ARMENIA AND EU: SECURITY AGENDA AS A FRESH START FOR ENGAGEMENT

Ani GRIGORYAN[*]

Abstract: *EU Eastern Partnership has gone through a number of difficulties and impediments since its establishment. In the case of Georgia and Moldova we have observed some progress, however in all other cases there is a certain setback. The political spectrum of Armenia was narrowed after September 3, 2013. In mid-January 2016 president Sargsyan held a meeting with EU ambassador in Armenia where he particularly mentioned that EU engagement is a top priority for Armenia (Armenpress, 2016) thus demonstrating that attitudes by both sides towards further engagement have undergone transformations. In the context of current geopolitical developments, the security sector could serve as a platform for Armenia and EU to foster collaboration. Thus, the main goal of the research paper is to seek avenues for approximation in the area of security and hence provide both parties with a deeper understanding of mutual objectives and visions.*

Keywords: Security; Eastern Partnership; Nagorno-Karabakh; CSDP; Conflict Resolution

Introduction

On April 22, 2016, the EU High Representative Frederica Mogherini had a speech within the framework of the annual conference on European Union Global Strategy where she mentioned that "We must strengthen regional orders because conflicts have increasingly transnational nature" (*Mogherini,* 2016) thus reinforcing the importance of the security dimension on the broader sense. Europe seems more than ever concerned about security in the aftermath of volatilities in the Arab world, refugee crisis, continuous terrorist attacks. These concerns are reinforced by a number of geopolitical shifts in the international arena. Particularly after Iran was lifted the sanctions and began taking huge steps towards reintegration in global issues Europe comes to view the energy problem from different more pragmatic/organizational and less problematic angle. Instead, the security issues within European Union and its neighbourhood seem to have gained momentum especially in the light of a number of unrests spotted in the countries of Eastern Partnership, thus questioning the success of this initiative. As a result, the security dimension for the EU and its importance in the context of Eastern Partnership as a whole and for each country separately has gained importance. Hence, the security platform has acquired quite paradoxical meaning. On the one hand, it endangers the stability in the region threatening to expand beyond its borders. On the other hand, it has the potential of

---

[*] PhD student, National Academy of Sciences, Yerevan, Armenia, e-mail: anihgrigoryan@gmail.com

becoming the platform that could enhance integration process with EU with all its favourable consequences.

However, the analysis of the overall history of EU engagement in the countries of Eastern Partnership demonstrates that the security dimension is the weakest circle in the set of activities implemented by the EU in the countries of EaP. Proceeding from this the research will aim at introducing the security dimension of EU as represented within the framework of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and the possible avenues of application of the main strategies as registered in CSDP. Consequently, the research paper will aim at addressing the following questions:

1. How Armenia could benefit from CSDP? In this context, the major problem to be addressed is how to prevent other security models from being detrimental to the achievement of the mutual goal.

2. Are there any platforms existent to embark upon integration between Armenia and CSDP? If not, what mechanisms should be used to create them with the aim of fostering collaboration, working out a joint agenda, sharing experience and expertise? Such initiatives do not pursue short-term goals, but could serve as introductory events to come to a deeper understanding in regard to future cooperation.

3. Consequently, why the collaboration between Armenia and EU within the framework of CSDP could enhance the effect of EaP in the region?

To answer the above-mentioned questions, we will study the official statements, interviews as well as correspondent documents concerning possibilities of future cooperation in the security sphere given the new geopolitical as well a security developments in the region. Therefore, the research paper is expected to be an intermixture of theory and practice. Namely, on the one hand, it will shed light upon previous extensive research carried out in the field and, on the other, it will introduce the theoretical framework of security and the main mechanisms making it compatible with the reality.

1. Literature review

As far as the research paper aims at introducing the set of prerequisites for cooperation between Armenia and EU in security sector most attention is paid to the official statements of EU External Action Service High official's statements on different occasions regarding ENP and namely EaP. Additionally, the research paper leans upon a number of key documents, e.g. Treaty of Lisbon, European Security Strategy and so on.

Given that the study is cohered around the concept of security (Rothschild, 1995) we have referred to the fundamental theories of the concept in academic literature such as national security (Wolfers, 1952), international security (Buzan and Hansen, 2009), security alliance dilemma (Snyder, 1984).

When preparing the article, a vast number of analysis regarding Armenia-EU relations have been examined as well as proceedings of various conferences regarding the question under consideration.

To make the research more comprehensive interviews and opinions by European and Armenian high officials as well as experts and academicians have been included.

2. The Imperatives of the Security Dimension: CSDP

The concept of security as a multidimensional phenomenon has gained much attention from scholars and politicians in recent years though without adding little understanding to the already existing concept of security (Baldwin, 1997). As it is contested in Rothschild's article the pluralistic understanding of security can be dated back to the time of French Revolution (Rothschild, 1995). However, as Rothschild's mentions the concept of security has been extended from national state to group and individual security on the one hand, and to international security on the other. The notion of security is highly relevant in neorealist approach. Waltz observes in his famous quote that "Only if survival is assured can states seek such other goals as tranquillity, profit, and power" (Waltz, 1979).

