



WWJMRD 2018; 4(5): 62-65

www.wwjmr.com

International Journal

Peer Reviewed Journal

Refereed Journal

Indexed Journal

UGC Approved Journal

Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25

E-ISSN: 2454-6615

**Dragos Ionut Onescu**

Strasbourg University Babes-

Bolyai University, Romania

## The Future of European Union

**Dragos Ionut ONESCU**

### Abstract

The European Union has evolved since its inception, both in response to tensions and crises between Member States and response to major global strategic and ideological games. Since 2009, with the signer of Lisbon Treaty, the Charter for Fundamental Right composes all the rights in a single act.

The EU institutions are obliged by Law to meet, as well as governments of Member States when implementing EU legislation. The same is true today.

In the present paper I analyzed the future of European Union.

**Keywords:** European Union; Romania; future

### Introduction

The historical imperative of enlargement of the European Union faces the evolution of the current institutions and policies. The reform challenges have as a starting point and also as final views, opinions and proposed scenarios both academia and think-tanks, and especially, the representatives of European and national political institutions.

EU cannot function unchanged, as would have learned nothing from the mistakes of crisis like the sovereign debt (see Greece) that caused the situation in Ukraine and the illegal annexation of the peninsula of Crimea to Russia or the refugees ; To this, add the recent decision of the British to leave the Union and the rise of the current populist in several European countries, current encouraged or led by politicians duplicitous that blame on Brussels from political calculation, such as when they are unable to take a decision unpopular but economically correct.

Technically, if the EU can be reformed need to change the current operating framework of the Union govern by the Treaty of Lisbon.

The negotiating a new treaty takes place in an Intergovernmental Conference, which in turn can be preceded by years of public debate. We are only at the beginning of any reform process: the European Commission launched the debate a so-called White Paper containing 5 possible scenarios of development of the EU after 2020.

The Rome Summit is therefore a very important symbolic value as it would at the first placement of Member States regarding these scenarios, positioning after which we can easily predict the direction in which will move the EU reform process.

Concerns about the future of the European Union were marked by moment's landmark, which generated the need for debate, conceptualization and formalization process.

One of these "pulses" was given initiative Movement Européen International (MEI) to launch such a debate in May 1998.

After the European Council in Nice, MEI proposal resulted in a draft drawn on the organization of debates based on a methodology, a calendar and an own theme, from the official calendar and the subjects of the Declaration on the future of the European Union annexed to the Treaty of Nice.

The future of Europe is most often associated with different visions and scenarios for reorganizing its policy. Since the inception of the European Communities, there were many views on how it will look united Europe: an intergovernmental structure, Member States gives sovereignty only in certain issues, timely, or a federal type, a sort of "State United

**Correspondence:**

**Dragos Ionut Onescu**

Strasbourg University Babes-

Bolyai University, Romania

Europe ", modeled on the United States. For fifty years, the Community and later the Union functioned on the principle of intergovernmental constituting, in terms of international law, strictly speaking, a set of regional organizations.

The prospects of EU enlargement from 15 to 27 Member States, and amid difficulties of today - a union is accused some democratic deficit, lack of transparency and communication with citizens, a certain slowness procedure and even some bottlenecks - to put the increasingly acute problem of launching a formal debate on the future architecture of the European Union.

The discussions of the debate addresses the institutional architecture of the European Union, making decisions, the role of regions within the Union, the structure of treaties, arrangements for financing the Union, the Community method modern and, not least, the role of social dialogue and civil society in efficient functioning of the European Union.

Recently, European Commission President published white paper, containing five scenarios for the possible further development of the European Union (EU) without expressing his own option. In this way, President Juncker a stimulated debate about the EU's future.

He promised two things: the coming period, the European Commission will publish a series of reports, reflection through to come up with details about important issues in those scenarios, such as the social dimension of the EU, deepening economic and monetary union, the future defense policy and of European finances; in September 2017, during the presentation of the report on the state of EU expresses its own option for the future EU.

