

4. THE EU'S MULTILATERALISM IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD ORDER TRANSFORMATION

4.1 Concepts of “world order transformation”, “conceptual framework of EU foreign policy”, “EU concept “Effective multilateralism”

4.2 European Union as a global actor of International Relations

4.3 Cooperation of the European Union with international, regional organizations and informal forums

4.1 Concepts of “world order transformation”, “conceptual framework of EU foreign policy”, “EU concept “Effective multilateralism”

In this chapter, based on the analysis of EU documents and works of European theorists and experts reveal the specifics of the EU's ruling circles of the emerging world order and the conceptual basis of the EU's foreign policy based on the concept of “effective multilateralism”. The essence of this concept is in adherence to legal obligations that states are ready to assume and to influential international regimes. In 2000s, the EU hoped that their model of “effective multilateralism” would become a global standard, but such hopes for today were not justified. Against the background of the rapid growth of rising powers, primarily China, the global financial crisis and the sovereign debt crisis in the eurozone have undermined the foundation of the positions of integrated Europe in the world. With that great anxiety, Europeans are concerned with the growth of multipolarity, which can lead to aggravation of internal contradictions and divisions in the EU and reduce its international role.

Acting as a global player, the European Union seeks to counter this trend by promoting a multilateral world order based on certain rules and to work out answers to global challenges in cooperation with international games with regional organizations, individual key states and non-state actors. While other states usually emphasize polycentrism (multipolarity) when describing the world order, for the EU it is fundamentally important that multilateralism be interpreted as a form of collective transnational action and cooperation between states in terms of global governance and world politics.

Published at the end of June 2016 of the European Union's Global Strategy gives reason to return to discussing the place of this association in the international arena. The EU is the largest market in the world and an important destination for the export of many developing and developed countries. European Union played a positive role in concluding the Paris Agreement at the end of 2015 in the context of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. The EU participates in global peacekeeping and is the largest development aid donor in the world. However, at the same time, political and economic developments in recent years have created a more complex and less favorable international environment for the EU.

On the one hand, the increase in polycentricity leads to a decrease in the concentration of economic activity in the core of the international system and an increase in such activity outside the traditional core, to which the EU belongs. On the other hand, the global financial crisis, the exit from which was given to the EU

extremely hard, and especially the crisis of sovereign debts in the eurozone, undermined the foundation of the international position of an integrated Europe, negatively affecting its previously impeccable reputation. Some European countries have become recipients of international aid, and the EU in some cases turned out to be dependent on third countries in solving their own complex problems. The inability of the EU to cope with the migration crisis itself and Brexit (the exit of the UK from the European Union) further aggravated the situation. The EU leaders are very worried about the growth of what they call multipolarity, seeing in it the danger of further deepening internal contradictions and splits in the European Union and reducing its international role.

The main content of the concept of “effective multilateralism”, as well as its significance in defining the role of the European Union in the conditions of transformation of the world order, are well studied in European scientific literature. The EU, like the US, is not interested in the West losing control over organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, but the European Union as a whole and its leading participants supported the revision of IMF quotas in favor of developing countries, implying a reduction in the share European states.

However, among some specialists, in our opinion, a rather schematic view of this concept has developed, which is why an equal sign is often put or implied between the concepts of “multipolarity” and “multilateralism” in publications of domestic authors. Also this chapter focuses on what world order desirable from European Union point of view as the most integrated regional association of states in the world. Also, multilateralism is considered as a theoretical concept developed by American scientists and in the practice of its application by the European Union; relations built by the EU with countries that it considers being its strategic partners. Such partnerships, taken together, constitute today the main EU-accessible form of implementing multilateralism in its international policy.

In modern conditions, the US and the EU, despite their power, are not able to cope with serious challenges on their own, especially when it comes to financial crises and their prevention in the future. This explains their active interest in strong regional and global institutions built on multilateral treaties, which they are ready to consider as the basis of the future world order. However, the growing number of large global players makes it difficult to achieve common interests within existing multilateral institutions.

About the benefits of “effective multilateralism” of the European Union first stated in the European Security Strategy (ESS) in 2003, which states “In a world of global threats, global markets and global mass media, our security and well-being are increasingly dependent on the effectiveness of the multilateral system”. The 2007 Lisbon Treaty states that the Union seeks to “develop an international system based on enhanced multilateral cooperation and good global governance”. In 2008, a report on the implementation of the European Security Strategy was published, stating that EU bilateral partnerships with key third countries were aimed at building “effective multilateralism”.

“Effective multilateralism” had to rely on strong regional governance, which emphasized significance of promoting regional integration projects by the whole

world according to the idea that the European integration project is, in essence, the embodiment of the idea of an international order built on common rules. It is clear that the priorities of regional integration are most important part of the identity of the EU. Inter-regionalism (relations with other regional groupings of the world), in turn, has already become for the EU one of the main directions of its foreign policy, which was well combined with “effective multilateralism”. The EU has special relations with the African Union, the Community of Latin America and the Caribbean and with NATO. The European Union’s global strategy for 2016 confirmed its loyalty to (inter) regionalism: it speaks of its intention to further contribute to the formation of regional orders and to cooperation between and within regions.

However, in such actions, the EU faces rivalry from other global players. China pursues its own interests on the basis of a system of bilateral relations and new multilateral institutions, such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). For Russia, the undoubted foreign policy priority is to strengthen cooperation within the framework of the CIS, the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization, other associations – not only the European Union, but also the SCO and ASEAN. Asian and Latin American countries are building their own institutions of regional financial management, trying to get away from the influence of the Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and World Bank), which are dominated by the West.

BRICS and alliances of growing powers of other configurations, like multilateral organizations in the Asia-Pacific region and in the global South, they are a world in which the EU is mostly unrepresented and where it is assessed less positively and generally less interested in them than it follows from Europe’s traditional perception of itself. In this series, the BRICS is “one of the overlapping and non-West Formations,” which together form a serious element in the gradual transformation of the global political landscape, which is difficult for the European Union to influence.

One of the important reasons for the failure of the EU principle line on upholding multilateralism is that in practice the European Union itself often gives priority to pragmatic protection self-interest contrary to the declared intention to strengthen international institutions. In addition, in general, multilateral EU countries are more inclined to multilateralism and unification of sovereignty at the international level, while large countries (starting with Germany and France) prefer to combine it more easily with one-sidedness and “ministerialness” in their foreign policy tools. There remains a clear gap between the collective and national interests of the EU member states, which has become particularly noticeable in terms of the exceptional role of Berlin in overcoming the financial and economic crisis in the eurozone and Germany’s insistent desire to become a permanent member in the UN Security Council. To the detriment of the goal of acquiring such status by the European Union, Germany formed a pressure group, which also included Japan, India and Brazil.

