

**Proposals on Europe's Future
project, method, agenda**



This document is the result of a debate in the European Movement regarding Europe's future, and on this same debate is based the "Covenant for Italy within the European Union: Decalogue for a united, supportive, democratic Europe, an instrument for peace in a globalized world", in view of the European elections which will take place from May 23rd to May 26th of 2019.

The starting point was the belief that European Institutions and national Governments have only proposed fragmentary and temporary solutions, which are inadequate to drive Europe out of the crisis we are facing; we believe this is the cause for the rise of Euroskepticism throughout the EU; however, going back to national sovereignty would be merely a dangerous illusion, and the only alternative is based on more integration in all those areas where national initiatives are insufficient.

It is, first and foremost, necessary to guarantee public goods to the European citizens, in order to promote equal rights and opportunities, hospitality, security, inclusion, and the respect of diversities, thus developing a model for European democracy, coherent with European values that must be respected by all Member States and Candidate Countries.

This could be accomplished by applying the fundamental principles of the rule of law, sanctioning, with no ambiguity, those in violation of such principles; safeguarding cultural diversities; ensuring the right to security and shared prosperity; using financial resources to benefit citizens; reducing inequalities and creating the foundations for a European welfare; welcoming those who have suffered violations of their human dignity; and pursuing the objective of sustainable development.

We believe, as does President Mattarella, that without a constituent phase and a deep reform of the European system "*we risk a lethal, unsustainable paralysis*". It is with this firm belief that we end our considerations with a proposal on the method and agenda necessary to go from the EU to a Federal Community, going back to the future envisioned by those who, during the night of democracy, offered an alternative to conflict between Sovereign States.

Rome, February 14th, 2018

Covenant for participatory and grassroots democracy in the EU

Decalogue for a united and democratic Europe inclusive: an instrument for peace in a globalized world

1. ensure the "Rule of Law": supremacy of law, right to have rights, non-discrimination, separation of powers, sanctions against the abuse of power – to complete the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, respecting Fundamental Rights and democratic principles;
2. preserve and enhance cultural diversity, starting from cities and regions, within the framework of a multilevel identity, which characterizes the European model, since it is at local level that cohesion and integration succeed or fail;
3. guarantee the right to asylum of and the hospitality to those who flee war, political persecution, starvation, natural disasters, and land grabbing, in the framework of a true foreign and inclusive policy engaging all the Member States and local communities; renew and enhance the cooperation policy with the countries on the Mediterranean rim and Africa, including a European Plan of Investments, based on public/private partnerships; govern migratory flows through supranational measures and instruments;
4. guarantee the right to external security, through the progressive integration of national military instruments for peace keeping and peace building, a common foreign policy and the establishment of a European peace corps; guarantee the right to internal security by reinforcing the fight against transnational organized crime, corruption and terrorism, laying the foundation for a European criminal law, reinforcing the powers of the European Public Prosecutor, and creating a common Intelligence Agency, with full respect for the prerogatives of the EP and national parliaments;
5. give the EMU an economic government based on democratic political institutions: overcoming the distinction between supranational monetary policy, intergovernmental economic policies, and national social policies, respecting the principle that the Euro is the single currency of the entire Union, with the obligation for all Member States to adopt it and creating the political and financial instruments necessary to ensure a shared prosperity;
6. adopt a long-term budget with a five-year term, to be adapted yearly according to short term necessities, based on a fiscal capacity independent from national budgets with truly own resources, strengthened by loans and mortgages to guarantee long-term, innovative investments, and provided with the amount necessary to provide citizens with public goods of European dimension;
7. adopt more effective measures to promote the convergence between the Member States, reduce inequalities between regions and between citizens with a strong European Cohesion Policy, and create a European Welfare, with a full and binding implementation of the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights adopted in Goteborg, creating the conditions for a renewed social dialogue, the characterizing element of economic democracy;
8. make the EU, and its industrial, technological, and scientific policies a model for ecological transition, fully implementing the Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the United Nations in 2015, and the Paris Agreements signed in 2016;
9. create a true European federal citizenship, as an added value to national citizenship, provided with an autonomous core of individual and collective political, civic, cultural, economic and social Rights, strengthened by the subscription to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and to the Reviewed European Social Charter signed in Turin, in a first significant step forward with the introduction of transnational lists for the election of the EP, with due respect for gender equality;
10. start a constituent phase for a united, inclusive and democratic Europe, through the election in the spring of 2019, on the occasion of the EP renewal, among the countries and the peoples that will wish to do so, of a "Congress" with the mandate to draw up the Fundamental Law for a future federal Community, democratically approved by means of a pan-European referendum.

FOREWORD

The European construction should be restarted, sooner than advocated in the proposals by European Institutions. Proposals such as The Five Presidents' Report of June 22, 2015, that pushed the completion of EMU back to 2025, or in indications by national governments, many of whom have excluded a possible revision of the Treaties.

In reading the European Commission's White Paper on Europe's Future, presented on March 1, 2017 the European construction appears at present to be shut down. The Paper presents five scenarios for a "Europe at 27" by 2025, without making the Commission's choice clear. The same seems to be true for subsequent communications, except for the EMU's proposals which, however, appear contradictory, based on a mix of the inter-governmental method and the community approach, with an inadequate level of financial resources, and the almost insuperable obstacle of unanimity.

However, on March 25, 2017, with the Rome Declaration and the mobilization of thousands of European citizens, some political opportunities came into existence. These need to be seized quickly, and require political parties, economic and social partners, and civil society organizations to take full responsibility.

Re-opening the European construction appears more and more necessary because of Brexit and its consequences, because of negotiations regarding the possible integration of the *Fiscal Compact* within the Treaties or in European rules – negotiations that still present many proposals that need clarification from the European Commission; because of the Eurozone's governance reform, and because of the update of the financial system of the Union, regarding both revenues and expenditures. The latter considers the proposals of the European High Level Group on resources, and the most recent communications of the Commission, while, at the same time, having the goal to contribute to a stable economic growth. For these reasons, we add to the suggestions already made our own proposals on the Eurozone's *fiscal capacity*.

Re-opening the European construction appears even more necessary because the economic crisis that has struck the Union and is still not behind us has made necessary a reform of the entire European system, which was established more than sixty years ago, with goals that have never been fully reached, and new challenges that member States are unable to face alone.

In order to overcome the sovereign and neo-nationalist threats that besiege Europe, it is therefore necessary to reform the European system, to strengthen federal aspirations and democratic legitimization.

Anti-European forces seem to have lost their momentum, as the last presidential election in Austria, electoral results in the Netherlands, presidential and general elections in France, and even trends in the UK have shown, and there appears to be an opportunity for a strong, innovative and ambitious European project to get started. An opportunity to be seized immediately, to show European citizens that a united, cohesive Europe can be the answer to their identity, economic, and social concerns.

