



Daviti Mtchedlishvili

## THE EU AND THE SOUTH CAUCASUS

*European Neighborhood Policies between  
Eclecticism and Pragmatism, 1991-2021*

With a foreword by Nicholas Ross Smith

*ibidem*

**General Editor:** Andreas Umland,  
*Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies, andreas.umland@ui.se*

**Commissioning Editor:** Max Jakob Horstmann,  
*London, mjh@ibidem.eu*

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE\*

### DOMESTIC & COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Prof. **Ellen Bos**, *Andrássy University of Budapest*  
Dr. **Gergana Dimova**, *Florida State University*  
Prof. **Heiko Pleines**, *University of Bremen*  
Dr. **Sarah Whitmore**, *Oxford Brookes University*  
Dr. **Harald Wydra**, *University of Cambridge*

### SOCIETY, CLASS & ETHNICITY

Col. **David Glantz**, *"Journal of Slavic Military Studies"*  
Dr. **Marlène Laruelle**, *George Washington University*  
Dr. **Stephen Shulman**, *Southern Illinois University*  
Prof. **Stefan Troebst**, *University of Leipzig*

### POLITICAL ECONOMY & PUBLIC POLICY

Prof. **Andreas Goldthau**, *University of Erfurt*  
Dr. **Robert Kravchuk**, *University of North Carolina*  
Dr. **David Lane**, *University of Cambridge*  
Dr. **Carol Leonard**, *University of Oxford*  
Dr. **Maria Popova**, *McGill University, Montreal*

### FOREIGN POLICY & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Dr. **Peter Duncan**, *University College London*  
Prof. **Andreas Heinemann-Grüder**, *University of Bonn*  
Prof. **Gerhard Mangott**, *University of Innsbruck*  
Dr. **Diana Schmidt-Pfister**, *University of Konstanz*  
Dr. **Lisbeth Tarlow**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*  
Dr. **Christian Wipperfürth**, *N-Ost Network, Berlin*  
Dr. **William Zimmerman**, *University of Michigan*

### HISTORY, CULTURE & THOUGHT

Dr. **Catherine Andreyev**, *University of Oxford*  
Prof. **Mark Bassin**, *Södertörn University*  
Prof. **Karsten Brüggemann**, *Tallinn University*  
Prof. **Alexander Etkind**, *Central European University*  
Prof. **Gasan Guseynov**, *Free University of Berlin*  
Prof. **Leonid Luks**, *Catholic University of Eichstaett*  
Dr. **Olga Malinova**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*  
Dr. **Richard Mole**, *University College London*  
Prof. **Andrei Rogatchevski**, *University of Tromsø*  
Dr. **Mark Tauger**, *West Virginia University*

## ADVISORY BOARD\*

Prof. **Dominique Arel**, *University of Ottawa*  
Prof. **Jörg Baberowski**, *Humboldt University of Berlin*  
Prof. **Margarita Balmaceda**, *Seton Hall University*  
Dr. **John Barber**, *University of Cambridge*  
Prof. **Timm Beichelt**, *European University Viadrina*  
Dr. **Katrin Boeckh**, *University of Munich*  
Prof. em. **Archie Brown**, *University of Oxford*  
Dr. **Vyacheslav Bryukhovetsky**, *Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*  
Prof. **Timothy Colton**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*  
Prof. **Paul D'Anieri**, *University of California*  
Dr. **Heike Dörrenbächer**, *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*  
Dr. **John Dunlop**, *Hoover Institution, Stanford, California*  
Dr. **Sabine Fischer**, *SWP, Berlin*  
Dr. **Geir Flikke**, *NUPI, Oslo*  
Prof. **David Galbreath**, *University of Aberdeen*  
Prof. **Frank Golczewski**, *University of Hamburg*  
Dr. **Nikolas Gvosdev**, *Naval War College, Newport, RI*  
Prof. **Mark von Hagen**, *Arizona State University*  
Prof. **Guido Hausmann**, *University of Regensburg*  
Prof. **Dale Herspring**, *Kansas State University*  
Dr. **Stefani Hoffman**, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*  
Prof. em. **Andrzej Korbonski**, *University of California*  
Dr. **Iris Kempe**, *"Caucasus Analytical Digest"*  
Prof. **Herbert Küpper**, *Institut für Osteucht Regensburg*  
Prof. **Rainer Lindner**, *University of Konstanz*

Dr. **Luke March**, *University of Edinburgh*  
Prof. **Michael McFaul**, *Stanford University, Palo Alto*  
Prof. **Birgit Menzel**, *University of Mainz-Germersheim*  
Dr. **Alex Pravda**, *University of Oxford*  
Dr. **Erik van Ree**, *University of Amsterdam*  
Dr. **Joachim Rogall**, *Robert Bosch Foundation Stuttgart*  
Prof. **Peter Rutland**, *Wesleyan University, Middletown*  
Prof. **Gwendolyn Sasse**, *University of Oxford*  
Prof. **Jutta Scherrer**, *EHESS, Paris*  
Prof. **Robert Service**, *University of Oxford*  
Mr. **James Sherr**, *RIIA Chatham House London*  
Dr. **Oxana Shevel**, *Tufts University, Medford*  
Prof. **Eberhard Schneider**, *University of Siegen*  
Prof. **Olexander Shnyrkov**, *Shevchenko University, Kyiv*  
Prof. **Hans-Henning Schröder**, *SWP, Berlin*  
Prof. **Yuri Shapoval**, *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*  
Dr. **Lisa Sundstrom**, *University of British Columbia*  
Dr. **Philip Walters**, *"Religion, State and Society", Oxford*  
Prof. **Zenon Wasyliv**, *Ithaca College, New York State*  
Dr. **Lucan Way**, *University of Toronto*  
Dr. **Markus Wehner**, *"Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung"*  
Dr. **Andrew Wilson**, *University College London*  
Prof. **Jan Zielonka**, *University of Oxford*  
Prof. **Andrei Zorin**, *University of Oxford*

\* While the Editorial Committee and Advisory Board support the General Editor in the choice and improvement of manuscripts for publication, responsibility for remaining errors and misinterpretations in the series' volumes lies with the books' authors.

# Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS)

ISSN 1614-3515

Founded in 2004 and refereed since 2007, SPPS makes available affordable English-, German-, and Russian-language studies on the history of the countries of the former Soviet bloc from the late Tsarist period to today. It publishes between 5 and 20 volumes per year and focuses on issues in transitions to and from democracy such as economic crisis, identity formation, civil society development, and constitutional reform in CEE and the NIS. SPPS also aims to highlight so far understudied themes in East European studies such as right-wing radicalism, religious life, higher education, or human rights protection. The authors and titles of all previously published volumes are listed at the end of this book. For a full description of the series and reviews of its books, see [www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps](http://www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps).

**Editorial correspondence & manuscripts** should be sent to: Dr. Andreas Umland, Department of Political Science, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, vul. Voloska 8/5, UA-04070 Kyiv, UKRAINE; [andreas.umland@cantab.net](mailto:andreas.umland@cantab.net)

**Business correspondence & review copy requests** should be sent to: *ibidem* Press, Leuschnerstr. 40, 30457 Hannover, Germany; tel.: +49 511 2622200; fax: +49 511 2622201; [spps@ibidem.eu](mailto:spps@ibidem.eu).

**Authors, reviewers, referees, and editors** for (as well as all other persons sympathetic to) SPPS are invited to join its networks at [www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614](http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614)  
[www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012](http://www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012)  
[www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/](http://www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/)

## Recent Volumes

- 257 *Robert M. Cutler*  
Soviet and Post-Soviet Russian Foreign Policies III  
East-West Relations in Europe and Eurasia in the Post-Cold War Transition, 1991–2001  
With a foreword by Roger E. Kanet  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1728-4
- 258 *Pawel Kowal, Iwona Reichardt, Kateryna Pryshchepa (Eds.)*  
Three Revolutions: Mobilization and Change in Contemporary Ukraine III  
Archival Records and Historical Sources on the 1990 Revolution on Granite  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1376-7
- 259 *Mykhailo Minakov (Ed.)*  
Philosophy Unchained  
Developments in Post-Soviet Philosophical Thought  
With a foreword by Christopher Donohue  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1768-0
- 260 *David Dalton*  
The Ukrainian Oligarchy After the Euromaidan  
How Ukraine's Political Economy Regime Survived the Crisis  
With a foreword by Andrew Wilson  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1740-6
- 261 *Andreas Heinemann-Grüder (Ed.)*  
Who Are the Fighters?  
Irregular Armed Groups in the Russian-Ukrainian War in 2014–2015  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1777-2
- 262 *Taras Kuzio (Ed.)*  
Russian Disinformation and Western Scholarship  
Bias and Prejudice in Journalistic, Expert, and Academic Analyses of East European, Russian and Eurasian Affairs  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1685-0
- 263 *Darius Furmonavicius*  
Lithuania Transforms the West  
Lithuania's Liberation from Soviet Occupation and the Enlargement of NATO (1988–2022)  
With a foreword by Vytautas Landsbergis  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1779-6
- 264 *Dirk Dalberg*  
Politisches Denken im tschechoslowakischen Dis-sens  
Egon Bondy, Miroslav Kusý, Milan Šimečka und Petr Uhl (1968–1989)  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1318-7
- 265 *Леонид Люкс*  
К столетию «философского парохода»  
Мыслители «первой» русской эмиграции о русской революции и о тоталитарных соблазнах XX века  
ISBN 978-3-8382-1735-2

Daviti Mtchedlishvili

# THE EU AND THE SOUTH CAUCASUS

European Neighborhood Policies between Eclecticism and  
Pragmatism, 1991-2021

With a foreword by Nicholas Ross Smith

*ibidem*  
Verlag

## **Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

### **Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Cover graphic: Pixabay.com

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-1735-6

© *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart 2024

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronical, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

“The fate of the Caucasian states, such as that of Finland and the Baltic states, will depend on the international situation; however — and this will be their feature — they will be victims of their differences and divisions.”

(Carrere d’Encausse 2005, 238).



