

# **T**he **N**ew **F**ederalist

Magazine of the Young European Federalists

Issue 3/2005



**Federalism:**

*if not now,  
when?  
if not us,  
who?*

# Contents

Editorial, Arielle Rouby	3
<b>Part I: The deadlocked ratification process?</b>	
The French Campaign and it's consequences, Florent Banfi and Ian de Bondt	4
The Dutch say "Nee" to the European Union Constitution, Daniel Schut	5
When the going gets tough, the tough get going, Siri Holland	6
For or against, Vaida Jazepčikaite	7
Austria's ratification - a more silent YES, Peter Stempel	8
The Cypriot Yes- Why we should be worried, Eleni Georgiou	9
<b>Part II: The period of reflection - what next?</b>	
The ratification process is dead, Long live the Constitution, Marko Bucik	10
My vision of JEF, Christian Wenning	11
Is there a future for federalism in Europe? More than ever!, Sandra Fernandes	12
Federalism... if not now, when?, Joan-Marc Simon	13
<b>Part III: Moving Europe</b>	
The bête noir of Europe, Piia Pappinen	14
Is enlargement still possible after the current EU crisis?, Radostina Zhelyazkova and Iva Dincheva	15
Fortress Europe for joint counter terrorist action?, Ecaterina Matcov	16
<b>Part IV: Living Europe</b>	
Cultural Capitals in Europe, George Kipouros	17
<b>Part V: Activity Reports</b>	
Belgium Training days, Belgium, Tilff, Daniela Grech	18
International Summer University Brave New Europe, Slovenia, Ljubljana, Matej Črnjavič	18
<b>Technical Information</b>	
List of JEF-Sections	19
<b>myEurope @home</b>	
Competition	Back

Photograph copyrights belong to the photographers. Some photos are copyright from Allan Siao Ming Withericks' photo library. JEF receives financial support from the Union of European Federalists. The views expressed in this publication do not however reflect those of any institution. This issues cover idea George Kipouros, photograph © European Community, 2005.

## The New Federalist (TNF)

is a publication of JEF-Europe, the Young European Federalists. It is sent to all JEF-Europe sections as well as to international politicians, political parties, governmental and non-governmental organisations and institutions and to members. Opinions expressed in TNF are – except if otherwise stated – the personal opinions of the authors, which are not necessarily the same as those of JEF-Europe or the JEF-Europe Bureau or Board of Editors.

### Editorial Board:

Arielle Rouby (Chief Editor)  
Allan Siao Ming Witherick (Layout Editor)  
Daniela Grech  
Peter Matjašič  
Peter Stempel

### Advertising

If you are interested in reaching out to our thousands of members across more than 30 countries in Europe, then we might be able to help.

Please contact our offices for more details:

JEF-Europe Secretariat      Tel: +32 (0)2 512 0053  
Chaussée de Wavre 214d      Fax: +32 (0)2 626 9501  
B-1050 Brussels              info@jef-europe.net  
Belgium                          www.jef-europe.net

# A word from the Chief Editor

The European integration process has been characterized by many crises, however, the French "non" and the Dutch "nee" to the European Constitution have brought the EU into a severe crisis. The process is now stuck even in a deeper crisis, since at the last European Council in June Heads of States and Governments dramatically failed to agree on an EU budget for the years 2007-2013. Last but not least, Member States nearly failed last October to open the negotiations with Turkey. To sum up, thanks to a scleroses intergovernmental system, the EU has no Constitution, no financial perspectives and nearly no enlargement perspective at the beginning of the 21st century! Therefore it is legitimate to ask whether the integration process is in a deadlock. Is there a way out of this new Eurosclisa?

Five months after the French and Dutch referenda the political class seems to a large extent paralyzed.. The European Council did open a period of reflection, which is closer at the moment to a period of political lethargy rather than a period of debates. Though the Commission did launch its plan for democracy and dialogue, and though the European Parliament is trying to give some input into that period of reflection with the Duff/Voggenhuber report, the wider European public has not yet been reached.

Challenges are ahead of us not only on how to resolve the current EU crisis but also on how we as JEF will tackle them. However I strongly believe that crises are opportunities as they are threats!

## If not now, when?

This situation is a unique opportunity for the federalists to come to the foreground of the political scene. At the moment the EU is lacking political leadership and is seeking answers to this crisis. The reflection phase has not produced any substantial results, or even a substantial debate beyond political rhetoric. The European Union and its Member States cannot afford to ignore the current situation, but neither can we, as federalists. But none of them has the political courage to come up with a concrete plan, none of them will be able

to bring the citizens back to believing in the European project. It will be up to civil society to react and become active. I would go even further; it is up to us, JEF, to fill that gap!

## If not us, who?

The authors of this edition are already taking the floor and expressing their views on the ratification process, on the current crisis and on the possible next step to take. It will be then up to the congress and the new elected Bureau and Federal Committee to take concrete steps and use this period of reflection to put our federalist goals to the foreground and put an end to this current political immobilism in Europe.

## What next?

I am sure that the period of reflection, Turkey's membership to the EU and the financial perspective of the EU will not only be the hot potatoes of the EU but also for JEF and for this magazine in the upcoming months.

This is the last edition of my term as Editor in Chief and therefore I would like to use this opportunity to warmly thank all of you for your support, but in particular I would like to give a special thanks to the writers, to the big support of the secretariat and above all to the extraordinary TNF team which have made this experience for me unique. I would like to give an enormous thank you to Allan Siao Ming Witherick, Daniela Grech, Elina Kiiski, George Kipouros, Jon Worth, Matteo Garavoglia, Peter Bancroft, Peter Matjaši?, and Vaida Jazepcikaite who have been indispensable to the success of TNF over the last two years.

Finally, I would like to wish the best of luck and success to the new TNF team!

**Arielle Rouby**

**Chief Editor**  
JEF Europe

[arielle.rouby@jef-europe.net](mailto:arielle.rouby@jef-europe.net)



## Calendar of Events

### October 2005

- \*23-28 International seminar "Asylum and Immigration in Europe" Starsbourg, France
- \*28-30 Congress of JEF-Europe, Strasbourg, France

### November - December 2005

- \*25 November - 4 December, International Rainbow Seminar, Vienna, Austria

### December 2005

- \*09-11 International Euro Seminar, Germany

### March 2006

- \*19-26 JEF-Europe International Seminar and Federal Committee, Finland

# The French Campaign and its consequences

After a month of debating, the French pronounced themselves against the Constitution after a Campaign that had been altered by an attitude from the No side that amalgamated populism and ideological reflex: the idea of the Polish plumber, ultra-liberalism, suppression of the right of abortion and Turkey, just to mention a few. The only thing that was missing in this debate, on both the yes and no sides, were real political projects.

## Missing a political project

The problem was that this Constitution did not have a clear political project. No concrete tool (like the Euro) or a clear definition of the Europe we want to build through this Constitution. The YES side should have explained why this Constitution was a fundamental step to go on with the European project. We did not find a strong political point to make people answer to the question: "Why should I vote for this Constitution?". Instead, we stayed passive, responding as well as we could to the NO side's arguments.

## To be pro-European ?

Another major problem of this Campaign was the amount of lies pronounced proudly by the so called "pro-Europeans". Actually, the entire political class considered itself pro-European as if the reality were that as soon as one takes part in a debate about Europe, one is necessarily for Europe. On the content, the opinions did not change before and after the campaign, it was just a way to play with words: "I am pro-European but for another Europe". The problem is that everything can be hidden behind the word "pro-European" and today there is no meaning in being pro-European anymore. Exposing our pro-Europeanism is like making the positions of the NO side more

normal. If we want to promote federalism, we need to show and explain federalism and not only pro-Europeanism. After this campaign, the only pertinent division is the one between federalist and nationalist. That's why we need to put forward federalism and not only Europe.

