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The European continent was eventually re-unified when the enlargement of the European Union occurred on 1st May 2004. After this major step in European history the twenty five member states are now on the eve of two other crucial events: the European Parliament elections and the adoption of the draft Constitutional Treaty.

JEF-Europe launched on 26th April its pan European elections campaign "Give Europe a Face" and this edition shall be an essential tool of this campaign, of OUR campaign.

JEF strongly believe that it is time to Give Europe a Face!

In fact, it is great time to Give Europe first of all a human Face. The European Union shall have two ears and two eyes in order to be able to listen and look at its people. Citizens need to make their voice heard by using their right to vote at the next European Parliament elections. Moreover to Give Europe its democratic legitimacy it is indispensable to draw Europe’s face with a mouth. The EU should not only be listening to its citizens but also speaking with them and for them. Therefore, it is essential that we, JEFers from all over the continent, encourage European citizens to go to the polls between the 10th and 13th June 2004!

It is also time to Give Europe a Constitution! According to the Eurobarometer more than 60% of European citizens since 2001, are willing to have a Constitution for the EU, but so far the heads of States and Governments have failed to reach any agreement on a Constitution. Though EU leaders managed to revive the Constitutional debate at the last European Council summit in March, they only decided to commit themselves to finalise the European Constitution by the next Summit 17-18 June. However, does it not make more sense to put forward the deadline of the adoption of this Constitution to the European elections? Having a Constitution for the EU is already a big achievement, but adopting it before the European Parliament elections would be an even bigger step. Indeed it would ensure that that the EP campaign would be a true pan European one and therefore it would also contribute to foster the democratic face of our European Union.

Last but not least, I hope, to Give The New Federalist a new breath in the two coming years! Since I have been elected at the last Federal Committee in Barcelona to the Editor in Chief I would like to thank all of you for giving me this new challenge within JEF-Europe. I won’t be alone in the next two years and I am very pleased to introduce you my team of The New Federalist: Lorenzo Cirio (JEF-Italie), Matteo Garavoglia (YFU-UK), Elina Kilski (JEF-Finland), Heikki Kontinen (JEF-Finland), Peter Matjašić (JEF-Slovenia), Jana Novotna (JEF-Czech Republic), Allan Siao Ming Witherick (YFU-UK) and Maciej Tysnicki (JEF-PL).

I and my team will do our best to Give The New Federalist the face you want to give it as this is YOUR magazine!
It was one year ago, when - having the Convention in progress- Young European Federalists, together with all the other pro-European organisations, were lobbying and campaigning for a European Constitution. When on 20 June 2003 in Thessaloniki, Valéry Giscard D’Estaing handed the Draft Constitution over to the Greek Presidency, most of us thought that the time of the adoption of the First European Constitution had come.

One year later, we are still at the same point, waiting for another Summit to adopt the text that the Convention produced.

One might wonder: Having in mind that this is not exactly the Constitution we wanted, does the adoption really make any difference for the federalist movement?

The only answer is YES, it definitely does!

Though, legally speaking, it is just another treaty - that has to be accepted, as always, unanimously by the member states- it is a significant step forward and a victory for the federal allies.

The symbolism of the name and the incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights plus the simplification of the existed texts and the introduction of a legal personality for the EU are already positive points and have to be taken into account.

The most important of all is the political message the adoption is carrying: "Us, the Europeans, have made the decision to go forward all together, in a more co-operative, more functional model of governance".

However, This message would be much stronger if the Constitution would be adopted before the European elections. All the political parties - pro or anti Europeans- keep asking for more involvement of the citizens in the European integration process and especially in the decision making procedure. This is the chance for them to prove what they really mean, by putting pressure on the governments and the national parties in order to move the date of the Summit BEFORE the European elections.

I am firstly addressing to the political parties and not to the governments as they are a broader family which includes both government and opposition parties in all member states. It is also because the future and the power of the European political parties will be very much affected by the role they will manage to play in these European elections and the adoption of the Constitution. Bringing the date of the Summit before the 13th of June can be proved a useful tool to underline the pan-European dimension of the elections and the involvement of the European parties in it.

Concerning the Governments and the European leaders it is essential to gain back some of their credibility they lost at the European Council summit in Brussels last December, when they failed to reach an agreement on a European Constitution-though all are claiming for "the shake of Europe". By adopting the Constitution before the European elections they would send a signal to the citizens that despite the difficulties and the contradictions of national interests, the
European Project must and will go on. As a consequence, the political debate during the pre-election period would focus on the European issues, the future of Europe and not on the national agendas, as usual. Constitution would be then on the first line of this debate.

In the end taking the decision before the European elections has to do with democracy and transparency. People have the right to know when going to vote for which E.U. they are voting for. Even for psychological reasons, since nothing will actually change within this mandate of the parliament, citizens will have one more motive to participate in the elections, if they feel that they can demonstrate their support or rejection to the adopted Constitutional text.

As you noticed so far I mentioned nothing about a possible rejection of the Constitution, significant modification or even a new postpone of the decision. Such a development can provoke chaos in the Union and will destabilise the integration process.

The same applies for the ratification of the Constitution by the national parliaments or referenda. Governments must ensure - especially in the second case - that all sectors involved will understand the importance of that ratification and the consequences of a possible negative vote. Particularly those countries opposing the idea of a multi-speed Europe should be the first to support the ratification of the Constitution to use it as a framework for the future in which all members will be bounded.

JEF, together with all its pro-European allies, gave a huge struggle for years in demanding for a European Constitution. The citizens broadly supported this demand, the European Parliament and the European Commission as well. The time has now come for the Council to take the final decision and prove whether it can be considered as a European Institution or has clearly become an Intergovernmental Forum far away from the European public opinion, from the European Citizens.

Many other issues still remain open to be debated. The draft Constitution - even if it stays unchanged - is not a federal one, for instance the way amendments can be made is not yet clear etc. But this is not the case today. These issues can be discussed after the 13th of June, after the European elections. Today, all our efforts, all our attention must be focused on the adoption of the text the Convention produced, unchanged as we always asked for. Now it is time to make our voice loud and clear: Give Europe a Constitution!