Thus, despite the EU’s general commitment to “effective multilateralism” as a way of moving towards global governance and enhancing the manageability of a

multipolar international system, one can state the continuing gap between European collective interests and the priorities of individual EU countries.

So, the desired model of multipolarity for the European Union is multilateral (controlled) multipolarity, in which all centers of power would be loyal to international law and played an active role, jointly solving global problems within the framework of international institutions and treaties. In the same time in its approach, the EU retains elements of Eurocentrism, which highlights some of the difficulties of its adaptation to a world that has ceased to revolve around Europe.

In the long run, the European Union, as a plurilateral regional association, is naturally focused on an ideal model of world order that would be based on integrated regions and “effective multilateralism”.

The inability of the EU to move forward on the path of building such a world order, which has become apparent now, threatens the European Union with a decline in its international role and a decline in internal cohesion. However, most likely, in the short and medium term, the promotion of the interests and values of the EU in the world will be more responsible for bilateralism and selective strategic partnerships.

In view of the fact that reforms of global governance mechanisms stalled, it is important for the European Union, acting in an international environment, to find mutual understanding with a wide range of partners that go beyond the officially delineated “dozens”. Slow EU withdrawal from the financial crisis combined with the intensification of the international role of the growing powers, makes it necessary for him to more actively seek a broad consensus for you on international politics that would take into account different points of view. Whether the EU’s diplomacy can cope with such a difficult task will show the future. In relation to the European Union to the new international organizations in which the BRICS countries are leading, it is likely that over time there will be some revaluation in more constructive spirit. At the same time, the official Brussels will take the exclusive place in the coming years to devote strategic partnership with the United States to compensate for the relative decline in its weight in the global economy and the growing threats to its own security.

4.2 European Union as a global actor of International Relations

The European Union plays an important role in diplomacy, the promotion of human rights, trade, development and the provision of humanitarian assistance, as well as in working with multilateral organizations.

The Lisbon Treaty clearly defines how the European Union should be guided in the international arena: “The Union’s activities in the international arena are based on the principles that guided its creation, development and expansion, and which the Union seeks to promote in the rest of the world: democracy, rule of law, universality and the inalienability of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and International Law”.

Outside its borders, the EU plays a role as an assistant in peacekeeping. At the international level, the EU conducts and supports peace negotiations around the world in order to simplify decision-making in conflict situations.

For example, in July of 2015, after lengthy diplomatic negotiations led by the EU, the historic international agreement on Iran's nuclear program was signed. The EU, together with China, France, Germany, Russia, Britain and the United States acted as a mediator. Iran has promised that under no circumstances will it seek, develop and acquire nuclear weapons. In Colombia, the EU is in peace negotiations with the government and the FARC movement (FARC). In order to complete the decades of civil war, the European Union appointed a special peace envoy. Thanks to its political, practical, and economic support to countries, the EU played an important role in achieving peace in the Western Balkans after the wars in Yugoslavia. The EU facilitated a dialogue between Serbia and Kosovo, which led to a historic agreement in April 2013 and is currently being implemented with EU support. This is only a small part of the work that the EU does in peacekeeping.

The European Union is a responsible neighbor. To the east and south of the EU there are many countries that have undergone or are still undergoing – enormous political changes. The European Neighborhood Policy aims to maintain strong and friendly relations with countries bordering the EU in order to help them fully with the democratization process. Promoting democracy, good governance and human rights, in parallel with the commencement of trade and cooperation in many policy areas, including migration issues and the visa issue, are some of the goals of the European Neighborhood Policy.

The EU is a partner and the largest contributor to development assistance. EU member states provide more than half of official development assistance (ODA) worldwide. In this regard, the EU provides substantial support to the new UN Goals on Sustainable Development, approved in 2015, and remains committed to their implementation.

As we all know, the EU places a special role on human rights policies. This issue is a central aspect of EU foreign policy, which positions them as a priority in political dialogues with third countries, in economic development policy and development assistance, as well as with participation in multilateral forums. In addition, the EU has human rights policy guidelines on issues such as the death penalty, torture and freedom of speech in online and offline environments. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) strengthens respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in countries and regions where they are predominantly under threat.

It is necessary to separately note the EU assistance in maintaining security in the world, within which civil and military missions around the world are conducted in accordance with the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). Such missions perform a variety of tasks, from border management to local police training.

The EU is the largest donor of humanitarian aid in the world. EU Member States help in the provision of first aid to victims of disasters, refugees and all who

need it. Humanitarian assistance is provided in accordance with the criteria of vulnerability and needs assessment.

The EU is actively involved in the international fight against climate change and played an important role in achieving the world's first universal, legally binding climate agreement adopted at the Conference in Paris in December 2015. The EU engages strategic partners in dialogue and cooperation to ensure the implementation of promising Paris commitments. In addition, the EU and its member states make the largest contribution to climate finance for developing countries.

Also, the European Union is the world's largest trading bloc. Trade is a single policy, which means that international trade agreements are negotiated and signed by the EU, and not by individual member states. This allows the EU to speak with a common voice with foreign partners, since such an approach promotes a freer and more equitable international trading system.

4.3 Cooperation of the European Union with international, regional organizations and informal forums

So, as we can see, the EU is a full actor of international relations and plays an important role in solving global problems. The Treaty of Lisbon underlines the commitment of the European Union to the principle multilateralism in the system of international relations. Key aspect of EU activity in this area is participating in international organizations. Organizations with which the EU cooperates can be divided into international, regional and informal forums.

It is difficult to highlight in one chapter all international, regional organizations and informal forums with which the European Union actively cooperates, we will focus on some of them. The EU cooperates with international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), the United Nations (UN), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Among the regional organizations with which the EU cooperates are the Andean Community, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the African Union, the European Economic Area (EEA), MERCOSUR, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe, the Cooperation Council of Arab States of the Persian Gulf (GCC), Asia-Europe Forum (ASEM), South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

EU collaborates with informal forums such as G7/G8, G20.

The status of the EU in international organizations varies from full membership to the absence of any official status. In most cases, the EU is content with incomplete membership with various kinds of additional features or their complete/incomplete absence, depending on the specific organization. On the one hand, the EU's position in international organizations is affected by the distribution of authority within the EU between institutions and member states; on the other

hand, the statutes of most international organizations determine that only states can be members.

Today, the following options for EU participation in the work of international organizations can be highlighted.

