned two factors have played determining role in Uzbekistan's foreign policy options and security alignments. Although it has several times attempted to alter its foreign policy towards the West, especially vis-à-vis the United States, and distance itself from Russian security and foreign policy sphere, such endeavors have proved time and again to be short lived. Nevertheless, this approach has helped Uzbekistan to maintain a multi-vector foreign policy. Nonetheless, at the end, geopolitical factors of its location, poverty and instability of the region, limit the foreign/security policy options this landlocked country has got.

b. Afghanistan

Afghanistan is located in between South and Central Asia and historically referred to as the heart of Asia (Tadjbakhsh, 2012, v). It is a landlocked country with three maritime neighbors: China in the far Northeast, Pakistan in the South, and Iran in the West. Its domestic underdevelopment and instability is intensified by the regional poverty and increasing insecurity. Besides poverty and instability, Afghanistan is positioned at the heart of regional and international rivalries between Pakistan and India, Iran and Saudi Arabia, the United States and Russia and China. Within the framework of this thesis, Afghanistan lays in a poor and unstable region.

The major conflicts in the region are the militant Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Kashmir conflict between Pakistan and India, and the Islamic militant insurgency in Central Asia, especially in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Afghanistan's foreign/security policies are directly affected by instability and poverty in the region. Dual vulnerability is visible in Afghanistan's case more than any other cases studied in this thesis.

Underdevelopment and lack of access to the sea. Afghanistan is among the poorest countries of the world with 31.63 million population and \$20.04 billion GDP size and it has a 35.8 percent poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines. The country's GNI per capita was \$680 in 2014, among the lowest in the world (The World Bank, Country Overview, 2016). Afghanistan's largest import partners are Pakistan 33.03 percent, India 28.04 percent, Iran 5.85 percent, and Germany 2.99 percent (The World Integrated Trade Solution, 2016) CIA's figures from 2014 mention Russia responsible for 13 percent of Afghanistan imports, the United States for 10.7 percent, India 6.1 percent,

China 5.4 percent, Turkmenistan 4.8 percent, Kazakhstan 4.6 percent (CIA World Factbook, 2014). Its export partners are Iran 19.45 percent, Pakistan 17.25 percent, China 13.49 percent, Japan 3.36 percent (The World Integrated Trade Solution, 2016). Again, CIA World Factbook indicates the United States and Tajikistan among Afghanistan's largest export partners with 8.7 and 7.1 percent respectively (CIA World Factbook, 2014).

Afghanistan not only lacks access to the sea, it also lacks modern major transportation network with no railroads and no navigable rivers. Thus logistics were one of major barriers for the Soviets during the 1980s and still is the challenge for the U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan (Rya, 2009, 4). In the Soviet case, distance and limited transportation facilities were the greater challenge. The U.S. and NATO forces, besides those two obstacles, use the main road between Kabul and Khyber Pass located at the border of Pakistan and Afghanistan in the east (Ryan, 2009, 4). However, the enmity in the relations of Afghanistan with Pakistan and insecure routes double the challenge

As mentioned it has three maritime neighbors, however, using Chinese routes is not feasible due to the unfriendly terrain and distance. Country's routes connection to the Iranian ports is just recently developed and still under construction. Moreover, Iranian ports are understood to be underdeveloped and far from the economic and political capital of the country, Kabul. In this situation, Pakistani ports seems to be the closest and most efficient window for Afghanistan to access international markets. However, underdevelopment of Iranian path and hostility in relations with Pakistan pushed Afghanistan to indulge its historic neutrality and go under the spheres of influence of the Soviet Union in during the Cold War.

Afghanistan's trade flows through these four main transit corridors: Central Asian countries (through Hairatan, Sherkhan Bandar, and Turghundi in the North and Northwest to connect to the former Soviet railways to access their western, northern and eastern seaports; the Persian Gulf through Iranian Bandar Abbas, Bandar Khomeini, and Khoramshahr ports; to Europe passing overland Iran and Turkey; and finally Pakistani seaports in Karachi and Gwardar utilizing Pakistani railways from Khyber Pass and border point of Chaman (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 90-91).

The transportation goods need to travel 1,250 miles from Pakistani seaports to reach Kabul taking 5 to 14 days. The second ground route from Pakistani seaports to Kandahar, the regional hub in the southern Afghanistan, is 570 miles long and usually takes 5 to 7 days (Ryan, 2009, 12). Attacks by the Taliban and other insurgent groups worsen the conditions and in some instances besides setting in fire the cargos they cause border closure for weeks and even months.

For most of the countries studied in this thesis, including Afghanistan, access to the seaports and international transportation routes build the corn-stone of their foreign policy. There was a time in the modern Afghanistan history when ruler Amir Abdurahman Khan proclaimed that "as long as Afghanistan has not arms enough to fight against any great attacking power, it would be folly to allow railways to be laid throughout the country" (Chowdhury and Erdenebileg, 2006, 92). This decision, which was based on Amir's Abdurahman's fear that the British India or Russia will undermine his power if the landlocked and mountainous country was more accessible through railways and modern transportation system. This decision was made in a time when Britain and Russia were building railways in Indian subcontinent and Central Asia. Afghanistan. after more than a

century, still is does not have the railways to put its trade on track. Not Afghanistan itself is affected by its domestic underdevelopment but also the neighboring countries, especially Central Asian ones.