The draft Constitution - even if it stays unchanged- is not a federal one...

Nikos Lambropoulos
Vice President
JEF- Europe

nikos.lambropoulos@jef-europe.net
The next few weeks are going to be exceptionally important for the future:

Ten new member states are entering the EU;
The European Parliament elections are taking place; and most likely
The first European Constitution will be adopted before the end of June.

In general, I think that MEPs are getting better and that the European Parliament is getting stronger. We think that this is a good process and good direction for the EP. In the future we hope that the EP will have more legislative power including the power of initiatives.

Already for these elections, we have got, and started, a pan European campaign. For this EP campaign almost all countries are involved, except the countries where we do not have a member organisation. For this campaign we set up common website (www.commonfuture.org), and we have got as well common leaflets. On the website you can see some kind of a "cookbook", where our candidates are sharing their favourite recipes. Furthermore, we are co-operating with the "adult" Greens and they in return are supporting us.

In general, we think it is very good that thanks to the Constitution the legislation of the EU will be clearer and therefore will make things easier for citizens to understand. Nonetheless, I think that the Constitution is still too long, as it is too long to be read by all citizens and I believe that a paper that everyone can read would be better. Concerning the policy section in the Constitution, we think that it is concentrating too much on trade and on the common internal markets. At the same time we are regretting that the environmental issues have not been taken sufficiently into account in this draft Constitutional treaty.

We would like to have a look at the final version of the draft of Constitution, but for now, we are not campaigning for the adoption of the Constitution before the 13 June 2004.

We agree with this principle and also have already put forward our candidate ...

I would like to see the face of Europe diverse and with a positive look into future. A smiling face of Europe!

**Question 1:** How do you see the role of the European Parliament vis à vis other EU institutions - now and in the future?

**Question 2:** This is the first EP election after the enlargement, in this perspective, are you helping the new Member States in their election campaigns? What are your hopes for a true pan European EP campaign in the EU -25?

**Question 3:** What are your opinions about the draft Constitution? What are its strengths and weaknesses?

**Question 4:** JEF's main campaign objective at the moment is to push the Head of States and Government to the adoption of the European Constitution before the 13 June 2004. Is your party campaigning for the adoption of the draft Constitution?

**Question 5:** JEF supports very much the article 26 of the draft Constitution, which gives the European Parliament the power to elect the president of the European Commission. Do you agree with this principle and if yes, will you already use this EP campaign to push forward a candidate of your party?

**Question 6:** As our EP campaign is based on the idea to "Give Europe A Face", I would like to ask you, which face you would like to give to the EU?
1. The European Parliament is more or less the talking shop of the European Union. The so-called representatives of the citizens are supposed to take important decisions, but instead they issue these wonderful reports, which can be taken into consideration afterwards by those who are taking the decision in the EU.

LYMEC would like to see the EP as the first and the main legislative chamber. The co-decision procedure should be applied in the European Parliament without any exceptions. We would like to see the Council becoming the second legislative chamber in the EU, and the European Commission becoming the main executive institution.

2. Although LYMEC is a pan-European organization, we are quite subsidiary. This means that the European Parliament campaign is national level rather than on the European level. When it comes to our member organizations in Eastern Europe we are trying to bring the debate on the European institutions into their organizations. We have offered them training courses on how to implement and make stronger the political message for their national European campaigns. Also, specifically for the young candidates to the EP elections, we have tried to give them some instruments, some arguments to bring to their own local campaigns, in order to strengthen their political message. In order to give a message which goes beyond national interest, something that goes into the European specific issues.

3. From the perspective of how the Convention has been working, we are quite satisfied. When it comes to the text, we are afraid, that the text gives a too broad and general framework, even if it’s strengthen some good points, such as the fact that the president of the Commission, for instance, or gives the European Parliament a bigger role, when it comes to the elections of president of the Commission or the simplification of the current structure and the legislative acts. We are concerned that there is a proposal to empower the Council and to make the Council to become the main institution by the creation of this president. We do not believe that the Council, must be such an institution and from that perspective, we are a little bit afraid that this Constitution is not properly reflecting the federal spirit that we would like to see in the Constitution.

4. LYMEC clearly favours a president of the Commission that is elected by the European Parliament, not upon a proposal of the European Council, but upon the proposal made by different European political movements in the EP. Yes, we do believe that the European political parties should nominate their candidates. But if you ask me specifically for the next EP elections, I would say that even if we would like to see much stronger political system, when it comes to the parties, we do not face this reality right now and it will be difficult for us to nominate one person for the European Commission. Nevertheless, I think that there are two potential candidates, Pat Cox current President of the EP and Guy Verhofstadt, prime minister of Belgium.

5. LYMEC clearly said “yes, we want the Constitution” and yes, we want the Constitution already in December. So, yes we want next European summit in Brussels in June to adopt European Constitution and we would like to see all the countries ratifying the Constitution in the autumn. I know that there are different discussions on how this should be ratified and of course this is up to the member states, but I would like to stress that for us it is very important that no single country has the power to veto the Constitution once the European Council approves it. That means, that the Constitution should go on, regardless one or two countries can have some problems to ratification.

6. What we would like to see and the way how we would like Europe to become and the face Europe to get, is the face of the people. Not the face of one person and absolutely not the face of the president of the European Council if this president might be in the future a permanent person. Not even the president of the European Commission, but the face of the people, of the 440 million people that are going to participate in this new project.
The European Parliament is the institution, that represents the European citizens. This means that we have to strengthen its role, give MEPs more possibilities to decide about the policies and we have to transfer the power in the decision making process from the Council and other institutions to the European Parliament. We believe that the European Parliament should in the future more co-operate with national Parliaments.

Yes, indeed, these will be the first European elections after enlargement. First of all, you can see that the interest concerning the EP elections in the new member states is much bigger than in the old member states. ECOSY is helping the new members in their EP campaign by giving them some practical good advises, by focusing on policies, which are more effective and more interesting for new member states. So our role as an umbrella organization of the European Socialist Youth is to strengthen the presence of our national organisations in every country. We elaborate for this purpose a common campaign, which will be translated in different languages in order to be more effective and more understandable by all the people. Moreover, we adopted last February, after six months of debates a manifesto, which is the basic political guideline of our organisation. This common political base, which has been accepted by all our organisations, is now our common base of everyday work for the EP campaign.

