

JUNCKER'S RESILIENT DISCOURSE REGARDING EUROPEAN SECURITY CHALLENGES

Ionelia Bianca BOSOANĂ*

Abstract

With this new configuration of the world stage, the meaning of security has changed. Entire areas are hit by states tension, lability and conflict, poverty and frustration that give birth or favor proliferation of new risks and threats. The aim of this paper is to analyze different evolutions of security from a comparative perspective. The main objective is to show the progress stage of security from the beginning of Juncker's Commission mandate to the end of the legislative and what are the directions of this subject in the future. As a methodological outline, is used a comparative approach with emphasis on the historical evolution of 'security'. There are used specific instruments such as: official documents, statistical data, private documents, data already available from others studies and press materials. Findings of the study may help the policy makers to increase the citizens' confidence in action instruments of the European Union by focusing on the minuses of the Common Security and Defence Policy.

Keywords: European Union, security, challenges, cooperation

Introduction

Nowadays, Europe is facing many challenges coming from inside and outside of the continent. The most important factor of change, which affected Europe both positively and negatively, is globalization. This phenomenon has seen a continuous intensification due to the progress of technology.

The concept of security and its component parts have suffered essential changes over time, as well as the attitude of states towards the ways of transposing life, in relation with the changes taking place internationally.

The European Commission headed by Jean-Claude Juncker, during the actual mandate, has had a resilient discourse on the topic of security challenges. They are optimistic regarding the fate of the European Union, considering that the actual crises are just developmental stages of the construction. They have taken over from the previous European Commission, a hard portfolio with much more responsibilities. Actual legislative mandate has a difficult role because they have to deal with strong issues such as Brexit, the intensifying of terrorism, the rise of Euroscepticism and the loss of citizens' trust in European values.

*Ionelia Bianca BOSOANĂ is PhD Student at Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania; e-mail: bianca.bosoanca@gmail.com.

The aim of this paper is to see from a comparative perspective, different evolutions of security. In addition, understanding the security evolution it can help us finding solutions for the actual problems that security is confronting with.

The main objective of the paper is to show the progress stage of security from the beginning of Juncker's Commission mandate to the end of the legislative and in which way this matter is going to evolve.

The objectives of the present research are both fundamental and evaluative. First category helps us gaining new knowledge and developing new theories. The second category is oriented to determine the effect of different actions.

This paper discusses the major security challenges because discourses on the future of the European Union are based on this problematic. There are some research questions targeted on this paper such as: how the issue of European security evolved under the mandate of President Juncker? Did European Commission succeed in offering citizens what it promised at the beginning of its mandate? Is European Commission responsible for all of the actual deficiencies of the European Union? All the security dimensions will be analyzed and the actual tendencies and vulnerabilities will be derived from this analysis. Actual political and economic dimension of European security will also be highlighted.

As a methodological outline, is used a comparative approach, with a predominantly descriptive style, that places more emphasis on the historical evolution of the term. In the field of public and European policies, the comparative research is used as a distinctive methodological approach with the aim of providing a wider context and the identification of general patterns.

Moreover, it will be used a discourse and a content analysis. Discourse analysis will help us to outline the approach of the Juncker's Commission to the development of European security issue and content analysis will have as main objective the highlighting of some key concepts that will guide us during the research.

There are specific instruments used for the present research such us: official documents, statistical data, private documents; data already available from others studies and press materials.

For our analysis, I will use five documents of the European Commission: the inaugural speeches of the 2014, July 15 composed by the *Opening Declaration of European Parliament Plenary Session* and The political guidelines for the future European Commission, the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union 2015: Time for Honesty, Unity and Solidarity*, the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union Address 2016: Towards a better Europe – a Europe that protects, empowers and defends*, the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union Address 2017* and the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union 2018*.



1. European security challenges

This subchapter will approach the problematic of European Security challenges, trying to define the concept and its applicability in the field of international relations. We will talk about the history of European Security, emphasizing all the dimensions of this concept and we will discuss the actual tendencies and vulnerabilities.

1.1. Security – definitions

The term *security* comes from Latin “*securitas*” and “*securitatis*” which express both, the absence of danger and a state of calm and peace (Irimia, 2015). Security also means “protection, defense” (Kolodziej, 2007). Essentially, security is “that state of affairs that secures every external and internal danger a community or any state, following specific measures, that are adopted and which ensure the existence, independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity of the state and respect for fundamental interests” (Afases, 1977).

