

Mizinich E. A. Hlobalnyi ekonomichniy prostir [Global economic space] / E. A. Mizinich. M: Univ. knyha, 2014. 152 s. [in Ukrainian].

14. Маркарян В. Р., Молчан А. С. Фактори сталого розвитку регіональних. Markarian V. R., Molchan A. S. Faktory staloho rozvytku rehional'nykh [Factors of sustainable regional development] / V. R. Markarian, A. S. Molchan [in Ukrainian].

15. Руденко Л. В. Управління потоками капіталів у сучасній бізнес-моделі функціонування транснаціональних корпорацій: [Монографія] / Л. В. Руденко. К.: Кондор, 2017. 480 с.

Rudenko L. V. Upravlinnia potokamy kapitaliv u suchasniy biznes-modeli funktsionuvannia transnatsionalnykh korporatsiy: [Monohrafiya] [Management of the resources streams in the modern business model of the functioning of transnational corporations] / L.V. Rudenko. K.: Kondor, 2017. 480 s. [in Ukrainian].

16. Савич Л. Н. Економіка / Л.М. Савич. М.: Джерело, 2017. 408 с.

Savych L. N. Ekonomika [Economics] / L. M. Savych. M.: Dzherelo, 2017. 408 s. [in Ukrainian].

17. Фітузов В. В. Реформування МВФ на сучасному етапі розвитку / В. В. Фітузов // Наука і освіта в житті сучасного суспільства: збірник наукових праць за матеріалами Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції: в 12 частинах. 2015. С. 136–140.

Fituzov V. V. Reformuvannia MVF na suchasnomu etapi rozvytku [IMF reform on the modern level of development] / V. V. Fituzov // Nauka i osvita v zhytti suchasnoho suspilstva: zbirnyk naukovykh prats za materialamy Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii: v 12 chastynakh. 2015. S. 136–140 [in Ukrainian].

18. Черковец О. Глобализация сотрудничества или конкуренция / О. Черковец // Экономист. № 10. 2002. С. 3–16.

Cherkovets O. Hlobalizatsiia sotrudnichestva ili konkurentsiiia [Globalization of cooperation or competition] / O. Cherkovets. Ekonomist. № 10. 2002. S. 3–16 [in Russian].

19. Gianmarco I. P. Ottaviano (DiegoPuga) / I. P. Gianmarco // Centre for economic performance discussion paper. No. 356, August 1997.

Ihor Shcherbakov

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

Vinnitsia

Research Supervisor: I. V. Bohinska, PhD in History, Assoc. Prof.

Language Advisor: O. Yu. Korzh, PhD in Pedagogy, Ass. Prof.

THE ANALYSIS OF EUROPEAN UNION GLOBAL STRATEGY: SHARED VISION, COMMON ACTION, STRONGER EUROPE

Introduction: European Union as an integrating group, which includes 28 states, is a unique international actor. This uniqueness occurs, particularly, in

understanding of its security, secure threats and methods of providing internal and external favourable secure conditions. Taking into consideration the fact that most of European countries are the members of NATO, it is necessary to understand how “European” and “North Atlantic” approaches in EU security are agreed, furthermore, if the new EU global strategy contains reduction of NATO’s role in Europe.

Review of recent publications: EU security issues have been the focus of investigation of such researchers as Daniel Fiott, Jakob Bund, Nicu Popescu Jan Techau, Jerome Legrand. Collective work of Fiott and Bund “EUISS Yearbook of European Security YES 2018” [4] could be considered as an annual secure report of European region and includes information about condition of EU strategies in sphere of security and their ways of action. Jerome Legrand’s article “Does the new EU Global Strategy deliver on security and defence?” [6] contains the analysis of “secure conversation” between EU member-states, reviewing of its priorities and methods of achieving the goals, which were declared in the strategy. Jan Techau in his article [8] tried to highlight strengths and weaknesses of the EU strategy and to analyse future possibilities of European Union in the sphere of security.

Objective of the paper: The aims of the work are to understand the future projection of EU as an international actor in the terms of secure aspects, to highlight strategy’s secure priorities and tasks, to analyze the reasons of EU wish to become stronger.

Results of the research: At the time, when the situation was almost critical, EU made another attempt to improve its security. A new global strategy “Shared Vision, Common Action: Stronger Europe” was presented on 28th June 2016. Due to common work of the EU’s state-representatives, the new strategy has clearly formed priorities, based on the analysis of unsuccessful experience. However, with the growing of problems like international terrorism, Russian’s hybrid war, uncontrolled streams of immigrants from Middle East and Africa, war conflict at the territory of Ukraine, the new wave of European separatism, a new threat to all positions which were mentioned above appears. EU attempted to formulate five main priorities to fight against the risks, which the Union had to face. These priorities were: Union’s security, counter-terrorism policy development, cyber and energy security, strategic communications, which involve internal and external cooperation. Before moving to the analysis of the strategy, it is necessary to monitor the attitude to the strategy. Many EU representatives declared the strategy as a guide for Europe. Some of researchers define it as a useless program. However, it is necessary to pay attention, that there are politicians who sincerely believe that the strategy will be a good basis for future EU. For example, Federica Mogherini defines it in such way: *“This Global Strategy will guide us in our daily work towards a Union that truly meets its citizens’ needs, hopes and inspiration; a Union which is based on the success of 70 years of peace; a Union with the strength to contribute to peace and security not only in our region but in the whole world”* [7: 3].