Electoral results in the Czech Republic and in Austria; the authoritarian arrogance in Hungary (which, gives little hope for change in the upcoming general elections), and in Poland; the fight between two opposing nationalisms in Spain - a regional one in Catalonia, and a state-supporting one in Madrid - which may even spread to other countries and, *last but not least*, the political instability in Italy, are all alarming signs for the new year.

A twenty-year long cycle has come to an end, marked by globalization inspired by liberal policies without rules, and by the longest and deepest economic crisis the world has ever known. The crisis has created both vertical and horizontal inequalities. Horizontal among social classes, because wealth has been redistributed to the detriment of jobs, of the middle class, and of young people. Vertical among nations, where the same mechanism has allowed stronger economies to create further impoverishment within the European Union.(2)

This is a structural, long-term issue that must be solved.

The entire planet is subject to changes that are more and more intertwined and rapid. These changes jeopardize the geo-political balance and increase social inequality. This is true for finance and monetary policies and their impact on the economy and on the social fabric, for the world's population growth and the desperate migration of its most vulnerable groups, for the excessive consumption of non-renewable resources and for environmental threats, for the accumulation of wealth by a small percentage of the world's population and the increasing poverty, hunger and spread of disease that affects another, larger percentage of the population.

These intertwined processes must be governed by supranational institutions, to avoid the destruction of institutional frameworks, even those of the world's most advanced democracies.

The achievements of civilization, especially in Europe, following centuries-old, controversial and conflicting initiatives for world domination, could be jeopardized.

European countries delude themselves, believing they won't be touched by the worldwide changes that we are witnessing today, withdrawing in a nationalistic dimension that belongs to the eighteenth century. This illusion will be wiped out, not only by African and Asian migration, but also by the progress of continental States.

Special attention must be paid to China, whose expansionistic policy has been implemented for decades in Africa, and now applies to other areas of the planet, particularly in Europe.

Since the President of the USA declared the need for greater financial contributions to NATO from European countries, the question of Europe's defense appears under a completely different light than it did during the long years of the Cold War; this is true also in relation to the impact of the arms industry on individual States and on international trade.

Populations in the Mediterranean coast of Africa and in the Middle East – especially younger people, who make up most of the population – had expressed their resolve to free themselves from the totalitarian regimes of their countries and promote human rights, but the international community, the European Union and National States were unable to provide the necessary support, and the Arab Spring quickly turned into democracy's winter.

Today's migration processes - that only appear to have slowed down, linked to a dramatic situation still not solved in the countries of origin - are a testament to Europe's (but not only Europe's) political unsuitability to improve the situation of critical areas. The suspension of the Schengen agreement has challenged some of the achievements reached with the Treaties of Rome of 1957 and with the Single European act of 1986.

Therefore, national governments and European institutions must elaborate and implement a *European investment plan*, in order to limit neocolonialist policies (and China's neocolonialist policies first and foremost) in those areas, and to manage migration fluxes.

Relationships with countries of Mediterranean Sea and Middle East must be established and developed by the Union based on truly supranational strategies and on a Mediterranean policy to implement Euro-Arabic-African integration, going beyond the colonial vision that characterized said relationships.

Furthermore, there are issues regarding energy and the environment that National States continue to address, singularly and in international forums, without many chances of success, lacking decision-makers and policies able to face and manage the complex processes characteristic of such issues.

Reopening the European construction therefore appears necessary – to address neoprotectionism in the USA, the transformation of global political power games, and Chinese economic neocolonialism – to give the Union the powers and the means necessary to play an autonomous role as a global player and contribute to launch a new cycle in the governance of interdependence. This new cycle must be marked by sustainable and balanced development, détente, and respect of human dignity.

No variation of the institutional construction must be excluded, regarding both the method and the content of the projects. In this framework, the European Movement believes that the Eurozone's Member States and those that committed themselves to join the Euro must represent the forefront of complete political integration to realize a federal Community.

Of course, it is a matter of the utmost importance to attain the goals defined by the Treaties, but it must be taken into consideration that the inadequate division of competences between the EU and Member States does not provide the instruments necessary to act at European level.

It is necessary to clearly define the essential elements of the European project, method, and agenda, opening the European construction to the layman, turning it into a public space made to widen Europe's public knowledge and to complete supranational democracy.

This is our sixth scenario for Europe's future.

ANSWERING EUROPEANS' QUESTIONS, ATTAINING THE EU'S GOALS, RESPECTING ITS VALUES

We have focused our proposals on aspects that we consider priorities: realizing a European welfare to reduce inequalities through strong cohesive policies, ensuring, at the same time, shared prosperity; focusing on the environment as the engine for the development of a green economy, to reach the objectives of sustainable development; a common industrial policy, culture and education, immigration and integration policies, domestic and external security. *Last but not least*, we propose popular action through a European Citizens' Initiative (ECI), to guarantee the respect of the rule of law by the EU and its Member States.

We believe, furthermore, that it is necessary to give precedence to the search for a common European Identity, respecting diversities, through the cultural dimension as an essential element of European citizenship, based on shared principles and values. We also believe that it is necessary to provide the EU with the necessary instruments, thus allowing the EU to act efficiently with Europe-wide policies where unity and cohesion are required, and allowing Member States as well as local and regional powers to intervene whenever differentiation is more appropriate.

1.1 Ensuring the Respect of the Rule of Law

Among the values that must be not only cherished but also fostered by the Member States of the EU, there is the respect of the "Rule of Law" (art. 2 TEU). This, along with the respect of human dignities, freedom, democracy, equality, and human rights, is the fundamental premise (even though not sufficient on its own) for the active involvement of Member States in the realization of objectives set by their participation to the EU.

To guarantee the respect of these values on behalf of Member Countries the Treaty of Lisbon includes, in art. 7, both an alert system in case of violation of any of these values by a Member State, and the possibility to suspend the right to vote of said Member State in case of severe and prolonged violations.

The problem with article 7 is that its activation is almost impossible, either because it requires high majorities within the European Parliament and Council, and the unanimity within the European Council, either because the values it refers to are stated in terms so vague that Member States potentially involved in these procedures could invoke the principle of respect of national constitutional identity, which is also protected by art. 4 of the TEU.

Given how difficult it is to apply article 7, the Commission, pressured by the EP, decided to apply article 258 of the Treaty, that allows the Commission to intervene, creating a direct political dialogue with the Member States involved when it considers they have "failed to fulfil an obligation under the treaties"; reserving the right, in case of non-compliance, to bring the matter before the Court of Justice.

The procedure laid out by article 258 is inevitably quite time-consuming, which could be a serious handicap when there is a prolonged violation of fundamental rights and values. This procedure also requires the involvement of a judge, who may not have all the necessary elements to evaluate if certain operative solutions are adequate to the objective set out; this may imply the adoption of different measures depending on national contexts.