# Contents

Abstract .....	11
List of acronyms and abbreviations .....	13
Foreword by <i>Nicholas Ross Smith</i> .....	15
1. Introduction.....	17
2. Theoretical framework.....	27
2.1 The notion and conceptualisation of European integration and Europeanisation .....	27
2.1.1 Europeanisation: the EU “hits neighbours’ homes” .....	31
2.1.2 Differentiation of Europeanisation: candidates and neighbourhood .....	36
2.2 A fusion of constructivism and rationalism as analytic eclecticism to study the relations between the EU and its neighbourhood.....	40
2.2.1 The overview of rationalism and constructivism .....	41
2.2.2 Contrasting constructivism and rationalism for empirical analysis: logic of consequences versus logic of appropriateness.....	50
2.2.3 Constructivism and rationalism complementary framework to study the EU’s relations with neighbourhood through eclecticism and pragmatism .....	53
2.3 Conclusions to chapter 2.....	60
3. The beginning of relations between the EU and the post- Soviet South Caucasus in the 1990s.....	61
3.1 A brief historical overview of the South Caucasus region.....	61



The 1918-1921 period.....	66
The 1922-1953 period.....	69
The 1953-1991 period.....	72
3.2 General political and socio-economic conditions and developments in the South Caucasus states in the early 1990s.....	79
3.2.1 Attempts for post-Soviet democratisation.....	83
3.2.2 Economic conditions in the South Caucasus in the first post-Soviet years.....	89
3.3 Conflicts over South Ossetia, Abkhazia and Nagorno- Karabakh.....	94
3.3.1 Wars in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.....	94
3.3.2 The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia.....	98
3.4 The early stage of EU relations with the South Caucasus: Cooperation via the OSCE and the Council of Europe.....	104
3.5 Early economic cooperation: The Partnership and Cooperation Agreements and Technical Aid.....	110
3.6 Strategic significance of the South Caucasus in the context of EU energy policy .....	118
3.7 Conclusions to chapter 3.....	124
4. The European Neighbourhood Policy and the South Caucasus Unfolding new patterns of relations .....	125
4.1 The rationale behind the ENP in the EU agenda.....	125
4.2 The key objectives and principles of the ENP.....	128
4.3 General political and socio-economic conditions and developments in the South Caucasus states in the early 2000s.....	136
4.4 The South Caucasus in the context of the ENP.....	141
4.4.1 The incorporation of the South Caucasus into the ENP.....	142

4.4.2	Action Plans for Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia.....	144
4.4.3	Financial aspects of the ENP .....	151
4.5	Implementation and results of the ENP in the South Caucasus .....	154
4.5.1	Implementation and results of the ENP in Azerbaijan .....	162
4.5.2	Implementation and results of the ENP in Armenia.....	164
4.5.3	Implementation and results of the ENP in Georgia .....	167
4.6	Conclusions to chapter 4.....	172
5.	The Eastern Partnership and the South Caucasus Relations through differentiation .....	173
5.1	The background of the creation of the EaP .....	173
5.2	The content, objectives and instruments of the EaP.....	178
5.2.1	The EaP meetings and bodies.....	181
5.2.2.	The EaP financial support.....	184
5.3	The South Caucasus between the EU and Russia .....	187
5.4	Country Studies .....	199
5.4.1	EU – Georgia relations in the context of the EaP: The AA, DCFTA and Visa Facilitation between the EU and Georgia.....	199
5.4.1.1	<i>The DCFTA and its effects in Georgia.....</i>	208
5.4.1.2	<i>Status Quo of the EaP in Georgia: Priorities and results .....</i>	215
5.4.2	Armenia in between the EaP and the Eurasian Economic Union .....	222
5.4.2.1	<i>Status Quo of the EaP in Armenia: Priorities and results .....</i>	230
5.4.3	EU – Azerbaijan relations in the context of the EaP: Developments from the AA to the Strategic Modernisation/ Partnership Agreements .....	234

5.4.3.1	<i>Status Quo of the EaP in Azerbaijan: Priorities and results .....</i>	241
5.5	Conclusions to chapter 5 .....	244
6.	Conclusion .....	247
6.1	Summary of the research .....	247
6.2	Review and discussion of the main conclusions .....	250
6.2.1	Complex factors and obstacles to EU-South Caucasus relations since the 1990s.....	251
6.2.2	Political conditionality and the South Caucasus countries' diverging patterns of persistence to the ENP .....	256
6.2.3	Pragmatic differentiation and three perspectives of the EaP .....	259
6.3	Final remarks and recommendations .....	262
	Bibliography .....	265

## **Abstract**

This book studies complex and contradictory relations between the South Caucasus and the European Union (EU). The book covers three main periods, which are: the early relations in the 1990s, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the Eastern Partnership Programme (EaP). The book employs Europeanisation theory and uses rationalist-constructivist framework as a complementary framework. The conducted research shows that the complex relationship between the EU and the South Caucasus states cannot be explained through a purely constructivist or purely rationalist theoretical framework. Thus, material and social motives are discernible, and rationalism and constructivism are complementary in explaining the relations between the EU and the South Caucasus countries. Therefore, when approaching the dissemination of values and normative connotation of the EU's relations with partner countries from a theoretical point of view that this book offers, a rationalist perspective explains actors' preferences towards maximising material utility and the calculation by EU policymakers as to which strategy is most likely to advance the material interests of the EU in a given situation. This argument needs to be supplemented with insights from constructivism, which emphasises the universal nature of the values of the EU, which are inherently linked to the internal dynamics of the EU itself, and manifests in the relations with neighbouring countries. However, the book illustrates that rational considerations primarily justify the stances of the South Caucasus countries towards the EU, which are related to Russia's political and economic influence in the region.