I prefer to start from the weaknesses in order to go to the strengths. One of the strength of the Constitution is that it is a document, which has cohesion and which can be understood by the majority of the people. For the first time the EU is abandoning its legal documents, which were hard to be understood by citizens.

We believe that the new Constitution, which results from the work of the Convention represents a big change for the European Union. It was the first time that the European Parliament, national parliaments, but also lobby groups and NGO's participated in the treaty revision process. The Youth Convention was also a first, as it was the first time that young people were involved in such a process. So, this experiment was a very good one and we hope that there will be many others in the future.

For ECOSY the main weakness of the Constitution is that no article in the Constitution clearly states that we have, as Europeans, to preserve the social model of Europe. Europe's social model is precious and unique in the world, and the growth of Europe was mainly because of its social model. Furthermore ECOSY is regretting that, the Constitution does not refer to public services, which are for us so essential for any social cohesion. Indeed, there is no article, which clearly state that public services have to be accessible for everybody. ECOSY also believe that the veto right has to be eliminated, that the EP role's in the decision making process has to be increased. Lastly ECOSY hopes that the Constitution will give the European Union a true Common Foreign and Security Policy, as the EU, if it wants to become a global player for instance in Iraq, urgently needs one.

It is not only JEF who campaigns for the adoption of the Constitution also ECOSY campaigns for it. These elections are different from the previous EP elections, because people also have to take into consideration the Constitution. In fact, the campaign of this European elections are about the future development of the EU, which is directly connected to the Constitution of the EU. We strongly campaign for the Constitution and we fully support the adoption of the Constitution before the EP elections.

Unfortunately, a lot of national interests are still alive in some national parties, which makes it hard to agree on a common candidate for the President of the European Commission. ECOSY really want to go on with one name, but this will be really difficult to occur, as I am afraid that we would not be able to overcome some national interests within our organisation.

I want to see Europe with a more social and more federal face!
In my opinion it is clear that the decision-making process in the EU needs to be more transparent and more democratic. The European Parliament is the only EU-institution which is legitimised by direct elections. Therefore EP elections are a great opportunity to inspire discussion of the EU in general during the campaign and remind the EU-citizens about the important function of the European Parliament. In my opinion EP should gain more power in decision-making process, it should become the truly organ of the Union - together with reformed Council as a second chamber. The EP should be given the right of initiative for legislation to be exercised by one parliamentary groups or 10 % of the MEP’s.

In order to keep the EU efficient after enlargement it is essential that the Constitution would be adopted as soon as possible. YEPP has reacted immediately submitting resolution to express the importance of the needed, rapidly completed reforms which could be completed in the framework of the Constitution. We will work on that in the future as well.

I do agree with the fact that the EP would elect the president of the Commission and confirm the Commissioners individually. The Parliament should also have the power to remove individual Commissioners. There is many good names inside EPP family to become the president of the Commission, and I’m also convinced that EPP will stay the biggest political party in the EP and therefore will have a strong say when nominating the president.

I would like to give the European Union a face, which continues to promote the idea of being a European with common goals and values. My Europe is dedicated to promote peace, economical prosperity and equality of every man and women. My Europe respects the plurality of the political and cultural factors in its Member states. My Europe gives an emphasis for its young Europeans to work together for even better and unified future of the European Union.

The full versions of these interviews can be found at: www.giveeuropeaface.net
Along with more information on our campaign for the future of Europe, to Give Europe A Face!
What is Poland famous for? Pure vodka, fatty food, John Paul II, Lech Walesa and maybe a few other things. In the European Union Poland is famous for its "Nice or die" slogan. I am afraid that this is all our political leaders can think about now.

When the first non-communist government led by Tadeusz Mazowiecki stated in 1990 that Poland aimed to be a part of the West - which meant NATO and the European Union - everyone looked at him as they usually look at mentally disordered people shouting in the middle of streets. Russian tanks still had bases on Polish soil, Warsaw's Treaty Organisation was doing quite well and Polish international trade still depended a lot on the soviet rubel.

For fourteen years the two aims I mentioned above were dreams of Polish political class and these dreams were also shared by Polish society (which does not happen too often here). We became members of NATO almost six years ago and we are becoming members of the EU now.

With those two achievements Polish international policy lost its vision and its strategic goals as they were fulfilled. The problem is that Polish politicians do not know what to do next.

Probably everyone who shows at least minimal interest in politics and European issues knows the "Nice or die" slogan created by the leader of the Polish conservatives and the most likely next prime minister of the government Jan Rokita - that was all that was remembered from the debate on the Constitution and the Polish contribution to it.

Everyone in Poland was quite strucked by the impact this easy to remember slogan made on our politicians. It received warm welcome from everyone except the small liberal party. Nationalists, Socialist, Social Democrats, Conservatives - all united as had not happened many times before. The effect? The Polish government had a substantial impact on the failure of the Brussels Summit.

What were the arguments given by Rokita or Polish prime minister Leszek Miller? There were many but the main one - never said straight forward, but understood correctly by the masses - was that Poland cannot have significantly less votes than Germany or France, that we cannot give up our independence.

It does show one significant change in Polish international policy, the change which will be visible in upcoming European Elections: lacking of easy to understand aim and of European ideas among Polish political class pushes politicians to play on low-scaled arguments based on nationalism, historical sentiments and popular emotions.

Polish representation in the European Parliament will be one of the weakest and most destructive we have ever seen in this institution. Polish media and public opinion is not prepared to start today a serious debate on European issues. There is a niche for our - JEF - presence in Poland. We can be the ones who will start the debate and lead it - first among young political leaders, than among their older colleagues and by them in the society.
This year is going to be extraordinary for the Czech Republic. On May 1st the country will join the European Union and the goal "Back to Europe!" raised in the revolutionary times of the late eighties will be accomplished. One of the first signs of change is going to be the first Czech elections to the European Parliament.