Full voting membership is an exceptional situation for the EU. Thus, the EU is a full-fledged member of the WTO, since international trade is precisely the area in which it has both powerful resources and great institutional potential. The same applies to the status of the EU in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and in most international fisheries organizations, for example, the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Commission for Fisheries in the North-East Atlantic Ocean (EAFC). However, between EU membership in the WTO and FAO, with one fisheries management organizations, on the other hand, have an important distinction: if in the first case the EU is represented along with its member states, in the second case there is no parallel membership, that is, the EU defends the interests of the community without the participation of its own member states. With parallel representation of the EU and its member states in the same organizations, disputes and disagreements often arise between them (for example, within the FAO framework), despite the division of competences agreed by the special conclusion of the Commission of 1991 (updated for 2013).

The European Union and the WTO play a big role in regulating international economic relations. The European Union participates in the activities of the WTO in those areas in which it has been given powers, and in those areas where the EU does not have unconditional powers, its member states themselves represent their interests. It should be emphasized that each of the member states of the EU is also a WTO member. The question of the delimitation of competence between the European Union and its member states was the subject of consideration by the Court of the European Communities. Even at the conclusion of the Treaty establishing the WTO, a dispute arose between the Commission and the member states of the EU who among them has the right to sign the WTO Agreement. These were the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a number of agreements on trade in goods, as well as the General Agreement on Trade in Services and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). In accordance with the conclusion of the Court, the EU has the exclusive competence to conclude international treaties in matters relating to trade in goods. Accordingly, when it comes to trade in goods, representation in the WTO is carried out by the European Union; when it comes to other aspects of the WTO, the Community and its member states have joint competence, and they are bound by the obligation to cooperate with each other

It should be noted that the exit of the UK from the EU will have an impact on the further development of trade regulation in the European Union. In this regard, in July 2017, WTO members considered the trade policy of the European Union. At this stage, the EU is in the phase of significant changes associated with the Brexit, as well as with the reform of the Common Agrarian Policy for the after the 2020 and efforts to conclude new trade agreements with third countries

Observer status is close to full membership, or advanced observer – in this case, the EU's relations with the UN and the World Customs Organization (WCO) can serve as indicative. At the World Customs Organization, EU status is close to full membership, but for formal acquisition, all member states of an organization need to adopt an appropriate amendment to its charter, which would allow economic and customs unions to join the organization along with sovereign states. WCO member states are delaying EU accession as a full participant. Therefore, raising the status of international organizations is the result of the painstaking and long work of representatives of a united Europe. Although the rights of an advanced observer do not include participation in voting, depending on the specific organization, they can be provided with such opportunities as speaking at a plenary session, participation in working groups, amending and so on.

3. Permanent Observer - the status of the EU is with the International Labor Organization (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), etc. However, the EU countries are complete members of these organizations, that is, there is a parallel representation. In most cases, being a permanent observer, the EU is trying to upgrade its status to an advanced observer, but it will not always succeed.

4. Lack of official status is not uncommon for the EU in practice of international cooperation. For example, despite the wide powers and the presence of supranational legislation in the field of transport, the EU was not even able to obtain observer status with such an influential transport organization as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Another example is the Security Council of the UN, in which the representation of the interests of the Union is carried out through member countries. Also, the EU has not yet managed to become an observer at the Arctic Council, despite the filing of the application three times. A special case is the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), where the EU has no formal observer status, but the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) has a corresponding status.

According to the Lisbon Treaty, the European Council may be represented in the international arena by the President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Head of the EU Delegation to the UN, the EU representation in international organizations is provided by the Commission. In practice, this means that the Directorate General, whose profile corresponds to the subject of this organization, deals with issues of European interaction in the international arena. The High Representative for Foreign Affairs carries out the external representation of the EU in issues that relate to the Common Foreign Security Policy. At the level of heads of state, the interests of the EU are represented by the President of the European Council; more rarely the President of the European Commission, in some cases both (for example, at the G20 summits). Of course, such a dispersion of the functions of the representation introduces its own difficulties.

An important aspect of EU participation in international organizations is internal legal issues and the division of competences between EU institutions, on

the one hand, and member states, on the other. From a normative point of view, the treaty basis and law enforcement practice of the EU Court of Justice supports the increase of EU participation in international organizations to exercise supranational powers. The difficulty lies in the fact that different policies are in different areas of competence. The competence of the European Union is divided into three main categories: exclusive, joint and auxiliary.

The first category includes issues whose solution has been completely removed from the jurisdiction of the participating countries and transferred to the EU institutions and bodies: customs union, general trade policy, monetary policy within the eurozone, etc. The second category includes the vast majority of issues, including the domestic market, rural farming and fisheries policy, environmental protection, transport, energy, consumer protection. In these areas, the member states are not deprived of the opportunity to adopt their own legislation at the national level with the proviso that these measures should not contradict the current European law, since European law has priority.

In 1974, the European Economic Community was officially granted observer status with the UN. The functions of the representation of the European Economic Community in the UN were assigned to European Commission. This was the first time in the history of the UN, when a non-state formation received observer status, along with the right to participate in the Economic and Social Council. Despite the fact that full-fledged membership in the UN for the European Union remains inaccessible – it is provided only for sovereign states – this did not prevent the EU from signing more than 50 multilateral treaties and conventions of the UN and becoming a full-fledged participant in several structures of the Organization. In 1991, the EU again became the first non-governmental structure to receive full membership with the right to vote in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Today, the EU has a comprehensive cooperation with the UN and its structures with the exception of the Security Council.

The European Union cooperates with the UN in almost all areas of the Organization's activities, including development policy, protection of human rights, environmental policy, peacekeeping, disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, humanitarian assistance, the fight against corruption, migration management, etc. The EU also has its delegations to UN agencies and structures that are based in Geneva, namely: the Human Rights Council, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, Conference on Disarmament and International migration organization.

It is also worth mentioning that the EU, together with its member states, makes the largest contributions to the UN system (38% of the regular budget of Organization, more than 40% of the budget of peacekeeping operations and more than 50% of all UN funds and programs are formed from contributions from EU countries. In addition, the European Commission annually spends \$ 1.35 billion from the European budget to finance United Nations foreign assistance projects. The EU, the EU institutions and the EU countries, taken together, are the largest donors to UN programs for humanitarian assistance and development assistance.

Despite this, there are quite serious limitations to further strengthen the EU's position in the UN system. First of all, this is due to the state-centered nature of the UN, which does not leave the possibility for revising the Charter, which provides for membership in the Organization only for sovereign states.

