327.7(165.611)

Analysis of the European union's supranationalism crisis within the political-institutional paradigm

O.V. BASHTANNYK
The Oles Honchar Dnepropetrovsk national university, Dnepropetrovsk, Ukraine,
E-mail: polit.dnepr2011@gmail.com

Abstract
The effect of integration policies and programs of the foreign policy of the European Union (EU) on the nature of the structural interaction between members and partners of cooperation is examined. It made possible to determine the "initiative" as a practical manifestation of "three-vector" model of the modern EU "drawing" integration strategy, which aims to bring the main state-initiated in cooperation certain group of countries, united mainly on a geographical basis, but conceivably have similar political-economic and socio-cultural characteristics. It is supposed, that interference characteristics of economic activities and socio-cultural differences in political life of the member states and invited to co-operate, in terms of the economic crisis has led to the undermining of the institutional framework of supranational organizations.

So, the same logic of integration policy has caused deferred manifestation of the contradictions that have not been resolved by the development of such a grand united project. It is determined that the investigation of this problem is possible by applying methodological tools of historical institutionalism within political-institutional paradigm of political science. In such kind of analysis it becomes possible to conduct qualitative research and perspective political component of European integration phenomenon's nature. Economic crisis was the challenge for those unifying international institutions that were considered "post-national polity" and whose institutional framework seemed never shaken. This proves once again that it is impossible to cancel on the willful way the influence of the historical patterns in principle and "path dependence" in particular.

Key words: integration, supranationalism, international organizations, the European Union, historical institutionalism, political-institutional paradigm

Дослідження кризи наднаціональності Європейського Союзу в рамках політико-інституційної парадигми

О.В. БАШТАННИК
Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, м. Дніпропетровськ,
E-mail: polit.dnepr2011@gmail.com

Авторське резюме
Розглянуто вплив реалізації інтеграційної політики та програм зовнішньополітичного співробітництва Європейського Союзу (ЄС) на сутність структурної взаємодії країн-членів Спільноти та партнерів співпраці. Це дозволило визначити проект політичної «ініціативи» в якості практичного прояву «тривекторної» моделі сучасної стратегії інтеграційного «залучення» до ЄС. Її метою є переконання до необхідності співпраці головною державою-ініціатором певної групи країн, що об'єднані в основному за географічним чинником, але ймовірно мають схожі політико-економічні та соціально-культурні характеристики укладу суспільного життя. Обґрунтовано припущення, що саме неспівмірні параметри регуляції господарювання та досить глибокі соціально-культурні відмінності в суспільній політиці країн-учасниць та ініціаторів співробітництва за часів економічної кризи призвели до підриву інституціонального каркасу наднаціональної організації.

Отже, безпосередньо логікою реалізації інтеграційної політики зумовлений відкладений прояв протиріч, які не були вирішені на самому початку розвитку цього грандіозного інтегруючого проекту. Встановлено, що аналіз вказаної проблеми є можливим через застосування методологічного інструментарію історичного інституціоналізму в межах політико-інституційної парадигми політичної науки. За подібного типу розгляду є всі підстави для проведення якісних досліджень та визначення перспектив розвитку політичної складової природи комплексного феномена європейської інтеграції. Економічна криза стала викликом для тих об'єднуючих міжнародних інститутів, які визначалися в якості «постнаціональних політій» та чиї інституційні рамки, здавалося, будуть непорушними. Це вкотре доводить, що неможливо вольовим чином відмінити вплив історичних закономірностей загалом та залежності від обраного шляху зокрема.

Ключові слова: інтеграція, наднаціональність, міжнародні організації, Європейський Союз, історичний інституціоналізм, політико-інституційна парадигма

The problem in common conditions. The expansion of the economical crisis in the EU on more and more areas raises further discussions among the masses, politicians and scientists about the political future of the Union. Undoubtedly, the economic factor was the trigger for the destabilization process of socio-political cooperation, but the origins of such problems should be seen deeper. We

suppose that the same logic of integration policy has caused deferred manifestation of the contradictions that have not been resolved by the development of such a grand united project. This situation is typical for cases where the following big ideas provoking the contempt with objective risk factors that only reinforce the negative effect of their break to the surface.

Analysis of the latest researches and publications explanted the indicated problem. Study of the process of European integration is supported by numerous research developments, among which we should name P. Schmitter, W.V. Gerven, S. Bartolini, I.M. Busygyna, M.V. Strezhneva, M.O. Lendel, O. Vradiy and others. Supranationalism as a phenomenon of international cooperation, particularly as system characteristics of the EU thoroughly been explored in works of G. Tsebelis, M. O'Neil, B. Rosamond, R.V. Bugrov, V.A. Smolyakov, O.M. Shpakovych and others. However, it is necessary to clarify the interplay of specificity integration programs of the Community and the fundamental ground of the EU functioning as a unique international organization with supranational mechanism of institutional government.