However, in this article the security will be discussed from the viewpoint of International Security Studies, thus placing the security issues in the light of external threats to the state. Hence, International Security is derived from the fundamentals of National Security accompanying rather than replacing the latter (Buzan *et al*., 2009, p. 10). It is of vital importance to stress that International Security owing its development as well as institutionalization overwhelmingly to the period after the Cold War incorporates mainly the military capabilities of states including its own military potential. Therefore, the concept of "national security" became to be identical with military security thus incorporating various economic, political as well as energy aspects (Buzan *et al*., 2009, p. 29). The international security rationale is best understood in the context of the security dilemma theory. More particularly according to the theory if the state does not have the intention of attacking other states, it can never be sure in peaceful mood of other states. Thus it strives to form alliances first to be more secure and secondly to maximize its share of benefits of the alliance (Snyder, 1984). The selection of

the ally is often conditioned by geographical proximity as well as a number of the particular interests such as economic, ethnic as well as ideological values to name just a few.

Proceeding from this the current research will aim at understanding international security aspects in the context of Eastern Partnership initiative taking into account recent developments on the international arena which keep altering security priorities on the one hand of EU and on the other hand of countries of Eastern Partnership initiative with the main focus on the South Caucasus region in the context of Common Security and Defence Policy. The security dimension being the most important aspect in bilateral relation given the instability and rise of violence in different corners of the world leaves its unavoidable negative impact also on the political landscape of bilateral relations. However, as it is fairly mentioned in the CEPS Task Force report "Effective security sector reform (SSR), with special emphasis on the defence and intelligence sectors, was not included" in the package of integration policy with its "strategic neighbourhood" (CEPS, 2015). The concept "strategic neighbourhood" implies also the MENA region however in this article the main emphasis will be on post-Soviet space and namely the South Caucasus.

Building regional security in the Caucasus listed among key priorities for European Foreign and security Policy (Derek, 2013). As stated in the implementation report of Council in 2008 "the frozen conflicts" in this region are a major threat to European security (*ESS Implementation Report*, 2008). However, there is nothing particular mentioned about the Karabakh conflict which nowadays could hardly be called a frozen one.

3. A new framework of strategies within Common Foreign and Security Policy

The review the European Security Strategy adopted by the EU in separate geographical and thematic dimensions incorporates a more integrated approach to reboot bilateral relations and to create more room for cooperation.

The new challenges EU faced during 2012-2014 provided new aspiration for Brussels to reconsider their security vision. The latest geopolitical developments in the EU neighbourhood and in the Middle East as well as Iran nuclear deal played a crucial role in redefining EU's relations and policy priorities pushing security issues to the first places thus reframing shared vision of security in and around Europe.

The European Security Strategy adopted in 2003 named "A Secure Europe in a better world" identified regional conflicts being one of the main 5 threats worldwide (European Security Strategy,

2016). Consequently, this issue has found its achievement within the framework of CSDP actions. As stated in the Lisbon Treaty, CSDP is an integral part of European foreign policy agenda consistent with EU and NATO priorities and commitments (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007).

In the 2003 European Security Strategy the relationship between security and development is formulated as "security is the first condition for development" (European Security Strategy, 2003). Still the need to reconsider the security aspect of this document in line with shifting security priorities has gained much importance especially in the light of recent attacks in Paris and Brussels. However, in 2008 amendments were made to the original document given changing circumstances which found their place in the implementation report of the document. These include EU enlargement policy and namely European neighbourhood initiative developed in 2008. Understandably, the Ukrainian crisis and major developments in Middle East have considerably changed the face of European security thus demanding urgent solutions to the problem. The shift in security agenda could serve as a new starting point to rethink Eastern Partnership Initiative, thus preventing the process of its failure and making the target countries more enthusiastic and motivated about it.

Coming back to CSDP we should mention that it is characterized as "the weakest link in the European integration project" (Derek, 2013) being a result and conditioned by divergence in intention, low level of solidarity and strategic vision. In functional terms it is the operations arm of Common Foreign and Security Policy.