Also, it believes that until the new elections for the European Parliament in May 2019, should be implemented necessary changes in accordance with the option that will be agreed on the future of the EU.

As President Juncker express mission is to Member States agree that the EU can and cannot do, so that people's expectations are aligned to EU realities. And, far from these realities is the fact that the EU manages, through its budget, one percent of GDP in the Member States, while the remaining 99 percent remains in the Member States. If we want the EU to take on higher goals, then it should have the necessary means to achieve new goals. It is gratifying that, in Romania, began debate on this very important issue of the future EU.

Therefore, in what follows, I want to express a point of view on the five scenarios, the White Paper reported on Romania's interests.

The first scenario provides continuity of the EU, as is currently the prospect of gradual improvement, as there is a need or crisis and continuing reforms already agreed, such as the completion of the EU banking union of European capital markets, European Union energy etc. As you know, in this structure, Romania was the net beneficiary of 27 billion euros (received from the EU budget about 40 billion and contributed to the budget by about 13 billion euros. How effective were used money in Romania is another discussion.). Therefore, we do not mind the first scenario.

The problem with the first scenario is that most Member States consider that the current structure, the EU can face the challenges (climate change, terrorism threats, immigration, change the geopolitical and geostrategic etc.) and the fact that the Eurozone lacks component fiscal policy (also known as the fiscal capacity or budget for the

euro area).

In the first scenario for Romania, there is an important issue to maintain in the next period of financial perspective after 2020, cohesion policies rural unspoiled, which will not be easy without allies and without coming up with proposals to improve these policies as Member States developed net contributors to the EU budget, want to reduce funding for cohesion and agriculture. But these policies are essential for Romania, another period of 20-25 years, until it is eliminated lag economic and social development, the EU average.

The second scenario, limiting the EU's single market is unacceptable for Romania. This scenario restricts European area mainly free movement of goods and poses substantial challenges, becoming more serious for the free movement of services, capital and labor. As already pointed out, cohesion policy and agriculture are vital for Romania's development at this stage where we are.

The third scenario opens the possibility of developing integration at different speeds in different areas, with the participation of groups large and small member states (those who want more, do more).

As expected, this scenario, which was understandable that enables a multi-speed EU and differences between Member States, triggered the most radical statements rejecting the "new" Member States. It should be noted that in a meeting of heads of state of the four biggest European economies (Germany, France, Italy and Spain), has opted for such a development of the EU. Currently, EU treaties allow a group of at least nine Member States to move faster towards European integration in one area or another, including those provided by European treaties, where the EU has competence (cooperation mechanism Advanced). But in one way or another, all Member States agree with this approach and the approach respective is open at any time participation of the other Member States, when they want.

This provision of the Treaties - advance- cooperation as proposed by opening the third scenario- definite-movement speed should not be confused, for example, the euro area, which are not part of all Member States. Except Denmark, which is not required to join the euro, other Member States which are not part of the euro area, have pledged that they will work to meet all the criteria to join the Eurozone.

The Romanian relations with third scenario should be more nuanced (and not rejection, as already there were many standpoints) subject to compliance with two principles: consent of all Member States develop integration in some areas by a group or the other Member States; keeping open the option of joining the group of any other Member State. The fourth scenario wants to focus the EU on less policy, where to pursue deeper integration while simultaneously restricting other policies in other areas considered less relevant for the EU (to do less, but better). Unfortunately, this scenario makes sense at first glance, raises big question marks for Romania as among the areas that are suggested to be restricted or abandoned are, for example, regional development, consumer protection.

Therefore, Romania can only be extremely wary of this fourth scenario.

The fifth scenario is developing the European integration member states' decision to cede more sovereignty and resources at EU level in all areas, such as, for example, the

creation of a European Defense Union.

