

A PROPOSAL ON EU REFORMS



Josef F. Palán

BANKING INSTITUTE - COLLEGE OF BANKING



GOAL AND METHODS

The research is aimed to assess the process of strategic decision-making of European Commission and propose elimination of revealed problems, which could negatively influence successful development of European project.

To be able to objectively assess the complexity, changeability and ambivalence of EU internal and external factors, the author used the field force model.

The proposed field force model characterising the EU status quo was preceded by content and comparative analysis of relevant data based on selected publications, journals and electronic sources.

INTRODUCTION



In the course of 2016 the European Union found itself in a difficult stage of its political, economic and cultural development.

Such a development has been due to different external and internal factors. The Global Risks Report (WEF-Global Risks, 2016) confirms the key role of geopolitical factors as related to the economic and cultural development of mankind.

The role of EC:

"European Commission defends the interests of EU in terms of international relations and is the 'guard' of agreements. The Commission also defends the unity of EU against individual interests of member states and fulfils the role of key moderator. Its impartiality and detached point of view should be stabilisation factors despite ideological differences of member states governments... It can be seen as an executive body of EU with vast bureaucratic machine"(Hodač et al., 2014).





The complexity and difficulty of strategic decision-making of European Commission, European Council, **European Parliament and European** Central Bank are represented by the force field model depicting the forces acting toward the further development of European integration including resistance forces. Their subsequent acting defines the dynamic balance of EU, see Fig. 1.



Figure 1 Force Field Analysis - Status Quo EU. Source: own processing based on (WEF, 2016)





The audit of strategic decision-making of EC comes from the force field model, see 'Fig. 1 Force Field Analysis - Status Quo EU' supplemented with a rough estimate of the magnitude of acting driving forces and restraining forces based on the probability of their occurrence and rate of **impact.** The values are taken from The Global Risks Report (WEF, 2016). The set of driving forces contains forces favourably affecting the political, economic and social stability of EU and contributing to its further development. The author includes the following forces:



- European Values, rooted in Antic, Jewish and Christian tradition of European thinking.
- Strategy Europe 2020 is creating the conceptual and system framework for medium and long-term strategic management of EU by the European Commission. The contemporary architecture of Strategy Europe 2020 does not integrate namely the common foreign policy, see Preliminary hypothesis, i.e. author's proposal to include it in the strategy.
- EU Common Foreign Policy creating good to optimal conditions for supplying the European project with specific proactive activities for its development. It is the deficit of implementation of well formulated EU global strategy published 30 October 2015 that is currently the source of instability and uncertainty in the further heading of EU. Its effective implementation requires proactive and dynamic decision-making and implementation process on the level of EU bodies and member states.





- **Effective local national governances are** preconditions efficient functioning of national economics. Stable pluralist political systems of member states create a solid basis for a further development of European integration toward European federation, shifting the role of EU to global political and economic powers.
- EU Common Market and Schengen Area represent one of the driving forces of European prosperity. Effective functioning of EU Common Market requires permanently optimal conditions. Essential is appropriate protection of the Schengen Area, at least on the level of protection of Great Britain or Unites States. Without such protection a reasonable immigration policy with appropriate level of solidarity can be formulated with difficulty.





There is a set of restraining forces acting against the above mentioned set of driving forces of EU sustainable development, important for its political, economic and cultural development. Some of them can completely block successful development of EU. These forces are called potential blockers and are plotted with the strongest and longest lines.

Successful implementation of the broader framework of Strategy Europe 2020 requires elimination of the restraining forces and maximal strengthening of the set of driving forces. In the following, the set of restraining forces will be discussed in detail.

- Interstate and Local conflicts-the probability of occurrence and impacts of these risks is considerably high. It is sufficient to consider the local conflict in Ukraine and its economic and social impacts. A plain example is the civil war in Syria supported by six countries. Unforeseeable consequences of forced migration of Syrian population to Europe and migration from the neighbouring countries document the failure of global governance and cooperation with negative effects on EU and its allies.
- Selfish Global Local Interest Group. The growing strength of highly selfish professional interest groups forwarding their interests by lobbying and influencing political elites may have unforeseeable political, economic and social consequences, not only on local scale. We can speak about erosion of pluralist democratic systems. An example is the dying away financial crisis that brought about significant national debts and vast social impacts.

