

## **LEGAL INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: ANALYSIS OF THE KEY PRINCIPLES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE NATIONAL LEGISLATION**

**VLADYSLAV NOVITSKYI**

[academy\\_knowledge@meta.ua](mailto:academy_knowledge@meta.ua)

Postgraduate Student, Department of Theory of State and Law V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Kyiv (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8929-4468>

**ANZHELIKA KRUSIAN**

[a.krusian@ujis.in.ua](mailto:a.krusian@ujis.in.ua)

Doctor of Law Sciences, Scientific Secretary of the M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Kyiv (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6437-2864>

**TETIANA SHYNKAR**

[shtatyanai@gmail.com](mailto:shtatyanai@gmail.com)

Doctor of Law, Associate Professor Department of Social Sciences and Humanities Faculty of Law Private Higher Education Establishment "European University" Kyiv, (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3252-2167>

**VOLODYMYR DEMYDENKO**

[demydenko.v@ujis.in.ua](mailto:demydenko.v@ujis.in.ua)

Ph.D in Law, Associate Professor of the Department of Constitutional Law National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kyiv (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6771-0080>

**ROMAN LEMEKHA**

[lemekha89@gmail.com](mailto:lemekha89@gmail.com)

Ph.D in Law, Associate Professor of the Faculty of Law Private Higher Education Establishment "European University" Kyiv (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3391-4143>

### **Abstract**

Legal integration in the European Union is a systemic phenomenon which goes beyond the coordination of national legislation and forms a supranational regulatory mechanism. The relevance of the study stems from the need to understand the role of the principles of legal integration as the basis of the EU's legal unity, and to analyze their impact on the transformation of legal systems of individual countries in the context of the growing volume of EU rules and the evolution of integration processes. The aim is to clarify the essence, structure and practical impact of the EU legal integration principles (rule of law, direct effect, subsidiarity, proportionality) on the formation and implementation of national legislation of the Member States, as well as to assess their role in creating a single legal space. The study is based on dialectical, hermeneutical, historical and legal, and comparative legal methods. The author analyzed the EU founding treaties, secondary legislation, case law, and constitutional provisions of the Member States. Modeling and forecasting methods were used to assess the prospects for the development of legal integration. It is established that legal integration in the EU forms an autonomous system that harmonizes national legal order systems through the rule of law. The author identifies the mechanisms of adaptation of national legislation to EU norms, in particular, through subsidiary control and judicial supervision, which ensure a balance between the supranational and national levels. Further



research may be aimed at analyzing the effectiveness of the subsidiary control mechanism, deepening the study of judicial influence on legal integration, and forecasting the evolution of the EU legal area in the context of new challenges.

### Keywords

Ukrainian constitutionalism, human rights, municipal security, European Union, legal integration, supranational law.

### Resumo

A integração jurídica na União Europeia é um fenómeno sistémico que vai além da coordenação da legislação nacional e forma um mecanismo regulatório supranacional. A relevância do estudo decorre da necessidade de compreender o papel dos princípios da integração jurídica como base da unidade jurídica da UE e de analisar o seu impacto na transformação dos sistemas jurídicos de cada país no contexto do crescente volume de regras da UE e da evolução dos processos de integração. O objetivo é esclarecer a essência, a estrutura e o impacto prático dos princípios de integração jurídica da UE (Estado de direito, efeito direto, subsidiariedade, proporcionalidade) na formação e implementação da legislação nacional dos Estados-Membros, bem como avaliar o seu papel na criação de um espaço jurídico único. O estudo baseia-se em métodos dialéticos, hermenêuticos, históricos e jurídicos, bem como em métodos jurídicos comparativos. O autor analisou os tratados fundadores da UE, a legislação secundária, a jurisprudência e as disposições constitucionais dos Estados-Membros. Foram utilizados métodos de modelação e previsão para avaliar as perspetivas de desenvolvimento da integração jurídica. Está estabelecido que a integração jurídica na UE forma um sistema autónomo que harmoniza os sistemas jurídicos nacionais através do Estado de direito. O autor identifica os mecanismos de adaptação da legislação nacional às normas da UE, em particular, através do controlo subsidiário e da supervisão judicial, que garantem um equilíbrio entre os níveis supranacional e nacional. Investigações futuras podem ter como objetivo analisar a eficácia do mecanismo de controlo subsidiário, aprofundar o estudo da influência judicial na integração jurídica e prever a evolução do espaço jurídico da UE no contexto de novos desafios.

### Palavras-chave

Constitucionalismo ucraniano, direitos humanos, segurança municipal, União Europeia, integração jurídica, direito supranacional.