## What should we learn from this failure?

This NO does not mean the end of the federalist project and we will have other fights. However, as in all defeats, we need to understand what we did wrong. The NO campaign had very few means in comparison to the YES one. Nevertheless, our opponents mobilised people and we did not. We did not have the capacity to attack, to gather people, to impress them with our arguments... While the NO side organised meetings with thousand of people,

*"This NO does not mean the end of the federalist project and we will have other fights. However, as in all defeats, we need to understand what we did wrong."*

we were discussing at the University "La Sorbonne" with the French Foreign Affairs Minister... We stayed among YES supporters, putting aside confrontations with the NO side. When polls indicated bad results, we preferred staying with our political friends and did not give space to the populists. Instead, we concentrated ourselves on the undecided, but this let the opponents install themselves and dictate their own rules. We must work, in the next few years, on this issue of mobilisation because although the political project presented by politics is not attractive, we have to explain it to the citizens. Where we failed was in the creation of an enthusiastic response to a federal Europe and this can be achieved mainly by mobilising our members and the civil society. If we do not get this point, the dream of the founding fathers to create a federal Europe will stay a dream of the elites and the actual Europe will be deconstructed step by step by nationalists.



**Florent Banfi**  
Member  
bafflorent@yahoo.fr

JEF France

&



**Ian De Bondt**  
Member  
iandebondt@hotmail.com

# The Dutch say "Nee" to the European Union Constitution

Dear reader, I owe you an apology. In the last edition of The New Federalist I predicted the Dutch Government would accept the EU Constitution, even though I expected the outcome of the referendum to be negative. I believed that the voter turnout would be low enough for the government to safely and legally ignore any result, even if it was a massive 'nee' (No). I was right on the negative vote: 61.6% of all voters who voted turned down the Constitution. I was very wrong on the voter turnout however; that turned out to be a staggering 63%, a turnout never seen before in European elections in the Netherlands.

The reasons for this No were the obvious ones: Some voters just didn't want to have such a complicated document as a constitution. Others used this opportunity to express their common dissatisfaction with the European Union - a Union which makes the Dutch pay a lot without getting a lot out of it, a Union which continuously passes and enforces legislation against the Dutch interests, a Union which is overbearing and way too bureaucratic. And thirdly, many citizens just disagreed with the content of the Constitution.

Those are all legitimate reasons. But what was very interesting in the run-up to the referendum was the role the Dutch Government played in campaigning for the 'Yes'. The 'no'-camps started their campaign early on; the Constitution came under fire from different sides of the political spectrum. Right-winger Geert Wilders attacked it because it was too centralistic while left winger and European politician Marianne Thieme attacked it because it was not centralistic enough, especially when it comes to animal rights.

The Dutch Government responded by being paternalistic. They were on the PR-defensive and did not have an effective strategy. The basic tone of their campaign was: "We are the experts; you the citizen do not know anything about the EU. Just believe us: the Constitution is good". This tactic did not recognize that the Dutch citizens had very legitimate and very substantive concerns about the European Union.

Dutch parliamentarian Frans Timmermans, who participated in the Convention for the Constitution, and

took the initiative to organize the referendum, however, expressed no regret of having had the referendum. He agreed with most Dutch analysts that the massive 'No' was a very valuable lesson, for two reasons:

It was a good lesson for the EU project as such. It showed all of us pro-Europeans that we are moving too fast, and that we need to focus on gaining legitimacy for the EU first, before we attempt anything else. The introduction of the Euro, the accession of ten new countries and the consequences of the internal market were met with great concern by the citizen and these concerns have not been addressed properly. We need to deal with that on an honest basis, re-evaluating what we need and want the European Union to be. In that sense the Dutch No is a good thing. It already led to a change of posture of the Dutch government, being more critical and voicing more of the public concern felt by ordinary citizens all over the EU. This may seem a nuisance at first

*...It was a good lesson for the EU project as such...  
...It was a valuable lesson for the Dutch Government...*

but on the longer term it will lead to a European Union being more legitimate.

Secondly, it was a valuable lesson for the Dutch Government. The Dutch Government

believed itself to have a broad popular mandate and moral majority. It did not: The "Nee" reminded the current coalition that the unrests, which helped spark the rise of the sadly assassinated politician Pim Fortuyn, are still there. It reminded the government that times have changed and that citizens do not buy "believe us, we know what's good for you"-messages anymore. It reminded our prime-minister that democracy is all about the common man and his interests and ideas, not about vague and abstract notions of political justice.

All in all, the Dutch No was a vote of "no confidence" by the citizens. No confidence first of all in the EU constitution and EU politicians, but also no confidence in the current Dutch Government.



The introduction of the Euro...felt by ordinary citizens all over the EU...

**Daniël Schut**

Editor-in-Chief of Newsletter  
JEF Netherlands

daniel.schut@gmail.com



## When the going gets tough, The tough get going!

**L**osing is never fun. Not in games, not in football matches and certainly not in a referendum. This year has been a difficult year for Europe, and it has been a difficult year for those of us who believe in the European dream. But trust me; after coming back after two NO-result referenda in Norway (1972 and 1994), nothing will convince me that we should give up. We might have lost the battle, but we will not lose the war!

2005 has been a challenging year for pro-Europeans in Norway also. In June it was 100 years since Norway declared itself independent from Sweden. Many have tried to use the independence-celebrations as a way to kindle the national ego, and to boost the Norwegian NO-side. The mantra goes "We left one union, why join another?". They argue that the world needs small countries that can operate independently of larger blocks. They are wrong! We cannot use yesterday's solutions to solve tomorrow's problems – simply because it is a different world today than it was in 1905. What we need today is not small countries running around trying to save the world on their own but, on the contrary, strong and solid international cooperations. While the NO-side look hundred years back in time for their solutions, we choose to look hundred years ahead. And our message is clear: Norway belongs in Europe.

For now, however, we have placed ourselves on the outskirts of European policy-making. That does not mean that we are unaffected by what happens in Europe; the results of the referenda in France and the Netherlands have also affected our debate. Not in a good way. We went from a stable majority in favor of joining, to a completely reversed situation. The most recent pole reads 58% against, 42% pro. And the NO-side

is thrilled. Aspiring NO-leaders have one by one stated rather bluntly after the referenda that the "people of Europe have rejected the European Union", as an argument for why also Norwegians should be more sceptic. They cannot see that a NO-vote for the constitution was not necessarily a NO-vote to the European Union. Actually, they refuse to acknowledge that many of those who voted NO, are in favour of MORE Europe, not less.

Furthermore, our strongpoint is that people voted. We have to turn the scepticism around and tell people that the referenda were a result of a functioning European democracy. Large turnouts for the referenda show that people care. Let us then use that, and turn this experience

into something positive. In order to make a better Europe, we have to make people care. This time they started to.

We have to keep fighting, and we will have to spend more

time to get to where we want Europe to be than we hoped for, but let us not put away the dreams. Eleanor Roosevelt said "The future belongs to those who believe in the greatness of their dreams". We have to keep believing in the greatness of our dream, and the future will be ours!

With 58% of the population against EU-membership, and politicians who are keener to keep their government positions than speak about Europe, it seems that Norway is further from the EU than we have been in a long time. But for those of us who believe in Europe, who believe in a democratic, efficient, and united Europe, we neither can, nor will, let anything keep us down. We are the ones that have to speak up when no one else dares to, we are the ones that have to keep the European dream alive when everyone else lets it die, and we are the ones that must show

European cooperation when no one else does.

I am proud to be in JEF. Not because we always get what we want, but because we never stop believing or working for it. Yes, this year is a tough year for all of us, but we will not give up. As the song says; When the going gets tough, the tough get going! WE keep going. Because we know we will be right in the end.

*"We have to turn the scepticism around and tell people that the referenda were a result of a functioning European democracy."*



**Siri Holland**

**Vice-President**  
JEF Norway

siri@jasiden.no

## For or against?

People all around Europe are arguing about whether we need the European Constitution or not.

However, the Baltics say YES to the European Constitution.