Security Challenges. Afghanistan's security challenges are fighting the Islamic extremist groups such as the Taliban, Haqani Network, al-Qaeda, and the recently ISIL. The first three mainly operate from Pakistan and enjoy safe heavens there. The last 15 years have not been an exception of insurgents using Pakistani soil to fight against Afghanistan's central government.

In the period of 1954 and 1963, the Soviet Union paid \$515 million as foreign aid to Afghanistan and the United States supplied \$178 million for the same period. Moreover, the Soviet Union provide almost three quarter of Afghanistan's foreign exchange needs (Hasan, 1964, 52). These figures explain how the Soviet Union won the good will of people and India is using a similar technique. Thus, Afghanistan foreign policy was shaped by its geographic handicap and the need for foreign aid.

This challenge roots back to the 1975 when a group of Islamists planned a military uprising against President Mohammed Daoud who came to power in 1973 as a consequence of a pro-Soviet military republican coup (Saikal, 2004, 14). Those militants sought refuge in Pakistan to rebel against the communist regime and the Soviet Union military invasion of the country in after a second military coup in 1978. Pakistan has continued to provide refuge and sanctuaries to the rebels fighting against Afghanistan's central government for more than four decades now. The reasons behind this hostility to be discussed later.

Foreign policy (Between being buffer state and neutral). Neutrality and a demand for access to the sea have been two principle features of Afghanistan's foreign policy. The first was a continuation of the role it played as a buffer state during the 19th century (Andisha, 2015, 1) between Russia and British India and the second has been based on a historical land dispute rooted in the mentioned rivalry between Russia and British India. Eventually, the desire to access the sea altered Afghanistan's so called neutrality entering the country in a phase of non-ending conflicts.

Understanding current conflicts in Afghanistan and the features of its foreign policy require a brief look in the country's history. Afghanistan's history in the whole 19th century and the first part of 20th century was determined by the growing rivalries between British India in the south and Tsarist Russian and then the Soviet Union in the north. Russians advancement in Central Asia, which started in the second half of 19th century, reached the Amu Darya (which is historically known as Oxus) by 1869 (Glassner, 1971, 49). From 1830s to 1870s Tsarist Russia occupied most parts of Central Asia getting closer to the British sphere of power in South Asia. According to an 1873 agreement between Russia and British India, Britain accepted Russian expansions in Central Asia as legitimate and in reverse Russia stated that Afghanistan lay outside its zone of interest (Saikal, 2004, 29). Thus, it was agreed that Afghanistan will remain as buffer state between two empires.

Russian adventures in Central Asia coincident with the demise of Amir Dost Mohammad Khan and chaos amongst his offspring on the crown. Dost Mohammad remained loyal to the British after being reinstalled to power in the aftermath of the first war between Afghanistan and Britain in 1841. After Dost Mohammad's death, Russians

sent a delegation to the Kabul to discuss further advancement towards India. British India, worried about Russian increasing influence, invaded Afghanistan in 1878 capturing the major cities and installing a new ruler: Amir Abdurrahman Khan in 1881.

Abdurrahman was the grandson of Dost Mohammad. Abdurrahman used iron fist and blood shedding to offset his opponents. Nonetheless, he was able to stabilize the troubled country and in 1893 agreed on a borderline with the British India (Glassner, 1971, 48) which later became known as the Durand Line and the base of hostility in relations with Pakistan since 1947.

Based on the same agreement, Afghanistan lost its sovereignty over its foreign affairs until the country's independence in 1919. The country became the *buffer state* to separate the spheres of influences of British India and Russia (Glassner, 1971, 49). After independence, Afghanistan altered its buffer role to proclaim neutrality.

Although some scholars (Andisha, 2015 and Cronin, 2013) have dispute over the nature and the circumstances under which Afghanistan's neutrality was formed and shaped, they agree that neutrality has been an important pillar in the country's foreign policy since independence in 1919. The first argues that Afghanistan's neutrality was a continuation of the externally imposed buffer role and the country never had a full neutrality as the term is defined in international law. Thus Afghanistan's neutrality was implemented only during the international wars like the World War II. Therefore, neutrality in the future cannot be a good option for the country while it does not have enough military strength and political cohesion (Andisha, 2015, 6).

Cronin, on the contrary argues that Afghanistan, like Switzerland, is one of best candidates for neutrality due to its “challenging topography, dislike of outsiders, and widespread warrior traditions...” (Cronin, 2013, 61).

To explain how neutrality could bring stability to Afghanistan and satisfy all neighboring countries and major powers in the region, Cronin believes that neutrality will guarantee regional balance of power over Afghanistan which has been the trouble hub of the region for more than three decades now. For instance, Russia was one of the first powers which accepted Afghanistan as a buffer state and even after invading the country in 1979, in 1985 Russia proposed neutrality of Afghanistan as a precursor for its troops withdrawal, which was rejected by the United States. Now, it is in Russian interest to see American forces withdrawal leave behind a neutral Afghanistan.

Similarly, Iran is eager to see American troops out of Afghanistan. At the same time, however, it is concerned with the re-installment of pro-Saudi Sunni extremist groups such as the Taliban on the power in Afghanistan. India is worried about the return of the Taliban to the power and presumably fall of Afghanistan back in the hands of Pakistan. Conversely, Pakistan has always shown anxiety about Indian influence in Afghanistan and as discussed, this concern has been in the core of Pakistan’s hostile policy towards Afghanistan. Thus, the only way to balance all these conflicting regional and international interests and bring stability to the country is Afghanistan’s neutrality with regional and international guarantees (Cronin, 2013 67).