In 2010, the EU submitted a proposal for discussion by the General Assembly to expand its observer status (to full membership, but without the right to vote). However, this initiative met with opposition from several regional groups, including the Caribbean Community and a group of countries led by Australia. In 2011, as a result of numerous consultations at international sites between Brussels, Geneva and New York and with third countries, the European Union achieved the expansion of its status and received privileges that only the Palestinian Authority and the Vatican State used to do. Respective Resolution A/65/276 was adopted in May 2011 became a real achievement of the European diplomatic service. From now on, EU representatives have had the opportunity to speak at meetings of the General Assembly, representing the position of the EU as a single actor, as well as participating in general debates and exercising the right to make unplanned speeches during meetings.

The adoption of this resolution was particularly important for the EU. The European authorities were afraid of the unintended weakening of the position of the united Europe in the UN after the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty – due to the fact that the Treaty abolished the rotation of the Presidents in the EU Foreign Affairs Council, which had previously been alternately headed by the EU countries that are full-fledged members of the UN, with voting rights in its governing bodies and having access to committees and working groups.

This was the main link between the EU Council and the UN structures, since the national foreign ministers presiding over the EU Council were important channel for reporting EU positions from the tribune of the General Assembly. However, in Lisbon Treaty, the functions of the permanent chairman of the EU Council on Foreign Affairs were assigned to the High Representative, who does not have his own access to the UN. The EU threatened a narrowing of influence and even isolation, since the possibilities for its participation in debates were minimized. Thus, the task of importance was to obtain the right for the High Representative to address the General Assembly. Providing a non-state actor with the opportunity to participate in debates demonstrate not only the importance of the EU as an international player, but also the strengthening of the role of supranational formations in world politics as a whole.

And for the first time before the General Assembly in the new role of the UN observer with extended powers on behalf of the European Union on September 22, 2011, along with the heads of the countries, the President of the European Council spoke. EU priorities are agreed in advance by the Union countries before each session of the General Assembly and approved by the EU Council. An important privilege provided under Resolution A/65/276 was the opportunity for members of the EU delegation to speak at formal meetings at the UN, thereby giving the opportunity to participate in the negotiation process and agree on positions from start to the end. This guarantees continuity and consistency in the work of the

delegation, which significantly strengthens the position of the EU. In addition, the EU delegation received the right, directly and not through the delegations of the EU Member States, as it was organized earlier, to distribute to other delegations their written messages as official UN documents. The EU also received the right to respond to questions during the final round of general debates, but this right is limited to only one statement on each agenda item. Insignificant at first glance but an important point of the same Resolution was the allocation of seats in the General Assembly for members of the EU delegation. According to the rules, the members of the delegation of each of the sovereign countries have given six seats, for observers – two seats.

Issues and prospects for interaction with the UN are also highlighted in the 2016 Global Strategy of the EU Foreign and Security Policy. The Strategy clearly marked the desire of the EU to strengthen its position in international organizations, following the principles of global governance. It also recognizes the need to reform the UN structure, including the Security Council, as resistance to change in a dynamically developing world undermines the influence of the Organization and threatens to create new, parallel groups to the detriment of the interests of the EU countries. The document focuses on the readiness of the Union to further expand its cooperation with the UN in the field of peacemaking and the provision of humanitarian assistance.

The relationship of cooperation between the Council of Europe and the European Economic Community was established as early as 1957. However, the first joint programs in the field of human rights protection and education were launched only in 1992.

Today, the basis of cooperation between the two organizations is based on the principles and values set out in 2006 by the J.-C. Juncker, at that time the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, who was entrusted with conducting negotiations with the Council of Europe on behalf of the EU, in a message about the “Common Aspiration of the European Continent”.

The European Union, in its foreign policy, relies on Council of Europe standards for fundamental rights. A new stage of cooperation between the EU and the Council of Europe marked the signing in 2007 of a Memorandum of Understanding. The EU does not have Formal observer status with the Council of Europe, although from September 1, 2010, the EU delegation to the Council of Europe began its work. Both organizations are actively developing political cooperation. Since 2012, the EU has published documents defining priorities in cooperation with the Council of Europe. For 2017-2018 Geographic cooperation, thematic cooperation in the field of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law were chosen as such priority areas.

Currently, cooperation between the EU and the Council of Europe is also being built on the basis of the Declaration of Intentions, which was signed in April 2014, which covers the Eastern Partnership and Southern Mediterranean countries. Another important policy document is the 2015-2019 Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy. There are also many joint programs that make up the largest source of funding for Council of Europe projects on technical assistance

and cooperation in support of democratic reforms in the countries of South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, the South Caucasus and Turkey.

Under the Lisbon Treaty, the European Union has committed itself to acceding to the European Convention on Human Rights of the Council of Europe, to which are all its member states. Article 6(2) of the Lisbon Treaty states that “the Union shall accede to the European Convention on Human Rights”. Special conditions for such accession are specified in Protocol No. 8 to the Treaty. The main condition was the requirement that as a result of the accession of the EU retained its special characteristics and the rule of law – in other words, the accession of the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights should not affect the exclusive right of the EU Court to adjudicate disputes between its member states on matters relating to EU law. The relevant provision is enshrined in EU law and is valid even in cases where member states are parties to international treaties other dispute resolution mechanisms.

At the same time, EU accession to the European Convention would solve several problems at once. First, it would put an end to the practice of applying double standards, when the European Union, while remaining outside the framework of the European Convention, demands from the candidate countries to join the EU mandatory participation in it. Secondly, it would bring the practice of the EU Court to the standards of the European Convention, that is, the judicial practice European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). By the way, the decisions of the European Court of Justice have recently become more and more diverge with these standards, especially when it comes to deportation from the EU illegal immigrants, asylum and extradition. Finally, thirdly, EU institutions that are currently time are outside the jurisdiction of the Convention, would be subject to external control. It should be noted that EU accession to the Convention would not mean that the EU automatically becomes a member of the Council of Europe itself.

In April 2013, representatives of 47 countries of the Council of Europe and the European Union agreed on a draft Agreement on EU accession to the European Court of Human Rights. The project was very difficult approval procedure. At first, it was approved at the level of the EU member states. Then the approved project was ratified by 47 member states of the Council of Europe. Further, the Agreement was approved by the EU Council, and the decision should be made unanimously and only after obtaining the consent of the Parliament. In addition, Protocol No. 8 provided for a mandatory appeal to the EU Court to obtain a conclusion on the compatibility of this agreement with the constituent treaties of the EU. After the Commission’s formal request to give its opinion, the EU Court held two-day hearings, where the opinions of the EU Council and the European Parliament were presented in support of the draft Agreement. Also during the hearings the Agreement was supported by 24 EU member states.

However, on December 18, 2014, the European Union Court issued a negative Conclusion 2/13 on the issue of compliance of the EU Accession Agreement to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms with EU constituent treaties, which came as a surprise to both EU member states and official Brussels. In its Conclusion, the EU Court of

Justice emphasizes that the Convention and its judicial mechanism were created for sovereign states, while the EU is not a state by nature.