### How to cite this article

Novitskyi, Vladyslav, Krusian, Anzhelika, Shynkar, Tetiana, Demydenko, Volodymyr & Lemekha, Roman (2026). *Legal Integrative Framework in the European Union: Analysis of the Key Principles and Their Influence on the National Legislation*. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. Thematic Dossier - Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Institutional Transformation in Times of Global and National Challenges, VOL. 16, Nº. 2, TD3, March 2026, pp. 66-81. <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.DT0226.4>

**Article submitted on 25 November 2025 and accepted for publication on 18 December 2025.**





## **LEGAL INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: ANALYSIS OF THE KEY PRINCIPLES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE NATIONAL LEGISLATION**

**VLADYSLAV NOVITSKYI**

**ANZHELIKA KRUSIAN**

**TETIANA SHYNKAR**

**VOLODYMYR DEMYDENKO**

**ROMAN LEMEKHA**

### **Introduction**

For the European Union, legal integration has become a systemic phenomenon that has gone far beyond the mere coordination of national legislation, turning into a powerful supranational mechanism that forms a new quality of interaction between member states. In the current conditions of the EU's functioning, law appears not only as a regulatory tool, but also as a fundamental structure that supports the integrity and efficiency of the integration process, defines the limits and mechanisms of influence of the supranational level on domestic legal systems. It is through law that the political ambitions of the member states are realized, aimed at achieving common goals and forming a single legal space that takes into account both common European interests and national legal specifics.

The essence of legal integration in the EU is not just the simple unification of legislation, but a deep harmonization of legal approaches, which ensures the formation of common, not just comparable, rules governing integration relations in all member states. Importantly, this integration is based on the interpenetration of national and European legal orders, resulting in a complex, multi-level legal system that does not offset, but rather enhances the potential of national law through its inclusion in the EU legal space.

In this context, the principles of legal integration, which serve as conceptual guidelines and regulatory frameworks for the functioning of the unified legal system, are of



particular importance. These principles - in particular, the principle of primacy of EU law, the principle of direct effect, the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality - determine the nature of interaction between the EU institutions themselves and the Member States, and ensure the effectiveness of legal regulation and legal certainty for all subjects of law, including individual citizens. Thus, the relevance of the study is stipulated by the need for a deeper scientific understanding of the role and significance of the principles of legal integration as a key factor in the formation of legal unity within the EU, as well as an analysis of how these principles affect the development and transformation of national legislation. The growth of the volume of EU legal norms, the expansion of their scope and the constant evolution of integration mechanisms necessitate a comprehensive study of the national dimension of supranational legal influence, which is the subject of this study.

## Literature Review

In the field of scientific discussions on the principles of legal integration in the European Union and their impact on national legislation, much less attention is paid to the analysis of specific mechanisms and methods by which integration legal development is achieved than to the justification of the supranational nature of the EU legal system, its economic, institutional and legal foundations, which, as noted by Dir (2024); Lampach & Dyevre (2020), seems to be the highest priority area of European law. This predominant focus on supranational aspects seems to be due to a certain caution of researchers who avoid questioning the consistency of the normative approach to integration that has become dominant since the adoption of the Single European Act, which effectively launched the institutional application of the communitarian method of European legal integration to address most development issues.

In this context, supranationalism is traditionally perceived by researchers such as Duttle et al. (2017), Müller-Graff (2018), Peers (2015) as a key factor in deepening legal integration in the EU, while inter-vernationalism often acquires a somewhat negative connotation, being associated with tendencies towards regionalism or even separatism, which, according to Van den Brink (2017), hinders the achievement of the goals of supranational integration. Without delving into a detailed semantic analysis of these concepts, which have already been thoroughly examined in the literature by authors such as Leruth & Lord (2015), Selck, Rhinard & Häge (2007), it can be argued that supranationalism and inter-vernationalism, despite their differences, have a complementary impact on the further implementation of the principles of legal integration, each using the most appropriate tools and approaches for this purpose.

According to Cattelan (2012), Hestermeyer (2015), Saracino (2024), the legal system of the European Union has an autonomous status and a special supranational character, and it is aimed at regulating social relations arising in the process of creation and functioning of the EU integration structures, with legal norms being institutionally binding. The group of scholars Lindeboom & Wessel (2023), Stone Sweet (2005) adds that this autonomous legal system emerged at the intersection of national and international law, distinguished by the fact that its norms directly generate rights and



obligations not only for EU states and institutions, but also for persons subject to the jurisdiction of member states.