Since the Independence "Afghanistan's traditional policy is the safeguarding of its national independence through non-alignment, friendship, and cooperation with all countries" and Afghanistan will continue to support the demand for Pashtunistan" (Dr.

Yusuf Policy statement, 1963). Hasan (1964) believes that these principles in Afghanistan's foreign policy are derived from the country's geopolitics, economic needs, racial structure (Hasan, 1964, 48). During the Cold War, while Iran and Pakistan were members of Cento and close allies to the United States, Afghanistan remained non-aligned as barrier between the Soviet Union in its north and Pakistan in its south (Hasan, 1964, 48). A policy to be altered later by growing hostility with Pakistan over the historic land dispute.

Neutrality was the core principle of Afghanistan's foreign policy through World War II. However, after the partition of the subcontinent, Afghanistan demanded self-determination for the Pashtuns on the Indian side of the Durand Line who were under the reign of British India according to the 1983 agreement (Glassner, 1971, 51). The campaign for self-determination of Pashtuns on the Indian side of line was contested inside Afghanistan on the ethnicity bases. Nonetheless, this demand reflected the desire of this landlocked country to get access to the sea.

In this period, transportation was prioritized for Afghanistan as a national security issue and on the top of foreign policy agendas. Afghanistan, constrained by the desire to regain the lost territories and get access to the sea, leaned towards the Soviet Union losing its historical neutrality.

The second peril of Afghanistan's foreign policy has been a historic demand for self-determination of Pashtun ethnics in the Pakistani side of the Durand Line. Afghanistan was the only nation in the world which refused to vote for Pakistan's membership in the United Nations in September 1947 and demanded self-determination for Pashtuns on the Pakistani side of Durand Line (Hussain, 1984, 500). This attitude

caused a perpetual hostility in the relation between this landlocked country and its closest maritime neighbor, Pakistan.

Pakistan rebuffed the idea to give autonomy or sovereignty to the Pashtuns residing in the newly independent country. Furthermore, in reaction to Afghanistan's pressure for the cause, Pakistan started using its transit route as a leverage against Afghanistan, delaying transport in transit and limiting its neighbor's access to Karachi seaport.

Afghanistan asked the United States for military assistance and support for its territorial claims against Pakistan. When Truman and Eisenhower administrations rejected Afghanistan's proposal and soled arms to Pakistan, Afghanistan turned to the Soviet Union which was ready to provide military assistance and support for the territorial claims against Pakistan (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 41).

Again, due to the hostile relations with Pakistan and the repeated blockade imposed on Afghanistan's transits through Karachi Port, Afghanistan appealed to the United States to build the Chabahar port in the Iranian coast of the Arab Sea for Afghanistan's use. This idea was rejected by the United states and Iran calling it economically impractical. On the contrary, the Soviet Union, in 1954, accepted to provide Afghanistan with the USSR transit facilities and increased its aid to Afghanistan (Glassner, 1971, 54).

Eventually, the need for access to the sea while it had an antagonistic relation with Pakistan and Iranian routes were underdeveloped, pushed Afghanistan towards the Soviet Union. It was a historic shift in Afghanistan's foreign policy mainly because this change shaped the country's fate in the following decades.

Some scholars have interpreted this policy as a demand to have easier access to the sea, however, some others believe that it was more a personal *lure* for the Afghanistan ruling family, who were known as Peshawar Sardars (O. Caroe, 1958, 435) referring to fact that their great-grand father ruled Peshawar in the 19th century. Another objective of the ruling family was to bring more Pashtu speakers under their rule to alter the balance of ethnic groups in Afghanistan in the favor of Pashtuns (Hasan, 1964, 56). Afghanistan didn't dispute on its northern borders with the Soviet Union and later with the Central Asian republics which similar to Pakistan have inherited lands, historically belonged to Afghanistan, from a former colonial power (Saikal, 2004, 29). The counterargument to that is that those lands do not bring Afghanistan any closer to the sea, in contrast, lands beyond Durand Line does. However, this is an example of how an internally disputed interest is translated as the interests of the state by securitizing an issue which consequently has affected foreign policy.

Securitization of border disputes and transforming it to a threat to national security is one of the characteristics of weak states who suffer internal violence and face low degree of socio-political cohesion. Weak states use the nationalistic impulses to securitize disputed issues with the neighboring countries (Rohers, 2005, 21-24). This tendency in the foreign policy is visible the cases of Afghanistan, Armenia, and Bolivia.

It is difficult to distinguish between national security and the ruling party's interest in the weak states. Thus, the ruling group or party may securitize its interest as the national security. In such cases, national security is devolved into regime security defending the interests of the ruling elite (Girgosian, 2006, 225), complicating the states'

orientation in the international system which could invite regional or international conflicts into the country (Rohers, 2005, 26).

The Pashtunistan issue and Afghanistan's campaign to promote self-determination for Pashtuns on the Pakistani side of the Durand Line resembles Bolivia's attitude towards Chile. Both countries show high level of frustrations by historical disputes towards their closest maritime neighbors. On the contrast to the existing literature, these two landlocked countries show no concession in their foreign policy towards their main transit neighbors. Thus, other factors like nationalisms can explain their exceptional behaviors.