Object of the research. In this research we determine for a necessary to establish the connection between the crisis of supranational governance mechanisms in the EU and those strategic goals that define integration policy in the Community at different stages of its development. Tasks of the research. For elaboration of this problem we should substantiate the choice of the research strategy for our review; consider the role of international political organizations in today's global political processes; outline priorities for implementing integration policies of the EU and emphasize the factors that led to the selection of foreign cooperation specific strategies.

The main content of the research. Research issues, relevant for the value of institutional type formations in the plane of the real political process functioning of international relations, in the past decade has greatly expanded, substantially and methodologically enriched by borrowing conceptual basis of political science, public administration, economics etc. In particular, political-institutional paradigm of political science, according to K. Johnson and J. Tallberg can be applied to the study of phenomena and processes of international politics through the use of three analytical approaches of new institutionalism - normative, institutionalism and rational choice institutionalism [12]. Not deeping into details about the different approaches, just remark that new institutionalism's schools in common study European integration using among others: rules, memory, legacy and culture (J.G. March and J.P. Olsen) [14]. K. Telen and S. Steinmo (historical instituonalists) considered the institutions that organize political and economic activity as the creators of "rich-information" conditions under which the cooperation elaborate joint strategies to solve specific problems [2]. So essential changing of approaches to the problem of institutional characteristics of the EU take place because in recent years its supranationality is in a situation of uncertainty, when difficult to form a clear view of both internal development and frameworks for cooperation with other countries, especially in the mainstream dialogue about integration into the Union. Within the historically-oriented type of political science research under the scrutiny of scientists in Europe such kind of investigations are provided underway the comparative methodology (study evolution of the relationship, which led to the formation of an institute) mostly [13]. Indeed, in such kind of analysis it becomes possible to conduct qualitative research and perspective political component of this phenomenon's nature.

Research opportunities of historical institutionalism as a tool for the study of international policy actors revealed, for example, in the works of O. Fioretos. According to him, in the development of problematic international relations indicated methodology currently is most successfully used in the study of the benefits of powerful nation-states in the design of international institutions and activities within them, in a broader sense - the general features of institution building in the international system [11, PP. 383-384] Thus, institutional organizations as such are not too important, because the real drivers of the political course became influential countries implementing policies. As the greatest paradox of modernity O. Fioretos regards that fact, that international institutions today as never before provided by all possible resources and authority to carry out effective work, but still not able to fulfill their tasks [11, P. 386]. In our opinion, the main reason for increasing rooting similar practices in international organizations is due to the efforts of single more powerful nations for preserving their privileged position through the organization in the international arena. That's why they oppose changing the balance of power and try to fix the current rules of the political game (as better) even in the face of crisis. Also, at the international level of functioning institutions "overlapping" of organizations mandates (spheres of activity and, therefore, spheres of responsibility) is provoked multiplication growth only of their number leads to a blurring of positions participants and normative provisions barely functioning [11, PP. 387-388]. Consequently, the modern international system is not so rationally organized, as is commonly believed: new structural designs are added to the old, displace them or fade – and in this utter confusion compounded position only the most powerful states, which may even be the personification of the institute (the USA role in NATO).

Formally supranationalism can be defined as a product of the delegation of governmental powers that belong to definite states the wider international organizations maintaining full formal sovereignty and only partially - the political. In this

sense, the state as a political institution is second in importance in the decision-making structures of higher order and possibility of public control over management seems doubtful, that leads to a deficit of democracy. Is formulated a crisis theory of a post-national legitimacy of international organizations and policy establishing by a common identity [8, P. 30]. At the first sight, Treaty of Lisbon (2007) has modified the EU supranationalism – for example, the right of initiative of the Commission is being shared with one quarter of the member states. But the "paradox of Lisbon" is interpreted as a reinforcement of intergovernmentalism while it was intended to strengthen supranationalisation [14]. As we have seen the EU, the fundamental idea of this mechanism is a complex interaction of supranational and national institutions, involving all parties on an equal basis grasped significant test - creating fiscal union (in 23 countries - 17 eurozone states and 6, which are not included in it) though is the chairman of the European Council, H. van Rompuy, to become a long-term means of stabilizing Europe [4], but in our view is a manifestation of a more threatening trends of decentralization not only economical, but also political. Integrative transformation across Europe began on institutionalizing economic aspects of cooperation and at present there is the problem of resource allocation can become a factor, the effect of which will guide the development of the EU as a supranational institution to another trend - the growing role intergovernmental principle in political life. In this concept as the central subject of the integration process in the newly created supranational institutions considered the state (state-centrist approach), and the integration is realized as long as it is possible harmonization of national interests of member states of the integration organization.