Over thirty parties and movements are engaged in the elections, which become a completely new factor in Czech politics. It is expected that the outcome will reflect the current domestic positions of the strongest parties, but no one can predict who will be chosen for the European Parliament and no surprises can be excluded.

How does the current situation look like? The strongest governmental party, the Social Democrats, is deeply divided and tossed about by inner conflicts. Maybe due to this they are stressing in their campaign mainly the strength of the European Social Democrats, which they are going to join, and their pro-European character.

Also the Christian Democrats, named Czech People's Party, show their close relation to the European People's Party (EPP). Unlike the Social Democrats who are busy with internal conflicts, they are promoting loudly their traditional topics like abortion prohibition, hardening of the drug policy or zero tolerance of crime.

The leader of the Czech Communist's candidate list, Miloslav Ransdorf, is one of the few party members who agrees to the Czech' EU accession. But his charisma might not be sufficient to pull the party's electorate to the poll. Communist voters have systematically been led by their representatives to a negative attitude about the EU. Now they have little reason to engage in voting for a European institution.

Personal charisma rather than party background might be the decisive factor in these elections. A good example could be the former foreign minister Jozef Zieleniec, who is running for the Regional European Democrats. Jan Zahradil would be a remarkable personality on the side of the Civic Democrats (ODS). His sharp euro scepticism could discourage many ODS voters, even though they are in general pro-European (80% in favour of the EU), and contradicting Mr. Zahradil’s opinions.

The election debate turns mostly to domestic issues. Governmental and opposition parties are concerned with strengthening their positions and see the polls as an opportunity to improve their power within the Czech Republic. The pan-European issues are second in the row, but this situation is no Czech peculiarity and can be observed in most European countries. The election is also overshadowed by the EU accession itself. This historical moment logically absorbs the very debate about European issues as well as domestic ones.

The Club of the Young Europeans (JEF-CZ) promotes knowledge about the European Union and its institutions for years. The latest big educational and informational action took place from May 16 on in Boskovice Castle near Brno: An international seminar and an attached conference, involving high representatives of Czech and European politics. The topic of those activities was evident - the elections to the European Parliament.
Finally Tony Blair made it clear: a referendum will take place in the UK. Trouble is, nobody knows what the question to be voted on will be. Whatever the phrasing of the referendum, consequences for the Union as well as for the United Kingdom itself will be far reaching.

One can wonder why the cabinet has decided to hold a referendum on a topic which the government is not legally bound to bring to the direct scrutiny of the people. Indirect democracy clearly seemed a safer option for the most pro-European government Britain has ever had. Hence, why this decision? Either the Prime Minister has gone mad, the government is aware of facts unknown to the public or a big surprise is in store.

Acknowledging the fact that Mr. Blair might have gone insane a long time ago and that cabinets spin the public on a daily basis, one can only view the "surprise option" as the politically most viable course. This would not consist in calling a referendum where Britons would be asked to vote in favour or against the draft Constitutional Treaty. Rather the question posed would be if Britain is to play a full and pro-active role in the European enterprise by accepting both the Constitutional Treaty and the Euro or if it is to withdraw from the Union. This option carries enormous political risks. In case of defeat the government would be forced to step down, the UK will have to radically redefine its role in relation to the Union and Tony Blair would be politically dead. But a great potential is at hand as well. In case of victory the Prime Minister would make it in history books, Britain would be once and for all positively engaged in the European enterprise and the Union would be immensely strengthened as a whole.

Whatever the outcome of the referendum, a number of advantages would emerge nevertheless: the UK would politically move on from an issue that has haunted its political establishment for the last two generations, the rest of the Union could further develop along federalist lines without being hostage of minority rule and democratic principles would have been upheld for both Britons and their fellow Europeans. A referendum styled along these lines is not only the clearest and most democratic the government might put to the people, but also the only one that Mr. Blair can ever hope to win.

Before starting to campaign we have only one last query to address: what is the question?
Allan Siao Ming Witherick

Give Europe a Local Face
Give Europe a Local Face

Democracy

All words which we hope are linked together in the public mind. Sadly this is often not the case. Europe is seen as distant, its powers stolen from their “rightful owners”. Where in the UK national elections attract a higher level of turn out, the last European elections were dismal. Held a short time after the local elections their importance seemed lost to voters.

The Iraq war, the rise of the far right, potential referendums on the Euro and proposed constitution have all helped to bring the issues to the forefront in peoples minds. People are finally looking out across the water and realising that it effects them. Cheap flights and more holidaymakers using the Euro are all bringing it home in a way that politics never could. It seems that the issues which might act to divide us, are also the ones which bring it to the publics attention.

Despite silence, in it’s penultimate hour the Constitution suddenly gained interest as it was spurned by governments. Those who fear a loss of “Britain” in an amalgamation of states protesting loud and hard. Recently it was announced that Britain WILL have a referendum on the constitution, battle lines are already being drawn.

Yet what has this meant on the ground? For the campaigner in local government, for the people who will work to get those sometimes distant seeming MEPs elected.

For me it has provoked many new angles.

In the UK one of the primary tools for electioneering are local newsletters. These are used to flaunt local campaigns, as well as a handful of national topical issues. Normally.

The European aspect, which will mean this years local elections are delayed to the European Election day June 10th, is changing the entire field.

Andrew Duff is my local MEP. Fears of lower turn outs, loss of voters to smaller fringe parties and anti-Europe sentiment are all helping to set an agenda which has brought Europe closer to home.

Our articles are featuring our local candidate and number two on the list, a local Councillor.

Where once we tried to push our parliamentary candidates, the name checks now include our European stars.

But it’s also the type of article which has changed.

A country which sees itself as often closer to the USA, needs to have some of the Euro-myths forcefully dispelled. The media seem loath to do it, so who else will?

So next time you see a local politician campaigning ask them- do they care about Europe? It might not always win votes- but then that’s not what Europe is about. Make sure that they tell people what the media chooses not to.

“\nIt seems that the issues which might act to divide us, are also the ones which bring it to the publics attention.\n”

Representation

Europe

The Pound... at least until a referendum...