Between Pakistan and India. India and Pakistan, two important actors in South Asia, have incompatible interests in Afghanistan which have complicated security and stability of Afghanistan and the region. Afghanistan is central to the Indian goals which seek to eliminate the safe havens of terrorist groups inside Pakistan, project power in South Asia, and getting access to markets and natural resources in Central Asia. Conversely, Pakistan's goals in Afghanistan are mainly India-centric and concentrated on countering Indian influence in Afghanistan. Hence, a fragile government which is subjugated by the Taliban, or under their influence, will help Pakistan to subdue Indian projecting power in South Asia, and undermine India's capability to support Baloch separatists in Pakistan (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, ix). Hamid Karzai, Afghanistan's former president, in an interview for Tolo News, told me that Pakistan has mainly two demands from Afghanistan. First, it wants Afghanistan to recognize the Durand line, and second, to cut its friendship with India (Black and White, Tolo News, August, 2015).

Therefore, countering Indian influence in Afghanistan, besides the historical dispute over the Durand, construct the main area of conflict between Pakistan and Afghanistan. It is not likely that Afghanistan will see peace unless Pakistani policy makers prioritize stability in Afghanistan over countering India (Rashid and Rubin, 2008, 6). From this perspective, Afghanistan's interests converge with those of India to tackle terrorism in the region and contain Pakistan. However, despite heavy Indian economic investment and its growing influence in Afghanistan, Pakistan has been capable to undermine these efforts and to continue the chaos.

Afghanistan signed a strategic partnership with India in 2011. In order to not antagonize Pakistan, the third article of the *Agreement on Strategic Partnership Between the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of India* states that: "The Strategic Partnership between the Sides is not directed against any other state or group of states". However, one of the areas that both countries will cooperate is stated in the b section in the Political and Security Cooperation part as: "Support for the reform and expansion of the United Nations Security Council, including a permanent seat for India in the Council" (AFG-Indo Strategic Partnership Agreement, 2011). This article looks like enough provocation for Pakistan to be cynical about growing cooperation between India and Afghanistan.

Transportation is one of core areas the strategic partnership with India is focused on. This agreement insists of transforming Afghanistan into the energy and transportation hub connecting Central and South Asia (Afg-Indo Strategic Partnership Agreement, 2011).

United States' military dependency on the Pakistani routes to supply goods for the battle grounds in Afghanistan, besides Pakistan's assumed role in the fight against the Taliban and Al-Qaida, is a major factor in the U.S. reluctance to pressure Pakistan. As Chalk and Hanauer (2012) argue, the United States gave out over \$16 billion in military aids to Pakistan between 2002 and 2011. However, Pakistan has supported terrorist groups which are fighting the U.S. and its allies' forces since the overthrow of the Taliban regime in 2002.

To stress on the importance of American dependency on the Pakistani transportation routes, Chalk and Hanauer argue that when the number of the U.S and NATO forces declines in Afghanistan, United States will be less dependent on Pakistan and thus more inclined to pressure Pakistan (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 3). Thus it is visible that access to the sea is a determining factor not only for Afghanistan's foreign policy, but also for a super-power which needs to get into this landlocked country via Pakistan

An illustration of this problem was more visible after a Pakistani border post was mistakenly attacked by American air force, in November 2011 and, in reaction, Pakistan closed its routes to American and NATO supplies for several months. To find alternate supply route, the United states signed a deal with Russia and several Central Asian countries to use their soil for military deliveries (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 5). Ironically, this resembled the same remedy that Afghanistan tried in 1950s and 1960s when facing blockade by Pakistan. This fact is a reminder that the very nature of Afghanistan's problem is not changed over half a century. A guaranteed access to the sea is still vital for the country and that need shapes the country's foreign policy and alignment.



Figure 6. The U.S. and NATO supply routes Source: U.S. TRANSCOM

Besides Pakistan's Indo-phobia, there are two other objectives which Pakistan pursue in Afghanistan and are related to the historic land dispute between Afghanistan and Pakistan. The first, as Chalk and Hanauer mention, is a fear that a stronger Afghanistan may strengthen the "Pashtunistan" and Balochistan separatist movements. And the second is related to Afghanistan's neglect on recognizing the Durand Line as international boundary between these two countries (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 2).

Afghanistan's government has used the competition between India and Pakistan to reduce the country's dependence on Pakistan route for trade with utilizing Indian investments in building roads and transportation system. At the same time, to reduce Pakistan's antagonism, President Karzai accepted Pakistani offers for training Afghanistan's military officers and called Pakistan his nation's "twin brother" (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 39). Calling Pakistan, created in 1947, the twin brother is ironic because

President Karzai continuously claimed that his nation is more than five thousand years old. These twin brothers were born several millennia apart from each other.

One can argue that Karzai's government was successful in using Pakistan and India against each other on the diplomatic and economic helm. Karzai's attitude resembled other Afghanistan rulers' tendency to balance between the British empire and then the United State on one side and the Soviet Union on the other. However, this game was not effective to bring peace and security when it was over-played by Premier and then President Daoud and is proved to be ineffective during Karzai's era. The rivalry between India and Pakistan deteriorated the security and rule of law in Afghanistan.

Chabahar vs. Gwadar. The idea of encirclement leads the politics of the region. Pakistan is encircled by India, on the return, India feels increasingly encircled by China, especially by Sino-Pakistani strategic alignment, and China is threatened by the United States-India-Japan trio in the region. American military presence in Afghanistan has intensified this feeling among Chinese policy makers (Daniels, 2013, 94). Afghanistan, similar to the 19th and 20th centuries, is located in the middle of these rivalries and influenced by the incompatible projects.