In 1993 A. Moravcsik defined as a key factor in European integration the political and economic convergence of the most powerful and influential member states - Germany, France and Great Britain and realization of the aspirations of these states. In his opinion, these countries direct the course of integration across the EU [1]. This thesis has not lost its value and now is not changed positions of leaders - tandem Germany and France ("Merkozi") and almost independent the United Kingdom (that stubbornly stands on the guard of maintenance their own interests). Prolonged financial crisis has contributed to the fact that the EU is also rapidly losing its "ever closer union" - the future of the eurozone (and with it the EU in general) seems the most influential states differently, but Britain traditionally prefers to keep clear of this dialogue, considering existing formal mechanisms for decision making and coordination ineffective [5]. Based on above mentioned, A. Moravcsik argues that the last fifteen years of constitutional debate and institutional modification have reinforced intergovernmentalism. In his view, the community method has given room to a constitutional consensus where essential areas of nation-states' sovereignty remain untouched in fields such as taxation, home affairs and foreign policy [14]. But, with great confidence we can say that the EU is currently still in the list of geopolitical "power centers" ranks with the USA, China, Russia and India. It is immediately noticeable that this union is here only integrative structure, and, as said A. Degtyarev [3], the EU as a new power – "pole" began to push the old institute – "policy" - the nation-state on the political map. Uniqueness of the situation is also that in its part of international policy between members states of the Union is elaborated "inner global policy" [7, PP. 88-89], which also have a great influence on the surrounding regions.

One of the practical implementations of this influence is proposed to consider the EU's "Eastern Partnership", "Union for the Mediterranean" and "Northern Dimension". Here we face the scheme of distribution of the integration process in the EU for three vectors: east, south and north. If somewhat abstracted from the flow of the current political situation, it is possible to conclude that this "three-vector" model of the EU foreign policy in relation to the neighbor circle of countries in one form or another will be stored for a long period of time. In our opinion, the research of the conceptual and institutional foundations of the EU functioning makes possible to determine the policy of "drawing" in the integration process (rather than integration in the formal sense - the criteria, applications, etc.) as the appropriate for the EU version of modern building relations with neighboring countries. There is a new instrument for the implementation of this policy - the policy of "initiatives". We see the initiative as a practical manifestation of "three-vector" model of the modern EU integration strategy, which aims to bring the main state-initiated in cooperation certain group of countries, united mainly on a geographical basis, but have similar political-economic and socio-cultural characteristics. This "drawing" has implemented formally under the control of supranational institutions, but steadily predominate informal agreements factor inside a group of states ("Northern Dimension"). Significant effects on the development of a particular initiative have nations that are most powerful among the others in the Community, even if they may not belong to the main composition of the states in subriginal country block (Germany). It's possible to observe increasing the balance between supranational and intergovernmental (interstate) levels of governance in the EU - strong overruling of supranationalism is gradually eroded.

In this case we are talking about the formation of a new cooperation model, which now structures the distribution of power within the EU with a move to the outer circle "friendly countries". The main feature of this process is that the EU can not formally increase the number of its members, but will try to extend its direct and indirect impact on

the largest possible number of neighboring countries. It is difficult to develop long-term predictions but it is clear that the traditional extended period of time rigid structure "EU member-states and non-EU countries" no longer corresponds to the realities, needs and possibilities of cooperation between Europe and those, that are in relation to them in a very dangerously close for leaving processes in surrounding countries without a minimal control at least. For example, as emphasized out by the majority of Russian experts, the initiative of "Eastern Partnership" was launched in order to minimize the influence of the Russian Federation in the post-soviet space - to force out strong actor from Eastern Europe and strike almost all its interests - the CIS, EurAsEC and CSTO [6]. In the EU this policy is called its own strategic imperative, and Russian negativism is named by the West entirely predictable given the fact that it always considered neighbors as own near abroad only [9]. Here we are talking about creating a certain concentric circles expanding influence of the EU in indicated three areas that extend beyond its formal frontier and a final design of the nucleus in the middle of the EU as well. It is also possible that some countries in these three projects later become the path of the EU accession, while others will try to force the EU to pay for a buffer zone of stability as possibly more expensive – by a privileged partnership, association etc.