The governments of three Baltic States decided not to have a referendum on the Constitution. The official reason was that by the time the referenda for the Accession of the Baltic States were held, the result of the Convention and the prospect of an Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) were already known and voters could take this into account when they had to decide about

Accession. The final decisions on ratifying the treaty have, by now, already been taken by the parliaments of Lithuania and Latvia

and will be taken by the

Estonian parliament in the near future. Although, the Estonian parliament postponed the ratification of the EU Constitution until autumn, officials denied that the delay was influenced by the French and Dutch rejection of the text. Prime Minister Andrus Ansip insisted on the fact that the parliament will vote as planned on the Constitution. "The government has given the text to parliament and lawmakers will take up ratification. [...] Estonia cannot declare the EU constitutional treaty dead", Ansip declared after the EU summit in June 2005.

Latvia ratified the EU Constitution in parliament on the 2nd June 2005 with the Latvian MPs backing it by an overwhelming seventy-one votes to five. At first, the parliament of

Latvia wanted to ratify the treaty as soon as possible so that there would be no time for anyone in Latvia to start protesting against it. Holding a referendum would have also been a bad idea, as the support for the EU is just about 35% at the moment. In this case, the ratification of the treaty most probably would have not been endorsed by the Latvian people. On the other hand, the promotion campaign would have had to be made, but as the previous experience showed, that was not a good practice in Latvia. Finally, it was decided to ratify the European Constitution by parliamentary vote and to do it as soon as possible, so that there would be no objections. However, when the treaty started to be discussed for the first time, the official translation was found to contain many mistakes.

*At first, the parliament of Latvia wanted to ratify the treaty as soon as possible so that there would be no time for anyone in Latvia to start protesting against it.*

Nonetheless, just hours after the French and Dutch had rejected the treaty, it was ratified in Latvia. The process happened smoothly and there was no extraordinary attention given to it. Mass media was not making a lot of noise and the only thing in question seemed to be the fact that it was unacceptable that in the European Commission the interpreters did not translate documents correctly.

Having clear majority (84 votes FOR and just 4 - against) the parliament of Lithuania was the first to ratify the European Constitution and in this case the ratification process raised a lot of discussions in the mass media.

While the leading majority of the parliament described the ratification as a logical and honorable step ahead, the others treated it as an auction of the country or the abandonment of independence.

In the end, Lithuanians said YES just a few days after it was ratified in Rome. As a result, it was argued that the ratification process was rushed and was in contradiction with the principle of democracy, as people had no time to discuss it. Moreover, there were rumours that some parliamentarians had not even read the treaty before they signed it.

On the other hand, however it can also be considered to be a sign that Lithuania is becoming a politically integrated part of a united Europe built on common social values.

Summing up, this article overviews the European Constitution ratification process within the Baltic States. The clear majority of Latvian and Lithuanian governments were saying YES to the European constitution while the ratification results from Estonia are still awaiting. Hence it can be said that the ratification in the Baltic states can be interpreted to be a way to show the willingness to be more integrated in the Union.



Lithuanian Parliament- Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas

**Vaida Jazepčikaite**

Member of the Board  
JEF Lithuania

vaida.jazepcikaite@gmail.com



## Austria's ratification - a more silent Yes

On the 25th May the upper chamber of the Austrian Parliament, the so called "Bundesrat", ratified the EU Constitutional Treaty with 59 out of 62 representatives in favour. This step followed the preceding ratification in the lower chamber, the "Nationalrat", on 11th of May with only one member against.

Austria a strong supporter of the EU Constitution? Austrians in favour of deeper integration of the European Union? A laugh and a half for every Europhile observer of our country in the "heart of Europe". According to latest Eurobarometer polls, Austrians are, after the Brits (of course), the most Euro-sceptic Nation among all Member States. And a survey conducted by the "Austrian Society for European Policy" (ÖGfE) showed that 46% of Austrians did not consider a European Constitution as 'necessary', against 35% who did - another clear indicator of the overall resentment of Austrians against meddling, by the European Union, of what is perceived as Austrian usage and sovereignty.

The decision of Austria's centre-right government to ratify the European Constitution without a referendum - a legally sound solution - found the silent support of all parties in the Austrian parliament, whereas many

not protest against official Austria's position.

As most other EU countries, Austria lacked a genuinely broad and well informed open discussion on the EU constitution carried by the mass media. In an environment of a weakly developed civil society, and an ever-growing (non-political) "infotainment" circus replacing politics, the remaining media attention and political discussion focused instead on domestic events like the discussion of a new

*As most other EU countries, Austria lacked a genuinely broad and well informed open discussion on the EU constitution carried by the mass media.*

Austrian Constitution, and on the EU level on the question of Turkey. Thus marginalised, the topic of the question of ratification never led to a generalised discussion, with the result that official politics and civil society lead two separate discourses in one country, with most of the Austrian public watching in disinterest.

Austria's Federal Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel had supported a single EU-wide referendum. As this did not materialize, he would only agree to a referendum in Austria if all other Member States decided to do so as well.

The Austrian President, Heinz Fischer, concluded the ratification process by signing the ratification document. Interestingly, in an additional note to the document, he wrote down a personal comment as to the ratification, and to the European Constitution 'in order to satisfy the justified call for transparency'. Fischer points out that by the nature of things, the EU constitutional treaty resulting from a compromise, it would not completely satisfy everyone involved. The Constitution was however a 'reasonable compromise', which brings substantial improvements as compared to the present situation. He mentioned in particular the



*Austrian Parliament- Österreichisches Parlament*

binding catalogue of fundamental rights, more power for the European Parliament, a simplification of decisionary processes, and the possibility of a European popular referendum.

Commenting on the situation after the negative referenda in France and the Netherlands, the Austrian president said that these must lead to a process of re-orientation of European policies in several areas, in particular strengthening its social dimension.

If only he would be heard...



**Peter Stempel**

**Member of the Presidium**  
JEF Europe

[peter.stempel@jef-europe.net](mailto:peter.stempel@jef-europe.net)



# The Cypriot Yes

## Why we should be worried

The Constitutional Treaty was the first European issue to occupy the Cypriot political landscape since Cyprus's accession in the 2004 enlargement wave. The ratification process was scheduled for the 30th of June, which gave Cyprus the role of reviving the Constitution, even though the two negative referenda rendered its value symbolic. The "Ecologists" and the "European Party" proposed having a referendum to ensure the participation of the Turkish-Cypriot citizens, who inhabit the North occupied by Turkish armed forces, sending a strong message of solidarity between the two communities. The engagement of the citizens in the process would have improved their low awareness about European matters; e.g. according to Eurobarometer 65% had never heard about the Treaty, 32% did not know much and only 3% knew its content.

In the end the path of parliamentary ratification was chosen, mainly due to constitutional restrictions. The discussion in the parliament has revealed the development of Euroscepticism among the members of the leftwing party AKEL, the party which was the last to consent to the accession of Cyprus to the EU. Apparently the satisfactions of their electoral base and the alignment with the communistic parties of Europe were higher priorities than the facing of the true facts about the economy and the progress of European integration, which is considered to be the desirable strategic environment for the solution of the Cyprus problem.

The AKEL deputies opposed the Constitutional Treaty on the grounds of being "an attempt to institutionalize and deepen the neo-conservative model of capitalism management" and supported that the term "competitive and social market economy is a profound contradiction". A strong argument against was the future loss of every state's Commissioner, which would "deprive small states such as Cyprus accesses to decision-making centres". The most worrying aspect of their analysis, the main argument of Eurosceptics, was the statement that the Constitution "undermines the principal of popular sovereignty" disclosing a dislike of the European unification process as a whole. Considering the fact that it is the biggest party of the coalition in power which gained 34% in the last elections, the future steps of Cyprus in the EU might be endangered.

For the time being, the ministers originating from AKEL have not been following the party's line and stood

in favour of the ratification as well as president Papadopoulos. Cyprus has a presidential system that gives the president, who is also the head of government, wide independence from the party in power, as he is elected directly from the people. Polls in Cyprus indicate the president's high popularity which, combined with his support of the Treaty, formed an obstacle to the spreading of Euroscepticism in the public opinion.