The Conclusion analyzes several prerequisites for the decision taken by the Court of Justice of the European Union. One of them is the introduction of a co-respondent mechanism that allows the European Court of Human Rights to intervene in the distribution of competences between the EU and the Member States, which at the moment can only be done by the EU Court. In essence, this mechanism allows the European Court of Human Rights to interpret the practice of the EU Court of Justice, with which the latter is not ready to accept. Another prerequisite for a negative opinion on the Draft Agreement was the issue of judicial control over EU acts adopted in the field of Common Foreign Security Policy. Today, the jurisdiction of the EU Court of Justice on these decisions is low. At the same time, the draft Agreement allowed interpreting it in such a way that the European Court of Human Rights itself would have the right of judicial control over the EU's decisions on Common Foreign Security Policy issues.

In other words, for the EU Court itself the attempt to endow the international court, located outside the EU institutional system, with the right of judicial control over EU acts, was unacceptable. It must be recognized that the essence of the Conclusion is reduced to the reluctance of the Court of the EU to lose its exclusive competence.

According to observers, the situation that has arisen does not negate the prospects for the EU to join the European Court of Human Rights, but will now require more time and effort to overcome the obstacles that have arisen.

The EU cooperates with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) on conflict prevention, crisis management and democratization (including election monitoring). All EU countries are members of the OSCE, providing up to 70% of the latest budget, as well as a significant part of extra budgetary revenues and 80% of staff. It should be noted that, according to the rules of the Organization of the EU, it cannot in itself be a donor of funds to its single budget; therefore, the EU is actively financing extra-budgetary programs and projects.

The EU and the OSCE pursue a number of common goals and interests, including the maintenance of peace and security in Europe and the prevention of conflicts. Both organizations maintain an ongoing political dialogue, regular meetings are held. At the same time, the status of the EU within the OSCE is not formally defined. Under current procedural rules, the European Commission, entering the delegation of the EU Presidency, can participate in meetings of the OSCE bodies, provided that the matter in question falls within the competence of the European Union. In areas that are in the exclusive and mixed competence of the European level of power, the Commission can participate in discussions on a level with EU member states on behalf of all EU countries.

The EU delegation in Vienna cooperates with OSCE institutions on an ongoing basis. The EU has its own ambassador/permanent representative accredited to the OSCE. Generally, according to the protocol, the same rules and procedures apply to the EU delegation as to the delegations of individual countries.

At meetings of the Permanent Council, the European Union usually makes a single statement.

Individual EU member states have the right to express their disagreement, but they resort to this measure infrequently. The EU Working Group of the OSCE Ministerial Council in Brussels meets once a month, but the main work is carried out by European delegations in Vienna. As part of this work, the EU constantly conducts consultations with its candidate countries, as well as with Norway, Switzerland, and Canada. The positions with which the EU comes forward often gain the support of the majority. In OSCE summits participation by the President of the European Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy in the annual meeting of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Within the framework of the EU's interaction with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which includes 35 countries (of which 21 are EU member states), the main focus is not on developing binding rules, but on exchanging information practices and soft forms of regulation. First of all, the OECD is a forum where opinions are exchanged and new approaches are being developed on common policy issues. It should be noted that the OECD cooperates with another 70 countries that are not among the permanent members of the organization. In the context of globalization and growing economic interdependence, such involvement of a wide number of participants in the dialogue makes the OECD an attractive platform where different countries establish relationships with each other, launch common economic development projects. In addition, the OECD also annually publishes statistical data and studies on the economic representation of its member countries, which is valuable analytical material. The organization constantly accepts open multilateral agreements that together form a soft law for the purpose of sustainable economic growth, financial stability and openness of the world economy.

The headquarters of the OECD is located in Paris. Like the member states, the EU has its permanent delegation to the OECD, which, in particular, includes a representative of the European Central Bank (ECB) and diplomats of various levels and employees of the European Commission. In general, the EU has a "ghostly status" in the OECD, since, despite the fact that the head of the EU delegation is a member of the OECD Council; it does not have the right to vote when adopting legal acts. The EU can only vote in the Development Committee, where it acts as an additional donor. EU representatives and others members of the permanent delegation meet in various specialized committees of the OECD system, along with national representatives. At the same time, despite the fact that the Commission often takes the lead role, the EU member states for the most part keep the right to participate in the discussions.

In general, the EU is seeking to increase its status in the OECD to the same in the WTO or FAO, that is, full membership with voting rights. However, this again requires amending the Charter of the organization, which provides for membership only for sovereign states.

The main working methods of the OECD are dialogue, consensus and mutual control. Within the framework of this international economic organization aimed at developing trade, EU status goes beyond observer and is close to full member status, but the EU does not have the right to vote when adopting legislation by the OECD Council.

At the same time, the members of the EU delegation can be elected as members of the subsidiary bodies of the OECD, participate in the elaboration of legislative acts and discuss, contribute unlimited number of amendments. The largest international organization in the field of cooperation in monetary and macroeconomic issues is the International Monetary Fund (IMF) with headquarters in Washington. Members of the IMF are 185 countries, and their goal is to ensure the stability of the international monetary system. The main task of the IMF is to promote global financial cooperation and international trade. The IMF is a classic international organization that has its roots in the Bretton Woods system.

Accordingly, only sovereign states can act as members of this organization; therefore, only member states represent the interests of the EU. At the same time, European countries that are fully involved in the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), have lost their sovereignty in the monetary sphere, and the external representation of the European Union in this area entrusted to the European Central Bank. However, in the IMF Executive Council, the European Central Bank has only observer status. When discussing issues relating to the euro, on behalf of the EU, statements are made by the observer for the ECB or the representative of the EU presidency of the ECOFIN (Council of Ministers of Economy and Finance). If the ECOFIN chairperson is from a country outside the eurozone, this task is assigned to the euro area country, which is next on the list for the presidency.

In recent years, the IMF has become an important partner for the EU in overcoming the financial crisis. On the one hand, the joint work was definitely useful for both organizations, despite the contradictions that arose during the interaction.

Coordination of positions of individual EU countries in the World Bank (WB) is less structured. At the core of the work of the World Bank is the intergovernmental principle. This international organization provides development assistance. European representatives at the World Bank plus Commission as an observer meet at least once a week to exchange information and develop joint statements based on proposals of the EU presidency. The role of the EU in relation to the WB is mainly to provide financial assistance, which is done by the European Commission. The EU's relations with the World Trade Organization (WTO) deserve special consideration. The EU has a long history of membership not only in the WTO, but also in the organization of its prior – the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The common trade policy is within the exclusive competence of the EU, and in this area the EU has the most powerful governmental and institutional resources.