## List of acronyms and abbreviations

AA	Association Agreement
AAP	Annual Action Program
BP	British Petroleum
CARDS	Programme of Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation
CEEC	Central and Eastern European countries
CEPA	Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
DCFTA	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement
EAEU	Eurasian Economic Union
EaP	Eastern Partnership
EC	European commission
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
EEAS	European External Action Service
EIB	European Investment Bank
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ENPAD	European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development
EU	European Union
EUMM	European Union Monitoring Mission in Georgia
EURONEST	European Parliamentary Assembly
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GRECO	Group of States Against Corruption
GSP	Generalised Scheme of Preferences
INOGATE	Interstate Oil and Gas Transport to Europe
INTERREG	European Regional Development Fund
MNPP	Medzamor Nuclear Power Plant
NATO	The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCDC	National Centre for Disease Control
NDI	National Democratic Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation

NHC	Netherlands Helsinki Committee
NINP	The New Instrument for Neighbourhood and Partnership
NIT	Nations in Transition
OCCRP	Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPEC	The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PCA	The Partnership and Cooperation Agreements
PHARE	Poland and Hungary: Assistance for Restructuring their Economies
SOCAR	State Oil Company of the Azerbaijan Republic
TACIS	Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States
TAIEX	Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument
TAP	Trans Adriatic Pipeline
TICPI	Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index
TRACECA	Transport Corridor Europe-Caucasus-Asia
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WTO	World Trade Organization

# Foreword

*Nicholas Ross Smith*

It is an honour to have the privilege of writing the foreword for this fantastic book by Daviti Mtchedlishvili. Daviti is undoubtedly one of the strongest PhD graduates the University of Canterbury's National Centre for Research for Europe has ever produced and this book is a testament to his hard work and talent. It was a pleasure to see this project mature from an initial research proposal into a fantastic scholarly contribution (in the form of this book) to the literature on the EU's interaction with the countries of the South Caucasus.

This book could not be timelier. Russia's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine has forced Brussels to seriously reconsider its interaction with the countries of its 'Eastern Neighbourhood'. Whereas accession to the EU was typically seen as an unrealistic pipedream for these countries, recent events in Ukraine have forced Brussels to re-evaluate its accession process. To this end, in 2022 Georgia formally applied to begin the EU accession process, making it the first country from the South Caucasus to do so. And while Armenia and Azerbaijan are unlikely to follow suit at this stage, there is the potential for a new era of EU interaction in the South Caucasus to emerge.

The EU has an opportunity to 'seize the moment' and reinvigorate the idea of pan-European regionalism as an antidote to the growing pressures of great power competition. Professor Gary Marks once remarked that what the EU did better than previous European integration projects (such as the rapid expansions of Napoleonic France and Nazi Germany) was that it combined the benefits of scale while respecting the importance of communities (through subsidiarity), of which there are many diverse ones within the EU. However, in recent years, the EU has seemingly lost a sense of purpose and has particularly proved woefully inept at times



when engaging with its Eastern Neighbours, with the South Caucasus often forgotten.

This book offers much food for thought about the strengths and weaknesses of the EU's engagement with the South Caucasus region. Daviti's great contribution here is that this book is both theoretically and empirically rich.

Theoretically, the synthesis of rationalist and constructivist views on the EU's international actorness into a single framework is adeptly undertaken and should offer interesting insights for EU foreign policy researchers in general, not just those that research the region. But, also, it is refreshing that the agency of the South Caucasus countries is not minimized and that they are treated as actors in their own right, not just passive recipients of the EU's policies.

Empirically, it provides a detailed examination of the EU's relationships with Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia from the onset of independence in the early 1990s with careful examination of the complexity of the region brought about by conflicts in Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Nagorno-Karabakh as well as the presence of Russia. It is process tracing done well, giving the reader a clear understanding of the evolution of the EU's relationships with these countries.

Ultimately, it is a sobering but important book as it helps identify why and how the EU has failed to make the most out of its engagement in the region. But, more importantly, it offers important insights and recommendations as to how the EU can combine its self-interest with its normative agenda into a coherent strategy. If the EU is serious about seizing the moment, taking on the lessons and feedback offered in this book would be a smart initial step.

# 1. Introduction

The security and stability of the European Union (EU) is considered to be strengthened by the creation of an arc of countries with good governance in its neighbourhood (European Council, 2003b, p. 10). For this reason, it is crucial for the EU to support state-building in contested states on its borders, and to induce domestic reforms in these states in order to promote democracy, good governance and prosperity. The relations between the EU and the three South Caucasus states – Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia – is an example of a complex and multidimensional neighbourhood relationship, which started in the 1990s after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In that early stage of relations, the EU perceived the South Caucasus as on the edge of the European continent with little economic or political significance. Since then, the South Caucasus region has experienced a significant economic and political transformation. Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia have moved beyond planned economies and rigid communist dictatorships but have not yet become fully fledged democracies and free market economies (Popescu, 2015). While the three countries share a common Soviet legacy, weak institutions, problems with corruption and oligarchic structures, the development paths of these countries have become increasingly diverse.

The common history, culture and domestic traditions do unite these countries, but differences in domestic and foreign policy have grown as independence has gained momentum. Relations of the three South Caucasus states with the EU have moved in different directions. If Georgia is aiming for closer integration and accession to the EU, Armenia is highly dependent on Russia (economy, security, energy). Moreover, Armenia is a member of the Russian-led Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) but has also signed the Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement (CEPA) with the EU. Azerbaijan has no interest in integration with either the EU or Russia and pursues a balanced stance between the two. Azerbaijan is interested in increasing energy and economic relations with the

EU, but accepts neither EU standards nor norms, and is not interested in the prospect of membership. The South Caucasus countries have different approaches to their relationship with the EU even though they all commenced relations with the EU at the same time. Furthermore, all three countries have a security challenge: Georgia with its two territories (Abkhazia and South Ossetia), which are occupied by Russia, while Armenia and Azerbaijan have been involved in conflict over the Nagorno-Karabakh region.