In turn, Canihac (2024) and Lawson (2024) emphasize that EU law is a separate, autonomous system that is in a state of development, and the final contours of which are currently difficult to predict, reflecting its dynamic nature. Legal scholars Priebus & Anders (2024) also emphasize that EU law is a special legal system that regulates relations formed in the course of integration processes within the Union, emphasizing its uniqueness. In addition to this, Tosiek (2022) also notes that EU law is a specific legal system of an international intergovernmental organization formed through complex law-making processes within four autonomous structures (Communities and the EU), adding that the hierarchy and structure of EU law sources differ significantly from general international law, which indicates its high autonomy. Polakiewicz & Suominen-Picht (2024), von Bogdandy, A. (2024) emphasize that EU law should be considered as an independent system built on institutions and branches, where rules are differentiated depending on the subject matter of legal regulation. Thus, EU law appears as an autonomous and complex legal system covering a wide range of legal relations and having a clear structure that reflects the principles of legal integration in the European Union and their impact on national legal models, which contributes to the further realization of the Union's integration goals.

The purpose is to conduct a comprehensive study of the principles of formation and practical implementation of the principles of legal integration within the European Union, and to highlight their significance for the common legal system.

### **Research methodology**

The methodological basis of the study is a set of interrelated philosophical and ideological approaches, general scientific and special legal methods of cognition, the use of which was determined by the purpose of the article and specific tasks aimed at clarifying the essence, structure and practical impact of the principles of legal integration of the European Union on the formation, transformation and implementation of national legislation of the Member States. In particular, the application of the dialectical method became the basis for an evolutionary study of the established concepts of legal integration and sovereignty in the context of both historical and modern changes, and to identify the dynamics of the content of these categories in legal thought. The hermeneutic approach was used for a deep and systematic interpretation of the provisions of the EU founding treaties, EU secondary legislation, international legal instruments, as well as constitutional provisions and legislative provisions of EU countries, with the aim of identifying the peculiarities of the legal integration principles and their application in the internal legal order.

The historical and legal method made it possible to study the process of formation and development of the legal framework for supranational regulation within the European Union, in particular, the transformation of approaches to the sovereignty of Member States in the context of integration cooperation. The comparative legal method was used



to analyze the peculiarities of national mechanisms for implementing EU law into the domestic legislation of different countries, which made it possible to identify common features and differences in the degree of adaptation of national legislation to the requirements of the EU legal system. In addition, modeling and forecasting methods were used to assess the potential development of EU legal integration in the future, taking into account the current challenges associated with maintaining a balance between national sovereignty and supranational mechanisms of legal influence, as well as to identify possible scenarios for the further evolution of the interaction of national legal systems with the EU legal environment.

## Results

### Historical and regional features of legal integration in the EU

The basic characteristic of the EU legal system, which reflects its essence as a supranational legal order, is its deep integration with the national legal field, which allows us to consider this interaction not as a conflict or opposition, but as a mutually enriching and mutually influential process of forming a common legal space. That is why the positions of some researchers who argue that there is a contradiction between the EU legal framework and the law of individual European countries seem to be somewhat simplistic and do not correspond to the current realities of the functioning of the integration mechanism in Europe. On the contrary, the European Union, through its regulatory and institutional instruments, is gradually introducing unified legal standards into the internal legal order of states, covering almost all major areas of law - from administrative and labor to environmental and financial (Makedon, 2022).

The fact of EU membership automatically means that the state agrees to participate in the further development of the Union, which, in turn, requires a flexible legal approach capable of ensuring the adaptation of the national legal order to new supranational realities, as well as the modernization of legislation to meet the requirements arising from legal integration (Fahey, Terpan & Zahn, 2022).

In this context, it is worth emphasizing that legal integration is not limited to the technical implementation of EU law into national legislation; it is a deeper process that includes amendments to constitutions and laws regulating social relations in areas where the relevant powers are transferred to the EU supranational institutions. It is this redistribution of competencies and the formation of a unified minimum legal standard that allows for effective interaction between member states within a single legal space, contributing to the stability, predictability and coherence of integration processes (Malone, 2025).

An original legal order has been formed within the European Union, which differs significantly from traditional models of national and international law. That is why in legal doctrine, the EU is increasingly qualified as a "sui generis" system, i.e., one that has an independent nature. Although EU law closely interacts with international and domestic law of the Member States, it, according to the Court of Justice of the European Union,



functions as an independent legal system integrated into the legal order of the Member States in such a way that their national courts are obliged to directly apply EU law, in particular those with direct effect. As the Court notes, the subjects of EU law are not only the Member States themselves, but also their citizens, so European law has not only a regulatory but also a direct law-making function in relation to individuals, granting them subjective rights and imposing corresponding obligations (Moreiro González, 2023).

It is important that the incorporation of EU norms into the domestic legislation of the Member States does not reduce the independence of European law, but rather confirms its autonomous status based on the principle of supremacy and the principle of direct effect. The peculiarity of the legal status is manifested in the fact that the membership of states in this Union is based on a voluntary but legally binding decision to transfer part of their sovereign powers to supranational institutions. Unlike ordinary participation in international organizations, where states retain full sovereignty, integration into the EU means limiting part of national sovereignty.