Potential all countries of the EU, as well as the European Union as a whole, participate in the WTO. The European Union is the third largest economy in the world; therefore it is rightfully one of the key players in the WTO. The interests of

the European Union in the WTO are represented by the European Commission, which conducts multilateral negotiations and participates in resolving disputes with other participants.

Unlike the classic international organizations of the Bretton Woods system, cooperation in such informal forums as the G8 and the G20 involves the development of solutions that are not binding. These forums do not have a legal base or permanent administrative structures. The participating States alternately, throughout the year, carry out the chairmanship at such conference meetings, replacing each other in rotation. However, they have an important coordinating role in global economic and financial management.

The G8 is a privileged club that discusses issues related to the key areas of competence of the European Union and affecting its strategic interests.

The European Commission and the Presidency in the EU have participated on behalf of the Community in G7/G8 meetings since 1977. But there is no formal connection between the G8 and the EU. The lack of full member status of the G8 deprives the European Union of certain privileges.

Thus, the EU cannot take the summit or take the initiative in shaping the agenda. The European Commission and the President of the European Council are staying at the G8 summits as if in a dual status – they represent both the European Union as a whole and those EU countries that are not in the G8.

In 1999, the G20 was created as another informal economic forum, in which the finance ministers and the heads of central banks of the respective countries discussed financial issues. As the global financial and economic crisis unfolds within the G20, summits are held to coordinate the anti-crisis strategy. The first was held in November 2008 in Washington. In 2009, the G20 became the main arena of international economic coordination, displacing the “seven” in this sense. Four EU countries (Great Britain, Germany, Italy, France) and the European Union are fully involved in the G20, as well as Spain and the Netherlands, which are not its official members, which allows critics to rightly point out that the representation of an integrated Europe in the G20 is disproportionately large.

The direct representation of the EU at the G20 summits is carried out jointly by the President of the European Council (on common cooperation issues) and the President of the European Commission (in areas that are under the exclusive competence of the EU), while the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs represents the EU at ministerial level G7 summits on issues of common security and defense policy and is not part of the EU delegation at the G20 summits. At the same time, under the leadership of the High Representative, the European Foreign Policy Service action provides administrative support to the EU delegation during the summits.

The lack of clear rules for EU participation in the G20 creates difficulties not only for the EU, but also for international partners who have to put up with the dual representation of the EU.

Despite the fact that the decisions taken at the G20 summits are advisory in nature, the EU is serious in the implementation of these decisions. For example, this is evidenced by the EU adoption of new financial norms regulation in response

to the global economic crisis – the vast majority of these norms were based on G20 decisions. EU Member States that are not members of the G20 have limited capacity to protect their interests in the format of such summits, which became especially evident in the financial crisis. An example of this is the situation at the G20 summit in London in 2009, when Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg were recognized as “tax havens”, despite the European Council’s previous decision that no EU country would be given such unenviable title. Soon after the end of this summit, the three countries mentioned rather sharply reacted to this conclusion and accused European partners of betraying their interests.

Another example was the reform of the IMF, in which the countries of the G20 were directly involved. EU Member States not represented in the G20, were notified of the change in the allocation of IMF quotas after the fact.

Realizing that the decisions of the G20 have a direct effect on them, they began to insist on agreeing on a common EU position. It should be noted that before this the position of the EU was agreed only between the UK, Germany, Italy and France, which are members of the G20. Thus, starting from 2010, more structured mechanisms were introduced in practice to harmonize the interests of all EU countries before the G20 summits.

From the above, it is clear that some aspects the relationship between the European Union and the G20 can be assessed both positively and negatively, depending on the specific interpretation and the agenda, as well as on whether the effectiveness or accountability are paramount. Nevertheless, the EU clearly has the potential to strengthen its position in the G20 and, accordingly, at the global level.

EU relations with NATO are a separate big issue. At the Lisbon summit in November 2010, the Atlantic allies expressed their intention to improve the NATO-EU strategic partnership. Nevertheless, the successful formalization of the cooperation of the two sides continues to be hindered by both transatlantic friction and differences within the European Union itself.

At the same time, there is no among the members of the European Union in determining the nature of the main threats to European security, the degree of EU independence with respect to the US, and the scale of the future European military potential. Part of these issues was addressed in the new “EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy,” which refers to the need for greater autonomy of the EU in relations with NATO.

The Alliance is not only a partner for the EU, but also a competitor. Each of the organizations retains its military potential. Almost at the same time, the decisions taken on the creation of EU combat groups (2002) and the NATO Response Force (2003) indicate a low level of coordination of their efforts.

In accordance with the Berlin Plus agreements, which were recorded in December 2002, which entered into force in March 2003, the EU gained access to collective NATO funds in their crisis management operations in which NATO is not involved. Representatives of the EU and NATO should meet regularly at the level of foreign ministers, ambassadors, high military officials and advisers to discuss issues of mutual interest. Since 2005, the NATO permanent liaison group has appeared at the Military headquarters, in 2006, a specialized EU command

emerged under the Supreme Command of the NATO Joint Armed Forces in Europe.

But in reality, the use of the most important Berlin-plus mechanisms turned out to be limited, in essence, by two peacekeeping operations – Concordia (Macedonia, 2003) and Althea (Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2004). However, in the difficult economic conditions of recent years, Atlantic partners are interested in coordinating defense efforts increased slightly. On the EU side, this is evidenced by the Swedish-German initiative for the development of military cooperation “Pooling and Sharing” of December 2010, and on the part of NATO by the Smart Defense initiative of February 2011. Today, the EU and NATO have a common understanding major security threats in the 21st century. It is understood that the two organizations largely complement each other with their predominantly military (NATO) and civil (EU) crisis management capabilities. But in fact, in their relationship a lot of difficulties, as well as elements of rivalry. At the same time, the EU is more focused on regional conflicts and instability, especially near its own borders, while NATO is more concerned with transnational and technological problems. In terms of operational interaction and improved capacities, the EU and NATO have some achievements and prospects, but in general, the development of cooperation and their practical dialogue still suffer from a lack of coordination and mutual trust.

The interaction of the European Union with the Arctic Council is an example of a situation where the EU is unable to obtain observer status, despite repeated attempts.

The Arctic Council, created in 1996 at the initiative of Finland, consists of eight countries. Five of them have official Arctic status – this is Denmark, Canada, Norway, Russia and the United States. They are already leading the actual economic development of the Arctic. Three members the Arctic Council – Iceland, Denmark and Finland – have subarctic status. In other words, of all the members of this organization, three states are members of the EU. At the same time, Norway, Iceland and Russia are EU partners in the Northern Dimension format. The Arctic Council is an intergovernmental forum of high level where decisions are made by consensus. Its member countries represent foreign ministers at meetings that are held twice a year.