To better understand the CSDP it is necessary to reflect upon 'The Programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts" (the Gothenburg Programme) (EU programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts) that foresees three main areas: early warning, action and policy coherence. As a result, the EU Conflict Early Warning System was developed directed to highlighting global threats, assessing, strategic planning and programming as well as developing response strategies (EU Conflict Early Warning System). Proceeding from this and taking into account the high level of volatility on the global level, complexity and uncertainty European Union is in need to assess challenges and threats and to develop mechanisms to respond adequately.. In this context, the role and importance of CSDP is constantly being reconsidered and revitalized. Namely, European Council on Security and Defence Interim Report adopted in December 2013 put forward the following criteria to improve CSDP missions: making CSDP "a part of more comprehensive and wider approach in accordance with EU instruments, engaging CSDP in capacity building measurements, to assist conflict prevention, conflict management (European External Action Service, 2013). Thus, CSDP is increasingly an integral part of bilateral relationships with third countries and with international

and/or regional organizations. It is perceived as a platform for the development of security and defence dialogues.

In this regard, it would be worthwhile to mention that in academic literature we distinguish between 5 types of interactions for avoiding and managing conflicts: severe rivalry, lesser rivalry, negative peace, warm peace, and security communities respectively (Goertz *et al.*, 2016). Among all these the most relevant issue is the problem of security communities. The so-called positive peace (Galtung, 1965) becomes realistic when considering it with warm peace (Diehl, 2016) such as having shared alliances. However, this does not guarantee security and peace within the alliances (e.g. Turkey and Greece in NATO). Warm peace between security communities is regarded as strong and the possibility conflict is low. The main characteristics of security communities are 1. Shared identity, values and norms, and proceeding from this they suppose extensive cooperation, interaction at several levels, i.e. private as well as government (Diehl, 2016). As Karl Deutsch mentioned security communities are "transnational spaces where shared identities and common ideas develop, based on a high level of transnational interactions, which in the long-term facilitate the development of shared expectation of peaceful change" (Deutsch, 1957). Waever, on its turn labels, Western Europe as security community adding that "security community proves to be a fertile organizing question in that it produced a re-thinking of European politics in the complex field where the historic novelty of non-war meets transformation of security from state to multiple units" (Waever, 1998). Therefore, one of the main steps towards wider secure Europe is close interaction of security communities of South Caucasus and EU. This interaction, however, should not be taken as between established rules and institutions. Rather it might serve as the basis for long-term vision of cooperation between the two communities. As it is suggested in the new threats should find their responses "through the lenses of societal resilience"(European Parliament, 2015) as these societies experience more prosperous mechanisms of responding to various challenges than fragile and underdeveloped societies.

Against this backdrop, the Council Conclusions of CSDP on May 2015 prioritised the following areas for CSDP as a security provider: addressing conflicts, instability, security challenges (Council of the EU, 2015). The document emphasizes the importance of cooperation between internal and external players, given the importance of the security dimension of its neighbourhood for the European world. Thus, a few mechanisms are put forward for achieving these goals. Particularly, measurements such as increasing hybrid operations, establishing crisis management and assessment structures as well as reinforcing capacity-building mechanisms gain momentum. Having assessed modern global threats and challenges the importance of CSDP has been reconsidered according to

Directorate-General for External Policies Policy Department Assessment. Here the following criteria can be found as why and how CSDP is relevant to the security of EU.

First of all, the EU engagement in conflict-affected areas and fragile countries has increased. The growing share of EU external action in the period 2014-2020 has been directed to the countries from the geographical proximity with focus on "security analysis at all stages, from programming, to implementation to after-action assessment" (European Parliament, 2015). As such, the CSDP actions are expected to be implemented in strong accordance with EU security interests and avoiding isolation form other EU actions.

Secondly, policy priorities reflected in December 2013 European Council on security and defence where the key expression "defence matters" by EU leaders aim at increasing EU role in international crisis management thus transforming EU external action priorities.

Thirdly, these shifts in EU security and defence sector have pushed forward the need to recalibrate CSDP-NATO relations. The dialogue between the two is in progress. It is not accidental that during his speech before the European Parliament NATO Secretary General mentioned three main areas that envisage cooperation: 1. building resilience together, 2. building resilience together with neighbours to the east and the south; 3. and defence investment (Stoltenberg, 2015).

Of these three the second point deserves clarification. Cooperation in the East which includes South Caucasus has always been in the centre of attention in terms of EU foreign policy agenda. However, it should be mentioned that a more profound and straightforward strategy and programme is needed in this regard to deepen EU engagement in the region in terms of security. A more institutionalized approach should be applied also to cooperation between EU and Armenia. The history of Armenia and NATO cooperation seems to have broadly confirmed the possible interaction between Armenia and CSDP irrespective of Armenia being a member of Russia-led Collective Security Treaty Organization. In connection with this, the Action Plan 2015 "Taking forward the EU's Comprehensive Approach to external conflict and crises" identified the main methodologies, regions to be treated capacity building initiatives in support of security and development (Day, 2015). However, the South Caucasus region does not come in the list of those regions and countries of immediate engagement. Given the four-day's war in Nagorno-Karabakh this conflict is a threat not only for the countries of the region but also for the West. However, in the aftermath of Vienna negotiations with the participation of Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group (Press Release, 2016a) a relative ceasefire was declared. The clear message of the negotiations was that the conflict has no military resolution[1]. However, the ceasefire is still not reliable given continuous violations resulting

---

[1] Statement by Representatives of the OSCE Minsk Group Countries, Vienna, 5 April 2016.

in fatalities from both sides (Global security, 2016). These causalities and unrest alongside the line of contact reconfirm the importance of a more institutional, fundamental and overwhelming approach to the resolution of this conflict. Thus, revisiting Eastern Partnership concerns in the region mainly from security perspective could appear efficient for both sides in terms of gaining peace, and consequently economic and political dividends.