The scale of the impact of EU law on national legal systems is evidenced by statistics showing that 10 to 40% of laws adopted at the national level are directly caused by supranational regulation, and about 60 to 70% of EU legal acts have a direct regulatory effect not only at the national but also at the local level of law (Chablais, 2024). Thus, national legal systems are gradually being filled with EU law, which is not perceived as external or temporary, but rather as forming the internal legal fabric and continuing to generate legal effects that reflect the dynamic nature of the European regulatory space. In this context, it is appropriate to quote Merusi (2024), who aptly noted that EU law is integrated into national legal systems not as a frozen set of rules, but as a "living code".

The key principle that ensures the effective integration of EU norms into domestic law is the principle of the supremacy (primacy) of EU law, which, despite not being formally enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty, was confirmed in Declaration No. 17 to it, and thanks to the case law of the EU Court of Justice, remains legally binding within the EU. First clearly articulated in the case of *Flaminio Costa v. ENEL* back in 1964, this principle established that no rule of national law can preempt EU law. Thus, according to the legal logic of the European Court, the provisions of national constitutions are valid only to the extent that they do not contradict the application of European law. National judicial authorities do not have discretion in the application of the Union's acts - they are obliged to ensure their priority application even in cases of conflict with the rules of domestic law (Elia Antonio & Boymans, 2013).

The mechanism of supranational legal integration within the EU is based on the fact that it is the Member States, and not the Union as such, that ensure the implementation, enforcement and application of EU acts through their executive and judicial authorities. Unlike federal systems or international organizations with their own local executive structures, the European Union does not have its own regional or local executive bodies in the Member States, and it is national institutions that are the main entities that guarantee the implementation of EU law. In this context, the role of national courts is particularly important, as they not only apply the Union's rules but also bear responsibility for violations of citizens' rights arising from EU rules. The Court of Justice of the European



Union has repeatedly recognized the liability of Member States for damage caused to individuals in the event of untimely or improper implementation of directives within the direct legal relationship (European Network of National Human Rights Institutions, 2024). The modern legal mechanism uses the principle of a clear delineation of competencies and procedures for adopting legal acts, enshrined, in particular, in Article 289 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) (Perederii, 2024).

The logic behind the Lisbon Treaty seems to be aimed at simplifying the understanding of the differences between acts that have the same formal title but differ in substance and legal force depending on the procedure through which they were adopted. Despite this procedural distinction, the EU founding treaties do not establish a single substantive criterion that would determine which type of legal act should be used to regulate a particular area of integration policy. As a result, the choice of the form of a legislative act (regulation, directive or decision), as well as the type of legislative procedure (general or special) is decided directly on the basis of the so-called "legal bases" contained in the relevant articles of the EU Treaties and the TFEU, which clearly state which form of act should be used to regulate a particular area of integration cooperation (European Parliament, 2024). In this regard, each EU legislative act must contain in its preamble a reference to a specific provision of the founding treaty authorizing its adoption; the absence of such a reference or its incorrect indication entails a high risk of the act being annulled by the Court of Justice of the European Union as violating the principle of legal certainty and the legality of the actions of the Union institutions.

The factor of "legal basis" on which each specific act is based is not random, but is determined by the political and legal sensitivity of the issue for the Member States, the level of their readiness for supranational regulation in the relevant area, and the degree of integration interdependence. An analysis of the existing legal framework shows that in situations involving industries that directly affect national interests, priority is usually given to a special legislative procedure, which provides for the key role of the EU Council as a representative body of the Member States. It is particularly noteworthy that the TFEU explicitly authorizes the European Parliament to adopt legislation on its own only in exceptional cases (Article 223), the procedure for exercising parliamentary investigative powers (Article 226) and the status of the Ombudsman (Article 228), while in the vast majority of such cases, the special procedural initiative and decision-making power belong exclusively to the Council (Canihac, 2024).

The Council of the EU has a crucial role in balancing supranational and national interests, carrying out legislative activities taking into account the need to achieve consensus or, in some cases, unanimity. It is in such situations, provided for in Articles 113, 115, 191 TFEU, that national governments retain the right of veto, which allows them to influence the content of decisions that are of particular importance for domestic policy (Peers, 2015).



## **Principles and foundations for the protection of national law within the framework of EU integration rights**

In the context of protecting national legislative prerogatives, the European Union operates on the principle of "intra vires", which means that its activities are limited exclusively to those powers that the EU countries have granted through the founding treaties to achieve the goals set out in these documents, leaving any competence not transferred to the Union to the Member States, which reflects the peculiarity of the distribution of powers laid down in the 1950s when the European Communities were established. The approach itself indicates that the functions of regulating not integral spheres of social relations are transferred, but only their individual aspects, clearly defined in the relevant legal frameworks, which is why the exercise of regulatory powers within the EU structure is restrictive - only within these legal frameworks, and in their absence is guided by the general principles of competence, which currently include the principle of granting competence, the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality, which together form the basis for legal integration within the EU.