A supranational approach to guarantee the respect of the "rule of law" is particularly important, foremost for the realization of an area of freedom, security and justice, as confirmed by the Treaty of Lisbon and by the Charter of Fundamental Rights, that clearly states in its introduction: "*the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice* (added emphasis). *The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the national identities of the Member States and the organization of their public authorities at national, regional and local levels...*".

Over the years the Court of Justice has contributed to the definition of the scope of the objective of transforming the EU in an area of freedom, security and justice, clarifying that its realization is necessary to create mutual trust, and the mutual recognition of the decisions taken in this area by one Member State by the others .

The principle of mutual trust is not, however, unconditional, nor is the respect of fundamental rights (in the understanding of fundamental rights which pertains to European law). This law obviously has an enormous impact in solving specific cases, but requires national judges to undertake an impossible task, and it could bring to aleatory results, which would be highly

detrimental for policies regarding citizens' rights. It then becomes necessary to devise collective, permanent mechanisms that would identify in a timely way the insurgence of possible crises, allowing the adoption of emergency measures as to limit the risk or contain the problem in keeping with what is foreseen, at a more general level, by article 7 of the TEU.

To overcome these and other obstacles, and ensure the physiological functioning of these policies, which are closely linked to national ones, the Treaty includes, specifically for policies aiming to realize the area of freedom, security and justice, an autonomous mechanism, complementary to the traditional control procedures for the implementation of EU law foreseen by the Treaty for all other areas of policy.

According to article 70 of the TFEU.

"Without prejudice to Articles 258, 259 and 260, the Council may, on a proposal from the Commission, adopt measures laying down the arrangements whereby Member States, in collaboration with the Commission, conduct objective and impartial evaluation of the implementation of the Union policies referred to in this Title by Member States' authorities, in particular in order to facilitate full application of the principle of mutual recognition. The European Parliament and national Parliaments shall be informed of the content and results of the evaluation".

For this reason, starting with the "area of freedom, security and justice", we intend to activate a European Citizens' Initiative - through the mobilization of civil society - on the grounds of article 70 of the TFEU, in order to create a permanent legal instrument, complementary to article 7 of the TEU, to ensure the respect of the rule of law in this area.

1.2. Reduce inequalities and create a European welfare

We believe that the guarantee of shared prosperity is the condition necessary to reduce inequalities and to build the foundations of greater integration. We also believe that a European welfare, with a common pillar of social rights - considered as a unifying factor, in line with the principle of subsidiarity, for local, regional, macro-regional, national, and European responsibility - must contribute to an integrated European job market. In this framework, there is the need for a renewed and reinforced social dialogue, as a characterizing element of European economic democracy.

This dialogue must include measures ensuring public goods such as the right to permanent education throughout the working life, and at the end of it in compliance with article 25 of the Charter of Rights, which guarantees active participation to social and cultural life for the elderly, gender equality, balance between work and family, occupational safety and health, workers' participation, full portability of social security benefits in all Member States, fostering the right to the free movement of workers.

It must foresee an adequate minimum wage, on the grounds of article 34, paragraph 3 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and of the *Joint Declaration* of 13th November 2017 - for those who do not have the necessary resources, combining financial benefits, social pricing for essential services, and the possibility to access training services and social inclusion programs (based on the model other European Countries have already adopted). This model would exclude invasive forms of employment coercion, which do not respect the human dignity which this measure aims to protect; grant access to public services for people with disabilities, eliminating all multi-dimensional barriers; grant universal access to services for all those who live within the Union's territories, with a model financed by a fair fiscal system.

European *welfare* must guarantee citizens against unemployment, and offer a social safety net, fair working conditions and an adequate, stable balance between rights and duties of employers and employees; a balance must also be offered between flexibility and security, in order to promote the creation of jobs, employment, and the ability of businesses to adapt to the market.

It is therefore necessary and urgent to fight absolute poverty (which affects one out of ten Europeans), and relative poverty (which concerns one out of four Europeans); policies aimed to fight poverty must use social clauses and *soft law* instruments, to ensure the respect of "Europe 2020" engagements by all Member States, and to reach the sustainable development goals set out by the United Nations in 2015 (twenty million less people living in poverty by 2020).

Specific attention must be given to the fight against youth unemployment, and to the full realization of the "European Youth Guarantee". To reach this goal it is necessary to rethink the instruments for its implementation in our country; providing options at the end of the academic career and/or against unemployment; promoting higher quality standards, training, and internships; implementing measures to strengthen citizens' trust in institutions, and measures allowing institutions to provide more and better services; European measures set to reduce the generational gap must also be implemented, along with funds aimed to reach these goals (especially concerning the housing and credit issues).

The reinforcement of academic and traineeship international mobility programs is also included in this framework; programs such as the European Volunteering Service, which must become a true European Civil Service; or the Erasmus-Plus program; for the latter, we request an overall budget increase of 10%.

The EU must promote forms of participatory and co-operative economy, and enhance the role of businesses in social economy, promoting initiatives on social enterprise and social innovation, aiming to generate both economic and social values, and to contribute to the creation of human capital without which Europe would become a desert of rules and currency, fertile land for populists.

Beyond the inter-institutional declaration on the "social pillar" adopted in Goteborg, the European welfare must be characterized by binding instruments; these instruments must be both normative - with the creation of new directives and the reinforcement of existing ones - and financial. They must also include decision-making instruments, and must be applied by Member States and European Institutions alike. It is important to ensure the rights of European citizens and residents of third countries, including a clause forbidding discrimination between posted workers and workers employed in the relocation country. We therefore wait for the legal proposals of the European Commission, to assert the coherence between the political engagements taken in Goteborg and the decisions taken by the Council and the EP.

Whenever an agreement among all 27 Member States cannot be reached, it will be necessary to use reinforced cooperation or act through innovative instruments such as the elaboration of a *social compact*, as was done for the Schengen agreement - that initially involved a limited number of countries - or for the Protocol on Social Policy of the Treaty of Maastricht. We believe that it is necessary to resume and enhance the difference between the supranational model implemented by the ECSC, which tackled the social consequences of supranational politics in the field of steel and coal, and the EEC model, that was focused on the realization of a single market, initially limited to goods only.

1.3. The EU as a model for Environmental Transition

All the legal commitments and the agenda undertaken so far by national governments, that could turn the EU into an engine of sustainable development, and, in particular, all the commitments undertaken by the 193 countries of the United Nations in September 2015, and the Paris Agreements signed by 195 State in December 2016, must be respected and become a global environmental organization.

Promoting a carbon free economy – beginning by making our energy systems independent from fossil fuels by 2050 - is not only the foundation for an efficient fight against climate change, but is, foremost, a crucial challenge for the European identity; Europe can save itself from decline and fragmentation only if makes environmental transition - along with a renewed and reinforced European *welfare* – one of its founding elements its "social policy", i.e. the most realistic option available to build a future based on development, job creation and technological excellence, which would safeguard its role as a major player in the globalized world.