As it is stated in the implementation report adopted on March 25, 2015 the CSDP engagement in EaP region has remarkably increased. However, it should be mentioned that only three countries Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia are mentioned in the report (European Commission, 2015). However shortly after the publication of this report Federica Mogherini mentioned in her speech during the follow-up meeting of the Defence and Foreign Affairs Council that among the three main strategies of CSDP is "the decision to increase our presence with the already existing CSDP missions and operations" (Mogherini, 2015). When we try to put this in the context of increasing the security dimension in the context of EaP, Mogherini mentioned during her visit to Armenia in early March 2015 that the security dimension remains an important part of bilateral relations between Armenia and EU (Mogherini, 2016). However, these words were not reinforced by action during the four days war in Nagorno-Karabakh in early April 2016[2]. Moreover, an attempt was made to treat the problem on parity principle given the fact that it was obvious for all sides the motivations of the aggressor party. In connection with April events high representative mentioned that "I call on the parties to stop the fighting immediately and observe the cease-fire...We expect both sides to respect strictly the ceasefire, refrain from the use of force and resume efforts towards a peaceful resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict" (Mogherini, April 2016).

The importance of security dimension of the EaP was also highlighted during the speech on the European Neighbourhood Policy Review published in November 2015. Particularly among key areas of cooperation, security dimension was stressed mentioning that so far the main portion of attention has been dedicated to community instruments. Thus, a shift is necessary to key challenges in the region. The document also addresses continuing cooperation with Armenia despite its entrance into the Eurasian Economic Union (Hahn, 2015). The fact does not let Armenia hopeless as it comes to cooperation with the West, however there exists a certain set of criteria such as judicial sector reforms and anticorruption measures that need to be fulfilled in order to proceed with the bilateral dialogue. However, the security dimension in bilateral relations has not been a priority. With Armenia extensively engaged in Karabakh war directly and indirectly which halts the process of development

---

[2] Nagorno-Karabakh Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs Statement, 30 April 2016

in key areas, Armenia-West cooperation could lay strong basis for recalibrating the EaP initiative thus ensuring its success in the foreseeable future.

Taking into account that EU and global security is interdependent the importance of bringing together EU internal and external security is prioritized in the document of the European Agenda on Security. In this connection "EU response must therefore be comprehensive and based on a coherent set of actions combining internal and external dimensions" (European Parliament, 2015). It is important to bear in mind that that there are certain limitations regarding the CSDP as an integrative tool conditioned by the inner logic of the main mechanisms that realize this policy (Dyson *et al.*, 2013). Thus, the effectiveness and success of CSDP is largely dependent upon the cooperation with international partners. Thus, the importance of deployment of security experts to neighbouring countries as well as of local coordination by EU delegates and representatives is stressed.

In the same vein, another question should be answered regarding EU's motivations in engaging with South Caucasus region. Although the EU demonstrates reluctance in addressing a number of important regional issues despite its stance of being a regional promoter (Kostanyan *et al.,* 2015), the EU interests in the region are twofold. First, a peaceful periphery serves as a safeguard preventing various security challenges from spreading to the centre and, second, it becomes the bearer of economic social and cultural progress that EU seeks to promote via soft power policies. Conflicts whether frozen or not are listed among the major threats to European security reflected in the European Security Strategy. Thus, a closer cooperation in the sphere of peace building, conflict prevention and conflict resolution in South Caucasus, and particularly in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict could be an opportunity to improve EU-Armenian relations. It would be worthwhile to mention that recent developments in EU-Armenian relations seem quite promising in the context of a set of communitarian programmes in judicial sphere, regional markets, CFSP statements that prove the willingness of a number of countries in the initiative to become an EU member.

EU-South Caucasus relations have been based on three main issues: assistance to political and economic transition processes; conflict resolution; and support to the development of the energy potential of the region (Simão, 2011). As Buzan mentions the South Caucasus forms a security complex (Buzan, 1991) where security is strongly dependent upon such factors as ethnic issues, territorial dispute vast and various cultural background together with far-going ambitions of each of three countries in the region. Hence, security cooperation mapping should be accompanied by configurations in accordance with international norms and principles facilitation.

