

утворення, розподілу та використання грошових фондів у зв'язку із здійсненням своїх освітніх, наукових і інших соціальних завдань.

Фінансова діяльність ВНЗ охоплює такі групи юридичних прав і обов'язків:

— з планування своїх фінансових ресурсів (бюджетних надходжень і широкого кола позабюджетних джерел);

— з розподілу та використання фінансових ресурсів на розвиток, на поточне утримання, матеріальне заохочення професорсько-викладацького складу;

— з виконання фінансових зобов'язань перед державою у сфері сплати податків та інших платежів до бюджету та позабюджетних фондів, а також з виконання зобов'язань перед банками, іншими господарюючими суб'єктами;

— із здійснення фінансового контролю у ВНЗ.

Проблема університетської автономії й академічних свобод – одна з найбільш складних проблем, з якими стикаються вищі навчальні заклади на всіх рівнях. Проте, на нашу думку, у цій сфері не може бути повної автономії, оскільки велика кількість вищих навчальних закладів фінансується в основному державою. Здійснюючи фінансову діяльність, вищі навчальні заклади повинні реагувати на потреби суспільства й держави в цілому, встановлюючи при цьому актуальні напрями розвитку.

Ідеальним у здійсненні фінансової діяльності вищими навчальними закладами в Україні стало б, на наш погляд, досягнення рівноваги між автономією й академічними свободами, а також державним управлінням і контролем, оскільки надмірна автономія вищого навчального закладу може призвести до того, що діяльність установи не відповідатиме потребам суспільства, а дуже жорстка підзвітність зруйнує його академічні засади, порушить ряд прав, закріплених у законодавстві

УДК 341.1 (043.2)

**Moskalenko O. M.**, Ph.D in European Law,  
post-doc researcher, Associate Professor,  
National Aviation University, Kyiv, Ukraine

## **EU AND DEMOCRACY – THE CURRENT STATE OF DEBATE**

The post-Lisbon discourse has been shifted from defining and justifying the existence of the EU as an international actor towards attempts to address the question of “Europe, to do what in the world”, and thus the question “*What kind of values is this actor based on?*” The normative power concept implies a strong interconnection of the EU as a normative power with the promotion of values that are of universal validity, as well as with the EU’s own politico-legal

order, which is viewed as the internal “reference point” for its outside projection. This article provides insight into both of the issues in focus. Manners refers to nine specific values that the EU has been promoting in its relations with the outer world. Despite criticism of the rigid framework of the norms that the EU “absolutely must promote”, in fact the totality of the “core” norms refers to a very specific governance mode of liberal democracy. Thus, the core value that the EU as a normative power promotes in its relations with third countries is the liberal democracy governance model. At the same time, the issue of democracy has been at the core of the debate concerning the EU’s own qualities with further references to the issue of the legitimacy of EU’s own legal order.

The starting point is the idea that the very foundation of individual and group interest is fundamentally rooted in their beliefs about how the world works and the group’s values. This approach echoes the Weberian understanding of the role that the ideas and beliefs play in terms of legitimising a political system. Moreover, in his understanding, the violation of traditions may have fatal consequences for the legality of the entire system. Later, Jachtenfuchs elaborated the notion and content of shared beliefs about a “legitimate political order” with their further interconnection with the constitutional perspective of the polity construction process. Thus, the political system has to comply with the “parameters established by the dominant institutional values”. In turn, these values are rooted in and derived from the cultural *milieu*, which is the ultimate source of “legitimacy” or “social appropriateness” in terms of the selection of particular arrangements. Extrapolating this approach to the EU context, it should be stressed that the liberal democracy model is today “the predominant legitimating belief in the ‘developed’ world,” shared by the political elites of the Member States, which set the parameters for the supra-national level of governance.

The fact that the model of the democratic welfare state is the dominant model for the EU Member States certainly influences the vision of the principles underpinning the EU institutional system that the national political elites have. Thus, the fact that liberal democracy is the shared standard of legitimate authority provides a powerful normative resource for the proponents of supranational democratisation. In other words, being a community, “of values and norms, in which all actors share fundamental principles of liberal democracy,” Member States “externalise their domestic political practices and norms about democratic governance”, extrapolating them to the supranational level.

In terms of specific EU-related approaches to perceiving a correlation between democracy and legitimacy, it is worth mentioning the concept of input-output legitimacy, with input legitimacy stressing the procedural aspect of the decision-making process and output legitimacy the effectiveness of the decisions. However, the efficiency-oriented reallocation of political

competences from the national to the supranational level “tends to devalue traditional democratic institutions and processes”. Furthermore, the EU’s evolution along the path of polity construction increasingly requires its own democratic legitimacy. Thus, the trend of strengthening democratic institutions at the EU level has been viewed as a compensation mechanism.

In search of the basic formula to adequately define standards for democratic legitimate, the three core principles by Abraham Lincoln – ‘government of the people, by the people, for the people’ – have been recognised by most scholars. This formula raised an intricate debate regarding the (non)-existence of the European *demos*. This approach was countered by post-nationalism social philosophers who were promoting a “thin” political identity detached from the nation in contrast to the “thick” ethno - nationalism identity. Thus, democracy has been detached from the nation state by shifting the emphasis towards the notion of “deliberative democracy”, which focuses on due deliberation during the decision-making process. This trend reaffirmed the idea of post-modern social philosophers of democracy lying at the core of legitimacy. Furthermore, in a wider context, democracy today is conceived as “a legitimation principle which lays out the conditions necessary for finding out what constitutes the “common interest” and, more generally, a community or common identity.”

#### *References*

1. Cederman L. - E., “Nationalism and Bounded Integration: What it Would Take to Construct a European Demos”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 2001, 7(2): pp. 139–174.
2. Eriksen E. & Neyer J., “Introduction: The Forging of Deliberative Supranationalism in the EU?” in *European Governance, Deliberation and the Quest for Democratisation*, Oslo: ARENA Report No. 2/2003.
3. Habermas J., „Die Postnationale Konstellation und die Zukunft der Demokratie“ in *Die Postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays*, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1998.
4. Jachtenfuchs M., *Ideen und Integration. Verfassungsideen in Deutschland, Frankreich und Großbritannien und die Entwicklung der EU*, Habilitationsschrift: Universität Mannheim, 1999.
5. Krotz U., “Momentum and Impediments: Why Europe Won’t Emerge as a Full Political Actor on the World Stage Soon”, *JCMS*, 2009, 47 (3), pp. 555–578.
6. Manners I., 2008. “The Normative Ethics of the European Union.” *International Affairs* 84(1): pp. 45–60.
7. Weber M., *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*, Vol. I, Bedminster Press, 1968.