



WHO IS AFRAID OF THE EUROPEAN UNION?

Sorin STANCIU*, Cosmin TABĂRĂ**, Alina GAVRA***

* Universitatea de Științe Agricole și Medicină Veterinară
A Banatului din TIMIȘOARA – Facultatea de Management Agricol;

** Avocat – BAROUL JUDEȚULUI TIMIȘ;

*** Inspector de Specialitate la Biroul Permanent al Consilierilor
din cadrul Primăriei Municipiului TIMIȘOARA

Abstract:

Serving to better public information, a sincere debate over the EU history, present status and evolution perspectives is undoubtedly welcomed especially that the Romania's accession negotiations are presently developing. In this context it is important that the opinion with pro and cons of those who live for several years in EU member states and know the problem their own experience to be also heard.

They can be useful to our country first of all by playing the role of an intermediary part within the bidirectional flux of ideas exchange, and secondly by militating for a better knowledge and correct understanding of Romania's realities in the world, as much as for a more precise representation in Romania of what are the values and the critical aspects of the western democracies.

All these on one condition: to be well intended, to prove through what they state and the way they motivate their claims that they have learnt something during the years of exile, namely civism, tolerance and respect for other's convictions and most of all, for the truth.

Key words: *adhesion, referendum, member states.*

There are more or less removed perspective of Romania's integration in EU has caused lately the expression of certain opinions that, in order to create confusion over the opportunity of the accession process, strongly contest the use and utility of the respective organization. In the support of such a point of view, a variety of historical, juridical, political, social and economical arguments are being brought that can create to a less informed reader the impression of undeniable truths.

To take them one by one, we are, for example, told that the idea of a union between the European states is older; however this idea is certified with paragraphs from Joseph Goebbles or Adolph Hitler. Should we understand from this that the European Union idea is from the start a diabolic fabrication that no mentally insane person would have thought to support?

We however notice that among the post-war supporters, founders and promoters of the EU enlist also personalities whose democratic convictions are beyond any doubt - for example, Charles de Gaulle and Konrad Adenauer, Francois Mitterrand and Helmut Kohl. The use of such

interpretation is that of suggesting that nothing good can come from a person like Hitler, which reminds of Eugen Ionescu that said that if the cat has four legs, and the table has also four legs, then the table is also a sort of cat. To put it in other words, any federalization formula of the European States is suspect of a totalitarian hegemonic form and whoever claims to be in favor of the EU idea can be considered a Nazi supporter.

What it is obviously and on purpose forgotten here is the fact that the frontispiece of a European project can include totally different conceptions and that the principles that guided the EU founders have nothing to do with the Hitler's doctrine. Whoever has the smallest doubt regarding this matter can at any time consult the EU's foundation documents on the internet, namely on the site: <http://www.europa.eu.int>

It is significantly important that along the whole argumentation against the EU, these documents are never mentioned. Sometimes, however such links are made, for example: referring to the fact that the possibility of renouncing to the quality of an EU member is not clearly settling, concluding that once a member the states fate and future is sealed without any chance of leaving the organization which is not true. The matter is far more complex both juridical and politically, to be exposed in two sentences. A very well documented and detailed answer comes from serves Arved Waltemathe in his doctor's degree thesis in international law, a paper of more than 500 – from which only the bibliography represents 18 pages – published under the name of Austritt aus der EU (Peterr Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 2000).

It is also stated that almost all the population of the EU states are not satisfied with this partnership putting eventually under a sign of doubt the EU legitimate existence. Consequently the impression that this organization was planned at a high level by a sort of conspiracy totally ignoring the population's will.

Moreover, fearing that their diabolical plans can be spoiled, the tyrannical eurocracy would be strongly against organizing a referendum that gives people the chance to directly express their opinion over the EU's fate. As an argument, it is also brought among others the majority refusal expressed by referendum of the Swiss and Norwegian people adhere, from reasons easily to understand, which however can not constitute a reason to apply this to all the member states population especially to those countries that have organized such referendums whose outcome was positive (Great Britain in 1975 – 67, 2% pro), Denmark in 1993 – 58, 8% pro).

An essential aspect is also left out, namely that the states we talk about are parliamentary democracies and so it is the free and democratic parliament who represents the main instrument through which the people decide over the fate, including by adopting or rejecting such treaties as those that sit at the EU's foundation.

Explicit constitutional stipulations also reglement the situations in which a referendum can be organized – we have not heard of any case in which a legal referendum initiative has been rejected. The statement that

the majority of the member states population would be against the EU is consequently hard to sustain through facts and not speculations.