*The lesson learned from the ratification process is that action should be taken for the further informing of the Cypriot society on European issues*

As I have mentioned previously, the EU is seen as a catalyst for the Cyprus problem. Therefore, the Charter of Fundamental Rights was one of the main arguments of the pro-yes parties.

The potential for the shielding of the rights of all the Cypriot citizens is of major significance. Another advantage stressed repeatedly were the attempts to reduce the democratic deficit, e.g. the increased weight of the European Parliament, the Ombudsman and the new role of the national parliaments for the examination of the compliance with the principle of subsidiarity. Furthermore, the much desired increase of the "visibility" of the EU on the international scene was a point appreciated, as the taking of action during international crises would earn credibility for the Union. Also the beneficial results on the economy and the competitiveness of Cypriot products and services were brought up several times.

However I must point out that the frequent references of the pro-yes parties to the scopes and values of the EU was nice as rhetoric but could not convince the citizens. Also, the attempt to present the Treaty as a

panacea concealing all of its disadvantages could not bear the heavy criticism of the pro-no party.

The lesson learned from the ratification process is that action should be taken for the further informing of the Cypriot society on European issues so that every citizen can judge for himself, which policy better serves his interests. Different opinions, even anti-European ones, should be welcome as long as they are the product of well-intentioned consideration and criticism.

**Eleni Georgiou**

Member  
JEF Greece

elenigeorgiou22@yahoo.gr



## The ratification process is dead, Long live the Constitution!

The summer period is always useful to reflect on and look for solutions to problems that have arisen in the first half of the year. This summer was not different. For us federalists the main challenge was to rethink the ratification process that stumbled over two negative results earlier in May and June in France and the Netherlands.

As the Constitution was signed in October 2004 in Rome, the European leaders bravely (or?) decided to set a gamble of 25 national ratifications, subject to national procedures that differ among the numerous Member States. Although including certain weaknesses, the Constitution was widely regarded as a needed step forward in the process of European integration. We federalists stood proudly in the front line of supporters and generously engaged into the YES Campaign.

No matter what the final Act Declaration 30, "on the Ratification of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe", says, the process clearly is in serious trouble. A majority of the citizens in two Member States have said NO to this Constitution and this does make a difference and should make us rethink how the business of ratification was run. Thinking of ratifying unanimously the Constitution in all 25 Member States in times of economic crisis, in times when no political leader in Europe is able to stand up for European ideals, in times when the Lisbon strategy and the financial perspectives of the Union are simply not taken seriously, was a political miscalculation. This much we can say after the summer break.

What are then the implications for the Constitution, you say? Firstly, the need for the institutional reform persists and we need a functioning



**Marko Bucik**

**Executive Bureau Member**  
JEF Europe

[marko.bucik@jef-europe.net](mailto:marko.bucik@jef-europe.net)

Union more than ever. The citizens want to see Europe delivering results, not messy compromises that are difficult to implement and easy to undermine. Secondly,

the EU has to take more responsibilities when dealing with the outer world. An exclusively economic Union, the dream of most Eurosceptics, is not an answer to any of the challenges posed to us by the 21st Century – lack of sufficient energy resources, natural disasters, ageing populations etc. Only good policies can tackle these problems.

Thirdly, part of the NO votes were casted because of over-ambition. The demands of what the EU should be doing have increased, but the EU has not been given the means to deliver.

The text of the Constitution tried to answer some of the questions that the populations have been raising during the ratification process, but surely could not answer all of them. What the Constitution can set is the framework, while policies should be the result of functional democratic procedures. This is where we need to be bold and where we need to continue our fight. Let us not pretend nothing happened. Let us not ignore the rules that have been set at the beginning. The ratification of this Constitution has failed, let us work on the future.

As federalists we believe in a democratic European unity. We believe that the citizens have the right to demand better policies, transparent democratic methods and their political involvement. Thus, let us make sure that we listen to these concerns. Let us learn the lessons from this ratification process and let us prepare the stage for a major victory next time around. We can be confident in our goals and our beliefs – thus supporting the achievements of this Constitution for the democracy in Europe. With our without the text, we reached a new stage in European politics.

We should stay ambitious and be proud of what we have done. We have to stand up for the achievements of this Constitution and work on its future. To paraphrase Moravcsik: "The ratification process is dead, long live the Constitution!"

*...Thinking of ratifying unanimously the Constitution in all 25 Member States in times of economic crisis, in times when no political leader in Europe is able to stand up for European ideals, in times when the Lisbon strategy and the financial perspectives of the Union are simply not taken seriously, was a political miscalculation...  
...The ratification of this Constitution has failed, let us work on the future.*



# My vision of JEF

For more than 50 years JEF has been successfully working towards its vision: a united and federal Europe. With the 2004 historic enlargement our dream of a united continent has come closer. Even with the severe break in the constitutional process we can be sure that the institutional changes written in the Constitution will be the central reference for upcoming reforms. The constitutional, economical and social crisis together with the lack of leadership in the EU are challenges we have to face. JEF has always been a step ahead therefore JEF should not now start to run away!

## Answers and Methods

Having tried to maintain the velocity of the growing and reforming EU we accelerated with our well developed JEF-vision and now experience the backdraft. It is very unfortunate that, as a result, a large part of the European youth has never heard about JEF. JEF is a juvenile elite project, which is now challenged by the expectations of a whole generation. I know those in JEF who consider themselves as a proud part of an intellectual avant-garde. We spoil our energy in EU-science, and our approach of winning the youth for the European Spirit would not be visible if we had not had referenda.

## An Elite for all young europeans

JEF can be a successful project if we use a simple and coherent method: maintain the critical-academic capacity and soberly work on the simple needs of our organisation! The latter is the hardest work but the more important one.

## Maths or Spaghetti?

Yes, we must continue campaigning for the Constitution because it is a deep rooted JEF-Project. In doing this, however, we must not forget the questions of young people. If we have hungry pupils we must give them Spaghetti. At this moment Spaghetti is more important than maths. If we insist on teaching maths instead of cooking spaghetti, they will not learn and we will fail. The new board must not only be able to adapt, reproduce and promote our ideological basis, but also to listen to what the potential audience is interested in.

## An accesible organisation with a clear mission

Our highest priority is to answer questions of our generation and to adapt the federalist discourse to an understandable language in order to win their interest for our organisation. In this field, no organisation is as

competent as we are. Following the new priority we would not only discuss Constitutional affairs, but we do need more effort in leading young people along the European way. The organisation and its events have to be more accessible to interested youngsters without an academic background. Less "Erasmus", more "Leonardo" can be a new motto and method.

## Grass root federalists

For the future it will also be important to strengthen the link between the European and the local level. The work with the people should be at the heart of JEF's work. The European network of people and sections is one of our most valuable assets. We should try to strengthen it by increasing the number of bilateral and multilateral contacts between local, regional and national sections. Some sections have developed a remarkable network that can help other sections – one can organise, the other can finance.

*The new board must not only be able to adapt, reproduce and promote our ideological basis, but also to listen to what the potential audience is interested in.*

## Story, service and growth

We should also be more open to co-operation and contacts from other organisations which fit partly to our aims. Here we should widen the focus also on groups which are not mainly focused on political issues such as educational institutes. Our neutrality in party politics is one of our greatest virtues which we have to preserve. Moreover we have to be much more sensitive in issues which are linked to personal beliefs including religion or partisan conviction. We still have ambitious political aims, but we can offer a forum where these issues can be debated with a real European approach. I am convinced, that we can soon offer a good and new story, a clear and positive vision of the future of Europe. The passion of all the JEFers will help us to tell this story to people in order to develop our organisation and to come closer to the aim of a real European Federation.

process and would rather risk the disapproval of the public, than securing the ratification of the Constitution based on the absolute ignorance of it.

Christian Wenning

President  
JEF Germany

christian.wenning@jef.de



# Is there a future for federalism in Europe? More than ever!

After the two failed referenda in France and the Netherlands, Europe is questioning itself. The French and the Dutch decided to say "NO" to the creation of a European political entity. Europe has indeed overcome a lot of barriers throughout the history of European integration, but today Europe is not only facing a simple obstacle: it is the essence of the European project itself which is put into question.