Large – Scale Involuntary Migration is a very probable blocker of the next development stage of the European project in terms of occurrence probability and potential political and economic impacts on EU competitiveness. Millions of involuntary migrants from Middle **East** are prepared to enter Europe. This large-scale immigration posing the danger of infiltration of terrorist groups represents a real threat to the stability of pluralist democratic political systems in Europe, and implies unemployment growth, social polarisation resulting from increasing income disparity and nationalism including increase of risks connected with inner safety. Fast and efficient protection of the Schengen Area will not solve the problem. The only reasonable outcome is well handled short-term political and economic stabilisation of Syria, Iraq and consequently Libya under the auspices of UN supported by a coalition of USA, EU, Russia and China.



- Cyber Attacks are a real threat for the control systems of developed economies on both local and global scale. In terms of occurrence probability and potential social impacts they are a significant risk i.e. serious social threat.
- Terrorist Attacks. In terms of potential social impact they represent a high risk, and higher occurrence probability can be expected especially in connection with the large-scale involuntary immigration to EU and infiltration by terrorist groups.
- Failure of global governance consisting in isolated activities of world powers, or institutions striving to maintain and strengthen global influence or even dominance, taking no account of allies, represent a significant hybrid risks based on Machiavelli's divide and rule, with no respect to fundamental civilisation values.

- Unemployment and underemployment not achieved strategic aims in employment related to implementation of Strategy Europe 2020 may become a blocker of the continuing political and economic integration of EU. There is a high probability of their occurrence and impact. Moreover, it can be strengthened by large-scale immigration.
- Global Financial System Failure is not a negligible risk mainly because of its impacts. Let us be reminded of the fundamental economic axiom: A permanently sustainable economic growth of national economies and global economy requires a stabilised and efficient global financial system.
- Climate changes besides the large-scale involuntary migration, climate changes may be another blocker of economic development of EU, mainly due to the failure of adaptation mechanisms and reduction of their effects. In a medium-term horizon we may see extreme climate changes, natural disasters, water and food shortage.

Based on the results of analysis, the author proposes three action hypotheses as successive steps to the strengthening of the global role of Europe as an equal partner to the biggest global players – United States, Russia and China.

1. Action Hypothesis: Fulfilling the global role of EU

Aim: Consistent enforcement of the global role of EU – Europe the first.

Intervention: The responsibilities of the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Safety Policy must be immediately divided. We recommend the European Council to appoint to the European Commission the EU High Representatives listed below:

- A. EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs an EU minister for foreign affairs (ex minister for foreign affairs/expert and manager in one /Italy)
- B. EU High Representative for Safety Policy an EU minister of the interior (ex minister of the Interior/expert and manager in one /Germany)
- C. EU High Representative for Defence an EU minister for defence (ex minister for defence/expert and manager in one/France)

2. Action Hypothesis: Elimination of forced immigration to Europe

Aim: With immediate effect, EU will accept only those economic migrants that will contribute to its economy, with possible individual exceptions

Intervention: EU High representatives in cooperation with our allies USA and UK and in cooperation with Russia and representatives of neighbouring countries will agree and ensure immediate termination of the war in Syria, induced and supported by greedy interest groups under the cover of implementation of pluralist democratic system in a prospering Arab country with a different cultural tradition. At the same time, it is essential to provide economic and military support for the termination of the conflict in Iraq and political and economic stabilisation of the country. And finally, political and economic stability must be achieved in Libya where intervention caused political instability and economic decay, thus creating a background for terrorism.

3. Action Hypothesis: United States of Europe

Aim: Transformation of EU to a political union – United States of Europe

Intervention: To be able to fulfil its mission and ensure political, economically sustainable and cultural development of Europe, EU needs to take the following step - the transformation of economic and monetary union to a political union i.e. United States of Europe. This is an essential step to the strengthening of the negotiating position of Europe in the global world and increased safety.