Therefore, the competing strategic projects of Chabahar, in Iran, and Gwadar, in Pakistan, are reflections of the growing geopolitical competition between Iran-India and China-Pakistan camps in the South Asia. These two projects aim to provide independent and reliable routes for India and China to get access to the resources of Central Asia (Daniels, 2013, 93). At the same time, Chabahar and Gwadar ports have the potential to be used for military purposes if tensions increase between India and China.

India in cooperation with Iran built the much waited highway linking Afghanistan major cities to the Chabahar port on the Persian Gulf. This route, which the United States refused to build in 1950s, may eliminate Afghanistan's dependence on the Pakistani routes to access the sea (Rashid and Rubin, 2008, 5).

Pakistan has built Gwadar port, with Chinese economic support, to facilitate trade with Central Asia through Afghanistan. This port also aims to limit Indian access to the Central Asian markets and energy resources, a goal shared with China. At the same time, it provides Central Asian Republics an alternative to the Iranian routes (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 31).

Chabahar provides Afghanistan with a less costly route, compared to the Central Asia-Russia route, to the seas and enables it to counterbalance Pakistan's leverage and lessen the countries dependent on the Pakistani ports. Chabahar also can



Figure 7. Chabahar route

increase Afghanistan's negligence to show concession in foreign policy regarding Pakistan.

Central Asia is important for both India and Pakistan due to their increasing need for energy and. The proposed \$7.7 billion Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India (TAPI) pipeline would provide India and Pakistan with 14 billion cubic meters' gas per

year (bcm/y). India, besides its need for Central Asian energy, wants to balance Chinese influence on Central Asian Republics (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 12), part of a strategic ambition to challenge China in South and Central Asia.

India has invested more than \$2 billion in Afghanistan's development projects such as infrastructures, agriculture, telecommunication, electricity power, and roads. India is the fifth largest foreign donor since 2001 which has helped India to build a friendly image for itself among ordinary people in Afghanistan and enjoy "soft-power" (Chalk and Hanauer, 2012, 16).

Conclusion. One can conclude that Afghanistan has practiced multi-vector foreign policy, a characteristic to landlocked countries, in most parts of its last one and half century history. Afghanistan has been able to keep its relations cordial with competing forces such as the United States, Iran, Russia, China and India. The complexity of this situation becomes more visible taking into account the presence of thousands of American soldiers in Afghanistan.

in the aftermath of the Indian subcontinent partition, because of the insecure relations with Pakistan and underdevelopment of the Iranian routes, Afghanistan didn't have other choice but to lean towards the Soviet Union. That stance altered Afghanistan's foreign policy and security measures like never before. Afghanistan, with a desire to get access to the sea using the Soviet Union military and economic power against Pakistan, got trapped in proxy wars and unending rivalries between major regional and international powers.

After the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the U.S. and NATO military campaign against terrorists, India is playing a role like that of the Cold War Soviet Union in

Afghanistan. but of course a less masculine one, to counterbalance Pakistan. However, Afghanistan's efforts to use these powers in its own benefit did not pay off very much and as a playground for the competing powers, remains unsafe and still with no guaranteed access to the sea.

furthermore, Afghanistan has not been able to change the rules of the zero-sum game with Pakistan, arguably the most important and vicious stakeholder. Thus, despite the presence of thousands of U.S. and NATO forces, the country is still bleeding from insecurity and growing geopolitical rivalries in the region which disables the government to provide security and economic prosperity for the population.

Afghanistan, prone to dual-vulnerability, suffers not only from domestic instability and underdevelopment, but also is surrounded, mostly, by underdeveloped neighbors and instable neighborhood. Afghanistan's location in the middle of regional competitions and its terrain bears a resemblance to the 17th century Switzerland. The role of a provocative nationalism and historic disputes in its foreign policy towards its closest maritime neighbor is similar to that of Bolivia and Armenia. However, unlike Bolivia, it lacks a developed natural resources industry. Underdevelopment and instability in the region is similar to Uzbekistan and Botswana. But the nature of its export products is not like that of Botswana and is constrained to have a cordial relation with the neighborhood or to suffer from perpetual poverty and violence.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

A. Introduction

This thesis was set out to explore the impact of regional factors of *wealth* and *stability* on the foreign policies and security measures of landlocked states. Looking at this question is important because there are 42 landlocked states in the world and most of them suffer from poverty and instability. About half of all low-income economies in the world are landlocked states. And most importantly, there is a correlation between insecurity and lack of development which most landlocked states suffer from.

Internal instability and domestic underdevelopment of landlocked states are intensified by lack of stability and poverty in the region. Because landlocked states are limited by their surrounding geography, and have to use the land of neighboring sovereign states to access international markets, which puts them in inferior power position compared to their maritime neighbors. In some of the case studies presented in this thesis, the instability of landlocked states is not contained within their borders. In fact, the surrounding region and beyond are effected, eventually, creating instability on regional and international levels. However, the existing body of literature about the matter does not give much focus on this issues.

this thesis assumes that the geographical situation and regional context of each landlocked country have different effects over its foreign policy and security. Accordingly, in its attempt to answer the initial research questions about the effects of regional contexts, the thesis uses a 2/2 theoretical framework which divides regions

where landlocked countries are located in four categories: Stable and wealthy, stable but poor regions, wealthy but instable, and finally poor and instable regions.

Six landlocked countries were chosen as case studies for the above four categories. Switzerland, Bolivia, Botswana, Armenia, Uzbekistan and Afghanistan. Their foreign policy papers, statements of leaders, scholarly books and articles, and finally facts and figures presented by international organizations were assessed to find answer for the research question stated earlier. Inductive reasoning was used to draw the final conclusion comparing all cases studied in this thesis.