In this framework the EU must strongly support the development of the new economic model, already strategically implemented by thousands of big and small businesses, based on decarbonization, circular economy, and reduction in raw materials' consumption. This model also implies an active commitment to reduce and/or compensate negative impacts on the environment and on society. This model must be applied not only to environmental policies, but, in general, to all policies that have an impact on development, such as investments in research, technological innovations, industrial and fiscal policies, concentrating support on environmentally friendly manufacturing processes, and deterring those which are not environment friendly, through instruments such as the "*carbon tax*".

It is also necessary to revise the fundamental instruments used to reinforce economic and trade cooperation between the EU and the rest of the world. One of the fundamental criteria must be the refusal of any form - explicit or not - of social and environmental dumping; as well as the refusal of arbitrary allocation of roles and functions, within bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, to private organizations that have no democratic legitimization. It would also be necessary to reintroduce the idea of a World Environmental Court, and demand a strict implementation of the Aarhus Convention.

The Paris summit of December 12th, 2017, called by Emmanuel Macron, and, even before that, the COP23 that took place in Bonn in November, did not allow much room for improvement; on the contrary, the fight against climate change seems to be losing momentum, just when the policies adopted were giving the first positive signs toward a carbon free economy. Even worse is the lack of progress in reaching the sustainable development goals, as shown by the annual report of the Italian Alliance for Sustainable Development, submitted on September 28th, 2017 to the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

1.4 A Strong, European Cohesion Policy after 2020

Recognizing that the cohesion policy is the first investment policy of the European Union, which aims to attain the social, economic, and territorial cohesion, set forth by the Treaty of the EU, we underline how, to reach this objective, the cohesion policy also has clear added value for employment, sustainable growth, modern infrastructures, eliminating structural obstacles, enhancing human capital, and providing higher standards of living. The cohesion policy also allows for cooperation among regions, cities, and districts of the different Member States, as well as for cooperation among the private sector, knowledge centers, and social parties at regional level.

In this context, the European Movement believes that, in order to promote social, economic, and territorial cohesion within the European Union beyond 2020, the new cohesion policy should:

- work as a long-term investment policy for all European regions, aiming to support growth and employment at regional and local level; promoting innovative solutions for challenges such as climate change, energy transition, social inclusion, cross-border, transnational, and interregional cooperation;
- be the expression of European solidarity in order to overcome economic, social, and territorial inequalities, offering all citizens, wherever they live in Europe, the concrete possibility of benefiting from the advantages proposed by the European Union;
- be presented, in all communication actions, as the EU policy implemented at citizens' level, with a direct impact on their daily life;
- continue to be an efficient policy with sufficient funding, which should be at least one third of the EU's budget, distributed through subsidies, and, when necessary, through financial instruments;
- be based on existing European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF), with a series of common rules ;
- promote partnerships and a territory-based approach and reinforce the role of local and regional bodies, which are fundamental in the implementation of the cohesion policy through the active involvement of urban and rural communities, the enhancement of tools intended to support and promote local development, and integrated strategies;
- be better coordinated and be on the same level of other EU policies, taking into account the specific characteristics of districts, cities, and regions of the European Union;
- not be subject to conditions set at European level, independent of local and regional bodies, or other beneficiaries;
- be simplified and improved, and based on greater mutual trust among the various levels of government responsible for the management of funds and on a more flexible, differentiated approach.

1.5 A Common Industrial European Policy

The fundamental changes in the world economy (global dispersion of production, automation, robotization, competition with emerging economies, overcoming the distinction between manufacturing and services) call for a change of course in European industrial policy. It is not a question of "additionality" of European policies to those implemented by Member States anymore; rather, it is time to form a common policy starting at European level and cascading down to define the type of intervention to be implemented at lower levels of government;

An innovative European industrial policy is therefore necessary, coherent with the commitments undertaken in Paris in December 2016 at the end of the COP21. This new policy should encourage and promote energy efficiency, the circular economy, digitalization, and the development of automation and artificial intelligence compatible with full employment.

We suggest rethinking the role of the "State as a facilitator" and innovator at supranational level. It is at European level that market failures produce greater costs, and thus it is at this level that the need for a private/public partnership capable of "creating markets" becomes more necessary. It is not merely a question of creating adequate *capabilities*, necessary in developing contexts, but that of solving the *coordination problem* that arises when trying to organize the productive and innovative specialization of an entire continent.

The EU must, first and foremost, work together with European enterprises, especially SME, in order to support them in the digital transformation, and to build the correct frame of reference, and the conditions necessary to promote innovation, investments, and financial and fiscal instruments needed for their growth.

The EU should envisage policies for technological innovation development, with a European control room, capable of providing guidelines and coordinating the work of all participants, paying attention to industrial development within the European territory, in order to increase the percentage of industrial production in GDP.

In this framework, the automation process involving the manufacturing industry, which will require supporting measures at European level, will need to be accompanied by radical changes in the training of workers. This can be accomplished by rethinking training programs and methods, and using robotics as a stimulus for cognitive skills and the creation of high-quality jobs.

European industrial policy must be based on a global strategy comprehensive of financial, legislative, and non-legislative measures in the domains of digitalization, sustainability, circular economy, energetic efficiency, and social economy enterprises.

Industrial policy must be able to use other supranational instruments: *i) a federal system of public investment banks*, revolving around the EIB, and involving the *State Investment Banks* of Member States (and international banks). This system would have the ability to realize coordinated investments far greater than the Juncker plan; *ii)(innovative) European public tenders*, able to mobilize the critical mass of demand, necessary to ensure the sustainable and accelerated development of *infant industries* and technological niches; *iii) mission oriented European public enterprises*, capable of exploiting continent-wide economies in limited sectors, where the private/public partnership is more efficient (such as *Galileo, Ariane, Airbus*, investing in new infrastructural, energy, technological projects); *iv) a European capital*, managed by a sovereign fund, that will make the benefits yielded by European *assets* intergenerational; these *assets* would be the result of supranational investments.

The European industrial policy should be combined, at European and at national level, and especially in Italy, by a tangible and efficient administrative simplification.

1.6 To guarantee the right to asylum and to govern migratory flows

A toxic product is invading Europe. It generates intolerance, uncontrollable feelings of fear, violent reactions and aggression. The toxic product is called “fake news” and concerns the movements of people from the African continent – devastated for centuries by Europeans among others – to continental Europe, but also concerns Latin America, Asia and Oceania. These movements have made the Geneva Convention “for the protection of civilians in time of war” dramatically obsolete, and ineffective when faced with the new reasons compelling people to flee from wars, environmental disasters and tribal violence.