Active interest in the EU Arctic Council began to show since the late 1990s. Since then, the European Union has applied for observational status three times. Twice the initiative was blocked by Canada and Norway due to the ban imposed by the European Union on the import into its territory of goods and products from seals and the subsequent proceedings on this issue in the WTO. For both countries, the seal industry has importance from historical and economic points of view. In addition, the EU is in conflict with Iceland and Denmark because of whaling, which also makes it difficult to raise the status of Brussels on the Arctic Council.

At a meeting of the organization's participants in Kiruna (Sweden) in 2013, it was decided to grant permanent observer status to a number of countries that do not belong to the Arctic geographically: including China, India, Italy, Singapore, Japan, South Korea and (conditionally) the EU. Formally, the EU application for

observer status was considered positively, but its implementation was postponed due to unsettled seals dispute. To date, the EU has not received the desired status under the Arctic Council. Observers agree that the complication of relations between Russia and the EU due to the Ukrainian events and the introduction of mutual sanctions also does not play in favor of the latter.

The members of the Arctic Council, in particular the five countries of the “Arctic Club”, are concerned about the internationalization of Arctic affairs and the growing political ambitions of the EU in the region. In its documents on this topic, the EU brings environmental and environmental issues to the forefront, emphasizing in every way how negatively the effects of climate change affect the European region. In this light, the EU puts forward itself as an expert on the development of energy-saving technologies and the preservation of Arctic resources. Thus, the environmental component is put at the forefront of the EU's argument, but under the “green” declarations a solid economic ground is felt.

The EU, in particular, calls on the International Maritime Organization to prohibit the use of heavy fuel oil (mazut) for arctic ships. He points out at the same time the harmful effects of this type of fuel on the environment. At the same time, such initiatives hide the desire of the EU to extend its norms and standards for shipping in the Arctic region in order to have a competitive advantage in the future in the struggle for the management of the region and in the extraction of natural resources.

Thus, integrated Europe has a clearly defined economic and strategic interest in the region, but up to now it has been opposed by “key” members of the Arctic Council, which is currently considered the main legitimate organization uniting the countries of the Arctic region. In the foreseeable future, the EU will step up efforts to expand its presence in the region and more resolutely defend its rights to the Arctic. True, unlike NATO, the United States and Norway, the EU will do this without a noticeable emphasis on military force, preferring diplomatic and economic methods”.

Originally uniting 5 Southeast Asian Countries, ASEAN doubled their number and turned into a powerful organization of the entire region with a population of 600 million people, with cumulative GDP exceeding \$ 2 trillion in 2018. The European Union, which began its history with the European Coal and Steel Community of 6 members, now includes 27 Western and Eastern European countries with a population of 500 million people.

The main goals of the ASEAN countries and the EU are almost the same – regional security, political stability, economic development, maintaining competitiveness in a globalizing world. Differences only in the methods of achieving these goals. The development of the European Union, ASEAN relations with its partners in the Asia-Pacific region in the framework of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the East Asian Community (EAC), the Asia-Europe Summits (ASEM) determine their active participation in the construction of a new world order. The leading world powers seek to establish close contacts and dialogue with ASEAN and the EU, competing for influence in these regions.

One of the main goals of the ASEAN leaders is to prevent the spread of the zone of socialism, which became a prerequisite for political cooperation with the West. For economic growth and consolidation of their status in the international arena, the ASEAN member countries initially focused on the developed states of the West. ASEAN focused on the established integration mechanism of the European Economic Community. The leaders of ASEAN chose the European Economic Community as their center of attention, and trade and economic ties between them became increasingly active. ASEAN considered Common Market as a possible source of large investments and a promising partner of trade and economic cooperation, and the Europeans sought to penetrate the rapidly developing market of the Southeast Asian countries. In all this, there was logic and expediency. The experience of economic relations with the developed capitalist states, accumulated by the countries of the Association by the beginning of the 70s, caused a new phenomenon – the coordination of their foreign economic policy.

The decision to establish official relations of ASEAN with the EEC was taken in 1971. ASEAN's turn to Western Europe was due to both economic and political reasons, a more significant exit to the world stage, to the European market, having achieved minimum restrictive quotas, taxes and duties goods – preferences, the desire to receive economic assistance. As a result, the EEC became the first ASEAN partner. The most important milestone in the development of this process was the formation in 1975 of a joint ASEAN-EEC working group, called upon to study specific areas of cooperation. The scope of cooperation has been adjusted and expanded. Thus, in 1976, a program for the exchange of young specialists in the field of management began to operate in order to attract novice professionals to study the specifics of business and exchange experience, a number of seminars on technology transfer were held, industrial conferences were held, and in 1979 inter-parliamentary contacts were established.

The meetings of ASEAN and European Union Ministers after the 1993 underlined the importance of the Joint Cooperation Committee, expressed satisfaction with the achievements of its cooperation with the European Council and the European Parliament in developing a new Europe strategy for Asia, in particular with ASEAN.

European Union viewed ASEAN as a key partner in building relations between Europe and Asia, expressed the hope of combining efforts to combat terrorism, drug trafficking, international crime, moreover, it was intended to focus on the protection of human rights and social rights, improving ecology and environmental protection.

Europe's heightened interest in ASEAN was dictated by the success of US regionalism policies in the creation of NAFTA (USA, Canada and Mexico) and in the Asia-Pacific Region (APEC Asia-Pacific Cooperation). In June 1995, the parties reached an agreement on an Asia-Europe summit involving, apart from ASEAN, the largest trading partners of the two groups – Japan, China, South Korea, which was the culmination of the evolution of relations between ASEAN and the EU.

ASEM reflects the desire to intensify the political dialogue between Asia and Europe, to identify common ground, to achieve mutual understanding, to promote deeper cooperation. During the summits, the relevance of promoting initiatives to control disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction was emphasized. It is particularly noted that the meetings gave stability to the triangle "EU - East Asia – North America", with the result that the area of maneuvering for Asian countries has expanded.

For the European Union, ASEM became the missing link in the common European foreign policy, which gave it a global character and made it possible to effectively defend European trade and economic interests in Greater East Asia. The ASEM process has been reviewed ASEAN and the EU, not as an alternative to a bilateral dialogue partnership, but as an arena for negotiations, allowing to effectively solving emerging problems.