Speaking about the analysis of understanding the future projection of EU as an international actor, it is necessary to say, that the document has some sort of balance between EU’s ambitions and challenges which EU has to fight with. It was clearly

declared, that “**principle pragmatism**” [7: 8], in which Europe is needed nowadays, would be essential basis in the process of decision-making. Such way of EU’s thinking can be described as development of following principles like unity, engagement, shared responsibility, partnership. From our point of view, it is a good solution of dilemma of balancing between real politics and idealism, which has not left EU for many years. Another advantage of the strategy is declaring high-level political goals, which do not include abstract arguments, based just on general democracy principles, but define and have concrete proposal. Global strategy also focuses on ENP (European Neighbourhood Policy), reviewing its present relations with surrounding countries, and developing resilience as a new guiding platform, deepening connections and finding new ways of cooperation, on the one hand, and establishing approaches to individual countries on the other. Federica Mogherini defined resilience as: “*the ability of countries and societies to reform and renovate from internal and external crisis*” [8]. Meanwhile, the strategy does not contain the analysis of mistakes of previous neighbourhood cooperation, which could be a good basis for improving European foreign policy [1: 432-433]. Enhanced cooperation with international partners will lead to sharing the responsibility and achieving internal and external purposes.

The document also has a point of formulation and developing of so called “**strategic autonomy**”. It also can be described as a key concept of new EU pragmatism [7: 14-15]. Thus, it is a new priority task and an attempt to develop EU “own security”, which always has had problems caused by the lack of institutionalized capacity to divide the financial obligations because of difficulties in forming secure proposal due to differences in national budgets and expenses on security sector of those budgets. “**Strategic autonomy**” implies an EU’s attempt to become more autonomous in the sphere of security from NATO and Washington, but including the fact that EU has relied on the support of the USA for many years, from our point of view, it will be very difficult to get an autonomy. It is necessary to emphasize that EU has to do everything gradually to get rid of this trap and convert north Atlantic relations in mutual support.

In our opinion, if EU declares the increasing of its secure role and developing its own security, they have to act appropriately. The first step was the determining of EDA (European Defence Agency) as a coordinator in developing secure level [5]. The EUGS includes the plan of improving the situation.

The main points are:

- intensification of connections among national states in secure sector inside the union;
- secure policy forming, which will take into account the differences among countries like military technology level, army’s stage of development;
- strengthening of coordination between CDSP operations and missions of the EU Border and Coast Guard.
- providing necessary equipment to member-states to fight with external and internal threats [6: 50-53].

We suppose, it will lead to sustainable use of secure budget and may increase the output.

Conclusion: To sum up, we have to confirm, that EU has made the attempt to reconsider previous mistakes in different sectors, especially in foreign policy and security. Nevertheless, there is a risk that the strategy could not be understood by the representatives of member-states and citizens and it would not use the whole potential and practical implementation, which it could receive.

Time, for EU, is a critical and fundamental factor, which might play a significant role in forming of future projection of the Union. EUGS is a good chance for Europe to fight against the challenges, that could put under threat all the principles and values, which EU has been trying to implement for almost 30 years. The strategy includes formed goals, which must be achieved and followed.

References

1. Biscop S. All or nothing? The EU Global Strategy and Defence Policy after the Brexit (Contemporary Security Policy, 2016). 431–445 pp. [in English]
2. Dijkstra H. Introduction: one-and-a-half cheers for the EU Global Strategy, (Contemporary Security Policy, 2016) 369–373 pp. [in English]
3. European Council meeting – Conclusions, EUCO 26/16, Brussels, 28 June 2016. [in English]
4. Fiott B. EUISS Yearbook of European Security YES 2018. Retrieved from: https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/YES_2018.pdf. [in English]
5. Frontini A. The EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy: A Short Guide for the Perplexed. Retrieved from: <https://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/eu-global-strategy-foreign-and-security-policy-short-guide-perplexed-15441> [in English]
6. Legrand J. Does the new EU Global Strategy deliver on security and defence? (Policy Department, DG EXPO, Belgium, 2016). 18 p. [in English]
7. Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe: A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy (2016). 60 p. [in English]
8. Techau J. The EU's New Global Strategy: Useful or Pointless? Retrieved from: <https://carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/?fa=63994> [in English]
9. Zandee D. EU Global Strategy: from design to implementation. Retrieved from: <https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/EU%20Global%20Strategy%20-%20AP%20-%20August%202016.pdf> [in English]

Anastasiia Shevchenko

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

Vinnitsia

Research Supervisor: L. F. Lozynska, PhD in Pedagogy, Assoc. Prof.