There are over sixteen million refugees worldwide, three quarters of whom have found shelter outside Europe, while in Europe itself they represent no more than 1% of the resident population. To give a scale of comparison, Europe – which is only in part a territory of immigration (legal, illegal and requesting asylum) - was for many years an area of emigration: from 1836 to 1914, thirty million Europeans sought and found refuge in the USA. According to the UNHCR, from 1 January to 30 September 2016 arrivals in Europe fell by 42% (from

500.042 to 300.927, of whom 166.749 in Greece and 131.702 in Italy) while the slaughter in the Mediterranean horrendously (+23%) increased.

The Treaty of Lisbon defined immigration and asylum policies, based on the values of respect of human dignity, equality, solidarity, rule of law, and respect for human rights. Nonetheless, faced with dramatic flows of immigrants and asylum seekers, they proved inadequate.

The increase in the number of refugees coming from war-torn territories, or of the number of people fleeing political persecutions, starvation, or natural disasters - which could create new migratory fluxes involving millions of people in the future - and from "*land-grabbing*", created several problems within the different countries, ripped apart the European spirit, let primordial fears resurface, and brought about unacceptable forms of closure.

To efficiently face these problems, we need a true European policy, capable of managing, in a balanced manner, the complex migration phenomenon, and to gradually implement suitable migrant reception systems, along with the protection of rights, the promotion of human development and integration. In this framework it appears necessary to implement, based on articles 33 and 77 of the TFEU, a European external borders control force, for people and goods, following the model of the "*US Customs and Border Control*".

A policy that will adequately support the economic development of migrants' countries of origin, and that will intervene to reduce and eliminate conflicts, and to ensure the security of NGO staff.

A policy that will be able to identify the capacity to assimilate and integrate migrants within the European territory; that will be able to tangibly tackle the multifaceted challenges posed by a correct assimilation and inclusion; that will recognize cities as the mechanisms and engines for integration, since it is through host cities and their cultures that migrants become European citizens.

A peace policy within the Mediterranean, implemented through the creation of European *Peace Corps* that will mediate conflicts.

A policy that will also be able to show to European citizens the opportunities created by the arrival of asylum seekers and economic migrants.

The European Movement believes that, together with the European Commissioner responsible for migration policies, and separately from internal security issues, Member States should entrust migration policies to the Ministers responsible for matters of welfare, and not, as happens at present in all Member States, to Ministers of the Interior.

We believe that a true European migration policy should include measures aimed to ensure the freedom of movement for the search for a job, equal access to the job market, equal opportunities, fair working conditions, occupational health and safety, healthcare, fair treatment of foreign workers that return to their countries of origin before the minimum period necessary for retirement, and childcare.

There are, in fact, several models that could be taken into consideration: considering migrants as resources for the development of rural areas, which are currently underpopulated and facing economic decline; or developing "circular migration" policies, facilitating the arrival of migrants and their reintegration in their country of origin, allowing the instauration of cultural and financial relationships with host countries.

The European Movement supports the creation of legal gateways through humanitarian corridors for those that flee war, starvation, natural disasters; it is necessary to protect unaccompanied minors, facilitate family reunifications, and speed up the European Asylum Agency's procedures, and the mandatory *resettlement* programs, for a European *ius soli*.

We support the idea of identifying the beneficiaries of international protection within those African and Middle-Eastern countries that are the hub of asylum seekers' movements; this could be done through a system of strongholds coordinated at European level, to be placed where possible within EU delegations in third countries, managed by major humanitarian organizations receiving those seeking shelter in those territories, so as to protect them from criminal organizations and human traffickers. Subsequently, it will be necessary to guarantee the transfer from the international stronghold to destination States, where the asylum request can be made official, with fixed, equitable quotas for each State to receive refugees.

In this spirit, we urgently call for a review of the Dublin Regulation. This must be based on a migratory policy that considers asylum the answer to a structural crisis (and not a mere emergency), and excludes coercive mechanisms, introducing the principles of professional paths, experiences, and aspirations of asylum seekers; it is also necessary to envisage the solidarity contribution, not only in case of auto-resignation from the system, but also in case of non-execution of relocation decisions. Since the European Council could not find an agreement in December 2017, the only solution can be a decision of the European Parliament, whose amendments to the proposals of the Commission we share. We also share the report to the Court for those States opposing a review, for the violation of article 80 of the Treaty of Lisbon and the solidarity principle.

We also believe that the EU and the Member States part of the United Nations - and especially the European permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council - must ask for an update of the Geneva Convention on Refugee of 1951, which limits international protection "*to any person... who owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality...*"

The immigration policy must be accompanied and reinforced by a cooperation policy and an aid policy in the framework of a European plan of investments which considers the political conjuncture and regime of underdeveloped and developing countries.

We believe in the need for Euro-Mediterranean policy that can guarantee peace, security and solidarity within the region, renewing the idea of a "ring of friends", launching concrete projects such as those calling for a reinforcement of the EIB and EBRD roles. This must not exclude: new possible financial instruments specialized in this domain; mixed Universities with equal mobility of students, researchers, and professors between North and South; recurring assemblies of civil societies and local communities allowing for a free dialogue and the development of active citizenship. To this issue is linked the idea of a Euro-Mediterranean Erasmus Program.

In Africa, and especially in its relationships with the African Union, the EU can have - conversely to Russia and China - a positive role, accompanying (and conditioning) financial cooperation with active reconstruction and reinforcement of democratic governance, the rule of law, and the respect of human dignity, which have been revealed to be fundamental levers for economic growth.

1.7. A Better External and Internal Security

We believe that an integrated defense policy would create economies of scale that could produce concrete political benefits and could reinforce citizens' consensus since security is one of those symbolic issues - along with democracy, rights and the currency - that constitute the foundation of the Federal Community we want.

In the new international system, European defense must be considered an instrument allowing the EU to efficiently work towards *peace keeping* and *peace building*, but also to intervene in the framework and under mandate of the United Nations, creating European *peace corps*. These Peace Corps would be aimed to mediate local conflicts. The EU must act to control the sale of weaponry, and for the balanced, controlled and mutual reduction of military forces and armaments at international levels.

In the short-term, through reinforced cooperation, it is necessary to think of common measures capable to react to cyber-attacks, and through permanent, structured cooperation, entrust the management of specific crises to a group of Member States, proceeding on the path of armaments standardization, and of the coordination of national industrial policies with common rules on the trade of weapons to countries outside the EU.

Following the decision of the European Council of June 22-23, 2017, and the decision of the European Council in December, the governments of 25 Member States agreed. According to article 36 of the TEU, the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy must ensure that the position of the EP is taken into consideration in the execution of the European Council's decisions.

Instruments must be put in place in order to make more efficient the definition of strategic common interests such as the enlargement of the 2002 European Union Military Staff's missions, in order to manage long term military operations. This will be done entrusting to the MPCC (founded by the Council on June 8, 2017), in addition to non-executive operations, also executive operations in the perspective of a true European Headquarters similar to SHAPE, operative up to 2003, which then became ACO (*Allied Command Operations*), and a Military Academy to train officers.