There is security when “states estimate that the danger of suffering a military attack, political pressures or economic constraints is null and, for this reason, they can follow free development” (Desarmement, 1986).

Foreign, military and economic policy of states, the point where they meet in exchange and displacement areas, as well as the general structure of relations, are all considered as aspirations to ensure national and international security. Before the emergence of economic and environmental concerns over the years 70, the concept of security was rarely treated in others terms than political particular interests of the participants and even by the end of the 80' the discussion still had one strong military accent.

The term security enters the current vocabulary of the international community after the year 1945 and was imposed in the mid-1970s.

The term security is used especially in the field of international relations system and others disciplines which had accepted this concept with reference to the protection of states. There are many authors who wrote about this subject and the following lines will describe the most important theories and definitions with reference to the meaning of term ‘security’.

Krause and Joseph Nye noted that “neither economists nor political science professionals have not paid sufficient attention to the complexity of the concept of security, including its instrumental role in the amplification of other values” (Afases, 1997).

One of the most well-known and old definitions of security belongs to Arnold Wolfers who said that “security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats on acquired values, and in one subjective sense, the absence of fears that these values will be attacked” (Wolfers, 1952).

In the terminology used by the United Nations, the concepts of security are equivalent to the resources that states and international community, as a whole, is leans on ensuring its security. Among these concepts we mention: the balance of power, discouragement, collective security, neutrality, non-alignment, peaceful coexistence, common security.

Another definition of security is found in the paper *Religion and Security in 21st Century Europe – Glossary of terms*, where is considered that security “means the situation in which a person, a group of people, a state, the alliances, following specific measures taken individually or in agreement with others actors, gains the certainty that their existence, integrity and fundamental interests are not endangered” (Buța, 2007, p. 217).

In the early 50s, researchers and theoreticians have talked about the ‘security dilemma’ which was defined as “a notion of structure in which attempts to self-help states to secure their security needs, indifferent of intention, lead to an increase the others’ insecurity, whereas each of them interprets their own measures as defensive, and others as a potentially threatening (Buzan, 2000, p.16).

The security dilemma, also referred to as the spiral model, is a term used in international relations and refers to a situation in which, under anarchy (Herz, 1950, pp. 157-180), actions by a state intended to heighten its security, such as increasing its military strength, committing to use weapons or making alliances, can lead other states to respond with similar measures, producing increased tensions that create conflict, even when no side really desires it (Jervis, 1978, pp. 167-174).

Robert Jervis tries to build such a dilemma, pointing back to the unintentional elements and interdependence between international relations. Ken Booth, Leonard Beaton, Stanley Hoffmann and Joseph Nye are among those who claim that the notion of security restricted to the individual level of states and of the military issues it is inadequate.

Ken Booth stressed the idea that the new security game can be characterized as a utopian realism and this perspective is, unlike the traditional realist perspective, holistic in character and non-statist in approach (Booth, 1991, p. 313). He added that security is apparent that issue areas like economic collapse, scarcity, overpopulation, environmental degradation etc. which lie outside the scope of traditional security thinking must be included in the new security agenda (Booth, 1991, p. 313).

For much of contemporary history, and certainly since World War Two, the concept of international security has been equated with the use of force between nations, with a particular focus on the role of great powers. This reflected the view that international security involved territorial integrity of nations and the greatest threat to such territorial integrity was posed by wars between states, and particularly great powers (Nye, Lynn-Jones, 1988, pp. 5-27).

“Security is taken to be about the pursuit of freedom from threat and the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their



functional integrity against forces of change, which they see as hostile. The bottom line of security is survival, but it also reasonably includes a substantial range of concerns about the conditions of existence. Quite where this range of concerns ceases to merit the urgency of the “security” label and becomes part of everyday uncertainties of life is one of the difficulties of the concept” (Buzan, 1991, pp. 432-433).

Barry Buzan’s theory regarding to security concept is a bit more complex than other definitions. He thinks security in terms of freedom, independence and integrity of states. Being an Emeritus Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics, he tried to tackle the security from a structural-realistic paradigm. So, for this reason he tries to be a little pragmatic defining security and I adhere to his idea.

It is certain that the international security environment is in a continuous transition. The classical meaning of security has changed over the years and today, security means much more than it did in the past. Barry Buzan’ analysis security from five perspectives: political, military, economic, societal, and environmental.