Discussion: United States of Europe will be committed to respect the territorial integrity of independent countries, also outside the European environment, and restrain from interfering in other countries' internal affairs. Emphasis on economic and cultural cooperation including respect to different religious and cultural traditions will be essential for keeping peace and increasing the quality of life on earth.

CONCLUSION

The process of EC decision-making and subsequent implementation of decisions on key issues is slow and inefficient. A glaring example is the approach to the massive forced migration. It is legitimate and logical that the Schengen Area and effective functioning of the common market require protection of borders and inner security. The Council of Europe and European Commission, however, deal with key problems ex-post rather than ex-ante.

The indifferent and inconsistent approach to the real causes of European problems creates a precedent that might result in disintegration of the European Union. Europe, despite Brexit, the second wedge driven between European nations (the first one being the international initiative destabilising Ukraine) has not lost its chance. It must start playing its global role and assert the rights of European nations as bearers of unique European tradition and culture.

REFERENCES

ANDREI, D. M. 2015. The 'Europe 2020' implementation results on Romania. Internal Auditing & Risk management, 10 (2): 1-12.

BISCOP, S. 2016. All or nothing? The EU Global Strategy and defense policy after the Brexit. Contemporary Security Policy, 37(3): 431-445.

BLAGDEN, David. 2015. Global multipolarity, European security and implications for UK grand strategy; back to the future, once again. *International Affairs*, 91(2): 333-350.

Dahl, R. A. 1989. Democracy and Its Critics. Yale: Yale University Press.

EISING, R., RASH, D., ROZBICKA, P. 2015. Institutions, policies, and arguments: context and strategy in EU policy framing. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4): 516-533.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2010. Europe 2020 Strategy for smart sustainable and inclusive growth. Brussels: COM (2010) 2020.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2010. Trade, Growth and World Affairs – Trade policy as a core component of the EU's 2020 strategy. Brussels: COM 612.

FABBRINI, F. 2015. Austerity, the European Council, and the Institutional Future of the European Union. A Proposal to Strengthen the Presidency of the European Council. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 22(2): 269-334.

GRAUWE, P. 2016. What Future for the EU After Brexit? Intereconomics, 51(5): 249-251.

HANDY, C. 1997. The Hungry Spirit. Beyond Capitalism - a Quest for Purpose in the Modern World. London: Hutchinson, 1997.

HODAČ, J., LACINA, L., STREJČEK, P. 2014. Evropské křižovatky. Brno: Barrister&Principal.

KEDAITIENE, A., STANKEVICIENE, J., GINEVICIUS, R., RUTKAUSKAS, A.V. 2014. Reflection of the economic growth theories in Europe 2020 strategy. In: *Proceedings of 8th International scientific conference on Business and Management*. Vilnius, May 15-16. Vilnius: Vilnius Gediminas Technical University Press, 379-388.

KLÜVER, H., MAHONEY, K., OPPER, M. 2015. Framing in context: how interest groups employ framing to lobby the European Commission. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4): 481-498.

KROLL, D. A., LEUFFEN, D. 2016. Ties that bind, can also strangle: the Brexit threat and the hardships of reforming the EU. Journal of European Public Policy, 23(9): 1311-1320.

RUSER, A., ANHEIER, H. K. 2014. The EU's Future Role on the Global Stage. *Global Policy*, 5(1): 58-67.

THATCHER, M. 2002. Statecraft. London: Harper Collins Publisher.

WHITMAN, R. G. 2016. The UK and EU Foreign, Security and Defence Policy after Brexit. National Institute Economic Review, 238(4): 43-50. WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM et al. 2011. *The Global Competitiveness Report 2011-2012*. Geneva:WEF.

WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM ET AL. 2011. The Global Risks Report. Geneva: WEF.

WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM ET AL. 2016. The Global Risks Report. Geneva: WEF.





THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION