restriction can only be the stage of direct decision-making and practical implementation, which in most cases is implemented by authorized bodies of state power and administration, parties, and civil society institutions.

References

1. Білецький В.С. Аналітичні центри в сучасному світі / В.С. Білецький // Науково-технічна інформація. 2002. № 2. С. 60–63

Bilets′kyy V.S. Analitychni tsentry v suchasnomu sviti / V.S. Bilets′kyy // Naukovo-tekhnichna informatsiya. 2002. № 2. 60–63 s.

2. Шкробанець О. «Роль аналітичних центрів України у формуванні громадської думки з проблеми євроінтеграції» / О. Шкробанець. Одеса: «Людина, суспільство, політика: актуальні виклики сучасності». Національний університет «Одеська юридична академія», 2014. 113–117 с.

Shkrobanets′ O. «Rol′ analitychnykh tsentriv Ukrayiny u formuvanni hromads′koyi dumky z problemy yevrointehratsiyi» / O. Shkrobanets′. Odesa: «Lyudyna, suspil′stvo, polityka: aktual′ni vyklyky suchasnosti». Natsional′nyy universytet «Odes′ka yurydychna akademiya», 2014. 113–117 s.

3. «Global Go to Think Tank Index Report-2020» James G. McGann. Retrieved from: https://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=think_tanks

4. «Old world, new world: the evolution and influence of foreign affairs think-tanks» Donald E. Abelson. Retrieved from: https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/journals/riia/v90i1/f_0029983_24265.pdf [in English].

5. Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy: A Policy-Maker's Perspective Richard N. Haass. Retrieved from: https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/p/rem/15506.htm [in English].

Daria Babii
Vasyl Stus' Donetsk National University,
Vinnytsia
Research Supervisor: M.I. Prykhnenko, PhD in Political Science,
Senior Lecturer
Language Advisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology,
Senior Lecturer

LEADERSHIP DEFICIT IN EU

Introduction. R. Schumann, J. Monnet, J. Besch, A. Spaak are the leaders who were able not only to establish and develop the structure of the modern European Union but as well to endow it with an ideological and substantive component, it is

exactly what has made this project a success. Unfortunately, nowadays the issue of BREXIT, the migration crisis, the issue of the place and role of individual states in the Community, the populist sentiments of individuals and states, the priority of national strategies over the collective interest are the manifestation of a serious political crisis of this Organization existence over the last sixty years.

Review of recent publications. Researchers concerned this issue in 2013, when lively discussions about the crisis of the European identity and the need to rethink not only the content of the Community's political life but the demand to rethink the "pillars" of the EU's functioning, began to be thoroughly observed in numerous scientific circles [6]. M. King noted in his paper "What is Europe now?" that it is necessary to clearly understand the difference between "common" and "unified" policies within the Union and that "common interests" cannot have a long-term impact on the development of the Organization [7]. Subsequently, S. Zhabo proposed the idea of a leadership deficit in Europe as the primary cause of the current crisis today.

Objective of the paper. Identifying the provoking factors of the integration processes "crisis" within the European Union is the aim of the current research.

Results of the research. Traditionally, the *pan-Europeanism* concept was at the origins of the European idea regarding unity and integration, which is based on the possibility of creating pan-European intergovernmental bodies based on liberal-democratic values. This concept meant a confederation of all European states (except Great Britain and Russia) with common institutions in the field of trade, finance, and external security [2]. Before the twentieth century, the ideas of common Europe had been purely abstract, their ideologists were accustomed to the utopian ideas of European unity, without taking into account all political, economic, and social realities. But after the first World War, the idea of keeping the peace has become relevant, because namely in this whole period, the European continent had lost its dominant position in international events. That was why Western Europe needed to re-establish its place in the system of international news, to find new leverages for strengthening its positions [3].

As a result of the post-war destruction, a general awareness of the need for unification reigned in the political and social circles of Western European states. In the beginning, two concepts on how integration could be realized, emerged: there were supranationalism and intergovernmentalism to be considered. The concept of supranationalism involved the creation of a system in which the national sovereignty of the member states was going to be significantly limited. At the same time, the concept of intergovernmentalism involved the integration through cooperation between national governments, minimizing the creation of new structures. But it should be noted that the presence of two essentially opposite approaches to integration has become one of the problems regarding the integration processes nowadays.

Particularly, at the European Parliament meeting back in 2011, J. M. Barroso noted that generally the EU and the eurozone are in the "deep" systemic crisis. The head of the European Commission suggested the EU member states "to limit their

sovereignty in order to increase the influence of Europe in the world" [5]. He spoke in favor of strengthening political integration through delegating the powers of the national governments structuring the Union Member States, to the EU institutions, fully complying with the principle of proportionality and subsidiarity enshrined in the EU law.