The limits of his definition are related to the globalization’s evolution in a quickly way, a proliferation of new risks and threats that intensify the issues of uncertainty and insecurity of the global environment.

We can draw a few conclusions at the end of this sub-chapter. There have never been so many elements in the modern history of mankind uncertainty. Despite the many assumptions issued in recent years, just few of them are able to predict what will happen in the medium or long term, and their assumptions are truthful. The rising values of the components of the new security equation lead to the conclusion that we have entered an era of strategic insecurity.

I strongly believe that the new threatens at the security obligates states to deeply cooperate for the defense of the common values of democracy, security and freedom. To meet the challenges of the 21st century, political is required, as well as significant financial and military efforts on the part of all.

1.2. History of european security

Defense is an instrument left up to the states. They choose how they use defensive instruments and they have the authority to control the national security concepts. For this reason, Europeans have noticed that Foreign and Security Policy is difficult to be coordinated. The cooperation in this field has gradually developed often on the spur of some external events which brought inconsistencies to light. The structures and hypothesis that today underpin in the shaping of public policies in this field, are marked by previous efforts regarding balance between national sovereignty and real capabilities (Giegerich and Wallace, 2010, p. 364)

National political cultures are significantly different with reference to the role of defence in the international policy and the projection of power beyond the



national borders. But the chance occurs progressively and there are some institutions which help states to understand the idea of Foreign and Security Policy.

European Economy Community brings up an interest to defence by the help of United States of America, Nord Atlantic Treaty being the proper structure of military cooperation at that time. Defense European Treaty was signed in 1952 for creating Defense European Community as a structure of military cooperation between the six founder members (Giegerich and Wallace, 2010, p. 365). Five years later, French President de Gaulle, chose the cooperation in the field of external policy for relaunch the ambitions of the European Economic Community. In February 1961, a conference took place in Paris, bringing together the heads of state, head of Government and foreign ministers for discussing a strong cooperation. Their plan was called Fouchet Plan - named by the French diplomat Christian Fouchet - but Holand and Germany objected to this proposal. All attempts of the foreign policy of European Union have developed gradually what we call today as PESCO (Giegerich and Wallace, 2010).

In December 2003, the European Council adopted the the European Security Strategy. There were established, for the first time, principles and clear objectives for promtion the EU's security interests based on our core values. It has a comprehensive approach and remains fully relevant (Consiliul Uniunii Europene, 2009).

The European Security Strategy identified a series of challenges for Europe and for the European Union such as: the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and organised crime, cyber security, energy security and climate changes. At the beggining, these challenges were clasified different because over the years priorities have changed and Europe is facing with others new situations. If before we were talking about security in teams of violence, nowadays, we are threatened by cyber security and climate changes which caused natural disasters.

On 13 November 2017, as the first formal step towards setting up PESCO, Ministers signed a common notification on the PESCO and handed it over to the High Representative and the Council. The notification sets out a list of 20 more binding common commitments in the areas of defence investment, capability development and operational readiness. It also contained proposals on the governance of PESCO and its principles (PESCO, 2018).

In the evolution of military forms of cooperation, we have to remaind Common Security and Defence Policy. It was disscussed in 1998 at the Saint Malo Summit between France and Great Britain and it was fully operational together with the European Security Strategy, in 2003. The growth of effectiveness, visibility and the impact of Common Security and Defence Policy must be observable in civilian and millitary missions.

Based on this notification, on 11 December 2017, the Council took the historic step to adopt a decision establishing PESCO and its list of participants. A total of 25 Member States decided to participate in PESCO (PESCO, 2018).



PESCO is a treaty-based framework and process to deepen defence cooperation among EU Member States who are capable and willing to do so. The aim is to jointly develop defence capabilities and make them available for EU military operations. This will thus enhance the EU's capacity as an international security actor, contribute to the protection of EU citizens and maximise the effectiveness of defence spending (PESCO, 2018).

The difference between PESCO and other forms of cooperation is the legally binding nature of the commitments undertaken by the participating Member States. The decision to participate was made voluntarily by each participating Member State, and decision-making will remain in the hands of the participating Member States in the Council. This is without prejudice to the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain EU Member States (PESCO, 2018).

1.3. Dimensions of Security

The end of the Cold War has brought with its change the common individuals perception on security threats of human nature. Thus, problems related to the nonmilitary dimensions of security have replaced the military one without eliminating them.