Another example comes from the chairman of finance ministers of the euro area, which, in its own name, said the current mechanism (fund) European Stability established by an intergovernmental agreement (outside the European Treaties), in order to provide a support Member States in the euro area financial difficulties, it should be transformed into a European monetary fund, accountable to Parliament. Obviously, such developments require modification of European treaties. It is vital for Romania to participate in such a scenario, if it is adopted.

Unfortunately, the overall development of our country, post-December 1989, showed how fragile democracy and democratic institutions created over the past 27 years and the lack of administrative capacity and capabilities.

Therefore, Romania needs European values and European funding and this can be secured only through full participation of Romania in the European project. Consequently, Romania: can support without reservation or scenario one or scenario five, as appropriate. But the script five involves modifying European treaties is not possible, at least the next two years, following the elections in France and Germany, as well as the long duration in time of such a process, which in some Member States passes through referenda; must reject the second scenario; be prepared to defend their interests in scenario three or four or a combination thereof.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is still the most important and comprehensive EU policy, at least in terms of budget involved, but also the social implications.

Since the time when enlargement of the European Union had not scale that has taken in recent years, launching new challenges, discuss a reform of the CAP. This has become all the more necessary and pressing in the light of discussions on the future of Europe, as in the new context of a globalized economy, where pressure for an open market is increasingly higher.

The planned EU enlargement is a major challenge for the future CAP guidelines. For many, the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) still seems a strange and risky operation. To a large extent, EMU was born out of necessity rather than as a result of any great vision.

The single currency has been a goal since the Common Market in 1957. It has always been seen as a distant goal, the holy grail of "United States of Europe". This decision meant that the German brand is adopting European standards de facto be creating a new currency common. From a political perspective, only the second solution may be adopted. Critics of EMU, not much predicted that this union will not exist now predict failure experiment.

Schematizing least, we can say that EMU is seen under two different angles falling so in two quite opposite visions of the future Europe. It is considered to be a development inevitable, which will join the other states that have not yet acceded to Euro land, representing up to what is acceptable in terms of transfer of national sovereignty or, rather, as a starting point of a more ambitious project, a European federalist policy.

The basis of this federation will stay so a treaty concluded between Member States and not the Constitution. Union would therefore be an area of free movement (four freedoms) imposing regulations likely to avoid destructive competition and with common policies, essential to ensure convergence between states and regions.

The federation would be focused mainly on the assertion of political capacities: EMU joint action in foreign policy and defense space, security and justice, the involvement of citizens in completing the political project etc.

In terms of institutional organization of the federative, Delors consider necessary to preserve the European specificity, which means a division of powers at the federal level which will allow national factor.

It is therefore clear some "fidelity" concerning the method, considers being able to keep this specificity, even if the alternative proposed an element of ambiguity maintain the separation between legislative and executive powers. Both the Union and the federation should be based on the classic "institutional triangle", which would add a General Affairs Council semi-permanent character distinct from the Foreign Affairs Council. It is also suggested non-legislative Commission involvement in political issues.

We insist on some factual details regarding the functioning of EU institutions and the federation. Commission and Court of Justice are common to both the Union and the federation, the former having a priority role in the Union.

In this context, Commission President is expected to be in some stage of implementation of this project, especially as head of the EU executive. Council of Ministers of the federation will be distinct from the Union. The mandate of the President Council of Ministers of the Union will be of two years and a half, when the federation will keep the half-year Presidency, choosing for two years and half a President for Foreign Affairs.

The Federation will also have a distinct Parliament of the Union, which consist of European and national parliamentarians from the Member States, be divided into two chambers. The Federation will have to make a decision on how it will be represented in the Union (seats in the Council, the number of commissioners) and may extend the application of the enhanced cooperation mechanism for the Member States of the Union, outside the federation.

In turn, Tony Blair favors a "Europe of nations free, independent and sovereign" that would be "a unique combination of power inter-governmental and supra-national". Europe can become a superpower, but we must not become a super-state.

