SECURITATEA UNIUNII EUROPENE - SOLUȚIONAREA CONFLICTULUI

LEON BEN-NUN Eti,
doctorandă, Academia de Administrare Publică din Moldova,
Israel, eti06011989@gmail.com

Rezumat

Articolul analizează gradul de participare a statelor membre ale UE la primirea solicitanților de azil. Autorul demonstrează pozițiile opuse cu privire la problema imigrației: Germania și Ungaria. Strategiile UE de soluționare a con- flictelor subliniază reformele lente, care sunt susținute de promisiunea de asisten- ță economică pentru a încuraja relocarea persoanelor strămutate și a refugiaților. O astfel de abordare nu permite crearea unei pârghii eficiente asupra conducerii locale pentru a realiza reforme semnificative, fără a menționa promovarea drep- turilor omului și încurajarea oamenilor să nu emigreze.

***Cuvinte cheie**: solicitanți de azil, imigrație, asistență economică, Uniunea Europeană.*

EU SECURITY - CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Abstract

The article examines the degree of participation of EU Member States in the reception of asylum seekers. The author demonstrates two opposite positions on the issue of immigration: Germany and Hungary. The EU's strategies for mana- ging these conflicts highlight slow reforms that are backed by a promise of econo- mic assistance to encourage displaced persons and refugees to resettle. This appro- ach fails to create effective leverages on local leaderships to carry out significant reforms, let alone promote human rights and encourage people not to emigrate.

***Key words:** asylum seekers, immigration, economic assistance, European Union.*

Introduction:

Along with the rise of Eurosceptic parties, the waves of immigration have led to a sharp controversy in the union European regarding the degree of participation of member states in the absorption of asylum seekers.

The two poles of the dispute between European countries over the issue of immigration represented the German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Urban. The first, following her decision, - to absorb hundreds of thousands of immigrants in Germany, and the latter, following the Hungarian government's decision, - to deport about 4,000 asylum seekers a day. Germany, led by Merkel, worked to ensure that the member states in the EU, they will have a mandatory obligation to distribute their applicants equally asylum all over the EU. Italy, France and Greece supported Germany in this policy, other European leaders, however, agreed to a policy of voluntary absorption only.

One of the bases of the dispute between States stemmed from the geographical position of States in relation to the route of arrival of asylum seekers. On one side of the debate were the "gateway States" located on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and, therefore, being the first destination for immigration, and on the other hand, more northwestern states that do not border the arrival route of asylum seekers from Asia and Africa.

The gateway countries and especially Italy and Greece, whose centers of ab- sorption were Loaded to capacity, the other union members demanded an equal distribution of the applicant burden. The shelter is proportional to their size and absorption capacity. Countries, on

the other hand Northwestern Europe was reluctant to accept hundreds of thousands of asylum seekers into their territory, claiming. That absorption should be done on a voluntary basis only. Among other reasons, their position was determined due to the fact that most asylum seekers sought to encrypt to more powerful European countries economically including Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands and Belgium.

One of the causes of tensions between the gate countries and the other countries on the continent is the 'Convention Dublin 'of the European Union. The Convention stipulates that asylum applications must be processed in the country The first to enter into it is the asylum seeker (Gate State). Under the Convention, asylum seekers those moving from the gateway state to other states may be sent back to the state where they registered as part of the so-called "Transfer Dublin». The wave of asylum seekers that plagued Europe has been revealed the weakness of the Dublin Convention and the need to implement a reform that will meet their needs

Of the gate states. A proposal for reform of the Dublin Convention began to take shape in June 2015 when A record number of asylum seekers have arrived in Europe. At the suggestion of the President of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker, the member states will share the burden of absorbing asylum seekers Balanced according to a key based on gross national product, population size, rates Unemployment and the number of asylum seekers previously admitted.

European statesmen have a significant role to play in escalating the refugee crisis on the continent. For many years they have been refusing to take on a leading role in resolving conflicts in Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

Without a change in European strategy regarding world conflicts, the crisis will intensify. The pictures are hard. They show thousands flocking to the barbed wire fences of European countries, standing thirsty and hungry at train stations and the tragedies of those who failed and died on the way to suffocation, drowning or any other way on their way to Europe. This media pressure focuses the discussion around the narrow question relating to the number defined as "foreign refugees" which will be absorbed by European countries and thus ostensibly the problem will be solved.

An analysis of the sources of conflict from which the refugees and displaced persons come indicates that their number will only increase. Whereas a decade ago the number of refugees and displaced persons in the world was estimated at 30 million, today the number is estimated at 60 million people, two-thirds of whom are displaced. Most of these people are in Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa. This number continues to grow rapidly.