It seems that the issues which might act to divide us, are also the ones which bring it to the publics attention.
According to a recently published Eurobarometer survey, participation in the sixth direct elections of the European Parliament this year is expected to fall under a third. If this expectation becomes reality, it would be the continuation of the ever bigger decline of voters turnout, which fell from 63 percent in the first direct elections in 1979 to 43 percent in the last one, five years ago and highlight the fact that the turnout at European Parliament elections has been declining at the very time when its power has been increasing. Against an expected high turnout in the acceding countries, the figures forecast an all time low of 26 percent and so put a damper on enthusiast.

While one might always reflect on the meaning of the trend of low voters turnout and abstentions in general, my aim is to focus on the question of how the turnout in the EP-elections could be increased and what consequences a low or a high turnout would have for the legitimacy and the future of the European Parliament.

First of all I would like to raise the question if a high turnout would necessarily be a sign for more integration, public awareness and democracy on the European level. Due to the fact that there are not only 'pro-European' parties which are running for the elections in almost every member country, parties that are against further integration or even opposed to the whole system, we will have to differentiate and look at the actual results that the elections bring. It will make a big difference for the actual turnout in the several member countries if the European elections are held together with sub-national elections, if they take place on a working day or not, on the density of poll stations, the media coverage and the priority given by the political class.

Even though the conservatives are expected to win again the majority of seats, a major percentage of 'eurosceptics' represented in the next EP would be reason enough for the intergovernmentalists to rub their hands and make it harder for every federalist to argue in favour of a strengthening of the EP. As research shows, the success of any campaign of political mobilisation depends highly on the capacity of neutral information about the political system and the ability to receive and respond to political messages and appeals.

Therefore we should not only encourage people to vote but also to actually having a look at the party programs and information brochures and presenting them the meaningful choices between parties and candidates. It should be our aim to diminish the information deficit and to convince the people of the need for a strong pro European sign by addressing their underlying attitudes towards European integration and the European Union itself. Finally we don't have to be shy to present our aims and arguments that we all believe in.
What has motivated the small JEF Section of Hamburg to push for the establishment of a sister group in Ireland for the last six years? It all started back in 1998 when a few members of JEF Hamburg formed a loose bond with an Irish youth group. This group finally decided to establish itself as "JEF Éire (JEF of Ireland and Northern Ireland)", but with one small yet decisive string attached: all members had to be Catholic. This would have imposed a severe limitation especially on potential Northern Irish membership. After all, 60% of the population there is non-Catholic. This clear-cut case of exclusion stood (and still stands) in contradiction to the JEF’s principle of being open to everyone who supports our aims, regardless of party or confession. Therefore a section limited to the Republic of Ireland did not come about, and eventually our contact with the original Irish youth group broke off.

Nonetheless, here at the Section Hamburg the Ireland idea continued to gain appeal. We imagine that an Irish JEF Section, made up of young people of all confessions and from both parts of the country, brought together by a common belief in European unity, could contribute something to the difficult peace process. After all, the European Union is nothing more or less than the institutionalization of peace - not only between France and Germany, but all of Europe.

Since the year 2000, we have been seeking to establish contact with suitable and willing Irish youth groups. Furthermore, we promote the Ireland idea in JEF meetings at the local, state, and federal levels. Following the negative outcome of Ireland's referendum on the Treaty of Nice, we submitted a formal proposal at the national JEF Congress of 2001. In the same year, we had an opportunity to work with the Hamburg-based group "Irland2000.de," which culminated in an exchange event in Hamburg in which Catholic boys and Protestant girls from Northern Ireland were brought together with young Germans in a relaxed atmosphere. Especially the Irish participants were impressed by the experience of talking and having fun together. Even a few couples were formed, some of which last to this day.

We are firmly convinced that the formation of a JEF Section Ireland, most likely based in Dublin, would not only benefit the JEF and the European cause as a whole, but also the Irish peace process. At present, our hopes lie with our JEF Hamburg members and friends in Belfast and Dublin, who are doing their utmost there. We maintain a steady flow of communication and knowledge with them, as well as with other scattered groups.

While the enlargement of the European Union is taking place these weeks, we should also take care of the existing countries that haven’t had a chance to build up a JEF section yet.

More Information on the situation in Ireland: www.jef-hamburg.de

We imagined that an Irish JEF Section, made up of young people of all confessions and from both parts of the country, brought together by a common belief in European unity, could contribute something to the difficult peace process.
How many centers of Europe do we have?

For decades after the Second World War most of the West Europeans saw the Iron Curtain as the border of the continent of Europe and all the countries lying on the other side of the dividing line were considered belonging to the Eastern Europe. For a long time Greece and Finland were seen as Western European countries while Slovenia and Czech Republic - which lie hundreds of kilometers to the west of Athens and Helsinki - were considered as part of the Eastern bloc. Now we are moving one of the largest steps towards the united Europe and this wall and division between West and East states in terms of political regimes (democratic - post-communist) no longer exists.

To its credit French National Geographic Institute determined in 1989 that a small hill some 20 km north from the city center of the capital of Lithuania, Vilnius, is the factual geographical center of Europe. Taking the Azores as the westernmost point of the continent, the Canary Islands as the furthest south, Spitsbergen as the northernmost tip and the Ural mountains as the furthest east, French researchers said to forget Berlin, Brussels of Vienna - the real center of Europe is far more East than ever imagined.

At least five Central and Eastern European countries - Lithuania (Purnuskes), Ukraine (Dilove), Slovakia (Kremnica), Belarus (north-eastern part of the country), and Poland (Sochowola) - claim to host the geographic centre of Europe on their territory. For these countries, such claims are more than mere trivia. They are an economic, as well as symbolic, way to show that they are just as European as their Western neighbours. Geographers in Minsk recently announced that the centre of Europe is in northeast Belarus. Belarus thus becomes the latest Eastern or Central European state to lay claim to the honour of being the geographic centre of Europe.