Scepticism is based in the disability of European leaders to gather their citizens around an overall ideal, even after more than 50 years of integration. What really preoccupied the French and Dutch at the time of the referendum campaign were issues such as unemployment, safety and social justice. Even now, they want solutions from their National Governments, because the EU is still not considered as a reliable instrument and source to solve their problems. It is rather perceived as an external, international and also malfunctioning entity. Since people do not remember the roots of the European project, and as they have not followed the evolution of the construction, they do not understand anymore the *raison d'être* behind the Union. It was first the politicians who asked for an integrated Europe, to avoid more fratricide wars and to gather all the strength of the European nations to face the world's new ambitions. Nonetheless, 50 years later, it yet has not earned the legitimacy demanded by the citizens, mostly because of the lack of transparency, democracy, communication and education of Europe's citizens by the political elite (this elite is partly lacking an understanding for Europe as well).

The comeback of nationalism and populism in Europe is really surprising, as it incarnates issues which supposedly had already been sorted out in the past. However, the people are not to be blamed of such anachronistic confusion. The sole entities with which

people had been solving problems and the only intermediary they have had until today are the Nation states. The European states have not been playing their part in the European construction properly. The responsibility of the political elite has been drifting away, doomed by their national interests and by the use of concepts of the past to maintain European stability in order to hold on to their own reduced powers.

The European project has become too imperative and too indispensable to be put into question again. The establishment, sooner or later, of a European federal state is undeniable. It is the only way to be united and to live together in peace, in political and economic security, and

*The European project has become too imperative and too indispensable to be put into question again.*

*The establishment, sooner or later, of a European federal state is undeniable.*

with social justice to overcome the past conflicts, cultural differences and to deal with the stakes of today. However, the strategy and the reluctance of some irresponsible politicians led to a

complete failure. People will be ready to accept a federal Europe when they know what a federal Europe means for them and when the political elites are willing to step forward.

The example of the Erasmus program is a wonderful initiative, but it needs to be accompanied by progressive



*The current European Parliament- a future home for federalism?*

school programmes to be really effective. Also, the Nation states are funding associations to communicate with and inform the citizens about the advancements of the European project, but these associations alone will never cover a nation-wide population and therefore cannot play the legitimate part of the state. If we analyse the situation, it becomes apparent, that the integration process took a wrong turn

due to a lack of political will. To educate, inform and communicate should become main elements in the European integration process and it is only with this approach we will be able to achieve more participation and enthusiasm of the citizens of Europe, a better understanding for each other, a higher knowledge of the relevance and necessity of this political project and a better vision of how our joint future may look like. Europe would be a political, cultural, social and economical success if the National Governments made the European Federation come true, in order to live in coherence with the demands of our time.



**Sandra Fernades**

Member  
JEF France

sandrafernades@yahoo.fr

# Federalism... if not now, when?

**F**ederalism is an instrument to deal with interests of different entities on an equal footing while applying the principles of solidarity, subsidiarity, freedom, democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights.

In Europe, as all over the world, the interests of Nation states collide with those of supranational bodies in a nonsensical fight which is leading us nowhere.

The age of Empires and Nation states has thus come to an end and while facing phenomena such as terrorism, economic globalisation, global warming, and AIDS, the influence of Nation states in the modelling of world policies is visibly decreasing. They are helpless if they do not manage to integrate into global systems.

The forces shaping the new world and pushing forward policies in our countries are all cross-border ones. Faith-based movements and the world-wide free market economy are leading the globalisation process and are modelling the developments that Nation states cannot repel, but rather have to adapt to – terrorism, financial speculation, birth-control policies, pollution, delocalisation, or social dumping.

A 3rd force, democracy, should be above those driving forces, guaranteeing that the rights and the will of the citizens are represented and respected whilst creating a space of dialogue where cooperation and solidarity could be the rule and not the exception. The consequence of the non-existence of democratic control at an international level is the increasing distrust in democratic institutions that we are observing among the citizens in the past years. National democratic institutions alone cannot generate trust, because they cannot deliver solutions on supranational problems. They will only succeed by integrating into international institutions and promoting active citizenship.

Unfortunately democracy at a supranational level remains a dream. And there we find the dreamers: the federalists!

They believe that democracy should be applied to all levels among equal entities which act in freedom and blah, blah... fools!

There is a far better system: problems with free market-economy? Let the governments meet at WTO and decide...

“Dangerous” countries? Use NATO under UN mandate... otherwise the US army is always ready to intervene in altruistic peacemaking missions...  
Environmental issues? Kyoto works great!...

Hold on a second ... who is the dreamer here?

A) Those who think that we can keep on using international organisations and uni/bi/multilateral agreements to deal with supranational problems?

B) Those who believe that democratic and human rights are universal and need to be reinforced at all levels by accountable and transparent institutions?

We cannot afford to have the most important world players out of democratic control. Agreements between countries always prioritise the national interests and end up in horse-trading manoeuvres and prisoner dilemmas which in the end leave the citizens without effective control on what is happening at the international level.



*Europe- overcoming borders... Schengen to the Euro*

The EU has been a perfect example of how to overcome borders and differences in order to create stability, prosperity and avoid war. Still, we have a long way to go before nationalism can be buried in the past and Europe achieves the Kantian peace.

In Europe and in the world we need democracy and rule of law at all levels. Following the principle of subsidiarity, the citizens should have a say on everything that affects them, including international decisions. Otherwise we risk losing any confidence in democratic institutions.

It is necessary that the citizen understands that Europe is lagging due to the fact of sufficient integration. The solution must be less, but better integration – including the adequate application of the subsidiarity principle - and not a re-nationalisation of policies and policy making just for the sake of it.

Therefore, now more than ever JEF has a role to play. We offer a solution that will turn European citizens into actors deciding about their future at all levels without having to deny any of the rights they already have.

It's time for European federalism; if not now, when?

**Joan Marc Simon**

**Secretary General**  
JEF Europe

[jm.simon@jef-europe.net](mailto:jm.simon@jef-europe.net)



# The bête noir of Europe

As the leaders of Europe place their stakes on the negotiation table over the next financial framework, fuss about competitiveness and growth is rivalling the open ended question on the future enlargement to the Western Balkans. Meanwhile, the stiff leaders keep their purses firmly aside, refusing to see the bête noir on their very own backyard. Though the Balkans is formally outside the EU, leaving it on its own might be truly detrimental. Its isolation is contingent on the failure of drawing EU attention. Catching the eye used to require utmost actions, which shouldn't be the case since the EU has learned its terrible lesson, hasn't it?

## The dispute over the next financial period

The 'big bang' has seemingly introduced a certain enlargement fatigue among the Heads of States. Politicians are not willing to pool their money in such quantities that the common political goal of regional cohesion and mere practical reasoning would outline. The negotiations over the next financial perspective ended up slashing the proposed level for all cohesion policies by 26, 4 billion €. The EU is in the risk of compromising the development done so far, if it neglects reading the signs and adapting its actions to the tides and changes of the political climate in the area.

According to European Stability Initiative (ESI), the most crucial problem is not the amount of financial assistance in general, but the timing in allocating the money, which painfully shows the principles laid down in the Instrument of pre-accession assistance (IPA). IPA implicitly outlines the prospective accession dates for the region to be 2020 in a "realist scenario", which is far behind countries' own expectations. Assistance is divided into five subcategories, and the budget lines allowing countries to adopt tools for managing development funds, are reserved for recognised candidates. For countries without a candidate status, the access is limited to two budget lines. This leaves Serbia & Montenegro (including Kosovo), Bosnia and Albania nibbling the leftovers until 2010.



**Piia Pappinen**

**President**  
JEF Turku, Finland

[ptpapp@utu.fi](mailto:ptpapp@utu.fi)

The tendency to lower the levels of assistance between 2007 and 2009 seems absurdly irrational as the momentum of the Western Balkan countries has come at grasp, all the critical junctures in the sight during 2006 - 2010. On the contrary, the Commission is proposing that the sums channelled to the region at this period of time, should be kept at bay, until the states of the region gain their candidate statuses, expectedly at 2011. In Kosovo, the decline in EU assistance will be particularly steep. Consequently, more absorption capacity is needed in order to make the most out of the diminished assistance. Stronger, but co-operative presence of the EU by Commission representations is needed, instead of ad hoc structures. Logically, the capacities of the countries' own democratic institutions must be bolstered without delay.