The low efficiency of defense expenditure in European Countries in general is also due to the fragmentation of the internal defense market, up until now opposed to any integration effort; it is therefore necessary to give new impulse to a progressive convergence of national industries in the sector, safeguarding technological capacities and employment bases, in a perspective of true rationalization.

It is also necessary to create a European Voluntary Corps, as foreseen by article 214 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. These Corps should have both functions of humanitarian assistance and civil defense, providing for an adequate coordination with the European Solidarity Corps, recently founded by the European Commission.

These two initiatives should lead the way to forms of European civil defense - unarmed and non-violent - including the training and education of European populations aimed at encouraging mediation, human rights promotion, international solidarity, peace education, opposing social, cultural, and environmental degradation.

A proposal should be submitted to the UN for the creation of an "International Police Force" (of which the European integrated defense forces could be the core) in alternative to the instruments of *peace keeping*, *peace building*, that refer to military operations and not to police operations.

The policy of security and defense, the beating heart of popular sovereignty, is based, nonetheless, on a comprehensive foreign policy strategy.

But strategic decisions regarding foreign policies, security and defense in Europe, are still in the hands of national governments within the European Council, or under the scope of international relationships management, notwithstanding the many missions of the EU in third countries, while National Parliaments and the EP are excluded from any form of democratic control in choices regarding peace and security, which are part of citizens' interests.

The foreign policy of security and defense, cannot, thus, be the result of anything less than legitimate and democratic choices accountable to the citizens, and therefore requires full political and decision-making integration, which are still far from being realized.

Without these fundamental instruments, the recent permanently structured cooperation - which is subject to unanimity from a high number of countries that have very different positions regarding European defense - would face the consequences due to the inefficiency of any interoperative cooperation treaty, and won't be able to create true shared sovereignty. In other words: it could suffer from an inefficient and ambiguous model, with the risk that the already weak military and security capacity of the 27 at national level could become a juridical monster just as inefficient and incapable to act at supranational level, if it is not put under the control of a federal government responding to a democratically elected Parliament. This government must be called to represent the Federal Community within the Security Council as a logical consequence of the attribution of a single seat to the EU, in the framework of a regional reform of the United Nations.

European citizens' fears are focused on internal security when facing international terrorism of Islamic fundamentalism matrixes.

This was evident over the last two years, after the terrorist attacks in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Sweden that were perpetrated by European residents. The EU showed, once again, unbelievable limits and gaps in its action. Much depends on the inadequacy of the present European Treaties; but much more can be done based on the Treaties, such as creating better legal cooperation instruments between police forces and intelligence services.

In particular, in recent years, the Duisburg massacre of 2007, and the more recent terrorist attacks, showed how the *European Public Prosecutor* - which was built on reinforced cooperation, based on a compromise distant from community values – cannot be competent only in guaranteeing the protection of the EU financial interests (as was established by the agreement subscribed by twenty different governments, including the Italian one), but must also act towards the true implementation of criminal law, defending our fundamental freedoms and our security.

This additional competence must operate through initiative, coordination, operational efficiency; answer the pressing call for action against terrorism and organized crime; it shall lay the foundation for a "Federal Public Prosecutor", and not a mere intergovernmental coordination of national prosecutors.

The fight against terrorism requires the creation of a Federal Intelligence Agency, while the fight against organized crime calls for the introduction of mob-type association felonies within the penal law system of other European countries, as proposed by the EP.

In this framework the EU – also bearing in mind the jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice- must establish rules ensuring both the respect of human rights and the right to security (of entire communities).

1.8. A European Identity and Cultural Diplomacy

14

The issue of the European identity being part of a multilevel identity is certainly a core component of the European Citizenship. Enhancing and protecting the common European heritage, as well as educating and training European citizens towards a new European cultural identity, must be the primary goals while defining future European policies and programs. These goals must be combined with the development of a cultural economy at EU level.

Many initiatives could be reinforced and expanded to support this fundamental pillar of European citizenship, built in the concrete of European *cultural and educational policies*. These goals could be reached through the reinforcement, within national educational programs, of European civic education themes, and by teaching history and foreign languages in order to enhance European multilingualism.

Since education and culture are intertwined, it is important to provide the EU with instruments that will start a dialogue between believers and non-believers, and support the fight against radicalization. A similar approach was already adopted during the Delors Commission's mandate, with the program "A Soul for Europe". These tools could find their legal base within articles 10, 17, and 19 of the TFEU, and in article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

The Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro 2005) and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Paris 2005) are the innovative legal bases defining European cultural production as a dynamic element that revolves around individuals to provide unity in diversity.

Cultural rights, active citizenship, democratic participation to cultural processes are channeled through the work of communities that enhance and protect their local heritage. The goal is to improve standards of living and pass our cultural traditions down to future generations. They represent a useful normative point of reference to safeguard traditions, foster innovations, and create new European cultural products.

Furthermore, it must be stressed how European culture (soft power) has a significant role in sharing European values based on cultural diversity, which fosters dialogue and not conflicts. Art thus becomes an instrument for peace, freedom of expression, open-mindedness, and cultural innovation. We thus propose the creation of a network of European Cultural Institutes in non-European countries, aiming to spread and manage cultural cooperation (bilateral or multilateral), as well as to spread awareness of European values through the works of European artists and intellectuals. This proposal could be a concrete conclusion for the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018, adding culture to the "*Urban Agenda*". It is, in fact, at local level that cohesion must be created to avoid failure.

COMPLETE AND REFORM THE EMU AND GUARANTEE PROSPERITY

Completing the EMU is, without a doubt, the fundamental condition to stabilize the economy, but also to promote sustainable development and ensure prosperity. At supranational level, it

thus becomes necessary to have a real economic government able to coordinate all the instruments (fiscal and monetary instruments alike) of economic and financial policy. Reaching the goals that have been set, and reforming the EU, will call for a reinforcement of the monetary union, at political, economic, social, and democratic level alike; the Euro shall thus become the currency of all Member States.

The opportunities offered by social and territorial cohesion policies have not been fully seized yet, either at EU level or at State level. These policies have of course promoted development, but they have not reduced the imbalances and inequalities among States, regions, and social classes.

Among incomplete policies must be recalled ongoing work concerning: the digital common market, the banking union, the common capital market, an energy union, a common European fiscal policy, and a real market for services, in the respect of unity in diversity.

It is patent that in certain cases (the digital common market, the common capital market, the common service market) the present Treaties already give enough room to maneuver, but decision-making rules in other cases (the European fiscal policy) or the unequal distribution of competences (energy union), will require a reform of the EU system.

The governance system of the monetary union, created to manage contained quantitative shocks, showed its limits when facing a bigger crisis.