There are various studies which analyses these changes and how the international arena has changed. Some authors like Edward Kolodziej consider that the new concept of security and the new security environment is due to the disappearance of bipolarity on the international arena, a structure which seems to offer a new global order which is apparently stable and adamant (Kolodziej, 2007, p. 24), and in the same time it undermines all the problems which humanity is confronted with for according a primordial importance to the relations between the two powers at the global level arguing over their supremacy – The United States of America and USSR.

Other authors haven't ignore the disappearance of bipolarity, but they believe that the most important factor of the security complexity is the process of globalization. Giddens believes that the intensification at the global level of social relations so that events from a part of world are influenced by events taking place in remote areas (Giddens, 2000, p. 64).

There are authors who extended the notion of security to many sectors than we were used. In his article "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century", Barry Buzan analyses how five sectors of security (political, military, economic, societal, and environmental) might affect the "periphery" based on changes in the "center". The five sectors of security are an important concept to understand Buzan's studies.

Military dimension of security is related to the mutual influence between offensive and defensive military capacities of states and their perceptions towards others (Frunzeti, 2006, p. 99). As I mentioned before, this dimension of security was the only one considered the most relevant for a long period of time and

nevertheless today is still the most important. And now that I have it, we can remind the today's military threatens are related to weapons of mass destruction, conflicts in the Middle East, organized crime, nuclear weapons, military disputes, all our problems demonstrates that military power continues to be present in our lives. The most important military problem at the present time is terrorism.

Moreover, military threats can affect all components of the state. It can put into question the very basic duty of a state to be able to protect its citizens as well as have an adverse effect on the "layers of social and individual interest" (Buzan, 191, p. 119).

The political dimension of security is aimed at both the relation between state and its citizens and between the international relations of that state (Sarcinski, 2005, p. 13). From this point of view, political dimension can be analyzed on two-tiered structure: the internal good or bad government, and the international one on international security and international law (Sarcinski, 2005, p. 14).

Political threats represent a constant concern for a state as well; however, they can be more ambiguous and difficult to identify in relation to military threats. As the state is, itself, a political entity, a political threat with the purpose of weakening that entity can be considered to be on par with a military threat. They can take the form of competition amongst ideologies, or an attack to the nation itself. However, it is important to distinguish between intentional political threats and "those that arise structurally from the impact of foreign alternatives on the legitimacy of states (Buzan, 1991, p. 120).

Economic dimension of security is identified with the access to resources and the basic infrastructure for insurance of a decent level of prosperity and power of the citizen and of that state (Buță, 2007, p. 115) and it has a specific significance because it indicator determinates the military power of a state. The significance is even more important because as neo-Marxism literature says that the economical factor is the leading cause of international conflicts. The most important factor from the economical category is the differences between richer and poorer people and sometimes the spread of poverty is also a factor of conflict.

From a social point of view, security assumes the protection of collective identity, a national specificity and national cohesion (Frunzeti 2006, p. 102). Among the issues in the field social issues include: migration, degradation of the educational environment and poverty as problems of present times.

The environmental sector also proves difficult to define and can be considered the most controversial of the five sectors. When thinking of possible ecological threats, one often thinks of the "struggle humans have with nature" such as earthquakes and hurricanes. These events, in themselves, are impossible to control. The more recent issues of human impact on the planet that are resulting in phenomena such as global warming, pollution, and the ozone layer to name a few, is where we can see more clearly a controllably variable in relation to the environment. If these issues come to the forefront in years to come, the ecological sector will be getting more attention (Buzan, 2000, p. 187).



Energy dependence is a particular concern for Europe. Europe is the largest global importer of oil and natural gas. For this reason, was proposed the Energy Union instrument to reduce the dependence of European states from Russia. Energy Union “gives hope for resolving a major paradox of EU energy policy - the inherent tension between national sovereignty over the energy sector and a solidarity – based on Community perspective and cooperation on a scale by-scale basis Europe” (Szulecki, 2015, p. 2).

2. Juncker's discourse regarding to European security challenges

In the previous subchapter we discussed about the security in general, pointing some definitions of this concept, dimensions of security and a short history of the European Security. Now, it is time to turn attention back to the President of European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker and his discourse regarding to European Security challenges.

This subchapter tries to respond to the following research questions how evolved European security under the mandate of President Juncker? Did European Commission succeed in offering citizens what it promised at the beginning of its mandate? Is it European Commission responsible for all of the actual deficiencies of the European Union?