In February 2016 Minister Soini underlined the urge to develop long-term strategic vision for the EU to meet global challenges. He particularly drew attention to the internal and external security dimensions. To achieve stability and to be more confident for the coming years the EU needs to look at its broader neighbourhood. In this regards it should be mentioned that Eastern Partnership has been recalibrated for the EU. Proceeding from this he mentions in his speech that more political and economic cooperation is needed with the six countries respecting their sovereign choices and avoiding "arrangements in a zero-sum manner" (Soini, 2016). In this path the cooperation with Russia cannot be ignored, moreover it is highly recommended to find fresh ways of interacting with Russia for the benefit of coping with the Syrian and Ukrainian crisis as well as to deal with other international security issues among which should also be mentioned the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. In this regard the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict resolution presents a beneficial platform to strengthen ties between Armenia and EU thus promoting the Eastern Partnership initiatives. This platform leaves room for hope given that this conflict is one of the few issues on which EU and Russia have reached a limited consensus. However, it would be worthwhile to mention that the ceasefire violations alongside Karabakh-Azerbaijani and Armenian-Azerbaijani borderline remain unnoticed by the international society raising questions among Armenian's towards EU aspirations regarding the peaceful settlement of the conflict.

Amidst a number of harsh political, socio-economic challenges the security issue seems to remain an underestimated problem in the South Caucasus region. However, it deserves more attention as stability and integration in the region and at a higher level in broad Europe are highly reliant on this factor. The EU should particularly be interested and engaged in addressing current security problems the biggest of which is the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. I would like to address the problem as why the Nagorno-Karabakh issue is the most important. First of all it includes two of the three countries in the region making peace and stability impossible: there are trilateral (Georgia, Turkey and Azerbaijan) economic projects. Secondly it should be mentioned that among other global players though indirectly but Turkey is also engaged in the process of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict resolution. Turkey has continuously been backing Azerbaijan thus triggering and encouraging ceasefire violations alongside the line of contact between Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan, Armenia and Azerbaijan (Hurriyet Daily News, 2016).

In this regard the Euronest Resolution adopted in March 22, 2016 on Common positions and concerns of the EU Member States and Eastern European partner countries over foreign policies and external threats to their security deserves attention. In particular, it calls on regional players to set up

joint actions towards security and defence issues, namely in the field of conflict prevention, anti-terrorist and anti-radicalization through substantial cooperation with CSDP missions and training activities, as well as within the framework of Eastern Partnership Panel on Cooperation in the sphere of security. The resolution also calls the European Neighbourhood Policy on more profound measurements regarding the security sector reform (Euronest Resolution, 2016). Thus, there is a strong need of cooperation among both sides seeking mutual benefits.

4. A reflection on the Armenian perceptions of EU-Armenia relations

Perceptions of EU engagement in the South Caucasus among Armenian officials and civilians represent a rich landscape and needs profound analysis. Before the decision to join the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) Armenians were looking positively towards the prospect of signing the Associative Agreement document. The decision to join the EEU was as shocking and unexpected for Armenians as it was for the European side. However, after Armenia's president Sargsyan's announcement (Press Release, 2016b) about entering the Eurasian Economic Union many civilians, experts expressed disappointment about the EU approach to the situation. Throughout out the time concern about the apparent ineffectiveness of the Eurasian Union appeared to be realistic. It did not prove to be successful neither in economic nor in political terms[3]. Still after the Riga summit it became apparent that Armenia is still considered a potential partner. This approach was also reinforced by the statement of EU ambassador Piotr Antoni Świtalski during his briefing in early 2016[4]. Therefore relaunching negotiations between the EU and Armenia seem to provide rich ground for "defining a new comprehensive framework for bilateral relations (which) will help Armenia keep up with its reforms and modernization of its institutions" (Poghosyan, 2016). Thus, a whole new vision is therefore necessary for the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict negotiation process after the four-day war along the LOC between Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan. It should be noted here that the term "local conflicts" does not exist any longer. As a result of globalization and technological advancements coupled with the geographical location of the region as "a bridge between the East and the West" extensive military actions cannot stay confined to the borders of the two parties involved in the conflict. The fact that representatives from different stakeholders in the conflict expressed their stance towards this four-day's war, comes to prove that: first, the military option for the resolution is

---

[3] It should be noted here that the Eurasian Economic Union has been perceived not as an economic but a political phenomenon both in the region and among the international community

[4] Press Releases (2016), "President Serzh Sargsyan received the head of the EU delegation to the republic of Armenia, Piotr Switalski", 13 January 2016

unacceptable to all parties, and secondly there is a strong need to identify the party that unleashed the violent actions which resulted in numerous victims from both sides. Consequently, a more comprehensive and overwhelming measurements should be applied for the peaceful settlement of the conflict the eruption which is a real threat not only for the parties directly involved in the conflict but also for key players on the international arena. In this regard, it would be worthwhile to refer to the visit of OSCE Minsk Group co-chairs to Armenia, Nagorno-Karabakh Azerbaijan after the four-day's war in April, 2016. Particularly, during their press conference, it became apparent that the co-chairs lack any consistent approach to the problem, moreover they treated the problem on parity principle which can have adverse results in the short-term future (OSCE, 2016)[5]. Given these facts the cooperation between Armenia and CSDP can be a driving force for the successful implementation of EaP in the region as well as for the peaceful settlement of the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh. More commitment is necessary from the international community over these issues otherwise the power vacuum in the region is supposed to be filled by Russia.