A landmark year was 2003, when the European Commission adopted the "New Partnership of the European Union and Southeast Asia" appeal, which reflected changes in the EU's strategic approach to relations with ASEAN and envisaged a transition to more flexible relations with ASEAN, a combination of multilateral and bilateral relations with individual members of the Association, taking into account the specifics of their political and socio-economic development on the model of the Mediterranean Partnership.

A promising and urgent task of the European-ASEAN partnership in the trade and economic sphere is the creation of an interregional free trade zone. In this regard, in 2008, the EU changed tactics and shifted its main efforts to concluding bilateral free trade agreements with the most developed members of ASEAN.

Despite the disagreements between ASEAN and the EU, cooperation has been developing quite actively. The goals of the New Partnership adopted in 2003 were expanded to include new tasks (expanding the dialogue on military-political issues, energy and environmental issues) and formed the basis of the Declaration of In-depth Partnership adopted in March 2007 in Nuremberg.

Mercosur was formed in 1991 as a union of Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay (currently Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, Venezuelan membership suspended, Bolivia is in the process of joining). The EU has openly supported the integration of Mercosur since its creation, emphasizing their shared political values and the importance of social cohesion for both regions. When Mercosur launched its customs union in 1995, the EU proposed negotiating an agreement between the two regions to become strategic interregional partners. An idea was proposed to adopt a bilateral free trade agreement, but the signing of this document continues to this day. If the trade agreement is signed, it will become the largest free trade agreement in the world.

Mercosur is the main trade partner of the EU in Latin America, as well as the main investment direction in the region. Although the interregional framework cooperation agreement was signed in December 1995, formal negotiations on the three elements of the political dialogue: cooperation and technical assistance, as well as trade issues - began only after the first bi-regional EU summit – Mercosur

in Rio de Janeiro in June 1999. In July 2001, the EU made its first tariff proposal, which launched the negotiation process on the terms of the agreement.

The EU-Mercosur Bilateral Negotiations Committee – is the main negotiating forum, and its work has been complemented by other institutional structures, such as the subcommittee for cooperation, as well as the three technical trade groups. Several interregional agreements have been adopted on a wide range of issues, such as competition policy, government procurement, services liberalization and investment rules.

The EU-Mercosur Bilateral Regional Negotiations Committee, met three times each year to discuss progress in the negotiations, with the greatest emphasis on trade issues. Despite regular meetings and joint efforts to revitalize negotiations since November 2003, the negotiators could not reach an agreement for the second EU-Latin America summit, which was held in Mexico in May 2004. The parties failed to reach an agreement before the EU enlargement process began, and in October 2004 the service commission expired. The political opportunity to complete the negotiation process and reach an agreement has disappeared.

The reasons for the failure in the negotiations were several problems that the parties could not solve. The first reason was the economic disagreements – the EU's tariff proposals for agricultural products of Mercosur were insufficient from the point of view of Latin Americans. In turn, representatives of the EU complained about the lack of access to the markets for textiles, shoes and cars. Further disagreements arose over investments; trade in services, government procurement and intellectual property rights issues.

Another factor in the non-acceptance of the EU's free trade agreement Mercosur was the political transformation in the EU, which accepted 10 new member countries. Thus, the EU has solved the problem of expanding the free trade zone, which he at one time wanted to solve with the help of the agreement with Mercosur.

The parties decided to resume negotiations on a free trade agreement. In 2010 in Madrid took place the sixth EU-Latin America summit, an agreement was reached on free trade between the EU and Central America. However, a treaty to create a free trade zone with the countries of the Mercosur group would be much more important.

Summing up the above aspects of EU participation in the work of international organizations, we note that the EU faces various kinds of difficulties on the way to more successful and effective representation of its interests: regulatory, political and internal (institutional and organizational). The main legal obstacle is the fact that most modern international organizations, by their nature, tend to the Bretton Woods system and, from a formal point of view, want sovereign states to be their members, rather than international organizations or integration groups, such as the EU.

Political obstacles also follow from this: far from all the powers pursuing their own foreign policy are willing to accept the strengthening of economic blocs and regional unions. This thesis concerns, *inter alia*, a number of EU member states (Germany, France, Great Britain before leaving the Union), which do not show the

intention to transfer their authority to work in international organizations to the supranational level.

There are difficulties inside the institutional structure of the EU. In the original project of the European communities, active cooperation with international organizations was supposed to. Therefore, the corresponding institutional units appeared later, which became the reason for their fragmentation today (the functions of interaction with international organizations are assigned partly to the Commission, partly to the Council, partly to the EEAS, and sometimes ad hoc units are created for this).

In general, the practice of representation in international organizations first of all gives an understanding of the EU foreign policy priorities. First, exactly engagement with the UN is the foundation of multilateralism for the EU. Secondly, the distribution of competences between the EU and the member countries is not really a decisive factor in choosing international organizations for cooperation.

At the same time, the persisting ambiguity regarding powers and legal status in some cases creates difficulties not only for the EU and its members, but also for third countries. Thirdly, it becomes obvious that the issue of EU involvement in the work of international organizations has not only a legal component, but equally, both political and diplomatic. The fact of the increasing importance of the EU role in the environment of international organizations needs further careful reflection.

Note that, in addition to representation in international organizations, the EU is authorized to negotiate the signing of international agreements on behalf of all member states. Since such agreements, in the case of signing, are binding on all EU countries (after appropriate ratification by the European Parliament), a lot of debate arises in the process of choosing the main negotiator from the EU and its team.

Under the Lisbon Treaty, the EU's main negotiator is appointed by the Council. At the same time, different Member States seek to enlist the loyalty of the main negotiator. In trying to expand its powers in a number of organizations, the EU faces the following main difficulties: 1) regulatory limitation of membership only for sovereign states; 2) the reluctance of third countries to see an increase in EU influence; 3) the reluctance of the participating countries to transfer their competencies to work with international organizations to the supranational level.

Thus, despite ambitions to expand participation in global governance and international relations, the EU does not always have the necessary political potential and resources to maintain and expand its participation in international organizations. Due to the structural constraints analyzed above, the EU has to carefully select international partners given the legal, political and diplomatic aspects and nuances of such cooperation.

Control questions and tasks for self-control:

1. Define the concepts the “world order transformation”, “conceptual framework of EU foreign policy”, “EU concept “Effective multilateralism””.

2. What are the differences between the concepts of “Multipolarity” and “Multilateralism”?
3. Characterize the role of the Lisbon Treaty in multilateral cooperation and good global governance.
4. Describe the role of the European Union as a global actor of International Relations.
5. In which international organizations does the European Union have full voting membership status, observer status is close to full membership, or advanced observer and status of the permanent observer?
6. Analyze the cooperation of the European Union with international and regional organizations and informal forums.