However, other than exceptionally economic components, we are faced with the issues that have already political and cultural orientation, because some European countries tend to involve cooperation of its strategic partners that are not the EU-member only, but not traditionally considered as European (remember new institutional emphasis on the value component of international politics). Previously considered, that the borders of Europe are the borders of Western civilization at the same time (similar economic systems, public policy and legal models, psychology, traditions and customs). Now Y. Shymov stresses that in modern conditions in general it should not be compared the terms "Europe" and "European Union" - the future Europe will not be any truly unified, i.e. unitary or federal, nor Europe of nation states, connected to each other something of a con-federal relationship, but the "Europe of regions". This co-operation has an advantage: it can serves as a bridge in the "other", "non-EU" Europe and even beyond [10]. But in the process of checking by the reality it becomes clear that in order to implement effective regional cooperation with EU countries not only basic democratic principles and values should be shared, but, at least to some extent, there is subjective sense of civic unity of European identity. As a fundamental factor in shaping its culture basis, that actually legitimizes the institutional system of the integration project. Interference characteristics of economic activities and socio-cultural differences in political life of the member states and invited to co-operate, in terms of the economic crisis has led to the undermining of the institutional framework of supranational organization. Thus, political integration should follow economic and cultural convergence of the European nations, but not precede it.

Conclusion. The actual political content of institutional relationships within the EU integration formation in today's economic crisis conditions promotes the transformation of the conceptual areas of cooperation, importance of which has recently been very high. The logic of integration strategies of influential EU member states was a desire to politicize economic cooperation in the early periods of the EU development, later – coincide geographic and political boundaries of Europe, and, eventually, even bring macro-regional cooperation beyond them, laid the foundations of the delayed actualization of diverse crisis trends. The most threatening of them can be called as a crisis of supranationalism - reducing institutional effectiveness of the organizational structure of intergovernmental association by introducing incongruence for it strategies of integration and involvement of countries to cooperate, which is related to the problem of generation and implementation of a collective European identity (design information-saturated conditions) as an indicator of integrating structures legitimacy in local controlled spaces. Unstable economic situation is the challenge for those unifying international institutions that were considered "post-national polity" and whose institutional framework seemed never shaken. This proves once again that it is impossible to cancel on the willful way the influence of the historical patterns in principle and "path dependence" in particular.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ:

1. Авраменко М. Аналіз концептуальних положень міжурядового підходу до європейської інтеграції [Електронний ресурс] / М. Авраменко. - Режим доступу: http://www.viche.info/journal/2056/
2. Бугров Р.В. Интеграция в теории международных отношений: обзор современных подходов [Электронный ресурс] / Р.В. Бугров. - Режим доступа: www.unn.ru/rus/fmo/Archive/books/posobiy/Integrationtheoriesrevision.doc
3. Дегтярев А.А. Политические институты и социальное общение [Электронный ресурс] / А.А. Дегтярев. - Режим доступа: http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Degt/_06.php
4. Дубровин Д. Евросоюз вышел на новый этап интеграции, но без Великобритании [Электронный ресурс] / Д. Дубровин, В. Макарчев. - Режим доступа: http://www.itar-tass.com/c137/293411.html
5. Кэмерон: Саммиты ЕС неэффективны [Электронный ресурс]. - Режим доступа: http://vz.ru/news/2012/6/28/585983.html. - Заголовок с экрана.
6. Первая министерская встреча участников инициативы "Восточное партнерство" [Электронный ресурс].

- Режим доступа: http://www.analitik.org.ua/current-comment/ext/4b2769f44215a/. - Заголовок с экрана.
7. Смоляков В.А. Европейский Союз и взаимопроникновение внутренней и внешней политики [Текст] / В. А. Смоляков // РОССИЯ и АТР. – 2005. - № 4. – С. 87-96.
8. Смоляков В.А. Политическое измерение экономической интеграции (сравнение европейской и восточноазиатской моделей) [Текст] / В.А. Смоляков // Вестник ХГАЭП. - 2010. - № 3(48). – С. 23-35.
9. Трейнор И. Инициатива ЕС бросает вызов российскому влиянию на Востоке [Электронный ресурс] / И. Трейнор. - Режим доступа: http://www.inosmi.ru/europe/20090508/248984.html
10. Шимов Я. Восход Европы? Расширение Европейского союза: вопросов больше, чем ответов [Текст] / Я. Шимов // Логос. – 2004. - №.1. – С. 28-41.
11. Fioretos O. Historical institutionalism in International relations [Text] / O. Fioretos // International organization. - Spring 2011. - № 65. - P. 367-399.
12. Jönsson C. Institutional Theory in International Relations [Electronic resource] / C. Jönsson, J. Tallberg. - Regime to access: http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId= 534142&fileOId=625444
13. Katzenstein P. J. Analyzing Change in International Politics: The New Institutionalism and the Interpretative Approach [Electronic resource] / P. J. Katzenstein. - Regime to access: http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp90-10.pdf
14. Schout A. Making sense of the "Paradox of Lisbon": Supranationalism-Intergovernmentalism as an administrative concept [Electronic resource] / A. Schout, S. Wolff. - Regime to access: http://egpa2010.com/documents/PSG14/Schout-Wolff.pdf