There is still work that needs to be done towards political, economic and social integration necessary to yield the benefits promised by the monetary union. A few examples of this reality are: the asymmetric responses of the Eurozone Member States to the economic crisis of the last ten years; the application of rules thought to foster adjustments of single economies facing external shocks without consideration for social consequences; public finance constraints regarding current and capital accounts; the content of the EU reform of economic governance when facing financial crisis, primarily aimed to ensure financial stability; the absence of adequate social safeguards, capable of reducing the impact of financial crises on the real economy and especially on weaker social groups.

These problems, along with the anachronistic separation (probably aimed to reduce social expenses) between monetary policy (which is exclusive competence of the EU), intergovernmental policy, and social policies which are mostly competence of Member States, prevented the realization of a single, border free, "socially fair" European space,

Symbolically, the four freedoms of movement (goods, services, capitals, and people) within the single, border free space are still fragmented, and, when implementing the Treaty, the free movement of goods took precedence over the free movement of people.

Thus, the absence of adequate compensating systems on the social front, and the severe constraints introduced by the Stability and Growth pact of 1997 and subsequently by its reformed version of 2011, as well as the Fiscal Compact, contributed to reduce citizens' approval of the European project, especially in the States that most suffered from the crisis.

Therefore, without relevant, efficient action that the citizens can easily identify, the EU is at significant risk of losing its solidity.

Furthermore, the mutual mistrust between "virtuous countries" and "unbalanced countries" (definitions based merely on financial variables), made political agreements extremely hard to

reach, impeding the implementation of decisions aimed at changing the political procedure of the last years.

Additionally, the Council's decisions and the European Commission's proposals - such as the White Paper and subsequent documents regarding globalization, social issues, and goals for sustainable development - do not question the present economic *governance*; thus shaking the basis of the European social model, which is, together with the unemployment rate, at the very core of citizens' mistrust towards European integration.

The proposals which the European Commission put forward on December 16th, 2017, although with their limits and vagueness, mark a change of pace that must be stressed and supported in a dynamic perspective.

Decisions need to be taken as soon as possible, in order to revamp the development process. The development process will, in turn, highlight the reasons behind the union, overcoming skepticism towards European institutions, improving citizens' standard of living - especially of those citizens at risk of poverty and social exclusion; particular attention must be paid to the unemployed, to minors and young people, and to the generational gap.

To let the EU truly attain the fundamental goal of sustainable development, the instruments of economic governance must be radically revised, starting from the Stability Pact of 1997, up to subsequent agreements adopted after 2011 (six pack, fiscal compact, and two pack), in light of a rigorous, comprehensive analysis of their social costs. The necessary consequences in terms of European rules and policies must also be taken into account.

In order to move forward within the present EU budget, we suggest the use of instruments such as *project-bonds* to increase income for small savers, offering them a safe investment that enhances revenues, and European public bonds.

Fiscal resources and project-bonds are tools that can turn public and private investments toward infrastructures, energy, networks, transportation, and telecommunication industries, as well as toward key enabling technologies (such as micro technologies, photonics, nanotechnologies, biotechnologies, innovative materials, innovative production systems), and towards innovation, research, high quality public services, education and training. The Juncker Plan should be reinforced both in quality and quantity in order to fund a New Deal for the European economy, proposed by a European Citizens Initiative and in a petition addressed to the EP.

These investments will have a positive impact on the creation of employment, exploiting the great amount of international capital (including *venture capital*) which is constantly looking for profitable investment opportunities.

Considering political obstacles to be faced in the implementation of these proposals, the *fiscal capacity* of the Eurozone must be reconsidered as soon as possible. In this way public goods and European economic and social policies will receive a new impulse, and will be funded through an ad hoc budget. The budget itself shall be funded by a small percentage of the GDP of Eurozone countries - with an initial deficit of public balances to be reabsorbed – in the framework of EU reform – through the progressive introduction of European federal taxes. We support the idea of a European Monetary Fund, which should derive from the reform of the present European Stability Mechanism, should in accordance with Musgrave's tripartite vision, allocate and redistribute capital to develop the real economy, have stabilizing functions within the EMU, as well as countering inequalities among Member States in the framework of territorial, social, and economic cohesion functions that need to be strengthened and renewed.

The European tax system should have high social value as well as harmonize taxation policies and national tax plans to a European tax plan, through a coordinated management of the overall tax burden in an anticyclical perspective. The overall fiscal burden on citizens and businesses must be kept stable, but it must be progressively and equally distributed.

A few examples of taxation come to mind: taxation of the gross margin of gambling, the carbon tax; the European taxation on tobacco and on short-term trading profits - made by businesses and trading companies; the tax on capital gains achieved by the trade in real goods, registered movables, and financial instruments by companies located in tax havens.

The EU must pursue greater integration of national fiscal systems, to reduce fiscal competition, which makes less mobile factors of production – and employment first of all - carry the fiscal burden.

In this framework the EU must act against money laundering, tax evasion by multinational companies and "tax tourism", overcoming taxation competition, a goal that can only be accomplished through real European fiscal harmonization. The European Movement considers the implementation of the agreements reached by PANA (The European Parliamentary Commission on Tax Avoidance, Evasion, and Money Laundering) and adopted by the Assembly last December necessary. It must be recalled that, according to a study conducted by the University of Copenhagen, tax avoidance by American multinationals is equal to about 600 billion euros every year.

Public debts must be stabilized throughout Europe, linking budgetary and default policies to GDP trends, in terms of economic cycles.

We support the idea of a European Monetary Fund, which should come from the reform of the present European Stability Mechanism. We also call for the conversion of sovereign bonds owned by the ECB and Central Banks, for all those countries having implemented adequate structural reforms. These bonds should be converted in fifty-year bonds, payed with capitals and bonds for later issues.

These bonds should be underwritten by the European Stability Mechanism and the ECB, but would not concur in the obligation to pay off the excess public debt.

The European Movement believes that the improvement in public finances within the EU over the last few years allows for a reformulation of the schedule for the reduction , now fixed at 60%. Bearing in mind the economic cycle, should allow faster reduction when the economy is flourishing, but should also allow slower public debt reduction in periods of economic stagnation.

Finally, the European Movement underlines the urgent need for a single EU representative within international monetary organizations such as the FMI,

COMPLETING AND CHANGING THE EUROPEAN UNION

As shown by the proposals made up to this point, much can be done without changing the existing Treaties.

However, we believe that a true, in-depth reform of the Union's system is now inevitable, going from a community to a Federal framework defining the essential elements for united and democratic Europe based on solidarity and the method, and agenda necessary to realize it.

The European system, with its mechanisms and its liturgies, now show several inconsistencies. Many of these derive from its initial conception, that has never been truly overcome through the many subsequent changes made to the Treaties, and has led Europeans to doubt the real democratic legitimacy of the Union. Other inconsistencies have become clear, in recent years, through the devastating sequence of crises that has struck Europe, economic, social and political.