There are key areas which require immediate settlements otherwise inaction in this regard would prove to be disastrous on regular basis. Of them I would like to mention the establishment of investigative mechanisms of ceasefire violation and early warning systems as well as clearing out political intentions and expectations of the parties involved in the negotiation process. These two steps are included in the CSDP missions and if undertaken could minimize the risks of escalation on the one hand and additionally they could give the parties to participate in negotiations.

Since OSCE has appeared to be reserved as far as the Nagorno-Karabakh is concerned, the EU more involvement in the process could serve "to underscore both collective European responsibility and individual member-state leadership" (Broers, 2016). The April events demonstrated how dangerous and violent the conflict can appear. Therefore, urgent need for diplomacy to take immediate steps to revitalize the peace process are important, otherwise as Armenian expert mentions another repetition of the four-day's war is a matter of time (Giragosyan, 2016). However, we have to justly notice that after the violent clashes the full OSCE Minsk Group issued a joint statement serving a precedent during the last year. Despite the fact that it was only Russia involvement when the comparative ceasefire was established still the joint statement was a little step forward. In this context, what the EU is expected to perform is to reconsider its role in the wider OSCE Minsk group on the one hand and on the other push forward the problem of conflict settlement in the political agenda with

---

[5] Press Release, the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, Moscow/Washington/Paris, 2 April 2016.

Armenia and Azerbaijan. Unfortunately, as it is illustrated in the European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2016 Wider Europe the Eastern Partnership countries are most importantly regarded by the West as sources for diversifying energy supply routes (European Foreign Policy Scorecard, 2016). As stated in the Council Conclusions on the Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy the "neighbourhood is a strategic priority and a fundamental interest for the EU" (European Council, 2016). Having this in mind the EU stresses the importance of capacity-building measurements to address security threats mainly via security sector reform. In this connection, a closer and comprehensive cooperation between ENP and CSDP is stressed. It should be added that in terms of security sector cooperation EU High Representative Federica Mogherini's statement during her visit to the South Caucasus in early January deserves attention when more particularly she mentioned that the peaceful solution of the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh is vital for EU (*Mogherini,* 2016). In this regards EU instruments for long-term and short-term prevention could provide a perfect solution among them development cooperation, arms control and political dialogue as well as diplomatic instruments as developed by ESDP[6]. Additionally, this would be a huge step forward in terms of EaP guaranteeing a new phase of cooperation between EU and Armenia resulting in a more stable South Caucasus and more profound interaction between the two parties.

Conclusion

Based on the security dimension the article was an attempt to draw the possible avenues of cooperation between the EU and Armenia within the framework of CSDP taking into account the current political developments on the international arena as well as CSDP geostrategic vision in the South Caucasus region. As it is apparent from the documents, treaties and official statements the EU pursues certain security strategies in the region although it does not seem quite enthusiastic about undertaking certain steps to translate its "defence policy" into "defence".

The above mentioned analysis was aimed at understanding to what extent the security sector recalibration could revitalize the EaP in the South Caucasus region through shedding light upon the inner security dynamics of the region. It became apparent that in order to achieve success in the EaP region, the EU should act more actively in the region. CSDP activities such as communitarian work, focus on awareness-raising measurements, fostering people to people dialogue as well as establishment of early warning systems could appear to have beneficial effects for both sides. On the

---

[6]Press conference, "Remarks of Foreign Minister Edward Nalbandian during joint press conference with Frederica Mogherini", 01 March 2016.

one hand, it could transform the security perceptions in the region making it more stable and preventing further escalation and, on the other, raise EU presence in the region within the framework of Eastern Partnership Initiative.

References

Armenpress (2016), "Cooperation with EU is among Armenia's foreign policy priorities", Yerevan, 13 January, available at: https://armenpress.am/eng/news/831825/president-of-armenia-cooperatison-with-eu-is-among-armenia%E2%80%99s-foreign-policy-priorities.html

Baldwin D.A. (1997), "The concept of security", *Review of International Studies*, No. 23, pp. 5-26.