The relations between the EU and the South Caucasus require further investigations considering their complexity as such and also due to fast-changing developments and transformations in the region. Furthermore, while some scholars see Europeanisation as the only one legitimate process for modernisation and democratisation of the post-Soviet states, the South Caucasus countries make different choices (Baev et al., 2003; Boonstra, 2015; Kakachia, Meister, et al., 2018). Even though the EU has had the ambition of being the most influential external player in the South Caucasus, it has left a rather small imprint on this region's development (Korosteleva, Naturski, and Simão 2013a). Moreover, the EU has been failing to manage the development of the South Caucasus in a systematic and decisive manner (Simão, 2013). The EU's technical and financial assistance in the 1990s, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) in 2003 and more recently the Eastern Partnership (EaP) in 2009 (which includes accession to the EU's vast internal market under favourable conditions) have been used as mechanisms to encourage the partners' domestic reforms or close political cooperation. However, Russia's EAEU was a more attractive option for Armenia whereas Azerbaijan is not interested in taking any such option.

Prior studies on relations between the EU and its neighbouring countries show that the main reason for lack of success of the EU's foreign policy in the neighbourhood is insufficient reward in exchange for adoption of EU rules, norms and standards (Kelley, 2006; Lavenex & Schimmelfennig, 2011). In addition, scholars quantify geopolitical pressures, especially in the eastern neighbourhood of the EU, including the South Caucasus, where Russia plays a role of integration "game changer" (Popescu and Wilson 2009). Having been caught between Russia and the EU, the neighbouring

countries often use the bidding and manoeuvring method to pursue their own interests, associated with the high political costs of compliance (Schimmelfennig & Scholtz, 2008a). Some authors argue that the EU has helped to stabilise rather than change existing regimes in the neighbourhood (Boonstra, 2015; Börzel, 2011; Mkrtchyan et al., 2009).

The increased interest in the South Caucasus region has resulted in a growing body of literature on EU-South Caucasus relations. The majority of works, however, focus on just one country case study: either the EU and its policies towards Azerbaijan, Armenia or Georgia, with an emphasis on domestic developments and the country's history, including the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict (Gils, 2019; Hewitt, 2013b; Hoch, 2020; Sierra, 2010). Several studies conclude that the EU has limited influence in the South Caucasus and has little effect in facilitating democratisation (Sierra 2012; Smith 2011; Chitaladze and Grigoryan 2015).

Scholars have blamed the EU for the lack of rigor and selective application of conditionality instruments that resulted in failed democratisation efforts in its neighbouring countries (Olazábal, 2019; Schumacher, 2016). The ENP and its Action Plans were hampered by an arbitrary and largely ineffective selection of democratisation benchmarks. The terms “democracy,” “the rule of law,” and “good governance” were used interchangeably and inconsistently without any definitions or clear criteria (Silander and Nilsson 2013; Smith 2011). Even though, a few anti-corruption measures were included in the Action Plans, they were more generic in nature and lacked specific benchmarks for measuring progress (Dandashly & Kourtellis, 2020).

Other scholars have lambasted the EU for a lack of alternative policy ideas (Heidbreder, 2013), a lack of consistency in the ENP instruments (Börzel & van Hüllen, 2014) and insufficient policy changes (Wolczuk, 2009). Despite the conceptual diversity surrounding the ENP/EaP, some literature has largely ignored the impact of domestic circumstances on the Europeanisation process in the South Caucasus and employed EU-centric foreign policy approaches (Ademmer et al., 2016; E. J. Stewart, 2011). Few studies

have linked the EU's democratisation failures to domestic structures in the partner countries, such as limited administrative capacity for rule absorption and reform implementation, or incumbent elites' domestic agendas driven by political and material gains (Börzel & Pamuk, 2012; Buzogány, 2019; Dimitrova & Dragneva, 2009). Others linked Europeanisation failures in the neighbourhood to interests and legacies of the actors involved (Alieva, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2008), foreign policy behaviours resulting from these contexts (Ayoob & Ismayilov, 2015), and bargaining power of the partner countries as explanations for varying degrees of success in enhancing actors' own interests in relationships with the EU (Gils, 2019). Tolstrup (2013, 2014) argued that domestic elites—ruling elites, opposition elites, and economic elites—are important actors in shaping domestic and foreign policies. Domestic elites act as gatekeepers, actively facilitating or restricting links to external actors and their efforts at democratisation (Tolstrup, 2013).

The premise of this book is that all of the factors (domestic and external) are relevant and, in fact, necessary for understanding EU-South Caucasus relations. The aim of the book is to overcome EU-centric tendencies and view relations between the EU and the South Caucasus as an interactive process. This will help to avoid the pitfalls of simplification and knowledge fragmentation.

The book aims to present a critical appraisal of the Europeanisation process beyond the EU borders and provide an important overview of the historical and current state of relations between the EU and the South Caucasus. From the perspective of prior and current developments in the South Caucasus, it is necessary to formulate alternative explanations of the reasons why the relations between the three South Caucasus countries and the EU have developed in different directions by applying theory to a new empirical domain and pose socially and politically relevant research questions (as explained in chapter 2).

The book objectives are:

1. To look at the development of the relations between the EU and the South Caucasus since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

2. To provide a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the current ties between the South Caucasus countries and the EU.
3. To explain the reasons for the political choices, domestic institutions settings, and economic preferences of the South Caucasus countries.
4. To shed light on areas of common interest between the EU and the South Caucasus countries that determine the dynamics of current and future bilateral relations.
5. To identify the factors that determine the different degree of relations and attitudes between the three South Caucasus countries and the EU.