For analyzing his discourse, we will use the Critical Discourse Analysis. Norman Fairclough is the one who thought about this type of discourse analysis, it is based on a critical analysis of the analyzed object, especially on inequalities, power relations and ideologies outline influence groups.

Jean-Claude Juncker was elected by the European Parliament to be the President of the European Commission in 2014, 15 July. He is the successor of the President Jose Manuel Barroso at the leadership of the European Commission.

He started his mandate with his popular speech from Strasbourg, 2014, 15 July. His opening declaration at the opening plenary session at the European Parliament was entitled *A new beginning for Europe*. At that time, elected president of the European Commission presented the proposed guidelines for his mandate and speak about “the necessity to meet their expectations, and addressing their concerns, their hopes and their dreams, because in Europe there is a place for dreaming” (European Commission, 2014). What he means by his statement is that during his mandate, Jean-Claude Juncker wants to restore citizens' confidence in EU values and mechanisms. He also wants to rebuild decks in Europe after the crisis, for regaining the trust of European citizens, to focus on our policies the key challenges for economy and our societies must deal with and to strengthen the democratic legitimacy on the basis of Community method (European Commission, 2014).

At this moment, I can say that President Juncker did predict wrongly the evolution of European Crisis. He didn't succeed in restoring the citizens' confidence in EU values. Even more, we can say that citizens' confidence in EU

has decreased dramatically from year to year. This truth is recognized by the President Juncker, in his discourse about the state of Europe, in 2018, when he said that “sometimes history goes haggard, sometimes it's headed elsewhere than we would like or pass quickly next to us” (European Commission, 2018, p. 1). Juncker stressed the boundaries of his commission saying that a five years mandate is too short for changing radically the course of things (European Commission, 2018, p. 1). Still here, he adds that he will continue to work for the perfection of the European Union and although there are a lot of imperfect things in the European Union and in his mandate, at the final review, he wants to stress the developments of the actual European Commission.

Returning back to the opening speech, in 2014, President Juncker proposed in the official document entitled *Political guidelines for the future European Commission*, ten lines of action for a better organization of the Commission's activity. There ten lines of action are: A New Boost for Jobs, Growth and Investment, A Connected Digital Single Market, A Resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy, A Deeper and Fairer Internal Market with a Strengthened Industrial Base, A Deeper and Fairer Economic and Monetary Union, A balanced and progressive trade policy to harness globalization, An Area of Justice and Fundamental Rights Based on Mutual Trust, A New Policy on Migration, A Stronger Global Actor and A Union of Democratic Change (European Commission, 2014).

Based on the annually discourse of President Jean-Claude Juncker, we will see if initial priorities can be found at the end of his mandate and what stage has been reached in the implementation of these proposals. Even if, we have some clues from the *Jean-Claude Juncker's Discourse about the State of the European Union*, in 2018, September 12 that they could many more progresses, we will see what the evolution of these actions' line was, regarding to the security challenges.

In the beginning discourse, Juncker reminded citizens about the importance of doing progress. He said that in his mandate, he is going to avoid ideological debates in favor of a pragmatic approach. He wanted to focus their efforts on achieving tangible results which benefit all Europeans. *Let us not try the public's patience by indulging in institutional debates which prevent us from focusing on what really matters - the people of Europe. And I call on governments to try harder to resist the temptation, when they address their national electorates, to criticise decisions that they actually took together in Brussels* (European Commission, 2014, p. 16).

For our analysis, I will use five documents of the European Commission: the inaugural speeches of the 2014, July 15 composed by the *Opening Declaration of European Parliament Plenary Session* and The political guidelines for the future European Commission, the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union 2015: Time for Honesty, Unity and Solidarity*, the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union Address 2016: Towards a better Europe – a Europe that protects, empowers and defends*, the document of the European



Commission - *State of the Union Address 2017* and the document of the European Commission - *State of the Union 2018*.

At first glance we can observe that every discourse starts with a desideratum. The first discourse - the *Opening Declaration of European Parliament Plenary Session* - begins with the desideratum - *A new start for Europe* – which suggests that they propose a new agenda for the European Union, making it stronger than in the past and capable to meet the challenges. The key point of this discourse is the renewal of the European Union on the basis of an Agenda for jobs, growth, equity and democratic changes (European Commission, 2014).

The second discourse - *State of the Union 2015* - begins with the desideratum *Time for Honesty, Unity and Solidarity*. This desideratum suggested the key topic of his discourse, the refugees and President Jean-Claude Juncker explicitly launches the idea that “We Europeans should remember well that Europe is a continent where nearly everyone has at one time been a refugee” (European Commission, 2015, p. 2).