Article 5 enshrines the principle of subsidiarity, and while the principle of competence is the very existence of the Union's competence, the others regulate its practical application, answering the key questions: whether the EU has the right to act (the principle of conferral of competence), whether it is appropriate for it to act (the principle of subsidiarity), and if so, to what extent and how (the principle of proportionality), which emphasizes their interdependence and convergence in the modern EU legal order. As noted by Muraviov 2023, the principle of competence is a prerequisite for the application of subsidiarity, as the lack of competence automatically violates this principle, while proportionality depends on subsidiarity, which already contains an element of proportionality, demonstrating the complex interaction of these principles in the process of legal integration and their impact on the balance between supranational and national levels of legislation.

This test, also known as the better achievement of the objective test or the "added value" test, is not an independent instrument, as it does not in itself justify the need for Union action solely because of its scale or consequences, but rather prioritizes the criterion of the adequacy of the means available to Member States to achieve the objectives, and assesses the actual capacity of Member States, not the potential, without comparison with possible results at the EU level (Stone Sweet, 2005). Thus, in the case of Member States that have sufficient means to achieve an objective, even if Union action could be more effective due to economies of scale, the current wording of the TEU does not give the EU priority, emphasizing that the Union acts only when national means are insufficient and objectives can be better achieved at the supranational level (Chiocchetti, 2023).

According to K. Lenarts, this norm, inherited from the Maastricht Treaty with certain changes in the Lisbon Treaty, serves as a guarantee of preserving national sovereignty, obliging the Union to refrain from acting if the Member States are able to achieve the goal on their own, which emphasizes the priority of the sufficiency of national means as a key criterion in the modern EU legal framework. In this context, the insufficiency of the means of at least one Member State opens up space for Union action, but only if the



scale or consequences of the action justify its better implementation at the EU level, while the mere higher efficiency of the Union without a link to national insufficiency is not a ground for intervention, which clearly reflects the modern approach to subsidiarity (Weatherill, 1995).

### **Subsidiary control mechanism of legal integration into the EU**

In terms of the existence of the subsidiary control mechanism (SCM), which serves as a tool to ensure the principles of legal integration in the European Union and their impact on national legislation, any national parliament or its separate chamber in the bicameral system has the right, within eight weeks of receiving a draft EU legislative act, to send a reasoned opinion to the Union institution responsible for its preparation, mainly the European Commission, indicating that this draft does not comply with the principle of subsidiarity, which in According to Article 7 of the Protocol on the Application of the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality, adopted with the Lisbon Treaty in 2007, depending on the number of such reasoned opinions, two control procedures are provided - the "yellow card" and the "orange card" - which serve as mechanisms to protect national legislative sovereignty in the integration process (Lampach & Dyeuvre, 2020).

The "yellow card" procedure is triggered when the reasoned opinions of national parliaments constitute at least one third (or one quarter in cases related to the area of freedom, security and justice) of the total number of votes given to national parliaments, where each parliament or its chamber has two votes, after which the draft legislation is subject to re-analysis, based on which the European Commission may decide to leave it unchanged, make adjustments or withdraw it completely, with the obligatory justification of its decision. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009, national parliaments have initiated the "yellow card" three times: in May 2012 on a draft regulation on collective action in the context of freedom of establishment and provision of services (Monti II project), in October 2013 on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office and in May 2016 on amendments to the seconded workers directive, in the first case the Commission withdrew the draft due to political opposition in the Council, and not because of the yellow card itself, in the second case it left it unchanged, recognizing the compliance with subsidiarity, and in the third case it also concluded that there was no violation of this principle, which demonstrates the flexibility of this mechanism in EU legal practice (Chiocchetti, 2023).

Instead, the "orange card" procedure, which operates exclusively within the framework of the general legislative procedure, is activated if the reasoned opinions are supported by a simple majority of votes of national parliaments, after which the draft is also revised.

### **Judicial supervision of the legality of the adoption of EU legislation**

Key doctrines, such as direct effect of law and the rule of EU law, which were not originally provided for in the founding treaties, emerged as a result of case law, which, according to Lawson (2024), has effectively made the EU Court of Justice the central coordinator



of the Union's legal development. An example of this is the well-known decision in the case of *Union Royale Belge des Sociétés de Football Association and others v Bosman*, where the Court ruled that the regulation of the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms falls within the exclusive competence of the EU, which allowed it to subsequently expand its jurisdiction even in areas such as education, culture or sports, where the founding treaties did not initially grant the Union clear powers, demonstrating how judicial precedents contribute to deepening legal integration and harmonization of national laws (Priebus & Anders, 2024).