The debates on the Eastern borders of Europe will really become heated after 2007 when Bulgaria and Romania join the EU and will strive to answer the age-old question whether Turkey and Russia are more European or more Asian countries. People think that Europe ends at the borders of Russia. Politically - yes, but geographically half or Russia is indeed in Europe. Therefore the answer on where the Eastern borders of Europe lie should be answered having both geographical facts and European values taken in to account. The answer is definite that with the political shift of borders of Europe the geographical lines will have to be redefined as well. However the question remains based on the account - do we want to define a geographical or political center of Europe (European Union)?
Imagine Peace and Prosperity in the Mediterranean

Steven Attard

John Lennon once wrote, “Imagine all the people living life in peace. You may say I’m a dreamer, but I’m not the only one. I hope someday you’ll join us, and the world will live as one.”

The world has long experienced periods of intense conflicts, but also peaceful periods in which cooperation was enhanced. Even though the Mediterranean region is linked to Europe though close historical ties and its contribution to a European identity, the Mediterranean remains as diverse in its cultures as it is in its political challenges.

The challenge rests in reciprocal mistrust in the region that the social, economic and cultural differences between the two shores has generated under great influence by the region’s past colonialism.

How can the Mediterranean become a stable and prosperous region? What peaceful resolution can be found? What is JEF Europe's resolve on the issue?

Friendly relations need to be built in the Mediterranean region, based on UN principles such as the respect for human rights, minorities, and gender equality. In times of conflict, international law must be respected.

A new era of co-operation has dawned. The exchanging of experiences among countries in the Euro Mediterranean region needs to keep up with its momentum. The region must make use of its common past to start a renewed process of exchange views between all neighbours. Europe must contribute to this process especially regarding its experiences in terms of regional integration and conflict resolution through multilateral means.

JEF Europe gives its support to the 1995 initiative known as the "Barcelona Process" and its further developments. The agreements have led to the reinforcement of regional co-operation between EU and Mediterranean countries with the financial support of the EC’s MEDA program.

The Barcelona Process is thus far a positive step in the development of a new way of managing relations in the region.

Nevertheless, a lot of improvements are still to be made in this framework in order to make the cooperation go beyond the economic field. The significant challenges are twofold.

The EU needs to ensure the implementation of its decisions in order to fix the credibility problem of the Barcelona Process.

Additionally, the Barcelona Process needs to become more visible among the EU and EURO-MED partners’ citizens as this has been lacking significantly in the past.

Public institutions, including EU institutions, EU member states' and other countries' institutions, have a decisive role in the achievement of all these goals. In addition, and beyond the institutional sphere, civil society also must get involved in the struggle. Prejudices need to be rid from the region. The co-operation must work, and all European citizens are responsible for joining the Mediterranean together as one, in peace.

For as Robert Louis Stevenson once said, "Don't judge each day by the harvest you reap, but by the seeds you plant."

A new era of co-operation has dawned, and Europe must contribute to this process...

Steven Attard
Member of the Federal Committee, President JEF-Malta
steve@socratxt.com
It has been almost ten years since the Barcelona Euro-Mediterranean conference, in which 27 States took part - 15 from the European Union and 12 from the Mediterranean. The Euro-Mediterranean partnership is undoubtedly an event that hallmarked the end of the century: it did not hide its -very-high ambitions, but the concrete results fall short of the hopes expressed at the time by the sponsors of this global initiative and by the diverse expectancies expressed by civil societies on both shores of the Mediterranean. Uncertainties, obstructions, the slenderness of some of the commitments included in this process can all be mostly explained by the fact that Europe is actually neither a homogenous polity, nor a unified military power.

Nevertheless, this process enabled the setting up of a regular dialogue between the partners, in order to strengthen security and stability in the region, and to build an area of "shared prosperity". Multilateral cooperation tends to become more customary than the bilateral approaches that long used to be sustained by "special and privileged" relationships between former occupiers and colonies.

Generally, the ambitions carried by the Barcelona process are becoming more and more justified for the Euro-Mediterranean area.

All European countries acknowledge the strategic importance of Mediterranean countries and the need to integrate the region in a global and geo-strategic vision. An economic and trade giant such as Europe, which accepted a huge effort to integrate East-European countries, will also have to help North Africa.

The building of this area of "shared prosperity" will require that major structural reforms be carried out in Mediterranean economies. With the 2010 prospect of having a free-trade area, tariffs dismantling and total market liberalisation, it is still difficult to imagine how North-African economies will manage, despite much encouraging results in the last few years, to be competitive, integrate in a complementary market and produce wealth so that they secure a stable and sustainable growth.

This fear is all the more justified since the free-trade area has obviously been imagined to operate under the rules determined by European countries: it will at first only concern manufactured goods, i.e. a sector in which Southern-shore countries are not competitive and which excludes agricultural products.

As far as modernisation and growth on the Southern shore are concerned, there is much to fear in the free-trade area, which by 2010 runs the risk of having the same effect on integration in the world market as programmes of structural adjustment, especially since South-South co-operation is almost non-existent. Trade flows between southern countries have very slightly stepped up from their starting level (1995): they only amount to 6% of the overall Euro-Mediterranean trade. Association agreements only enable vertical exchanges (North-South).

In our view, Europe should rather help and support horizontal integration (South-South) with important efforts, for the boosting up of the free movement of goods and of capital in the region will develop markets big enough to attract European investments and guarantee their profitability.

In this spirit, would it not be necessary to think over the concept of free trade area and...
turn it into a genuine "common market" open to all products - included agricultural ones - if the aim really is to build up a fair, balanced and sincere co-operation?

The weakness of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership lies in the marked primacy of its political and economic content, at the expense of the cultural, human and social side of things. This situation appears very clearly in the association agreements. It can be easily noted that, over the course of their history, the populations on each side of the Mediterranean have never been as distant from one another: the North have no or scant idea of the South's way of life and living conditions. On the opposite, the South knows far too well, thanks to satellite TV, the progress enjoyed a few nautical miles away from their problems and poverty. This gap is getting deeper and deeper. It will keep on doing so if people are refused the freedom enjoyed by goods (free movement). To change this, a reorientation of the process is long overdue: it can be achieved by arguing for a change in the "hierarchy of priorities", by encouraging the active involvement of the civil society in all Barcelona processes and actions, by associating as many social actors as possible to the setting up of programmes and to decision-making, by defending the idea of a Mediterranean Parliament and a Mediterranean Investment Bank to secure a more efficient Euro-Mediterranean co-operation. Finally, and however much paradoxical this may be, a very important point: the third part of the Barcelona process has been the most beneficial for never before had Southern governments consulted or bothered to associate NGOs, social actors, young people and women to consultation and decision-making. A new system of governance is settling in North-Africa - this is one of the fundamental achievements of the Barcelona process.