The book seeks to address a number of theory-driven and empirical problems by answering the following research questions:

- What factors have determined the relations between the South Caucasus and the EU since the early 1990s?
- How did the ENP affect relations between the EU and the South Caucasus?
- Why and under what conditions Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia have established different relations with the EU through the EaP?
- What types of attitude/action have the EU and the South Caucasus countries been employing in relations to each other?

This book is of an interdisciplinary nature, linking theoretical insights from EU studies, international relations and philosophy. The analysis relies on theories of Europeanisation, as well as constructivism and rationalism. The research incorporates both a methodological and an analytical toolkit which are based on the insights of Kratochvil and Tulmets' (2010) four combinations of rationalism and constructivism. The analytical toolkit is developed in chapter 2, whereas methodologically the book utilises a system of logic. "A system of logic ratiocinated and inductive" is a method of scientific investigation which was developed by English philosopher John Stuart Mill in 1843. In this work, he formulated the five principles of inductive reasoning known as Mill's methods (Mill, 1882). One

of the principles of experimental inquiry from inductive reasoning is the method of difference. In a situation where a phenomenon being investigated has everything in common with another instance where it does not occur, according to Mill's theory, is the "effect, or the cause, or a necessary part of the cause, of the phenomenon" (Mill, 1882, p. 483).

Furthermore, this is a method of artificial experiment that helps the researcher, at least by direct experience, arrive with certainty of causes. Various scholars have developed this method since its invention by Mill between 1843 and 1872. The method developed by John Gerring, a professor of Political Science at Boston University, and his so called most similar cases method from the Case Study Research (Gerring, 2009) is one such example. This method requires the selection of a case with two essential elements—the causal variables of interest and outcome. The most-similar cases method examines cases that are as similar as possible, except on the outcome of interest (the dependent variable) (Gerring, 2006). Based on Gerring's method, this book employs a case study that challenges a scholarly community to think differently about the relevant dimensions of a chosen theory. The book aims not to generalise but to problematise. The method of difference provides opportunity to select cases that are similar in various relevant characteristics except for two: the outcome the researcher is trying to explain ( $y$ —dependent variable) and what the researcher thinks explains this outcome ( $x$ —independent variable). Thus, the rationale for selecting the countries of the South Caucasus lies in their confounding similarities and disparities. Despite obvious similarities in geography and history, these countries have different attitudes towards the EU and a degree of Europeanisation. Furthermore, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia are quite similar cases in many ways, including their historical legacies, independence experience, communist and post-communist experience, and territorial conflicts.

The study of the South Caucasus and developments in the countries of this region has been an object of research on a theoretical and empirical level since the beginning of the 1990s. While the wider Caucasus region, both in its historical and contemporary di-

mensions, has been extensively examined in the international bibliography, the Europeanisation process in this region has received little attention in mainstream scholarship. Therefore, the innovative nature of this book is based on two premises. Firstly, from a theoretical perspective, the book presents a critical appraisal of Europeanisation theories and provides an important added value to the existing body of literature on Europeanisation, its concepts, terms and practices. Furthermore, whereas constructivism and rationalism are used and extended at the theoretical and analytical level to study the relations between the EU and its neighbours, such an approach has not yet been used in the case of the South Caucasus. Thus, the book provides some alternative explanations at the theoretical level and gives a wider picture of the reality.

Secondly, at the methodological and empirical level, the book employs the most similar cases method, which includes three neighbouring countries from the South Caucasus region. The reasoning behind exploring these particular case studies is to illuminate the areas of shared interest between the EU and the countries concerned and help clarify why and under what conditions these three countries have different attitudes towards the EU. Considering the peculiarities of the region, the results obtained in the course of research may be of interest to foreign affairs analysts and practitioners involved in the development and implementation of EU foreign policy in the South Caucasus. This book's findings can also be of use to political scientists, historians and scholars and students of other related disciplines who study the South Caucasus countries or the foreign policy of the EU.

### **Structure of the book**

The book consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 comprises the introduction, the background of the research and justifies the choice of the South Caucasus case study. The chapter also provides an overview of the methods involved, the research questions, objectives and limitations.



Chapter 2 is devoted to the theoretical framework. The first part of the chapter analyses the conceptualisation of Europeanisation and European integration theories. It includes a broad analysis of the literature of Europeanisation, its concepts, terms, and practices. Since the Europeanisation concept is broad and “conceptually stretchy”, the chapter offers to draw limitations regarding the examination of the Europeanisation process in the South Caucasus. The second part of the chapter examines rationalist and constructivist theories of international relations. Despite the epistemological and ontological differences and conflicting logics of action, the chapter suggests using the rationalism-constructivism dilemma as a complementary framework through pragmatism and analytical eclecticism. This framework helps to address the interest versus values dichotomy in relations between the EU and the South Caucasus.

The rationale for chapter 3 is to assess the beginning of the EU-South Caucasus relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The first part of the chapter offers a brief historical overview of the South Caucasus region, its geography and characteristics. The second section describes the general political and economic conditions and developments in the region, including the separatist conflicts of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia. The last part of the chapter addresses the early stages of relations between the EU and the South Caucasus in the 1990s/early 2000s as well as the EU's key policies and interests in this region.