## Reform before significant and timely financial assistance is a dead letter

Political conditionality has been the guiding norm in EU's relations towards its neighbours. Yet, it is questionable whether applying conditionality gives the EU the leverage it needs to promote its values in the Balkans. The EU should ask itself whether the

*.. it is questionable whether applying conditionality gives the EU the leverage it needs to promote its values in the Balkans.*

stringent "conditionality before status" approach chosen towards Western Balkans is actually viable. The war-ridden region is clearly not in the same position as the previous incomers, and some positive discrimination should thus be considered in terms of financial aid and conditionality applied to their integration paths.



*"Politicians are not willing to pool their money in such quantities"*

ESI's recommendation on the access to all pre-accession programmes be linked to the signing of SAAs, rather than to formal candidate status, could have far-reaching positive implications, if combined with bolder integration plan. In practice this would mean closing the status issues by autumn 2006, drafting an EU road map for each country of the Balkans and co-ordination of EU and US policies in the region.

Reform without additional contribution from the EU to the Balkans is not the most feasible way of dealing with the state building challenge and stagnant economies. Despite the reflection period the EU should not turn inwards and forget the Western Balkans.

# Is Enlargement still possible after the current EU crisis?

In the aftermath of the French and Dutch referenda the EU is facing one of the most serious crises ever. The No votes can, of course, be attributed to many reasons and factors; one of them being the disappointment with the biggest Enlargement to date only one year after it took place. For these two countries, saying No to the Constitution was a way of saying No to the Enlargement on which the public was not consulted. The voice of the public was so strong that everyone started asking themselves: "Is Enlargement still possible?" The "big" debate is predominantly focused on the case of Turkey and partially on Ukraine. And while it has been discussed by everyone whether these countries are part of Europe or whether they have the same values, three countries seem to be left in the background: Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia. Nobody ever doubted that they are part of Europe, nobody doubted that their people share the same values. And still they are not members of the EU. They certainly feel threatened by such a decisive public NO vote and by the statements made by some European politicians.

However, it wouldn't be fair to blame it all on France and the Netherlands, as they were not the only ones who showed scepticism towards the Enlargement. But they were the only ones who had the guts to say it out loud, or who have been given the chance to do so. (e.g. all polls are showing that the result would have been similar in Germany if there had been a referendum.) The truth is that the whole European public seems to have serious doubts about whether further enlargement is needed at all. On the other hand, Bulgarians, Romanians and Croats feel like they have been betrayed and lied to. And they accuse the EU of setting double standards (not without reason, one must admit). Politicians are confused and don't know what to do. Hence that is why they are not doing anything, or - as they call it - are having a "reflection period". Enlargement which used to be branded a "win-win situation" by both politicians and experts now turned into a "lose-lose" one.

The political elites on both sides failed to communicate the Enlargement appropriately. As federalists we cannot forgive the politicians from the "old Europe", who did not manage to explain well enough to their citizens that Europe needs to be larger and stronger and enlargement is the one necessary step towards security and prosperity for the current EU - and that a certain price has to be paid

if we want to see Europe becoming a global and competitive player.

Not only as federalists but mostly as Bulgarians we also cannot forgive the "new Europe" politicians, who failed to point out both the benefits an EU accession will bring to their citizens, as well as the compromises they will have to make. With deepest regret we should say that the politicians in an Accession country like Bulgaria use the EU as a beautiful slogan to win elections with, but when it comes to implementing unpopular reforms they use the EU as an excuse. This creates a completely wrong vision of the Union for Bulgaria's public, which potentially may cause various negative effects once the country eventually enters the EU.

All this shows that a totally new approach is needed to overcome the current stereotypes and prejudices. The European public has clearly shown their political elites that the old method of artificially forcing the political processes in Europe will no longer be achievable. We - the public - still believe that further enlargement and integration are possible, but only under the condition that both politicians and citizens change their attitudes.

*saying No to the Constitution was a way of saying No to the Enlargement on which the public was not consulted.*



How far does Europe go?...



**Radostina Zhelyazkova**  
President  
radostina\_zhelyazkova@yahoo.com

JEF Bulgaria

&

**Iva Dincheva**  
Secretary General  
iva\_dincheva@yahoo.com



## Fortress Europe for joint counter terrorist action?

Various changes and benefits, such as the free movement of persons or capital, that occurred in the international and European system in the last few decades have made it possible for terrorist groupings to accomplish their atrocious devices. Perhaps, the statesmen and politicians, who first conceived these advantages in the form of increased cooperation between states and of greater large-scale wealth, did not foresee some of the end results that such changes have put in motion.

To this extent, the EU's gradual response to these menaces - the both religiously and politically inspired terrorism - incorporated a more extensive border cooperation, development and harmonization of international legal instruments and review of shipping and aviation security. Nevertheless, one of the core mechanisms at hand was the implementation of an upgraded Action Plan adjusted to deter terrorist recruitment, to endorse a dialogue between religions and to strengthen anti-terrorism forces through mutual aid.

Given that the EU is the world's largest trading block and provider of humanitarian aid, it can play an essential role in highlighting the importance of the economic security. Thus countries that deny any kind of support in the fight against terrorism should be rejected trade and aid agreements. Not to forget to mention the solidarity clause stating that in case of a terrorist attack mutual aid is guaranteed and a terrorist attack against one Member State is viewed as an attack against all EU 25. It is not known if the clause from a dead or still alive EU Constitution will ever come into force, yet this is a big step nonetheless that leads to a higher level of cooperation between member states. In view of the fact that security is so much less incorporated in Europe in comparison to business or transportation networks, the implementation of a 'principle of availability' tool - all the information used by police in one member state should be available without any restriction to all other member states - is seen as a crucial device that brings progress to police's investigation work.

In view of all the measures taken by the European Union to combat the horror campaign, it still faces criticism for being "soft on terrorism" and for lacking military preparation to win this struggle against terror. Mr. de Vries, EU's counter-terrorism coordinator, or the so

called "Mr. Terrorism" responded that Europeans understand the threats from terrorism, but also value economic aid, diplomacy and peace operations in European foreign and security policies. Perhaps this could be the clarification on how to deal with such a menace, more exactly a powerful counterterrorism instrument could be a fusion of military power combined with a diplomatic approach.

The terrorist threat is a versatile problem to which democratic governments have to respond in an intelligent way. The pattern of departure has to be that segment of society, which believes that terrorist actions are justifiable and that terrorism is an acceptable political culture. Actions shouldn't be orientated towards the modification of religious extremist belief systems given that it is practically impossible to alter an inherited culture, religion and set of values of a nation that are prevailing for centuries. The causes of this problem have to be identified and tackled. It is necessary to draw near the sources that feed these horrifying actions and most

*No cause justifies terrorism, but nothing justifies ignoring the causes of terrorism..*

important to determine what is at the base of terrorism, as Javier Solana stated, "No cause justifies terrorism, but nothing justifies ignoring the causes of terrorism".

We must be realistic about what we can and cannot do in defence and how well the EU is equipped to prevail over these hindrances. There is still much to be done: to share law enforcement information, to improve legislation and to work together to enhance border security control are only some of the proceedings that have to be implemented without delay by all EU member states and the rest of the international community, so as to regard Europe as an established fortress against terrorist actions.



*Terrorism doesn't respect borders- and anything can be used...*



**Ecaterina Matcov**

Member  
JEF-Moldova

[ecaterina.matcov@jef-europe.net](mailto:ecaterina.matcov@jef-europe.net)



# European Capitals of Culture

The European City of Culture project, designed to "contribute to bringing the peoples of Europe together", was launched as an initiative of the Greek politician Melina Mercouri by the Council of Ministers on the 13th June 1985. The first European City of Culture was Athens in 1985, while major cities such as Florence, Dublin, Paris, Lisbon and Stockholm have also been awarded the title.