Broers L. (2016), "Decisive Diplomacy Essential to Securing Fragile Nagorny Karabakh Ceasefire", Chatham House the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 11 April 2016, available at: https://www.chathamhouse.org/expert/comment/decisive-diplomacy-essential-securing-fragile-nagorny-karabakh-ceasefire(accessed 15 April 2016)

Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (1991), "The Evolution of International Security Studies", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Catherine Day (2015), "Taking forward the EU's Comprehensive Approach to external conflict and crises Action Plan 2015", Joint Staff Working Document, 10 April 2015, available at: http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/EU/XXV/EU/06/21/EU_62111/imfname_10543107.pdf (accessed 20 April 2016)

Council of the EU (2015), "Council Conclusions on CSDP" Security & defence and Foreign affairs & international relations, 18 May 2015, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/05/18-council-conclusions-csdp/(acccessed 08 April 2016)

Council of the European Union (2001), "European Union Programmeme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts", Brussels, 7 June 2001, available at: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=ST%209537%202001%20REV%201(10 April 2016)

Derek, E.M. (2013), "The European Union Foreign and Security Policy", available at: https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41959.pdf (accessed 20 April 2016)

Deutsch, K. (1957), "Political Community and the North Atlantic Area", Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Diehl P. F. (2016), "Thinking about Peace: Negative Terms versus Positive Outcomes", for Air Force Research Institute (AFRI), 17 March 2016, available at: http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?&id=196303(accessed 30 March 2016)

Dyson, T. and Konstadinides, T. (2013), "Understanding the Limitations of the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy", *E-International Relations,* available at: http://www.e-ir.info/2013/09/26/understanding-the-limitations-of-the-eus-common-security-and-defence-policy-a-legal-perspective/ (accessed 19 March 2016)

EU Conflict Early Warning System Factsheet (2014), available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/cfsp/conflict_prevention/docs/201409_factsheet_conflict_earth_warning_en.pdf

EU programme for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts; available at: http://www.eplo.org/assets/files/3.%20Resources/EU%20Documents/EU_EU_Programmeme_for_the_Prevention_of_Violent_Conflicts.pdfz

Euronest Parliamentary Assembly (2016) "Resolution on Common positions and concerns of the EU Member States and Eastern European partner countries over foreign policies and external threats to their security"*,* 22 March 2016, available at: http://www.euronest.europarl.europa.eu/euronest/webdav/site/mySite/shared/general_documents/fifth_ordinary_session_2016/resolutions/pol_resolution_2016_en.pdf(accessed 10 April 2016)

European Commission (2015), , "The European Agenda on Security", Strasbourg, "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions", COM(2015) 185 final, 28 April 2015, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/basic-documents/docs/eu_agenda_on_security_en.pdf (accessed 18 April 2016)

European Council (2016), "Council conclusions on the Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy", 20 April 2016, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/04/20-council-conclusions-review-european-neighbourhood-policy/(accessed 10 April 2016)

European Council on Foreign Relations 2016, "European Foreign Policy Scorecard 2016", available at: http://www.ecfr.eu/scorecard/2016/wider

European Council on Security and Defence (2013), "Interim Report by the High Representative", Brussels, available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/library/publications/2013/24072013_hr_interim_report_en.pdf

European External Action Service (2013), "Preparing the December 2013 European Council on Security and Defence Interim Report by the High Representative Brussels", 24 July 2013 http://eeas.europa.eu/library/publications/2013/24072013_hr_interim_report_en.pdf

European Parliament (2015), "Towards a new European security strategy? Assessing the impact of changes in the global security environment", Directorate-General for External Policies, available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/534989/EXPO_STU (201)534989_EN.pdf (accessed 02 April 2016)

European Commission (2015), , "Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Eastern Partnership Implementation Report", 25 March 2015, Joint Staff Working Document, available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/pdf/2015/enp-regional-report-eastern_partnership_en.pdf (accessed 14 March 2016)

European Security Strategy (2003), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs /cmsUpload/78367.pdf (accessed 20 April 2016)

European Security Strategy (n.a.), available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/about-csdp/european-security-strategy/ (accessed 20 April 2016)

Galtung, J. (1965), "Institutionalized Conflict Resolution: A Theoretical Paradigm", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 348-397.

Giragosyan, R. (2016), "A new attack by Azerbaijan is a matter of time", Radio Liberty, 13 April 2016, available at: http://www.armenialiberty.org/content/article/27672432.html (not available in English) (accessed 13 April 2016)

Global Security (2016), "Nagorno-Karabakh", available at: http://www.globalsecurity.org/military /world/war/nagorno-karabakh.htm (accessed 03 March 2016)

Goertz, G. and Diehl, P. F. and Alexandru, B. (2016), "The Puzzle of Peace: Explaining the Rise of Peace in the International System", Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hahn, J. (2015), "European Neighbourhood Policy Review and Package with the European Parliament's AFET Committee and National Parliaments", European Parliament in Brussels, 05 May 2015, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/2014-2019/hahn/announcements /speech-european-neighbourhood-policy-review-and-package_en (accessed 18 April 2016)

Hurriyet Daily News (2016), "Turkey backs Azerbaijan in conflict with Armenia", 05 April 2016, available at: http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-backs-azerbaijan-in-conflict-with-armenia.aspx?PageID=238&NID=97338&NewsCatID=510(accessed 10 April 2016)

Kenneth N. W. (1979), "Theory of International Politics", Addoson-Wesley Pub. Co.