Chapter 4 examines the relations between the EU and the South Caucasus countries in the context of the ENP. Furthermore, the chapter critically discusses key concepts and approaches to analyse the ENP – its principles, prospects and instruments – and relies on Europeanisation concepts. The second part of the chapter analyses the objectives, content and principles of the Action Plans which were introduced within the ENP for the three South Caucasus states as well as the implementation and results of the ENP in the three countries.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the EaP. The first part of the chapter examines the background of the creation of the EaP, its concepts,

aims and objectives. The second part of the chapter analyses the different ways of cooperation with the EU which the three South Caucasus countries have established under the EaP. Each country is presented in a separate section to follow the concept of differentiation and outline factors that determine the different degrees of relations.

Finally, chapter 6 presents the conclusions, and the main findings of the book. The chapter summarises the answers to the research questions posed in chapter 1, assesses the explanatory value of the applied theoretical framework and concludes with final remarks and recommendations.



## 2. Theoretical framework

This chapter provides the theoretical foundation of the book. The first part of the chapter analyses the concepts of Europeanisation and European integration. The second part of the chapter provides the critical assessment of the rationalism and constructivism theories of international relations. The final part of the chapter defines the framework built to study the relations between the EU and its neighbourhood using constructivism and rationalism as analytic eclecticism.

### 2.1 The notion and conceptualisation of European integration and Europeanisation<sup>1</sup>

Scholars have been trying to better understand how the EU influences across time and space, whereby the EU impacts domestic political and social processes within and beyond the member states. Though, as Jensen and Kristensen (2012) point out in their paper referring to Puchala's (1972) metaphor<sup>2</sup> of blind men and an elephant, in which the European Commission is the metaphor for the elephant and the scholar is the blind men, each blind man felt the different parts of the elephant and, hence, understood it in a different way. They offered a different description of the "beast" based on the part of the animal they touched.

".... scholars coming from different theoretical traditions, touch upon different parts of the elephant and thus portray a very different beast.... None of them are mistaken, but none of them have the complete picture either" (p. 267).

- 
- 1 An earlier version of this section was published in the Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies. The original citation is as follows: Mtchedlishvili, D. (2018). 'Theorising Europeanisation in European literature: Conceptualisation and Operationalisation,' Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies 10(1), pp. 79-91. Available at: <https://esaanz.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Theorising-Europeanisation.pdf>
  - 2 See further: Donald Puchala (1972) Of Blind Men, Elephants and International Integration. Journal of Common Market Studies. Vol. 10, N. 3, pp. 267-284.

Using this logic, Puchala urged a search for a joint theoretical effort to understand the whole phenomenon beyond its single parts (Falkner, 1998).

At first glance, the concepts – European integration and Europeanisation – seem to be similar, though, as Radaelli (2000) argued, Europeanisation should not be identified with either harmonisation or convergence. Undoubtedly, the concept of European integration has played an important role in the theoretical analysis of the EU, as it reflects the development and institutional changes within this organisation and its predecessors from the foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 (Mikkelsen, 1991). Furthermore, European integration began in 1950 with the Schuman Plan which launched the European Coal and Steel Community. Its supporters expected integration to expand beyond coal and steel and looked forward to deeper European integration. The creation of the EU was inspired by Jean Monnet's vision that technical and functional integration within Europe could lead to political transformation.

European Integration is traditionally defined as the convergence of relations between the various elements of the institutional structure and/or strengthening the relationship itself, that is, the intensification of any communications in the European orbit (Howell, 2002). In fact, the term European integration refers to the process of creating European institutions and policies, whereby policies are increasingly shaped and set at the EU level and impact on national governments and wider civil society (McGowan, 2007). The result will be the formation of a supranational centre around which is constituted a common European space. In some definitions, it is difficult to distinguish between European Integration and Europeanisation. As Olsen (2002) argues, European Integration and Europeanisation are the same thing, and from the perspective of the EU it is a political project in the context of unification. However, the processes of Europeanisation and European Integration have been considered two distinct phenomena and while the EU has matured as a political system, these two phenomena have developed reflexive or dependent relationships, necessitating a reconsideration of the

research agenda for both phenomena (Ladrech, 2014). From Radaelli's (2000) perspective, Europeanisation is not political integration and Europeanisation would not exist without European Integration. He argues that the Europeanisation concept belongs to the ontological stage of research, that is, the understanding of a process in which countries pool together sovereignty (Radaelli, 2000). In contrast to European Integration, Europeanisation is not a *sui generis* (unique) phenomenon, rather it is conceptualised in a way that makes it "possible to compare European dynamics with the dynamics of other systems of governance" (Olsen, 2002, p. 922). Olsen (2002) suggests differentiation of the concept with *what, why* and *how* questions. In particular, what is changing and how and why Europeanisation takes place. Furthermore, he has identified Europeanisation as the changes that take place in member states of the EU and quantifies processes of institutional change and how/why they take place.

Europeanisation can be interpreted in three ways. Firstly, as the emergence and development at the European level of the various structures – meaning the political, legal and social institutions (Risse, et al., 2001). This process includes institution-building at the European level/building of (common) EU institutions and explores how the Europeanisation process impacts the member states. In this approach, the level of analysis is the domestic system and the main objective of the study is the impact of the EU (Grabbe, 2006).