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.04.2014

REFERENCES:

1. *Avramenko M.* Analiz kontseptualnykh polozhen mizhuriadovoho pidkhodu do yevropeiskoi intehratsii (Analysis of the conceptual provisions of the intergovernmental approach to European integration). Regime to access: http://www.viche.info/journal/2056/
2. *Bugrov R.V.* Integracija v teorii mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij: obzor sovremennyh podhodov (Integration in international relations theory: a review of current approaches). Regime to access: www.unn.ru/rus/fmo/Archive/books/posobiy/Integrationtheoriesrevision.doc
3. *Degtjarev A.A.* Politicheskie instituty i social'noe obshhenie (Political institutions and social interaction). Regime to access: http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Degt/_06.php
4. *Dubrovin D., Makarychev V.* Evrosojuz vyshel na novyj jetap integracii, no bez Velikobritanii (EU entered to the new stage of integration, but without the UK). Regime to access: http://www.itar-tass.com/c137/293411.html
5. Kjemeron: Sammity ES nejeffektivny (Cameron: EU summit ineffective). Regime to access: http://vz.ru/news/2012/6/28/585983.html. - Zagolovok s jekrana.
6. Pervaja ministerskaja vstrecha uchastnikov iniciativy "Vostochnoe partnerstvo" (The first ministerial meeting of the initiative "Eastern Partnership"). Regime to access: http://www.analitik.org.ua/current-comment/ext/4b2769f44215a/. - Zagolovok s jekrana.
7. *Smoljakov V.A.* Evropejskij Sojuz i vzaimoproniknovenie vnutrennej i vneshnej politiki (The European Union and the interpenetration of domestic and foreign policy). *ROSSIJA i ATR*, 2005, № 4, pp. 87-96.
8. *Smoljakov V.A.* Politicheskoe izmerenie jekonomicheskoj integracii (sravnenie evropejskoj i vostochnoaziatskoj modelej) (Political dimension of economic integration (comparison of European and East Asian models)). *Vestnik HGAJeP*, 2010, № 3(48), pp. 23-35.
9. *Trejnor I.* Iniciativa ES brosaet vyzov rossijskomu vlijaniju na Bostoke (The EU initiative challenges Russian influence on the East). Regime to access: http://www.inosmi.ru/europe/20090508/248984.html
10. *Shimov Ja.* Voshod Evropy? Rasshirenie Evropejskogo sojuza: voprosov bol'she, chem otvetov (Sunrise Europe? Enlargement of the European Union: more questions than answers). *Logos*, 2004, № 1, pp. 28-41.
11. Fioretos O. Historical institutionalism in International relations. International organization, 2011, № 65 (Spring), pp. 367-399.
12. Jönsson C., Tallberg J. Institutional Theory in International Relations. Regime to access: http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId= 534142&fileOId=625444
13. Katzenstein P. J. Analyzing Change in International Politics: The New Institutionalism and the Interpretative Approach. Regime to access: http://www.mpi-fg-koeln.mpg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp90-10.pdf
14. Schout A., Wolff S. Making sense of the "Paradox of Lisbon": Supranationalism-Intergovernmentalism as an administrative concept. Regime to access: http://egpa2010.com/documents/PSG14/Schout-Wolff.pdf

Bashtannyk Oksana Vitaliyjivna – postgraduate
The Oles Honchar Dnepropetrovsk national university
Address: 72, Gagarin Avenue, Dnipropetrovsk, 49010
E-mail: polit.dnepr2011@gmail.com

Баштанник Оксана Віталіївна – аспірант
Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара
Адреса: 49010, м. Дніпропетровськ, просп. Гагаріна, буд. 72
E-mail: polit.dnepr2011@gmail.com