The European Cities of Culture designation was replaced by the European Capital of Culture scheme and host cities have been determined by the Council upon a Commission recommendation, which takes into account the view of a jury comprising seven prominent independent members, each of them experts in the culture sector.

The host cities are challenged to recognize the power of culture and creativity as an engine for regeneration, firing of imagination and as a way of boosting the image of Europe and the European Union. The designation is conceived as a journey to put culture in its European dimension at the heart of the host city. For a whole year the European Cultural Capital presents a programme including highlights of architecture, dance, design, film, literature, music, theatre and visual arts from around Europe.

Millions of visitors are attracted every year by a variety of events and have often embraced the idea of Europe wholeheartedly, while acknowledging the cultural differences and similarities between the peoples of Europe, the energy of differing national characteristics and the poetry of every unique locality within our continent.

However the designation is far from being an entirely successful story.

On the one hand, there have been brilliant examples of how a city can take advantage of the designation showing that cultural transformation goes hand in hand with an urban renaissance, city renewal and physical transformation. Many of the city projects have been inextricably linked to regeneration schemes and waterfront developments; most importantly the idea of cultural understanding, of a Europe united in diversity has been put forward in an indirect way. A recent poll

showed that citizens of Graz, Austria (Capital in 2003) feel much more "European" now and dare regard themselves supporters of the European idea.

On the other hand, the previous lax working framework of the designation in conjunction with the limited funds allocated by the Commission for the planned projects have resulted in Cultural Capital years, whose host citizens are still being taxed for and that

barely benefited the city as a whole or promoted the idea of Europe. The year 2000 has been especially challenging, with thoughts of cancelling the whole project; 10 cities around Europe shared the title resulting in very limited Commission support for each city, while many received little publicity and lack of local support caused cancellations of many events, Europe wide. It has also been argued that cities allocate the financial resources of the designation mainly for infrastructure development while reducing the "culture" and "Europe" part.

Each city has responded to the awarded title in a manner that reveals its own nature, its strengths and challenges, its continuities and moments of redefinition. This year, small scale Cork, Ireland ([www.cork2005.ie](http://www.cork2005.ie)) is striving to cope with the demands of an ambitious program. According to the organizers "the city opens its arms to Europe and Europe speaks to itself through us". Indeed, this year the aspect "European Union" and the European integration process has received a pre-eminent place in the official programme of activities; a highly successful "Enlargement! Bringing the New Europe to Cork" exhibition, displaying the artistic qualities of the 'new' states of the expanded European Union has already attracted record crowds. Next year Patra, Greece will take over, followed by Luxembourg and Sibiu in 2007.

The designation involves the European citizens in sharing and loving the energy of an orchestra of voices – all different, humane, yearning to be heard in the common house we call Europe united.



**George Kipouros**

**Secretary General**  
JEF Greece

[george.kipouros@jef-europe.net](mailto:george.kipouros@jef-europe.net)



## Belgium Training Days

Belgium, Tilff, 12-17 June 2005

The “Belgium Training Days” can definitely be considered as an example of the importance, for JEF-Europe, of training seminars for members who show a strong degree of enthusiasm for JEF and its ideals. In fact, it took a greater effort than usual to organize this seminar, since the original project was supposed to be held in Latvia, but the plans had to change because of unforeseen technical (in the form of financial) difficulties... Nonetheless, after a few days of discussion and brainstorming a solution was found that ensured that not only the Training Days would be held, but that they would also be a great success!

The high costs of accommodation were mitigated by the innovative idea of renting a farmstead in the picturesque town of Tilff, and involving all the participants by creating teams that would help out in the kitchen according to a pre-determined schedule. Through this method they also experienced team-work in practice and were able to bond immediately, thus facilitating also the rest of the training, both in political and in organizational sessions.

All the participants were relatively new members of JEF and were given sessions in creative thinking, project management and financial planning in order to help them in the sustainability of their sections. They were also introduced to the Youth Programme and its assistance to the financing of projects. One session dealt with the world of NGO politics while another offered some very useful

advice on how to deal with the press and gain credibility with the media.

The group used the YES campaign as an example to come up with their own campaign focusing on one particular aspect of the Document, mainly Social Europe, Human Rights and the Environment. All ideas were absolutely great, and creativity was certainly not lacking!

One evening was dedicated to JEF and the participants got a basic but thorough introduction to federalism and its origins, the structure and work of JEF and our objectives for the future of Europe. A lively discussion followed and it was a particularly positive learning experience for us to hear the views of our new members, since they provided very interesting feedback upon various issues which will definitely be taken up in future activities. Thus it can be said that the “Belgium Training Days” was an extremely motivating seminar even for older and more experienced JEFers!



**Daniela Grech**

**Secretariat 2004/2005**  
JEF Europe

[daniela.grech@jef-europe.net](mailto:daniela.grech@jef-europe.net)

## International Summer University Brave New Europe Slovenia, Ljubljana, 3-16 July 2005

The 4th traditional summer university Brave New Europe, organised by JEF Slovenia, was the reason for 36 students from 23 European countries to gather in Ljubljana, all with the aim of learning about the European Union. The theme of this year's edition was “Dinner for 25”, indicating important achievements in the development of the EU in 2004..

The programme, which lasted for almost two weeks, covered a wide range of topics about the European Union – participants had the opportunity to discuss and learn about its history and institutions, its law and its economy. Distinguished lecturers and prominent experts from Austria, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Spain, the UK, USA

and Slovenia provided the participants with a high level of knowledge about European issues. Participants were also given a chance to debate in panel discussions, participate in workshops and experience the working procedures of the European Council by playing their role in a simulation game.

An important part of the programme, however, were the social activities, organised to get to know each other, and to make this summer university become an unforgettable experience – such as the European Night, dance workshop, Concert Night, an excursion to the Karst region and the coast, EuroQuiz, Movie Night and a big farewell boat ride party on the Ljubljanica river, and many more.



**Matej Črnjavič**

**Member**  
JEF Slovenia

[matej.crnjavic@gmail.com](mailto:matej.crnjavic@gmail.com)

According to the response from the participants it is safe to say that this unique project, organised by students for students, is one of the best of its kind. Participants have gained new experiences and learned something new, not only about the European Union, but also about themselves and others.



The Young European Federalists (JEF) is a supranational non-party political youth organisation with over 30,000 young members from 35 European countries. The aim of JEF is to work towards the creation of a European Federation, as a step towards a peaceful, just and democratic world order.

### Build the Europe you want.

The European Union is one of the biggest achievements of the European history, but it is still far from what the European citizens are entitled to expect. A true European Federation is needed to fully achieve democracy, economic prosperity, social justice and environmental protection. With JEF you can have your say on the future of Europe.

### Shape the future you want.

JEF members are involved in many different activities from the international right down to the local level: putting forward the arguments for a European Federation, lobbying governments and decision-makers to support our vision of Europe, raising public awareness of European unification and its importance, promoting federalism, the political thought of "unity in diversity".

JEF-Europe, the supranational level of the organisation, provides its sections with information, publications and support, and provides its members with the ability to become involved in activities such as:

- Transnational campaigns-like the one for a European Constitution and the enlargement of the Union;
- Public events and demonstrations at the important European summits- to show that citizens support federal Europe;
- Seminars on European unification and federalism- allowing young people from all over Europe to meet each other.

JEF is the youth section of the Union of European Federalists and is a member of the International European Movement and the World Federalist Movement.