Secondly, the concept of Europeanisation can be seen as an incremental process while political and economic dynamics become part of the organisational logic of national politics and policy-making (Ladrech, 1994). By 'organisational logic', Ladrech means the 'adaptive processes of organisations to a changed or changing environment' (Ladrech, 1994). This scholarship of Europeanisation emphasises that the actions of pan-European institutions may have different consequences and results in the member states and that the EU's influence at the national level depends not only on the effectiveness of the functioning of its institutions, but also on specific national factors. The object of Europeanisation is not limited to national politics and one could add national identities (Radaelli, 2000). By contrast, this definition accommodates both – organisations and

individuals and covers the political structure, public policy, identities and the cognitive dimension of politics (Radaelli, 2000). This interpretation suggests two types of Europeanisation—the “top down” and “bottom up”. “Top down” or a process of *downloading* (Börzel & Risse, 2000) seeks to explain the conditions and causal mechanisms through which the EU triggers domestic change (Börzel & Panke, 2016). It quantifies that EU policies and institutions are a constant impetus of domestic change for all states (Cowles, et al., 2001). The top-down approach uses the concept of “downloading” to elucidate how the member states or the third countries can be successful at downloading EU policies and implementing them into their national politics (Börzel & Panke, 2016). Top-down Europeanisation occurs, for example, with the European Central Bank through the establishment of pan-European indicators of price stability. This is the so-called “financial integration” that requires selected policy implementation for the member states to avoid prolonged inflation and deflation and to achieve high levels of economic activity and employment (European Central Bank, 2017).

On the other hand, “bottom up” Europeanisation or *up-loading* analysis shows how states upload their domestic preferences to the EU level (Howell, 2002). An EU member state is a successful “uploader” if it manages to make its preferences heard so that EU policy, political process or institution reflects its interests (Börzel & Panke, 2016). The member states in their reform strategies try to be original with their character models to provide a way to solve their own problems, and to ensure the transfer of specific elements of the local political system at the EU level.

The third interpretation of the term—“Europeanisation”—summarises the previous two definitions, namely, the development and consolidation of certain institutions and practices at the EU level as well as on their national political systems (Olsen, 2002). This process relates to not only to the political system as a whole but also its individual components and, in particular, the rules, paradigms, policies and political programmes of the member states. Thus, Europeanisation is defined as the design, diffusion and institutionalisation of formal and informal procedures, beliefs and norms which

are first defined and consolidated in the process of developing common European Union decisions and then incorporated into the local discourse, identities, political structures and public policies (Radaelli, 2000). This effect of Europeanisation can be conceptualised as a process of change at the domestic level in which the member states adapt their institutions, policies and processes to new practices, rules, norms and procedures through different mechanisms of institutional change (Börzel & Risse, 2000). This approach stresses the importance of change in the logic of political behaviour, which gives the opportunity to distinguish Europeanisation effects from the many other processes of change in the post-communist political context (Grabbe, 2006). Nevertheless, this type of Europeanisation studies not only the members of the EU but also the countries beyond the Union—extending to the candidate countries for EU membership and/or the neighbouring countries of the EU.

### **2.1.1 Europeanisation: the EU “hits neighbours’ homes”**

Sustained interest towards Europeanisation emerged in the late 1990s through the study of the dynamics of integration in the EU. As Börzel and Risse argue, the scholarship of Europeanisation has become a “cottage industry”, exemplified by various edited volumes (Börzel & Risse, 2000). For that reason, Olsen (2002) argued that Europeanisation was a fashionable term for which there were many definitions. Europeanisation might have been a fashionable term but it needed further exploration, explanation and conceptualisation (Howell, 2002). Furthermore, since the development of the concept of Europeanisation, the concept has also been applied in the investigation of international conflicts. For example, Emerson explores the prospects for resolving European conflicts in the formation of a common European political space and expanding the influence of “political Europe” borders (Emerson, 2004). This scholarship studies European regional conflicts by taking into account continued Europeanisation and integration in Europe (Noutcheva, et al., 2004).

Some researchers seek to identify the degree of the EU’s influence on cross-border conflicts through Europeanisation process



and to conceptualise the channels of the EU's influence including a range of deliberate, direct and indirect effects of integration (Noutcheva, et al., 2004; Diez, et al., 2006). Much of the literature on the theoretical understanding of "external" Europeanisation considers the EU's influence on international relations and international regimes. The significant work of specialists of the Institute of European Integration Studies contains an analysis of the measurements, mechanisms and results of the process of the Europeanisation of the EU's foreign policy (Müller & de Flers, 2009). The most important added value of studying European foreign policy from a Europeanisation perspective lies in the fact that Europeanisation concepts shift the attention to the interactions between national and EU levels in European foreign policy (Müller & de Flers, 2009). Meanwhile, the range of research on "external" aspects of Europeanisation remains small, and their conceptualisation is fragmented.

Theorists of the "internal" Europeanisation (see, for example, Olsen (2002), Borzel and Risse (2003), Radaelli (2003)) agree that the Europeanisation process may unfold not only within the EU but also outside its borders, but their works are limited to the study of the experience of the candidate countries for accession. Scholars have been studying the dynamics of the impact of Europeanisation and transformations of the internal politics of the states that have been linked to the enlargement of the European Union in 2004-07. This particular research focus had shifted to issues of adaptation of the future EU member states to the requirements of supranational institutions. However, over time, European researchers were not limited to considering only this experience. They also began to apply a "top-down" approach to analyse the impact of integration on the member states and third countries. This type of Europeanisation has become increasingly referred to not only in connection with the integration and regionalisation but also in the context of globalisation and democratisation (Flers, Patrick Müller and Nicole Alecu de, 2009). As Professor Radaelli indicates, there had been many attempts to develop a theory covering "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches to Europeanisation and the study emphases of the concept had differed from the control groups to the focus of mechanisms (rather than variables) and the qualitative aspects in