Urged by necessity, in order to face the emergency and solve the crisis, the European Council has progressively taken upon itself most of the decisional power, overstepping the boundaries set for it in the Treaties, without being able to face today's challenges. In this unsatisfying European Union, a different allocation of responsibilities from what was set out set in the Treaties has been established, which remains inadequate.

3.1 For an open and democratic debate on Europe's future

The usual method, that prioritizes agreement among governments, doesn't seem to be suitable anymore, and will not be suitable in the future. At the same time, the method of the *Convention* convened without a real European debate and subject to the obligation of submitting its result to an intergovernmental conference and ratification by all Member States doesn't address the need for a transparent and participative reform.

We believe that defining the elements to reform the European system will not be enough.

We believe, instead, that it will be necessary to act in a democratic and transparent manner, innovating the method, so as to allow the countries and people that have democratically agreed to share parts of their sovereignty to complete the path to a federal system.

To define Europe's future, an articulate debate involving citizens, opinion movements, intermediate bodies at European level, social partners, and political parties will be necessary; a debate that will stimulate national Governments and Parliaments, regional assemblies, and the European Parliament through dialogue among parliamentary delegations.

An extensive discussion is necessary, without avoiding the confrontation with euro-critics. It is paramount to guarantee the best and most extensive informative action, both on method and content.

We, therefore, believe, that the European Parliament must widen, complete and specify the guidelines adopted on the Union's system and on Europe's future, so as to offer voters and European political forces a coherent and global vision on the content, method, and agenda of the project, before the spring of 2019.

Downstream, there must be a constitutional change, carried out with maximum accountability and transparency. We believe in the election, in 2019, of the 73 seats currently attributed to British MEPs on transnational lists, presented by the European parties according to a uniform and proportional European procedure, without a preference vote, respecting gender equality and geographic balance. Presenting transnational lists will allow the long overdue full implementation of article 10 of the TEU which states: "*Political parties at European level contribute to forming European political awareness and to expressing the will of citizens of the Union*". In this framework, it can be imagined that European parties will adopt democratic and transparent internal procedures to select their candidates, to the Presidency of the European Commission, and that said candidates will be at the top of transnational lists for the elections, as

foreseen by article 17.7 of the TEU. According to article 15.6 of the TEU the role of President of the Commission could coincide with that of President of the European Council.

Furthermore, according to article 14 TEU the European Parliament is made of “*representatives of European citizens*”, and not by representatives “*of the people of the States*”, as was set out in article 189 TCE, and its composition is not set by the Treaty, but “*on initiative of the European Parliament*” and unanimous decision of the European Council with prior approval of the EP itself.

Coherently with our federalist ideals, based on the Ventotene Manifesto, and strengthened by the experience of European integration, we want to open a debate on the method that must lead us, within a clear period of time, towards a federal Community.

It is practically impossible to reach this goal by amending the existing Treaties, because this would require a unanimous agreement of all the Governments of the member States of the European Union, and the ratification of the amendments – by parliaments or through referenda – in all the States.

Furthermore, this process would involve States that haven't made the choice to make their economies interdependent, unifying monetary policies and accepting common rules, while denying their consensus to essential principles regarding citizenship, rights, mobility and solidarity.

For these very reasons, we believe that the best path to follow would be to start a constituent phase for a united, inclusive, democratic Europe, through the election, in the spring of 2019 on the occasion of EP elections, by universal direct suffrage, of an Assembly with the mandate to draft the Constitution of the Future Federal Community.

Said Assembly should be integrated by a delegation of representatives of the EP chosen so as to respect gender and geographical balances (“*ad hoc assembly*”). Thus, the Convention provided for by article 48 of the Treaty of Lisbon would become a body legitimized by the vote of the citizens, respecting the principle written in all European Constitutions that states that “Sovereignty belongs to the people”.

Ultimately, it is up to the governments of the Eurozone (and those who will decide to become part of the Eurozone), to jointly decide on the convocation of this Assembly, adopting a declaration (“*Federal Agreement*”) that could have the same historic value of the one adopted in Messina in June 1955, being based on the vital need to lay the groundwork for a democratic community with a democratic method.

This decision could be preceded by a political act by the Parliaments of the area meeting in interparliamentary assize, like the one in Rome in November 1990, and take the legal form of the Act of September 20, 1976, that opened the way to direct universal suffrage for the election of the European Parliament, or by consultative referenda such as the one that took place in Italy in June 1989, regarding a possible constituent mandate for the EP.

The assize and the decision of the Governments should be prepared – in a European public space – by thematic conventions of the European citizens, proposed during Emmanuel Macron's presidential campaign.

The constituent phase will be followed by a deliberative one, which, we believe, will call for a popular response through a pan-European confirmatory referendum. Moreover, a referendum is already compulsory in many member States and is politically essential in many others, with a fragmentation of the ratification procedures giving greater importance to national choices and debates, and putting European choices and debates in the background.

With the referendum European citizens will express themselves on the new European federal framework, on the constitutive and founding rules, and on the overcoming of the National States' dimension. If the preparatory phase will be effective, the electoral body that will be called to vote will be more consciously "European".

3.2 A Federal Community

The aim, the explicit goal of the future reform, can be nothing else than a European federation. Not a super-state, but a federal Community. A new Treaty must be prepared, drawing up a true constitutional system enabling the Community to act effectively and democratically.

The European federation could have the following structure:

- A federal level, with all the necessary, exclusive competences, in all those sectors where the action of individual States is inadequate;
- A Parliamentary Assembly with full legislative powers (including the right of initiative), to be exerted together with a "Chamber of States";
- More advanced forms of active, engaging democracy, in order to turn the federal community into an open society, and to guarantee the involvement of the citizens, together with local and regional entities;
- A true European government, with a small number of ministers and limited but effective powers both in domestic and foreign policy, bound by democratic and fiduciary ties to the Assembly;
- The Council of Heads of State and Government, bound to its role of discussing and defining strategic guidelines, and forum of bi-annual discussions on major political priorities;
- Appropriate ways to include the National Parliaments and regional assemblies of the different federal States;
- A federal budget coherent with common goals, and revenues based on European taxation and policies aimed to guarantee Europe-wide commons;
- The Court of Justice with the mandate to respond to specific actions regarding fundamental rights, and ascertain the risks of possible violation, by one of the Member States, of the values of the EU, or to evaluate the actual existence of said violations;
- The European Central Bank as an autonomous (and not independent) institution, side by side with the executive, legislative, and judiciary branch, whose action shall be coordinated with the governmental policy, respecting the goals of the Federal Community, and seeking sustainable growth aiming for full employment and social progress;
- A true European federal citizenship, separate from national citizenships, with its own, autonomous core of individual and collective rights, reinforced by accession to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms, and the amended Turin Social Charter.