The third discourse - *State of the Union Address 2016* - proposes a new desideratum, different from the previous one, *Towards a better Europe – a Europe that protects, empowers and defends*. This time, discourse it's about the interests of citizens, about the protection in face of dangers like cybernetics one, travel security or terrorism phenomenon. Security is the key concept of this discourse and European Commission numbered more than 30 terrorist attacks in Europe (European Commission, 2016, p. 4).

The forth discourse - *State of the Union Address 2017* - has the desideratum - *Wind in our Sails*. These were three principles invocated in the Juncker's discourse: freedom, equality and the rule of law – must remain the foundations on which we build a more united, stronger and more democratic Union (European Commission, 2017).

The fifth discourse - *State of the Union 2018* - proposes a new desideratum *An Imperative Obligation of Action and Viability*. He talks about their obligation to continue reforms until the end of their mandate. Juncker talked about a convincing perspective for the future of the European Union.

It's easier to follow the advances in the field of security by separately taking each dimension of security. In that way we will respond if European Commission did succeed in offering citizens what it promised at the beginning of its mandate. The analysis will start a reverse order than it was presented in the first chapter, starting with the energetic dimension of security. As an instrument of cooperation between the states in the field of energy, was developed the Energy Union for diversifying energy sources and for reducing the high dependency of our states from external sources. Another purpose of the European Union in the field of energy is to significantly improve energy efficiency beyond the 2020 target, especially for buildings, and support an ambitious and binding target for this purpose, which will continue the current energy efficiency pathway (European Commission, 2014, p. 7). Along this mandate, European Union insisted on the idea

that the reduction of CO₂ emissions by the year 2030 will protect our planet. Juncker added that “we did not hesitate to defend the Paris Agreement regarding to the climate changes because we want to leave a clear planet to the next generations” (European Commission, 2018, p. 2). Energy imports still remain a problem because of the purchase price.

From the point of economic security, the European Union made some progresses. At the beginning of his mandate, Jean-Claude Juncker proposes a renewable European Union on the basis of an *Agenda for jobs, growth, equity and democratic changes* (European Commissions, 2014). In 2018, the economic situation of the European Union has significantly improved. For 21 consecutive quarters, Europe’s economy is on a sustained growth path. The unemployment situation has improved, with almost 12 million new jobs created since 2014 so far (European Commission, 2018, p. 3). From statistics a problem remains on the youth unemployment rate which has a high level of 14.8%, but despite this fact, it hasn’t been lower than this percent since the year 2000 (European Commission, 2018, p. 3).

The unresolved problem remains the disparities between the regions of states. Growth and competitiveness are different between East and West and from this reason Europe operates multispeed. Growth is greater in the Western Europe and the quality of life is better there than in other parts of Europe. Those disparities still generate conflicts and a considerable number of grievances against the European Union, because citizens accused it of neglecting those issues. Thus this is the way in which it appears a lack of confidence in the European mechanism and this aspect favors the populism phenomenon. Skeptical leader in the European Union’ values take the advantages of these tendencies and they promote an anti-European trend, making the European Union being vulnerable in face of these attitudes.

Regarding the social field of action, the European Union struggled in the last few years with the migrants and the problem of granting asylum to political refugees. Here, the evolution of this problematic is quite critical. There have been setbacks during the parallel negotiations in Brussels, between states and the European Commission. The flow of refugees is only going to increase, the imposed cotes were strongly contested by states and the points were not showing up where you would expect. For some Member States was difficult to achieve this result and for this reason a plea agreement hasn’t been reached. It is the case of Great Britain where those sensitive problems have further embedded the distrust in European institutions. It is well-known the fact that the problem of refugees was one of the facts that caused Brexit.

From the politically point of view, European Union has failed in the negotiation with the United Kingdom. It has reached a kind of threshold tipping point of the relations between the European Union and the United Kingdom because they haven’t found a compromise for the negotiations. The traditional parties have lost their popularities in front of populist ones. Policy failures have further embedded distrust of citizens in traditional parties and in the values of the



European Union. The obvious example is the Brexit Party of Nigel Farage which wins the European Parliament election in Great Britain. Same political figure has succeeded in convincing citizens to vote for a Brexit in the referendum which took place in 2016. So, from this point of view, the European Commission has fallen away in terms of political security. It is true the fact that Jean-Claude Juncker hasn't expected this dramatic evolution although he predicted that policy is a strength point for the European Union security.