Kostanyan, H., Delcour, L., Vandecasteele, B. and Van Elsuwege P. (2015), "The Implications of Eurasian Integration for the EU's Relations with the Countries in the Post-Soviet Space", Studia Diplomatica, available at: https://www.ceps.eu/publications/implications-eurasian-integration-eu%E2%80%99s-relations-countries-post-soviet-space (accessed 11 April 2016)

OSCE (2016), Statement by Representatives of the OSCE Minsk Group countries and Statement by Representatives of the OSCE Minsk Group countries Vienna, 5 April 2016, available at: http://www.osce.org/mg/231386 (accessed 05 April 2016)

Mogherini, F. (2015), "Joint press conference with Mr. Edward Nalbandian, Foreign Minister of Armenia, Yerevan", 01 March 2016, available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2016/160301_01_en.htm (accessed 29 April 2016)

Mogherini, F. (2015), "Remarks at the Defence and Foreign Affairs Council", Brussels, 18 May 2015, available at: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2015/150518_05_en.htm (accessed 14 March 2016)

Mogherini, F. (2016), "Participation of Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the EC, to the annual conference on European Union Global Strategy", European Commission Audiovisual Services, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player.cfm?ref=I120304&videolang=INT&devurl=http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player/config.cfmhttp://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player.cfm?ref=I120304&videolang=INT&devurl=http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/video/player/config.cfm (accessed April 25 201)

Mogherini, F. (2016), "Statement on the escalation in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict", Brussels, 02 April 2016, available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2016/160402_03_en.htm (accessed 04 April 2016)

Poghosyan, T. (2016), "An exclusive interview with the member of the Parliament, National Assembly of Armenia and Heritage Party Mr. Tevan J. Poghosyan", 14 March 2016, available at:http://www.eurodialogue.eu/Tevan%20J.%20Poghosyan%3A%20%20I%20hope%20that%20the%20relaunched%20negotiations%20between%20the%20EU%20and%20Armenia%20%20will%20help%20Armenia%20to%20keep%20up%20with%20its%20http://www.osce.org/mg/231216(accessed 20 April 2016)

Press conference, "Remarks of Foreign Minister Edward Nalbandian during joint press conference with Frederica Mogherini", 01 March 2016, available at: http://www.mfa.am/en/press-conference/item/2016/03/01/min_euhrvp_jpc/ (accessed 03 March 2016)

Press Release (2016a), the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, 2 April 2016, available at: http://www.osce.org/mg/231216 (accessed 2 April 2016)

Press Releases (2016b), "President Serzh Sargsyan received the head of the EU delegation to the republic of Armenia, Piotr Switalski", 13 January 2016, available at: http://www.president.am/en/press-release/item/2016/01/13/President-Serzh-Sargsyan-meeting-with-ambassador-of-EU/ (accessed 25 April 2016)

Report on the Implementation of the European Security Strategy (2008), *"Providing Security in a Changing World" (*Executive Summary), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104630.pd (accessed 20 April 2016)

Rothschild, E. (1995), "What Is Security", *The Quest for World Order,* Vol. 124, No. 3, pp. 53-98.

Simão, L. (2011), "EU-South Caucasus Relations: Do Good Governance and Security Go Together", *Political Perspectives*, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 33-57.

Snyder, G. H. (1984), "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics", *World Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 461-495.

Soini, T. (2016), "The EU's Strategic Vision for Relations with Russia and the Eastern Neighbourhood", Opening speech at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki, available at: http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=341055 (accessed 11 April 2016)

Solana. J., Blockmans, S. and Faleg, G. (2015), "More Union in European Defence", Centre for European Policy Studies, available at: https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/TFonEuropean Defence.pdf (accessed 20April 2016)

Statement by the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 30 April 2016, available at: http://nkr.am/en/news/2016-04-30/831/ (accessed 30 April 2016)

Stoltenberg, J. (2015), "Remarks before the European Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee and Sub-committee on Security and Defence (followed by Q&A session)", 30 March 2015, available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_118576.htm (accessed 29 April 2016)

Treaty of Lisbon (2007), available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri= CELEX:12007L/TXT&from=EN (accessed 20 April 2016)

Waever, Ole. (1998), "Insecurity, security, and asecurity in the West European non-war community", in: Adler, E. and Barnett, M. (eds), *Security Communities*, pp. 69-118.