**AT**

**Junge Europäische Föderalisten Österreich**  
Europazentrum Wien, Fleischmarkt  
19/2/DG2, A-1010, Wien  
[t] +43-1-5333290  
[f] +43-1-5332944/92  
[e] office@jef.at  
[w] http://www.jef.at

**HR**

**JEF-Croatia**  
Pirovec gorjji 4, HR-10000, Zagreb;  
[t] +385 91 5740454  
[e] klement@net.hr  
[w] http://www.jef-croatia.hr

**DK**

**Europaesk Ungdom**  
Bremerholm 6, DK- 1069  
Koebenhavn K  
[t] +45-33-731002  
[f] +45 33 15 54 84  
[e] info@euro.dk  
[w] http://www.euro.dk

**FI**

**JEF - Eurooppalaisen Suomen Nuoret**  
Oikokatu 3, FIN-00170, Helsinki  
[t] +358-9-6811570  
[f] +358-9-68115720  
[e] es@eurooppalaisensuomi.fi  
[w] http://www.eurooppaanuoret.net

**HU**

**Fiatal Eurpai Federalistak Egyuesulete**  
Varkorut 52, 8000, Szekesfehervar  
[t] +36-22-348095  
[e] jefhun@mail.datatrans.hu / info@europeer.hu  
[w] http://www.europeer.hu

**LT**

**Lietuvos Jaunieji Europos Federalisai**  
Baltupio 123-6, LT-2057, Vilnius  
[t] +37052328025  
[f] +37052698723  
[e] ljef@takas.lt  
[w] http://ljef.org

**MD**

**Tinerii Europeni Federalisti**  
Puskin street 33, ap.1A, MD-2012, Chisinau  
[t] +373-2-226649  
[e] youngeuropeans@hotmail.com

**PT**

**Juventude Europea Federalista**  
Urb. Pátio do Pinheiro, 36  
2640 Mafra  
[t] +351-96-3035828  
[e] jefportugal2@yahoo.com  
[w] http://jefportugal.itgo.com/

**CS**

**Mladi evropski federalisti**  
Fruskogorska 12, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia and Montenegro  
[t] +381 21 454 476  
[f] +381 21 444 875

**SE**

**Unga Européer**  
c/o Stein Ramstad Mandolingatan  
29, 42145, Västra Frölunda  
[t] +46-0-31473938 or +46-0-703674765  
[e] president@ungaeuropeer.org  
[w] http://www.ungaeuropeer.org/

**BE**

**Jonge Europese Federalisten België/Jeunes Européens Fédéralistes Belgique**  
63 Avenue d'Auderghem, B-1040  
Bruxelles  
[t] +32 2 231 06 22  
[f] +32 2 280 09 65  
[e] jefbelgium@jef-europe.net  
[w] http://www.mouvement-europeen.be

**CY**

**JEF-Cyprus**  
c/o Mary Polydorou, 108 Athalassas  
Avenue, Dasoupolis, Nicosia  
[t] +357-2-360633  
[f] +357-2-360633

**EE**

**JEF Estonia**  
Mõisavahe 22-15, 50707, Tartu  
[t] +372-55-667935  
[e] annica@ut.ee  
[w] http://www.jef.ee

**DE**

**Junge Europäische Föderalisten - deutsche Sektion**  
Haus der Demokratie und  
Menschenrechte, Greifswalder Str. 4,  
D-10405, Berlin  
[t] +49-30-42809035  
[f] +49-30-42809036  
[e] info@jef.de  
[w] http://www.jef.de

**IT**

**Gioventù Federalista Europea**  
via Poloni 9, 37122 Verona  
[t] +39-045-8032194  
[f] +39-045-8032194  
[e] gfe@mfe.it  
[w] http://www.mfe.it/gfe

**LU**

**Jeunesse Européenne du Luxembourg**  
c/o Gilles Bley, 10 rue des  
Eglantiers, L-1457 Luxembourg  
[t] +352-422750  
[f] +352-422750  
[m] +352-021272774  
[e] gilles.bley@education.lu

**MT**

**JEF Malta**  
Student's House, University of  
Malta, Tal-Qroqq, Msida, MSD 07,  
Malta  
[t] +356 7971 0827  
[e] melvinmizzi@yahoo.co.uk

**PL**

**Mlodzi Europejscy Federalisci**  
ul. Niecala 6/42  
00-098 Warsaw, Poland  
[t] +48 501 454 323  
[e] maciej.tysnicki@247pr.pl

**SI**

**Mladi Evropski Federalisti**  
Cankarjeva 1/II, SLO-1000,  
Ljubljana  
[t] +386-41-883527  
[e] info@jef.si  
[w] http://www.jef.si

**CH**

**YES Young European Swiss**  
P.O. Box 449, CH-3000, Bern 26  
[t] 41 31 3023536  
[f] 41 31 3025682  
[e] yes@europa.ch  
[w] http://www.y-e-s.ch

**BG**

**European Youth Movement - Bulgaria**  
10 Narodno Sabranie Sq., room  
302, 1 000;Sofia  
[t] +359-2-9867982  
[f] +359-2-9872285  
[e] eym@scas.acad.bg  
[w] http://eym.dir.bg

**CZ**

**Young European Federalists - Klub mladych Evropanu**  
Zelezna 18, CZ-10000, Praha  
[t] +420-723-359474  
[e] dneuwirth@seznam.cz  
[w] http://www.federaliste.cz

**FR**

**Les Jeunes Européens-France**  
95, rue de Rennes, F-75006 Paris  
[t] +33-1-45498166  
[f] +33-1-45499661  
[e] president@jeunes-europeens.org  
[w] http://www.jeunes-europeens.org

**GR**

**Neoi Europei Federalistes**  
Akadimias 69, 106 78, Athens  
[t] +302-10-3820980  
[f] +302-10-3820470  
[e] jef-hellas@europe.com

**LV**

**Club "The House"**  
Basteja bulv.14 - 1.st, LV-1050,  
Riga  
[t] +371 7 221658  
[f] +371 7 221658  
[e] birojs@klubsmaja.lv  
[w] http://www.klubsmaja.lv

**MK**

**Mladi Evropski federalisti na Makedonia**  
Blagoj Gjorev 61/2-5, MKD-1400,  
Veles  
[t] +389-70-535734 or +389-2-447647  
[f] +389-43-212450  
[e] info@jef.org.mk  
[w] http://www.jef.org.mk

**NO**

**Europeisk Ungdom**  
Fredensborgvein 6, N-0177, Oslo  
[t] +47-22-993600  
[f] +47-22-993601  
[e] eu@jasiden.no  
[w] http://www.jasiden.no/eu

**RO**

**Tinerii Europeni Romani**  
Alea Sandu Aldea no.4 BL 2, AP.  
1,district 1., Bucharest  
[e] info@jef.ro  
[w] http://www.jef.ro

**ES**

**Juventud Europea Federalista, Movimiento Europeo**  
C/Princesa nº 6 (Viver d'entitats),  
8003, Barcelona  
[t] +34-933-194948  
[f] +34-933-151328  
[e] info@jef-spain.org  
[w] http://www.jef-spain.org

**UK**

**Young European Movement**  
7 Holyrood Street, London SE1 2EL  
[t] +44 20 78818989  
[f] +44 20 78818988  
[e] yem@euromove.org.uk

**Become an activist for European unity and federalism: Join JEF!**



**After the 1st May 2004,  
Europe has changed.**

**The European Union is now made up of:**

- 25 nationalities**
- 20 languages**
- 450 million citizens**

**What can we do to strengthen it?**

**Do you think that Enlargement  
enhances European identity?**



**Express your opinion on  
enlargement and European  
identity through one of these  
competitions**

If you're 17 to 25 years old why not get  
involved and send your entries to:  
[myeurope@europeanmovement.org](mailto:myeurope@europeanmovement.org)



Put pen to paper and voice your opinion on  
enlargement and European identity.

The written works will have a maximum length  
of 3 pages/1000 words.  
Use Times New Roman, font size 12.  
The works must be written in your national lan-  
guage if you are submitting the entry to your  
local European Movement office or in English if  
you are submitting your work to the EMI office.

Using any type of graphic expression, tell us  
what the European enlargement and European  
citizenship means to you.

The art works will have a maximum of A-4 size.  
The entries can be presented in black/white or  
colour.

**The 25 winners will get:**

- A free place in the 'AEGEE Summer University 2006'
- A digital camera and computer courtesy of Hewlett Packard

<http://www.european-movement.org/myeurope/>