Today, in the practice of EU legal support, the Union's regulatory powers are clearly limited to those areas that the countries of the Commonwealth have, in due time, transferred to its competence through the so-called "legal frameworks", and EU acts that are not based on such frameworks or do not fully comply with them are considered symbolic, violate the principle of granting competence and can be annulled by the Court of Justice of the EU under Article 263 TFEU, which empowers the Court to review the legality of Union legislative acts. In the 1992 judgment in *France v Commission*, the EU Court of Justice emphasized that every legislative act must contain a direct reference to the "legal basis" and its absence is grounds for invalidation or repeal, but this ruling did not become decisive for further practice, as none of the challenged legislative acts was repealed due to insufficient justification (Lindeboom & Wessel, 2023).

Undoubtedly, in a legal system based on democratic values and the rule of law, the CJEU has an important role to play in identifying violations of procedures and rules by the legislator in the exercise of its powers, but calls for stricter judicial control over the validity of the Union's legislative competence, as noted by Telle, Chiocchetti & Laffan (2025), may threaten the institutional balance in the EU's multi-layered constitutional system, where decisions on the level of legislative action - supranational or national - are made by different political institutions, such as the Council of the EU and the European Parliament, representing different views and interests. If the EU Court of Justice, when reviewing an already adopted act, questions the appropriateness of its adoption at the supranational level, this may lead to a conflict with the will of the qualified majority of Member States that considered such an act necessary and approved it through the legislative process (Van den Brink, 2017).

The effective consensual nature of supranational decisions within the European Union is a guarantee of their procedural legitimacy, which, in turn, ensures the relative simplicity, predictability and efficiency of the implementation of such decisions in the national legal systems of the Member States, including both the authorities and citizens themselves - active participants in legal integration processes. This model of decision-making, based on mutual coordination of positions between EU institutions, demonstrates one of the most important features of European legal integration, namely the formation of a normative consensus as a tool for achieving a balanced legal convergence of national legal orders. In this context, inter-institutional coherence and cooperation become a kind of "gold standard" of integration lawmaking, which allows for effective adaptation of the principles of EU law to the domestic legal environment without violating fundamental national interests.



## Discussion

In the course of the current study, a significant scope of scientific approaches and practical mechanisms that form the basis of legal integration within the EU was investigated in detail. The summarized results confirm the key points highlighted in the works of such researchers as Lindeboom and Wessel (2023), Saracino (2024), Muraviov (2023), who emphasize the autonomous nature of the EU legal mechanism and its ability to integrate through binding legal principles. At the same time, the novelty of this study lies in the comprehensive analysis of the impact of the key principles of legal integration - in particular, subsidiarity, proportionality, conferral of competence and the rule of EU law - not only on the regulatory framework, but also on the institutional and procedural mechanisms of interaction between the EU and national jurisdictions.

We note that the consistency of the study's findings with the scientific positions of Stone Sweet (2005) and Canihac (2024) is manifested in the statement that EU law does not function as classical international law, but as a supranational legal order that is directly applicable in national legal systems. However, in contrast to some theoretical approaches that emphasize the priority of supranational law as a unilateral dominant (e.g., Muller-Graff, 2018), the results of this study demonstrate a more complex, multilevel model of legal interaction, where the implementation of the principle of subsidiarity is a key mechanism for maintaining a balance between integration imperatives and national interests.

It is also worth paying attention to the comparison with the research by Telle, Chiocchetti & Laffan (2025), which critically assesses the limited nature of judicial review of the legal basis of EU legislation. In the current work, it was confirmed that although the EU Court of Justice has formal powers to strike down legislation adopted without proper legal justification, its practice remains limited and focused mainly on maintaining institutional balance rather than strict legal control. Thus, it was argued that the flexible nature of judicial review contributes to the preservation of political consensus within the EU's multi-level system.

With regard to the subsidiary control mechanism, the results of the study coincide with the analytical conclusions of Lampach & Dyevre (2020) and Chiocchetti (2023), which emphasize the limited effectiveness of the "yellow" and "orange" card mechanisms due to their declarative nature and difficulty in implementation. At the same time, this study proposes a conceptual reassessment of the role of national parliaments in the process of legal integration: not as passive observers, but as active participants capable of influencing supranational processes through early warning control.

The discussion part of the study gives grounds to assert that the author's vision of the principles of legal integration, their practical implementation and impact on national legislation is consistent with the main trends of modern scientific discourse, but at the same time complements it with new emphases - in particular, regarding the flexible interaction between national and supranational law, the role of legal grounds in the rulemaking process, mechanisms of parliamentary control and the limited, but strategically important, nature of judicial oversight within the EU.



## Conclusion

The study of the historical and regional aspects of legal integration in the European Union has established that the creation of a single legal space within the framework of cooperation between member states is based on close interaction between EU law and national legal systems, and subsequently leads to a gradual transformation of domestic legislation of member states in accordance with supranational legal standards, while preserving the autonomy and uniqueness of EU law as a "sui generis" system. The study has shown that the principles of competence, subsidiarity and proportionality are the key principles that define the limits of EU intervention in the legal regulation of certain areas of public life. These principles ensure respect for the sovereignty of the Member States and justify the Union's actions only in cases where national means are insufficient to achieve the goals set.

It is established that the system of legal restrictions on EU activities based on the principle of "intra vires", together with a clear hierarchy of competence principles, serves as a mechanism for maintaining a balance between the supranational and national levels. The identified factors ensure stable structural stability of the legal process of integration and reduce the risk of conflict of norms. The author examines the peculiarities of the functioning of subsidiary control, which forms the institutional basis for national parliaments to be able to influence the EU legislative process by submitting motivated comments on compliance with the principle of subsidiarity itself, and this increases the level of democratic legitimacy and transparency of lawmaking.

The author assesses the effectiveness of the "yellow" and "orange" card procedures as instruments of parliamentary control. It is established that their use, despite limited practical implementation, is an important means of preventing violations of the principles of legal integration and enhances the role of national parliaments in the system of multi-level governance. It is revealed that judicial supervision over the legality of legislative acts is the main source of ensuring compliance with the principles of legal certainty and validity of actions of the Union's institutions.

## References

Brasseur, C., Pachta, V., & Grigolo, C. (2024). Towards an enlarged union: Upholding the rule of law (Policy Paper No. 30). International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. <https://doi.org/10.31752/idea.2024.25>

Cattelan, V. (Ed.). (2012). Integration through legal education: The role of EU legal studies in shaping the EU. Società editrice il Mulino. [https://www.academia.edu/2774383/Integration\\_through\\_Legal\\_Education\\_The\\_Role\\_of\\_EU\\_Legal\\_Studies\\_in\\_Shaping\\_the\\_EU](https://www.academia.edu/2774383/Integration_through_Legal_Education_The_Role_of_EU_Legal_Studies_in_Shaping_the_EU)

Canihac, H. (2024). The law against the rule? Ambivalence, ambiguity, and the historical sociology of European legal integration. *Historical Social Research*, 49(2), 195–223. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.49.2024.19>



Chablais, A. (2024). EU accession to the ECHR: The non-EU member state perspective. In S. Ø. Johansen, G. Ulfstein, A. Føllesdal, & R. A. Wessel (Eds.), *The revised draft agreement on the accession of the EU to the ECHR [Special section]*. *European Papers*, 9(2), 715–728. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/779>

Chiocchetti, P. (2023). A quantitative analysis of legal integration and differentiation in the European Union, 1958–2020. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 61(5), 1337–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13467>

Dir, I. Y. (2024). Legal essence of the European Union. *Uzhhorod National University Herald Series Law*, 2(80), 301–306. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2023.80.2.49>

Duttle, T., Holzinger, K., Malang, T., Schäubli, T., Schimmelfennig, F., & Winzen, T. (2017). Opting out from European Union legislation: The differentiation of secondary law. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 24(3), 406–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2016.1149206>

Eliantonio, M., & Boymans, P. (2013). Europeanization of legal principles? The influence of the CJEU's case law on the principle of legitimate expectations in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. *European Public Law*, 19(4), 715–738. <https://doi.org/10.54648/EURO2013043>

European Parliament. (2024). Deepening EU integration in view of future enlargement (2023/2114(INI)). *Official Journal of the European Union*, C/2024/6746. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52024IP0120>

European Network of National Human Rights Institutions. (2024). The state of the rule of law in the European Union: Reports from national human rights institutions – Spain 2024. [https://ennhri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Spain\\_Country-Report\\_Rule-of-Law-2024.pdf](https://ennhri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Spain_Country-Report_Rule-of-Law-2024.pdf)

Fahey, E., Terpan, F., & Zahn, R. (2022). Understanding EU legal integration/disintegration: In search of new perspectives (City Law School Research Paper 2022/XX). The City Law School, City, University of London. [https://www.strath.ac.uk/media/1newwebsite/departmentsubject/law/CLS\\_WP\\_2022\\_XX\\_Understanding\\_EU\\_legal\\_integration\\_disintegration\\_v273\\_\(002\).pdf](https://www.strath.ac.uk/media/1newwebsite/departmentsubject/law/CLS_WP_2022_XX_Understanding_EU_legal_integration_disintegration_v273_(002).pdf)