Last but not least, from the point of importance is military security. Very considerable progress is being made in this field of action, but it seems that there weren't enough for eradicating this phenomenon. Juncker stressed the idea that "Europe to get off the side-lines of world affairs. Europe can no longer be a spectator or a mere commentator of international events. Europe must be an active player, an architect of tomorrow's world (European Commission, 2018, p. 12).

I left this dimension at the end of our discussion because I consider it being the most important. Although, the European Commission tried to make major leaps forward, the evolution of conflicts was hard to be anticipated correctly. There had happened conflicts that changed the conception about security. The most important achievement in this field was the founding of the Permanent Structured Cooperation during the mandate of President Jean Claude Juncker. He encouraged states to cooperate because he considers that cooperation is the key for the survival of the European Union. He also adds that moving forward together as a Union is the key for all of the scenarios regarding to the future of the European Union (European Commission, 2017, p. 15).

The European Commission proposes a series of actions for completing the NATO mission. One of them is the European Army, a controversial project both sustained by some European states and contested by other states. We have the example of President Emmanuel Macron who sustains this structure because he considers that it would be a plus for the European Union. When he pleaded for defense, he stressed clearly that our objective must be to give Europe the capacity to act autonomously, in complementarity with NATO, adding that the European Defence Union is a necessity for the success of the European Union (European Commission, 2017, p. 7).

What is clear is the fact that security has changed and nowadays its impact on Europe is bigger than it was in the past. Terrorist actions are becoming more frequent due to high extent of technology and dependence on new technologies. Terrorism affects the safety of the population, international system is being overcome to numerous changes and crises (Bosoancă, 2019, p. 6). Europeans need an organization which can protect them and gives them the sense of security. It is less important for citizen which is about NATO or European Army.

At the question *is European Commission responsible for all of the actual deficiencies of the European Union?* President Juncker answers to our question in the final discourse, in 2018, September 12.



I cannot accept that the blame for every failure – and there have been a few – is laid solely at the Commission's door. Our proposals are there for all to see. They need to be adopted and implemented. I will continue to resist all attempts to blame the Commission alone. There are scapegoats to be found in all three institutions – with the fewest in Commission and Parliament (European Commission, 2018, p. 6)

His presumption is right because, it is easy to evaluate the mandate of the European Commission as being unsuccessful, but we can't forget that it is a trilogies of work, and not just the European Commission is responsible for an evolution or a devolution, it's about all of the involved actors. Several times it turns out that the blame for the situation belongs to states because they cannot implement efficiently the European policies and for they reason The Member States are not making progress.

It is clear the fact that the European Commission made some great steps in consolidating their institutions but there were some events that falling confidence among citizens in European values. It will be difficult for the following European Commission to regain the trust of citizens in Europe, but not impossible. The European Union needs to improve its instruments and to be close to their citizens.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we can point out some remarks regarding to President Jean-Claude Juncker discourse and about the evolution of his mandate in the field of security.

First conclusion regarding Jean-Claude Juncker is the fact that his discourse is a resilient one. He has still believed in the force of the European Union to pass over difficulties and he encourages citizens and states to cooperate for a better Europe. Despite the fact that the European Commission recognizes the minuses of their legislative, he is still confident that the European Commission did important steps in the evolution of the European Union.

Secondly, the President of European Commission encourages us to be pro-Europeans because “We are all responsible for the Europe of today. And we must all take responsibility for the Europe of tomorrow” (European Commission, 2018, p. 12). He thinks that the European Union' values are stronger than the anti-European convinces and the only one thing which can help Europe to move forward is the citizens' trustworthiness in the European Union' values.

“As the French philosopher Blaise Pascal said: I like things that go together. In order to stand on its own two feet, Europe must move forward as one. To love Europe, is to love its nations. To love your nation is to love Europe. Patriotism is a virtue. Unchecked nationalism is riddled with both poison and deceit. In short, we must remain true to ourselves” (European Commission, 2018, p. 13).

President Juncker did predict wrongly the evolution of European crisis. He didn't succeed in restoring the citizens' confidence in EU values, even more than



we can say that citizens' confidence in EU has decreased dramatically from year to year. But if we start now to rebuild Europe, we can succeed in restoring the citizens' confidence.

It will be the following European Commission duty to learn from the failures of the actual Juncker's Commission and to consolidate the future speech and actions for a better Europe.