Later the flow of migrants to Europe threatened the existence of the Schengen area and stimulated numerous lively discussions about its abolition. As D. Tusk noted in 2016: "The March meeting of the European Council will be the last chance to understand whether our strategy is working ... If not, we will face dire consequences, such as the collapse of the Schengen area. Of course, this alternative to our strategy is bleak, so I urge the member countries to fully implement the strategy. "

After a large-scale enlargement in 2004, the issue of reforming the governance principles of the EU arose with a new "urgency". Along with the expansion and deepening of the integration processes within the EU, it became a complicating factor in the decision-making process. And it as well raised the issue of the need to develop a document for a clear organization of the EU institutions activities and delineating the competencies of the member states national governments and supranational structures.

Back in the late 1990s, European parliamentarians began to raise the issue of creating coherent legislation that is necessary and conducive to coordinating work within the EU. The adoption of the EU Constitution was supposed to become a qualitatively new stage of the European integration, significantly strengthen the EU institutions, and logically continue the campaign of EU enlargement. Thereby moving from the economic to the political integration level. Furthermore, it was assumed that the Constitution would absorb all previously signed agreements, and thus a single document could simplify the understanding of the EU legislative framework [4]. However, in the reality, the opposite happened: some states rejected the constitutional draft due to lack of information and fear of losing the sovereignty.

As can be noted, the large-scale enlargement of the EU not only complicated the adoption process many times, the search for compromises solutions on the main issues of the EU's activities, but also increased the qualitative heterogeneity of the union. Thus, within the EU, there was a division of both the member states and their interests. There was a sharp stratification of national and supranational interests and priorities, that consequently impacted the formation of an increase in the number of different points of view on the same issues regarding the organization agenda. The presence of a large number of member states, which had different views of integration processes and common policies, contributed to the emergence of several crises in the EU. The crisis demonstrates the weakness of the mechanisms for the states consolidation. This tendency can be illustrated by the BREXIT issue.

Indeed, the French and German politicians played one of the key roles in the establishment, construction, and development of the European project. Nevertheless, at the present stage, the prioritization of one's national interests and foreign policy tasks as opposed to collective ones can be observed. Today, France views Europe as a tool which can increase its political influence. On the other hand, Germany views the

Union as a tool to enhance its economic potential. At the same time, the decline in the leadership potential of both states was noticeable even during the negotiations on the EU Constitutional Agreement, when the expectations regarding the leadership of the Frenchmen and the Germans were not fulfilled, and it became clear how different the vectors of actions and goals of both states were [1].

Conclusion. The events of the post-Cold War period testify to the attempts of the EU to move towards a political union as a single institution, rather than an aggregate of states. The main problem in this context was the process of coordinating positions between all member states, which demonstrated their reluctance or unwillingness to strengthen the level of integration processes within the framework of the European project. This process has led to a certain stagnation in the development of the EU (in the context of an integrated development model), which is due to the lack of a clear ideological background for the development of the organization, is a consequence of the leadership lack in Europe, which is expressed in the absence of a person, group of persons, state or group of states who could revise the "outdated thinking imperatives" of the EU and provide the organization with a new ideological basis and content.

References

1. Babiy D. Defitsyt liderstva v Evropi / Babiy D. Zbirnuk materialiv naukovoi konferentsyi molodykh vchenykh z mizhnarodnoiu uchastiu «Fenomen Evropy: problem derzhavotvorennia. Lviv: LNU im. Franka, 2018. S. 32-34.

2. Prykhnenko M. I., Babiy D. Ideia «obiednanoi Evropy» v suchasnykh realiiakh funktsionuvannia Evropeiskogo proekty., Istorychni ta politolohichni doslidzhennia. DonNU im. V. Stusa, m. Vinnytsia, 2019. №1. st. 60-69.

3. Skrypnyk O. M. Rozvytok idei yevropeiskoi yednosti u 20–30-kh rr. XX st. Eminak: naukovyi shchokvartalnyk . 2017. Vyp. 1 (17). st. 28–33.

4. Konstytutsia Evropeiskogo coiuza: istioria gidgotovky ta prychyny provala yii ratyfikatsi. Retrieved from: http://elib.bsu.by/bitstream/123456789/18818/1/2009_2_JILIR_kruk_r.pdf .

5. Politychna integratsia Evropeiskogo Soiuzu kak shjiakh vykhodu iz finansovoi kryzy. Retrieved from: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/politicheskaya-integratsiya-evropeyskogo-soyuza-kak-put-vyhoda-iz-finansovogo-krizisa .

6. Coggan P. The Last Vote: The Threats to Western Democracy. London: Penguin Books, 2013.

7. King M. "Which Europe Now?" The New York Review of Books 18 (August 2016).

8. Louise M., Peterson J. New model leadership in a new European Union. Paper Series of the Europa Institute, University of Edinburgh. 2010. p. 31.

9. O'Neill M. The Politics of European Integration. London: Routledge, 1996. 360 p.

10. Staab A. The European Union explained: institutions, actors, global impact. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011. 211 p.