The fact that on the contrary, the number of member states has increased continuously in time and that more and more states express their wish to become a EU member talk for themselves. Of course there are also enough opponents to the European idea, but they represent the minority, and a simple principle of any democracy requires that the minority to accept the will of the majority. It is obvious that such elementary principles are not easy for everyone to accept.

EU is also blamed for breaching the national sovereignty of the member states. It is by no means clear the fact that by giving EU certain attributions the respective competence at national level is somehow restrained. But an organism without any attributions would resume itself to a formal existence lacking any utility. The question over the EU's use is put right from the beginning: why it has been founded and what are its goals? Who has the gain from this undeniable restraint? A circulated argument is that the main advantage would be Germany, a state that would seemingly pursue to obtain through this way the European hegemony after the previous attempts have failed. These false accusations can not be taken in serious only by those who do not know at all the present German policy. EU has been founded and evolved on this basis of certain treaties whose content is available to anyone not mentioning at all such false aspects. The endorsement of the European Council's important decisions is done by the rule of unanimity, any member state having the possibility to stop by its veto a decision that would hurt its fundamental rights.

We may say referring to the EU goals that the use of such an organization is especially that of coordinating and harmonizing the efforts of the member states in pursuing common objectives. Such objectives exist without any doubt and some of them have already been accomplished, such as: maintaining peace in Europe and the whole world by preventing and reasonably solving conflicts (let us remind here the two major world catastrophes that have started from European conflicts, or for example the fact that in the 70's the French and the Germans have declared three times war to each other) by helping the countries; by stimulating the economical development through the process of customs elimination, the creation of a common market, by introducing the monetary unity, by reducing the differences among the member states, by encouraging the regions less developed; facilitating the multilateral exchanges and of free circulation of people by eliminating visa and introducing the European citizenship, by offering a guarantee for the people's rights and liberties, by protecting the private property and the minorities, by according political asylum to those persecuted from political, economical, ethnic or religious reasons, by fighting together against the international terrorism and the organized crime and so many others.

It would be interesting to know what other solution propose the EU opponents for accomplishing the above-mentioned objectives. The

champions of Europhobia prefer to remain silent when such accomplishments are brought as arguments, except for the case when they try to misinterpret the facts, presenting for example the common European coin as an aberration, a total fiasco neglecting its obvious success and its popularity in countries that have not yet adopted this system such as Great Britain.

Finally numerous arguments refer to measures adopted by EU in order to avoid economical imbalances especially in the field of agricultural policy. Consequently the follow fields, the milk or mine thrown in water, the oranges that have no buyers as well as the risks not quite easy to prevent of the agricultural overproduction are enlisted as being the result of the EU policy and not of the increase of productivity in this sector in all economically developed states.

The measures of encouraging ecological methods and through which the agriculture is set on more rational bases are completely left out. The problem with hens being raised in industrial batteries would be also caused by EU, although rigorous regulations have been settled in this domain too. Even the mad cows are considered the responsibility also of the Bruxelles bureaucrats, when we all know how the disease appeared and that the only fault of the Eurocrats was that they could not stop in time its spreading – due to the stubbornness of the British government who pretended to defend selfish national interests after it has done everything for hiding the seriousness of the danger, purposely misinforming a whole world.

There are, beyond any doubt reasons for criticizing EU: too much bureaucracy, lack of transparence, reduced possibilities of a direct control performed by citizens, lack of efficiency due to the reduced competences and of course to the requirement to assure the unanimous acceptance of the major decisions. It is important to remind in this context to the fact that it is not quite easy to bring together and adjust interests that often exclude each other.

The attributions of the European Parliament should be enlarged and in general more decisive measures should be taken on the way of accomplishing a political union – a perspective that seems to lower the enthusiasm of those who see even now the national interest and the sovereignty of the member states threatened. But we do not believe that there are any reasons to fear the process will be to fast in this direction: the EU is and will remain for a long time, due to obvious historical, political and cultural reasons, a Europe formed of free nations and of developed regions, and not a federal state as the USA and even less a prison of nations under the yoke of a hegemonic power such as URSS – in fact another label for the old tsarist empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. PETRIȘOR P.: *Drept comunitar și instituții comunitare*, Editura Mirton, Timișoara, 2001
2. *Rețeaua internet – Site-uri:* <http://www.europa.eu.int>, <http://www.europarl.eu.int>, <http://europa.eu.int/futurum>, http://publications.eu.int/general/en/index_fr.htm