Hestermeyer, H. (2015). The implementation of European Union law in Germany. In E. de Wet, H. Hestermeyer, & R. Wolfrum (Eds.), *The implementation of international law in Germany and South Africa* (pp. 444–467). Pretoria University Law Press. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306400675\\_The\\_Implementation\\_of\\_European\\_Union\\_Law\\_in\\_Germany](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306400675_The_Implementation_of_European_Union_Law_in_Germany)

Lampach, N., & Dyevre, A. (2020). Choosing for Europe: Judicial incentives and legal integration in the European Union. *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 50(3), 565–586. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-019-09622-9>

Lawson, R. (2024). Atlas shrugged: An analysis of the ECtHR case law involving issues of EU law since Opinion 2/13. *European Papers*, 9(2), 647–671. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/775>



- Leruth, B., & Lord, C. (2015). Differentiated integration in the European Union: A concept, a process, a system or a theory? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(6), 754–763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1021196>
- Lindeboom, J., & Wessel, R. A. (2023). Introduction: The autonomy of EU law, legal theory and European integration. *European Papers*, 8(3), 1247–1254. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/716>
- Makedon, V. V. (2022). Assessment of the processes and macroeconomic consequences of international labor migration in the context of the global economy. *Economy and Society*, (35). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2022-35-6>
- Malone, M. M. (2025). European Union, 2024. *Administration*, 73(1), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.2478/admin-2025-0007>
- Merusi, F. (2024). Integration between EU law and national administrative legitimacy. *Ius Publicum*. [https://www.ius-publicum.it/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/02-Integration-EU-Law-and-administrative-Law-Ius-Publicum\\_EN.pdf](https://www.ius-publicum.it/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/02-Integration-EU-Law-and-administrative-Law-Ius-Publicum_EN.pdf)
- Moreiro González, C. J. (2023). Implementing the rule of law in the European Union: How long trapped in Penelope's spinning wheel from Article 2 of the TEU? *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 25, 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cel.2023.17>
- Müller-Graff, P.-C. (2018). The rule of law in European integration: Roots, functions, challenges. *Kyiv-Mohyla Law and Politics Journal*, 4, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.18523/kmlpj153249.2018-4.1-14>
- Muraviov, V. (2023). Principles and values of the European Union as a legal basis for European integration. *European Studies*, 6(1), 73–94. <https://doi.org/10.2478/eustu-2022-0029>
- Peers, S. (2015). Trends in differentiation of EU law and lessons for the future. European Parliament, Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2015/510007/IPOL\\_IDA\(2015\)510007\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2015/510007/IPOL_IDA(2015)510007_EN.pdf)
- Perederii, O. (2024). Innovative transformations of the national legal system of Ukraine as a condition for participation in european policies. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series Law*, (37), 51-57. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2075-1834-2024-37-05>
- Polakiewicz, J., & Suominen-Picht, I. (2024). A Council of Europe perspective on the European Union's accession to the European Convention on Human Rights. In S. Ø. Johansen, G. Ulfstein, A. Føllesdal, & R. A. Wessel (Eds.), *The revised draft agreement on the accession of the EU to the ECHR [Special section]*. *European Papers*, 9(2), 729–744. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/780>
- Priebus, S., & Anders, L. H. (2024). Fundamental change beneath the surface: The supranationalisation of rule of law protection in the European Union. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 62(1), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13489>



---

Saracino, D. (2024). Understanding solidarity in the European Union: An analytical framework. *Theory and Society*, 53, 1093–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-024-09566-3>

Selck, T. J., Rhinard, M., & Häge, F. M. (2007). The evolution of European legal integration. *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 24(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-007-9024-8>

Stone Sweet, A. (2005). European integration and the legal system. Institute for Advanced Studies [https://aei.pitt.edu/3006/1/pw\\_101.pdf](https://aei.pitt.edu/3006/1/pw_101.pdf)

Telle, S., Chiocchetti, P., & Laffan, B. (2025). External differentiated integration: between stability and change. *West European Politics*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2024.2444774>

Tosiek, P. (2022). The European Union in multi-crisis: Towards differentiated legal integration? *Review of European and Comparative Law*, 50(3), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.31743/recl.13007>

Van den Brink, T. (2017). The Impact of EU Legislation on National Legal Systems: Towards a New Approach to EU – Member State Relations. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 19, 211-235. <https://doi:10.1017/cel.2017.2>

von Bogdandy, A. (2024). The European renaissance of republicanism: On the future of EU law in light of Article 2 TEU. *Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law & International Law Research Paper Series*, 2024(02). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4695467>

Weatherill, S. (1995). *Law and integration in the European Union*. Clarendon Press. <https://www.gbv.de/dms/spk/sbb/recht/toc/278814700.pdf>