There are several explanations for the accelerated increase in the number of refugees and displaced persons in the world. First, the long-standing international efforts to stabilize the conflicts in countries such as Afghanistan, Syria, Congo and Sudan while promoting democratization have not borne fruit. UN body reports indicate that these and other countries are tainted with corruption. State authorities are weak and fail to regularly improve services to residents. In many cases, state institutions use violence against groups of citizens or violence is perpetrated between religious, national, ethnic and tribal groups. The EU's strategies for managing these conflicts highlight slow reforms that are backed by a promise of economic assistance to encourage displaced persons and refugees to resettle. This approach fails to create effective leverages on local leaderships to carry out significant reforms, let alone promote human rights and encourage people not to emigrate. In many cases, the assistance is used by local

leaders for their political purposes and not for the welfare of the residents. A notable example from recent years is the lack of European commitment to rebuild state institutions in Libya following the fall of Gaddafi's regime. Since the great victory in 2011, the violence has continued and today Libya is a divided country where violence has become routine.

Existing humanitarian policy does not reduce the population growth which despite the wars is on the rise on the one hand and leaves millions of people in basic, poor and hopeless living conditions on the other. Examination of reports and studies on refugees and displaced persons reveals that the harsh images in the countries of origin of these people are far more serious than anything revealed so far in the Western media. Many of them were not housed in tent camps. They subsist on a few tens of dollars a month when most of their money goes out on housing. Many do not have access to electricity and water. Children were not integrated into any education system, suffered from malnutrition and poor health.

The lack of a clear horizon for resolving conflicts such as the conflict in Syria alongside the spillover of conflicts to neighboring countries such as Lebanon and Iraq are forcing entire families to choose to risk their lives for hope for a better future in Europe, over static, dangerous lives in large refugee camps. Many criminal entrepreneurs are taking advantage of the growing human pool of displaced persons and refugees in order to make a profit from forging identities, transporting populations, making false promises and more. Finally, the EU's hesitant policy regarding refugees knocking on its gates precisely because of the same liberal-democratic values, obliges it to absorb many and thus signals EU statesmen to millions of others in the world that the risk they take on a trip to Europe pays off.

Europeans seem to be refusing to admit that resolving conflicts in the world is in their strategic interest no less than that of Syrians, Afghans or Sudanese. New strategic thinking, Europe can spawn strategies such as a commitment to dramatically improve refugee camps and thus also facilitate host countries such as Turkey which is currently home to over one and a half million refugees. Another policy is the creation of "safe humanitarian areas" along the borders of Syria, Libya and perhaps even in other places where residents will be protected which will allow them to develop civilian institutions under supervision and per- haps even international management. A third move that can be initiated is to advance the resolution of conflicts while creating economic and military coalitions after which transitional regimes will be established under international auspices if not in the whole arena of the conflict then in parts of it. Should European states continue to play with refugee absorption numbers only, it would be a Sisyphean process that would end up rolling as a heavy burden on the entire continent. Right-wingers claim that these are migrant workers, whose goal is to reach rich countries, strike roots and over the years will threaten the identity of European countries. Leftists claim that these are refugees fleeing battle zones who must in the name of moral considerations assist and absorb them. Both sides are examining the issue from internal considerations. It should be understood that the absorption of tens and even hundreds of thousands of "refugees" in European countries is a Don Quixote war.

The waves of asylum seekers arriving in Europe in 2015-2017 have become a major challenge for the EU. The economic, social and political costs of absorbing asylum seekers led European countries to refuse to share in their absorption burden in most cases, and thus a huge burden fell on the absorption centres of gateway states, which collapsed under it. The success of the EU institutions and its leading companies in formulating an agreed policy which will lead to a fairer participation of the reception of asylum seekers in the EU countries has revealed the lack

of solidarity between the various EU countries, and the weakness of the EU institutions in finding Agreed solution. And the Russian issue of the EU reflects deeper European concerns about it the immunity of the European Union, the transatlantic alliance and the democratic fabric of Continental European countries. These disputes between the member states of the Union have so far been curbed following the systematic extension of sanctions against Russia, they may abate suddenly

Conclusions:

In times of crisis however, the imprint that Russia has left on the social spheres of the countries Europe is expected to be deeper and to influence over time the accepted rules of the period that after the Cold War in all the mourning. Also the issues of economic sanctions, Ukraine's crisis and competition between the United States and Russia for the European energy market plug a wedge (possibly of a temporary nature) between the United States and Europe. If the United States is becoming less and less predictable, so may the EU Be tempted to adopt a softer stance towards Russia. Finally, the different European perspectives on Russia combined with trans-atlanteans on the Russian issue have caused confusion in Brussels' policy towards Russia, and this phenomenon serves Russia's "divide and rule" strategy.

Bibliographical references:

1. https://european-union.europa.eu/index_en
2. https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/stronger-euro- pe-world/eu-solidarity-ukraine_en
3. https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/stronger-eu- rope-world/eu-solidarity-ukraine/eu-assistance-ukraine/eu-stands- ukraine_en
4. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-response-ukraine-in- vasion/
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russia%E2%80%93European_Union_re- lations
6. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/migration-and-asylum/ common-european-asylum-system_en
7. https://www.politicshome.com/news/article/which-european-coun- tries-are-taking-the-most-ukrainian-refugees