References

- Bantea, E., Banu, I., Blaj, C., Kallós, N., and Trăsnea, O. (1977), *Mica enciclopedie de politologie*, București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Booth, K. (1991), Security and emancipation, *Review of International Studies*, 17, pp. 313-326.
- Bosoancă, I. B. (2019), Challenges and opportunities for European Union in the XXIst century, *CES Working Paper*, 11(1), pp. 1-21.
- Buța, V., Ion, E. and Dinu, M., S. (2007), Religie și securitate, in: *Europa secolului XXI – Glosar de termeni*, București: Editura Universității de Apărare „Carol”.
- Buzan, B. (1991), New Patterns of Global Security, in *The Twenty-first Century, International Affairs*, 67(3), pp. 432-433.
- Buzan, B. (2000), *Popoarele, statele și teama*, Chișinău: Ed. Cartier.
- Clueless political scientist (2017), *Security and Emancipation by Ken Booth — A Summary*, (retrieved from <https://cluelesspoliticalscientist.wordpress.com/2017/10/18/security-and-emancipation-by-ken-booth-a-summary/>).
- Consiliul Uniunii Europene (2009), *Strategia Europeană de Securitate - o Europă sigură într-o lume mai bună*, (retrieved from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/30815/qc7809568roc.pdf>).
- Declarația de deschidere a sesiunii plenare a Parlamentului European (2014), in: *Un nou început pentru Europa: Agenda mea pentru locuri de muncă, creștere, echitate și schimbări democratice Orientări politice pentru viitoarea Comisie Europeană*, (retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/juncker-political-guidelines-speech_ro.pdf).
- European Commission (2014), *A new start for Europe- Opening statement in the European Parliament plenary session*, Press Release, (retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-14-567_en.htm).
- European Commission (2015), *State of the Union 2015: Time for Honesty, Unity and Solidarity*, 9 September 2015, Strasbourg, (retrieved from https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-15-5614_en.htm).
- European Commission (2017), *President Jean-Claude Juncker's State of the Union address 2017*, 13 September 2017, Brussels, (retrieved from https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-17-3165_en.htm).
- European Commission (2017), *White Paper on the Future of Europe – Reflections and scenarios for the EU27 by 2025* (retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/white_paper_on_the_future_of_europe_en.pdf).

- European Commission (2018), *Discursul președintelui Jean-Claude Juncker privind Starea Uniunii în 2018*, 12 Septembrie 2018, Strasbourg (retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/romania/sites/romania/files/docs/soteu2018_discurs_ro.pdf).
- Frunzeti T. (2006), *The security Globalization* (translated from Romanian: *Globalizarea securității*), Bucharest: Military Publishing House.
- Giddens, A. (2000), *The Third Way and its Critics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giegerich, B. and Wallace, W. (2011), *Elaborarea politicilor în Uniunea Europeană*, in: Wallace, H., Pollack, M.A., and Young, A.R., *Elaborarea politicilor în Uniunea europeană*, București: Institutul European din România.
- Herz, J. H. (1950), *Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma*, pp. 157-180.
- Irimia, C.V. (2015), Human security psycho-moral consideration, *Research Institute for Quality of Life*, Brasov: Romanian Academy (retrieved from http://www.afahc.ro/ro/afases/2015/afases_2015/socio/Irimia%20Cristian.pdf).
- Jervis, R. (1978), Cooperation under the Security Dilemma, *World Politics*, 30(2), pp. 167-174.
- Jervis, R. (1978), *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, Princeton: N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Kolodziej, E.A. (2007), *Securitatea și relațiile internaționale*, București: Editura Polirom.
- Nye, J. and Lynn-Jones, S.M. (1988), International Security Studies: A report of a Conference on the State of the Field', *International Security*, 12(4), pp. 5-27.
- Permanent Structured Cooperation (2018), *Depening Defence Cooperation Among EU Member States* (retrieved from https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/pesco_factsheet_november_2018_en_0.pdf).
- Sarcinski, A. (2005), *Dimensiunile nonmilitare ale securității*, București: Editura Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I”.
- Szulecki, F. (2015), *Giving Shape to the Energy Union - Evolution, national expectations and implications for EU energy and climate governance*, Working Paper, Berlin.
- Wolfer, A. (1952), „National Security” as an Ambiguous Symbol, *Political Science Quarterly*, 67(4), pp. 481-502.