It can "project a collective power" thanks to a closer cooperation between all its members. Partizan a clarification of the division of responsibilities Blair proposes a book that would be a political document and not a legal one. Also, to ensure compliance with the main principles, the British prime minister is in favor of 2 entities, the European Parliament, an elected upper chamber consisting of national member countries. National interest tends to manifest acutely especially in matters financial.

For example, federalist Germany supports a partial "re-nationalization" of costly development aid (development aid) and Union agricultural subsidies. The idea encountered resistance to countries with little or no federalist vision, such as France, the biggest beneficiary of subsidies to farmers in the European Union. There are intermediate positions or neutral on the future European architecture: in a speech on the future of Europe, trying to maintain a position of neutrality, the executive arm of central Union Romano Prodi described himself explicitly, as neither federalist nor intergovernmental.

For the 2000-2006 period, despite the announced changes

especially in the sustainable development of infrastructure represents 40% of the allocation regions of type I, including the Cohesion Fund, which marks an evolution.

The support of human resources will decrease slightly reaching 24% and the intended production sector decreased from 41% to 35%. Based on the initial diagnosis, the future policy of economic and social cohesion should take into account a greater measure of new factors of convergence and to support the modernization and equipping of the physical infrastructure, investment in the science and new technologies of communication, environment and sustainable development. These recommendations are important for the present Member States, and for those who join later.

In this context, "Community value added" is presented as a viable solution to the needs of countries in Central and Eastern Europe. In the list of priorities of the future cohesion policy, some are territorial in nature (less developed regions, urban issues, diversification of rural areas, cross-border, transnational and inter-regional industrial restructuring areas, areas affected by geographical or natural handicap) others are general or regional (creating jobs of the highest quality, supporting the new economy and information society, promoting social integration and equal opportunities).

As regards other sectorial policies, which require only recommendation is to strengthen the synergy between them and complementarity with cohesion policy.

### Conclusion

The best scenario for Romania as scenario no. 5 "A lot more together."

In all other scenarios, the advantages can become disadvantages, since Romania is not in the Eurozone and the Schengen Area and will find it difficult to catch up states will choose to go with a higher speed of integration.

However, given the odds rather low this scenario to become reality, any assessment of the current situation should consider urging Member from hard core to advance integration in a faster pace, according to the scenario no. 3 "multi-speed Europe".

The most important conclusion that emerges from this analysis is that the speed with which Romania will go to the EU depends heavily on ourselves; the only chance to catch a group of countries decided to move towards integration, a group that is already before us on this path is to accelerate the pace of reform if we want to be at the table where decisions will be important for the entire Union EU.

Media reactions, sometimes critical shades enhance the debate on the future of Europe. Its different approaches offer the public a choice of views expressed, and shape and could, thus, an advisory opinion on European issues.

The debate on the future of Europe involves the use of important concepts that often are understood differently, leading to transformation into a confrontation semantic debate.

### References

1. George Angheloiu (coord.), *Europenizarea: studii de guvernare și securitate*, Ed. C.H. Beck, București, 2015
2. *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe*, Ed. John Peterson and Helene Sjursen, Routledge, 2000
3. Marcel Heide, *The European Union - past, present and future*, GRIN Verlag, 2013

4. George Andrew MacLean, *Between Actor and Presence: The European Union and the Future for the Transatlantic Relationship*, University of Ottawa Press, 2001
5. Ksenija Premur, *European Union - History and Future*, Lulu.com, 2008
6. Instytut Spraw Publicznych, *Future of European Union enlargement*, Institute of Public Affairs, 2006
7. Dusan Sidjanski, *The Federal Future of Europe: From the European Community to the European Union*, University of Michigan Press, 2000
8. Birol A. Ye?ilada, Jacek Kugler, Gaspare Genna, Osman Gökku? Tanr?kulu, *Global Power Transition and the Future of the European Union*, Taylor & Francis, 2017