B. Empirical findings

Location matters the most. Stability and wealth of the region have direct impact on the security and foreign policies of landlocked states. Thus, the understanding of the location of landlocked countries and their regional context proves very crucial to comprehend its current internal situation and introduce policy changes or interventions. For instance, in the cases of Switzerland and Afghanistan, both countries are landlocked and share a somehow similar history of lack of domestic cohesion, regional tensions, and difficult topography. While Switzerland managed to grow one of three highest GDP per capita internationally, Afghanistan is still one of the poorest countries in the world. If only landlocked status was the determining factor, both countries should have similar economic conditions. The difference between the countries, however, is apparent in their locations and the level of wealth and stability their respective regions enjoy. This suggests that if Switzerland was located in a poor and instable region, we can assume that it would have been experiencing similar conditions as Afghanistan today.

The study of the six different case studies from five different regions of the world led, through this thesis, to assess how the two independent regional variables: wealth and stability, affect the two dependent variables: security and foreign policy.

Poor and unstable regions (Uzbekistan and Afghanistan). If a landlocked country is located in a poor and unstable region, its foreign policy and security are directly affected by those regional factors. The country's economic prosperity and internal security are affected by its landlocked status and, therefore, it experiences dual-vulnerability. Some landlocked states in such regions show concession towards their maritime or transit neighbors and are more likely to experience underdevelopment and insecurity. Some others, due to nationalism, may not show the same level of *concession*. Uzbekistan is an example of a country which shows concession towards its main transit neighbor, Kazakhstan. And Afghanistan, on the contrary, does not show concession towards its closest maritime neighbor, Pakistan. Thus, Access to the sea and transportation issues are securitized as national priorities in this category of landlocked states.

Poor but stable regions (Bolivia and Botswana). If a country is located in a poor but stable region, poverty, and weak infrastructure of the region affect the wellbeing of the landlocked country and hence its foreign policy. Landlocked countries located in this type of region are less likely to experience insecurity. Thus, economy is the main concern for these countries, not security. Such countries concern themselves more with developing means of transportation and cross-country commerce routes to secure their economic activities. They also concern more with their relationships with neighboring countries to find means of transportation for their national exports. However, the nature

of the country's exports and domestic wealth may determine the trends of their foreign policy and security measures.

For instance, Botswana uses air transportation for its rich diamond industry export rather than overland transportation. Therefore, it is not much affected by underdevelopment of its neighbors' transportation systems and regional poverty. On the other hand, Bolivia is affected by its own poor infrastructure and the tensions with its closest neighbor, Chile. The nature of Bolivia's main exports of oil and gas, forces it to depend on overland transportation via its neighbors which makes its external relations a matter of importance.

Rich but unstable regions (Armenia). Instability of the region is a fundamental factor affecting foreign policy and security measures of landlocked states. Besides being affected by the spillovers of instability in the region, the *dual-vulnerability* of landlocked countries is more visible in such cases.

Rich and stable regions (Switzerland). Landlocked countries located in the wealthy and stable regions are rare. They do not seem to share many characteristics with landlocked countries located in the other three categories. They do not prioritize the development of transportation issue and access to the sea as much as landlocked countries in other regions. Mainly because their main export and import neighboring partners are wealthy and stable. Nonetheless, history shows that being neighbors with big powers, for instance in the case of Switzerland, effects the security and foreign policy of the landlocked country. Moreover, it is effected by the changes in the balance of power in the region and mighty neighbors may have plans to occupy or intervene in the landlocked

country's affairs. However, since its declaration as a neutral state, Switzerland has been able to maintain its internal stability and sovereignty.

C. Theoretical implications

Findings of this thesis show that contrary to the existing literature (Idan and Shaffer, 2001), some landlocked countries do not show concession in their foreign policies towards their maritime neighbors and in contrast have antagonistic foreign policies against them. Bolivia's attitude regarding Chile, Armenia's relations with Turkey, and Afghanistan's behavior towards Pakistan are examples of this pattern. Aggression based on *nationalism* is at the core of this behavior. However, this factor is not addressed in the literature concerning foreign policy and security of landlocked states.

A second factor which is widely forgotten in the literature on the foreign/security policies of landlocked states is the influence the nature of export products on the foreign policy trends or security measures of landlocked countries. Botswana's case, for example, shows that if the main product of a country does not need to be exported through transportation systems of the neighboring countries, the landlocked country's foreign and security policies may not be much affected by its landlocked status or wealth and stability of the region. To some extent, the same is true about Switzerland due to its service based economy. In contrast, when a landlocked state's main export is largely dependent on the overland transit routes of its neighbors, such as Bolivia's gas export or Uzbekistan's Catton, it is affected by the regional factors of poverty, underdevelopment, and instability and, thus, needs to tone its foreign policy accordingly.

D. Policy Implications

Case studies presented in this thesis show that the landlocked countries which managed to stay away from regional and international wars or rivalries tend to be more secure and less affected by conflicts in their regions. Switzerland's permanent neutrality, Botswana's ad hoc neutrality during the liberty movement in the Southern Africa, and Afghanistan's neutrality during the two World Wars and then its non-alignment during the first half of the Cold War, are examples of such foreign policy behaviors. Most landlocked countries follow multi-vector foreign policies which enable them to keep the balance between different influential actors. However, the overlay of this policy, such as Afghanistan in 1950-60s, can invite regional and international conflicts into the country.