One of the criticisms to be raised about Barcelona is indeed its far too wide-ranging scope of intervention, going much beyond what it is effectively up to. The ambition to set up a Euro-Mediterranean Peace Pact will actually never come true because of the quagmire peace-process in the Middle-East and the anti-peace criminal policy carried out by Sharon's government, unfairly supported by the USA. Europe, like the other members of the quartet, is unable to impose the road map. No step forward towards the drafting of a Peace and Security Charter in the Mediterranean can be imagined as long as this conflict will linger. We have to accept that the Middle East conflict will only reach a solution when the Israeli and Palestinian sides accept to live side by side and are moved by a genuine desire of peace.

Should we thus condemn or give up the Euro-Mediterranean partnership?

To protect Barcelona's achievements and enhance the values of forthcoming actions, a pragmatic and realist approach would be to concentrate all our efforts towards the three Maghreb countries (Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco). Carrying on with Barcelona is for our region more than a hope, for it is everyone's determination that will turn tomorrow's challenges into a reality: an area of peace and security for all.

In our view, Europe should rather help and support horizontal integration

Bank to secure a more efficient Euro-Mediterranean co-operation. Finally, and however much paradoxical this may be, a very important point: the third part of the Barcelona process has been the most beneficial for never before had Southern governments consulted or bothered to associate NGOs, social actors, young people and women to consultation and decision-making. A new system of governance is settling in North-Africa - this is one of the

Carrying on with Barcelona is for our region more than a hope, for it is everyone's determination that will turn tomorrow's challenges into a reality: an area of peace and security for all.
**Brezovica, Kosova Seminar, 26-29 February, 2004**

"EU Enlargement: Importance of regional youth cooperation"

Isak Gllogovci

More than 35 people from Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia and Kosova met at the international seminar "EU Enlargement: Importance of regional youth cooperation", in Brezovica, Kosova, from the 26th to the 29th of February.

During the 3 days work, delegates discovered youth’s role in the strengthening of the region's civil society. They met with officials from Kosova and activists from Albania, Serbia and Montenegro to debate problems faced by the Balkans. Their work was beneficial in creating youth networks, new friendships and in elaborating ideas for future activities.

Some of the topics discussed were:
- "Overwhelming the ethnic distinctions, implications in the process of the integration" by Albin KURTI (Kosova Action Network) and Filip PAVLOVIC (Fractal), Belgrade.
- "Kosova’s perspective towards European Integration", with Venera Hajrullahu, Prime Minister’s office.
- "Youth Cooperation: forms and propagation of activities" by Erion VELIAJ - "MJAFT"

Barcelona, Spain Seminar, 21-28 March 2004

"Overcoming North-South divisions - An approach to the Euro-Mediterranean co-operation"

Albert Padrós

Gabriel G. Márquez once said "We don’t expect anything from the 21st century. The 21st century is who expects all from us". And that’s the main reason why it is important to get involved in JEF and its activities.

This time, the Barcelona seminar hasn’t disappointed us either. More than 60 people from all over Europe and the Mediterranean attended this seminar that lasted five busy days.

The first session reminded us of the marginalisation of the region after EU’s 5th enlargement, the persisting problems in Southern Mediterranean (e.g. autocratic regimes) and the on-going conflicts that still threaten the region.

Then we went on to speak about the Middle-East conflict. A structuralist professor presented an historical overview, while the Palestinians and the Israelis provided passionate explanations of their realities, which showed the fear that the conflict had brought into their lives.

We also had a great session about the inter-religious dialog and interesting working groups on the issue of Turkey in the wonderful garden of the hostel.

The traditional international evening and the rest of the activities we took part in this week have not only helped us discuss the past, present and future of the EuroMed region, but also live all together and learn a lot from people that live so far and in such different ways. Furthermore, participants from other organisation gave us the incentives to work harder politically in order to build a better world. Yes, as Ramon Llull said, “justice will provide peace, but also efforts”.
From 2nd to 4th of April, a seminar on European elections, organized by JEF-France with the participation of JEF-Germany, JEF-Italy and the Spinelli Institute, took place in Paris. During the seminar we concentrated on two themes: "The role of the European elections in the constitutional process" and "How European are the agendas of European parties?". In two panels Pervench Berès (MEP from the Socialist Party), Jean-Louis Bourlanges (MEP from the Popular Party), Anna Lurhmann (German MP from the Greens) and Alfonso Iozzo (President of the Spinelli Institute) expressed their views on the topic.

In a street action led around a market 103 people approved JEF's appeal on the European constitution. Thus, one week after the FC, JEF's campaign to support the rapid adoption of the Constitution has been launched effectively.

In the conclusion of the seminar we called for an effective campaign all around Europe to support the adoption of the Constitution on the basis of the Barcelona resolution, in the short time we have until June. The campaign should consist of street actions using the appeal, which can be later used for lobbying purposes at national and European level - something that has already started in Italy, in Germany and in France.

Lastly, we also expressed the need for JEF to start thinking about our actions after the Constitution is adopted. For instance, article 46 of the Constitution on the citizens' legislative initiative could be used as a great tool for the progress of a federal Europe.

From the 13th until the 18th of April, JEF Denmark in co-operation with SILBA, JEF Latvia, JEF Lithuania and the European Movement in Belarus organised a Spring Seminar: "Training and Co-operation for young Belarussians".

The seminar took place in Brest. The official part of the seminar were lectures on the freedom of speech, public speaking, EU and its institutions etc. One of the most interesting things was the simulation game, were they had to simulate a Parliament of one "made up" country agreeing the budget for the upcoming year. For the participants from Belarus, it was a great opportunity to experience, how a parliament in a democratic country works. Eurovision song contest, theatre evenings, energisers, workshops - all the methods that we used were quite unknown by the participants. Most of them said that for the first time in their lives they didn't feel as students and we weren't seen by them as teachers. "I loved the atmosphere and the relationships between the organisers and the participants, everyone got along as friends" said one of the participants from Belarus.