More investigation is still needed to see if neutrality can be the best foreign policy option for landlocked states. Existing literature (Cronin, 2013 and Andisha 2015) show that neutrality might work in some but not all cases. For instance, neutrality paid off for Switzerland but not for Austria. Although, the current argument (Cronin, 2013) is that Switzerland had *armed-neutrality* and thus was successful. In contrast, Austria was disarmed and neutralized by the foreign forces, hence, it was unsuccessful. Nevertheless, it is not very clear if the kind of neutrality was behind Austria's failure to prevent Germany from invading it at the wake of World War II or it was other factors. Further scholarship on this issue may prove helpful.

E. Limitations of the study

Scarcity of literature on the foreign policy and security of landlocked countries proved very limiting for this thesis. Even when foreign policy or security of landlocked countries are studied, it is not focused on the landlocked factor. The existing body of scholarship on the landlocked countries is mainly concentrated on development and

economy. Thus, most of the literature used in this thesis is extracted from studies which are not resolute on the landlocked factor from security or foreign policy perspectives.

In addition to that limitation, there are two other factors which play significant roles in determining a landlocked country's relation with its neighborhood. Nationalism and the main export product. Future research may discover more about these two factors and their relation with landlocked status and how they influence the landlocked countries shaping their foreign policies and security measures.

F. Conclusion

In contrast to the existing literature, which suggests that there are no direct relations between being landlocked and security, findings of this thesis show that foreign policy and security of landlocked countries are directly affected by the landlocked status and two regional factors: wealth and stability. Wealth and stability of the regions are decisive factors for foreign policy and security of landlocked states. These two factors, with some exceptions, determine landlocked countries' foreign policy options and their security measures. The fact that those landlocked states, which are better off now, are located in wealthy and stable regions and those which are struggling with instability and underdevelopment are located in instable and poor regions reveals the importance of region. Exceptional landlocked states, like Botswana, may run out of their natural resources one day, but location doesn't go anywhere.

REFERENCES

- Aeschimann, S. (2004). Elements of Neutrality. Retrieved from <http://www.vbs.admin.ch/internet/vbs/en/home/documentation/publication.parsys.0008.downloadList.9934.DownloadFile.tmp/neuteebook.pdf>
- Andisha, N. (1972). Neutrality in Afghanistan's Foreign Policy. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 2(1), 59-60. doi:United States Institute of Peace
- Aras, B., & Ozbay, F. (2008, September 08). Turkish-Armenian Relations: Will Football Diplomacy Work? - SETA Foundation at Washington DC. Retrieved from <http://setadc.org/turkish-armenian-relations-will-football-diplomacy-work/>
- Armstrong, B. (n.d.). A Landlocked Bolivia: Disputes between Bolivia, Peru and Chile. University of Puget Sound. Retrieved 2010, from http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=writing_awards
- Bluestone, D. (n.d.). A Day of Unrest: A Report on Bolivian Identity Politics. Kennedy School Review. Retrieved from <https://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-237943398.html>
- Bolivia-Overview. (206). Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/bolivia>
- Botswana. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/botswana>
- Caroe, O. (1958). *The Pathans: 550 B.C.-A.D. 1957*. London: Macmillan.
- Chowdhury, A., & Erdenebileg, S. (2006). *Geography against development a case for landlocked developing countries*. New York: United Nations.

Collier, P. (2007). *The bottom billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cronin, A. K. (2013). Thinking Long on Afghanistan: Could it be Neutralized? *The Washington Quarterly*, 36(1), 55-72. doi:10.1080/0163660x.2013.751650

Daniels, R. (2013). Strategic Competition in South Asia: Gwadar, Chabahar, and the Risks of Infrastructure Development. *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 35(2), 93-100. doi:10.1080/10803920.2013.776887

Diehl, P., & Tir, J. (2000). The political geography of enduring rivalries.

Domínguez, J. I. (2003). Boundary Dispute in Latin America. Retrieved from http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~jidoming/images/jid_boundary.pdf

Dunne, J. (2014). Order at sea and landlocked countries in Africa: Economic Benefits.

Faye, M. L., McArthur, J. W., Sachs, J. D., & Snow, T. (2004). The Challenges Facing Landlocked Developing Countries. *Journal of Human Development*, 5(1), 31-68. doi:10.1080/14649880310001660201

Foreign policy strategy and implementation. (2016, April 28). Retrieved from <https://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/fdfa/fdfa/implementing-foreign-policy.html>

Galstyan, N. S. (2013, March 26). The main dimensions of Armenia's foreign and security policy. Retrieved from <http://www.peacebuilding.no/Themes/Emerging-powers/Publications/The-main-dimensions-of-Armenia-s-foreign-and-security-policy>

Giragosian, R. (2006). Redefining Armenian National Security. *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, 14(2), 223-234. doi:10.3200/demo.14.2.223-234

Giragosian, R. (2006). Redefining Armenian National Security. *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, 14(2), 223-234. doi:10.3200/demo.14.2.223-234

Glassner, M. I. (1971). Access to the sea for developing land-locked states. The Hague: Nijhoff.

De Blij, H. & Glassner, M. (1989). *Systematic Political Geography* (4th ed.). New York, NY.

Gleason, G. (2006). The Uzbek Expulsion U.S. Forces and in Central Asia. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 53(2), 49-60. doi:10.2753/ppc1075-8216530205

Hanauer, L., & Chalk, P. (2012). United States Should Encourage India to Take a Greater Role in Afghanistan. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/OP387.html

Hasan, Z. (1964). The Foreign Policy of Afghanistan. *Pakistan Horizan*, Vol. 17(1), 48-57. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41403798>

Hussain, I. (1984). Pakistan's Attitude towards the Question of Free Access to the Sea of Landlocked States. *Archiv Des Völkerrechts*, 22(4).

Idan, A., & Shaffer, B. (2011). The Foreign Policies of Post-Soviet Landlocked States. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 27(3), 241-268. doi:10.2747/1060-586x.27.3.241

Mahdi, S. (Director). (2015, September 3). BLACK AND WHITE: Ex-President Karzai On His Presidential Journey [Video file]. Retrieved from

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=92pYA-EkUhE>

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of Great Power politics*. New York: Norton.

Möckli, D. (2007). Swiss Neutrality: Rhetoric and Relevance. *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, 2(20).

Möckli, D. (2008). Swiss Foreign Policy: Strategies of a Niche Player. *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, 3(44).

Mirzoyan, A. (2010). *Armenia, the regional powers, and the West: Between history and geopolitics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mishra, R., & Singh, S. (2008). Defence and security problems of Land-locked Countries (LLCs). *India Quarterly: A Journal of International Affairs*, 64(3), 55-74.

Retrieved from

http://econpapers.repec.org/article/saeindqtr/v_3a64_3ay_3a2008_3ai_3a3_3ap_3a55-74.htm

Monquet, C., & Rocimora, W. (2013, January 17). The Armenian-Iran relationships Strategic Implications for Security in the South Caucasus Region.

Morris, K., & White, T. J. (2011). Neutrality and the European Union: The case of Switzerland. *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution*, 3(7).

Neimann, M. (1993). *Diamonds Are a State's Best Friend: Botswana's Foreign Policy in Southern Africa*. Indiana University Press, 40(1), 27-47.

Neutrality: The Essence of Swiss Neutrality. (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/fdfa/foreign-policy/international-law/neutrality.html>

Objectives of Uzbekistan's foreign policy course. (2010, April 27). Retrieved from http://www.uzbekistan.nsk.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=81%3Aobjectives-of-uzbekistans-foreign-policy-course&catid=28%3Aforeign-policy&Itemid=89

Petros, T. G. (2003). Evolution of Armenia's Foreign Policy. Armenian International Policy Research Group.

Rashid, A., & Rubin, B. (2008, November). From Great Game to Grand Bargain Ending Chaos in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2008-11-01/great-game-grand-bargain>

Ree, G. V. (2010). Chile's (Inter)National Identities: Framing the Relations with Bolivia and Peru. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 29(2), 208-223. doi:10.1111/j.1470-9856.2009.00349.x

Republic of Uzbekistan and the IMF -- Page 1 of 5. (2015, April 15). Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/external/country/uzb/>

Roehrs, P. (2005). Weak States and Implications for Regional Security: A Case Study of Georgian Instability and Caspian Regional Insecurity. *Research Institute for European and American Studies*, (79).

Ryan, K. J. (2009). Exploring Alternatives for Strategic Access To Afghanistan (Unpublished master's thesis). U.S. Army War College.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. New York: Penguin Press.

Saikal, A., G., R. F., & Nourzhanov, K. (2004). *Modern Afghanistan: A history of struggle and survival*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Shaffer, B. (2010). Foreign Policies of the States of the Caucasus: Evolution in the Post-Soviet Period. *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 7(26), 51-65. Retrieved from www.uidergisi.com

Shahnazaryan, D. (2006). The South Caucasus: Problems of Stability and Regional Security. *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization*, 14(3), 355-360. doi:10.3200/demo.14.3.355-360

Starr, S. F. (2005). *Violence in Andijan, 13 may 2005: An Independent Assessment*. Washington, DC.

Stone, S. (2010, May 14). Gas & Geopolitics: The Foreign Policy Implications of Energy Import Dependency. Retrieved from http://cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/publications/gas__geopolitics_the_foreign_policy_implications_of_energy_import_dependency

Stovall, P. A. (n.d.). THE NEUTRALITY OF SWITZERLAND. *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, 6(3), 197-210. Retrieved 1922.

Switzerland. (2016, March 24). Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sz.html>

Switzerland. (2016). Retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/country/switzerland>

Tadjbaksh, S. (2012). Central Asia and Afghanistan insulation on the Silk Road Between Eurasia and the Heart of Asia. *Human Rights Documents Online*. doi:10.1163/2210-7975_hrd-0165-0028

Tahsin, E. (2011). DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS IN THE ALBA. *International Journal of Cuban Studies*, 3(2/3, Special Issue: A new dawn? ALBA and the future of Caribbean and Latin American integration), 198-220. Retrieved from <http://unohrlls.org/UserFiles/File/LLDC%20Documents/ALMATY%20+10/Master%20Copy%20development%20cost%20of%20landlockedness%2030%20June%202013.pdf>

Taylor, I., & Mokhawa, G. (2003). Not forever: Botswana, conflict diamonds and the Bushmen. *African Affairs*, 102(407), 261-283. doi:10.1093/afraf/adg004

Trinkunas, H. (2013). Reordering regional security in Latin America Harold Trinkunas. *Journal of International Affairs*, 66(22), 83.

Wehner, L. E. (2011). Developing Mutual Trust: The Othering Process Between Bolivia and Chile. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 36(71), 109-138. doi:10.1080/08263663.2011.10817002

The World Factbook: Bolivia. (2016, May 05). Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/bl.html>

The World Factbook: Uzbekistan. (2016, May 10). Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/uz.html>