Sometimes I felt myself as if I was a rock standing in the middle of the river, which in a way has the same flow, but two sides - West and East. At that point I tried "to build a bridge" between the two sides, which was not one of the easiest tasks to do, because of the different mentalities that each side had. That is the same type of bridge that is being built nowadays between the 10 acceding countries and the EU. But will Belarus ever get the chance to walk on this bridge?

For the organisers the seminar outcome seemed to be successful, nevertheless we kept on asking ourselves "why aren't we still being thrown out of the country?"

Some may say we were playing with the fire. While "Men in Black", "Pappa Kids", "Black Volgas" were around us, we tried to give and share, we tried to break the stereotypes, we tried to co-operate, whether we succeeded - that's for other people to judge.

After spending one week in Belarus, we might complain about salty water, radioactive food, cold showers and the police at every corner, but we left being happy to breathe the air of freedom in our home countries. Left - leaving the people living in "that world, that isn't ours". Yes, you might find places in the new member states where the standards of living are not much higher. But the biggest difference is not in the standard of living - people in Europe have the possibilities of influencing the changes in their countries, but no one knows when people in Belarus will...
So now what?
You’ve read the magazine. Visited a few
websites. Listened to the debates.

The Constitution never happened.
Does that mean that it’s all over?
No where near!

While not the success that many had
hoped, the Constitution is still very
much an issue and will continue to be
long after the dust of the most recent
enlargement of Europe has settled.

With European Elections on the
horizon as well, it is more important
than ever that young people are
encouraged to vote. 2004 is a year
of opportunity and one which might
be recorded in history as the “European
Year”. It remains to be seen
whether it will be a good year.

During the European Youth
Convention in 2002 we were
criticised by the Euro-Sceptics
for having the same ideals,
the same dreams, as our parents and
forefathers 50 years earlier.

Does that make them any less valid?

“Give Europe a Face”

“Give Europe a Face – Give it a President!” is
one of JEF’s demands. We ask for a President of the
European Union which is democratically legitimized to gain
the respect of the European citizens.

“Give Europe a Face - Give it a Democracy!” seeks to increase awareness of the
European Parliament elections and encourage young
people to vote. The role of the EP becomes more and more
important in the institutional framework of the EU - it is
necessary that people’s awareness of it’s power is raised.

“Give Europe a Face – Give it a
Constitution!” explains why a European Constitution is a
positive step towards the creation of a democratic and
effective European Union. The European people needs a
coherent and understandable text to identify who is
responsible for what in Europe.

“Give Europe a Face” includes a range of different
activities, building together a coherent paneuropean
project framework: the “Give Europe a Face” action, local
events, organised directly by our local partners, a multi-
lingual and disabled-compatible website (www.yes-to-
europe.net) and e-mail information bulletin and the
international youth gathering “Give Europe a Face”. 

Don’t forget that JEF-Europe has other useful
websites online including:
http://www.jef-europe.net/infopool/
http://www.constitutional-convention.net/
So what are you waiting for?
Do you want to support JEF not only morally but also financially?

Of course running an activity from the size of the new Convention project “Give Europe a Face” involves a lot of expenses. Thus we would be very grateful for every donation.

You can make a donation by bank transfer to:

Name of account holder: JEUNESSE EUROPEENNE FEDERALISTE
Name of the bank: FORTIS BANQUE
Name of branch: AGENCE SCHUHMAN
Address of the bank: Rue Archimède 21
              1000 Bruxelles, Belgium
Bank/branch code: 001
Bank account number: 001-1128794-81
BIC code: GEBABEBB (swift code)
IBAN: BE36 0011 1287 9481

Or if you prefer, you can send a cheque, accompanied with the form below to:

JEF-Europe
Chaussée de Wavre 214d
B-1050 Bruxelles

If you wish your friends and colleagues to receive The New Federalist, do not hesitate to send us their addresses, and we will send them a free copy of the next edition!

Call for Contributions

Enjoyed this edition of The New Federalist? Or maybe you think that you could do better?

Well now’s your chance! If you think that you could write a suitable article then get in contact with the Editors! Every issue we try to include a range of articles from across Europe and covering a wide range of topics, but all of them are written by people just like you.

They range in size from 250 words for a very short report to a thousand for a two page feature. Articles with suitable quality photographs are especially welcome.

Help to make The New Federalist YOUR Magazine.

Calendar of Events

MAY
* 1, Accession day, border actions organised by JEF sections
* 9, Europe Day
* 1-9, UEF/JEF Europe Day Campaign Week
* 15-22, JEF International seminar, Boskovice Czech Republic
* 20-23, JEF-UEF Conference in Prague on the European elections

JUNE
* 10-13, European elections
* 24-27, Seminar at the Marienberg Europe-House (co-organised by UEF) on the outcome of European elections
* 20-25, JEF International Seminar “enGENDERing Europe”, Norway

JULY
* 4-17, Summer University “Brave New Europe”, JEF SLO, Slovenia

AUGUST
* 8-14, JEF @ World Youth Festival, Barcelona
* 8-16, International Seminar “New Europe – Human Rights Issue in the New Neighbouring countries of the EU”, JEF Moldova, Chisinau

SEPTEMBER
* Ventotene seminar, Italy
* Balkan Training days

OCTOBER/NOVEMBER
* 24-1, JEF International seminar and FC, Oostende, Belgium

If you wish your friends and colleagues to receive The New Federalist, do not hesitate to send us their addresses, and we will send them a free copy of the next edition!
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 for the establishment 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. A true European Federation is needed to ensure 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 carry out the following actions on the national, regional and local levels: 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 offers its members the following activities: 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 support of 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 member of the International European Movement and the World Federalist Movement.

Become an activist for European unity and federalism! Join JEF.

Full contact details of national and local sections of JEF: www.jef-europe.net/contact