

POLICY

Historic Archive

LYMEC Archive of Past policies

1992-2020 (created in 2013)

(Last updated after the Online Congress, November 2020)

Contents

Policy Archive Chapter 1 - EU Institutions and Institutional Reform	6
PA 1.01. European Defense	6
PA 1.02 Stateless Nations' right to decide their own political future	7
PA 1.03 Resolution on the European Electoral System	8
PA 1.04 Resolution on the Reform of the European Institutions	9
PA 1.05 Resolution on Public Access to Documents	10
PA 1.06 Resolution on the Post-Nice Process.....	11
PA 1.07 Resolution for Speeding Up the EU Enlargement Process	12
PA 1.08 Towards the Brussels-Laeken Declaration	13
PA 1.09 Yes to the European Constitutional Treaty	14
PA 1.10 Resolution "Tear down the Fortress of Europe!"	18
PA 1.11 Resolution "The European Union: a State?"	20
PA 1.12 Internal Motion of the Debate on Europe's Future	21
PA 1.13 Resolution on the Future of Europe	23
PA 1.14 Young liberals' vision for the future of the Council of Europe.....	25
PA 1.15 Resolution on European citizenship – from dream to reality	26
PA 1.16 Resolution on the Presidency of the European Council	28
PA 1.17 On the European Integration of Iceland	28
PA 1.18 Resolution on the "Innovation Union" strategy	30
PA 1.19 Urgent resolution on the Noble Prize for Peace awarded to the European Union	31
PA 1.20 No double standards – the EU needs a frugal budget that invests into the future!	32
PA 1.21 Resolution on the European Elections 1994.....	33
PA 1.22 Give power to the Parliament - the representatives of the people	34
PA 1.23 Internal motion of European Parliament elections of June 2009: European liberal youth's top 3 issues	34
PA 1.24 Urgency resolution on the future of the Euro	36
PA 1.25 Resolution on NATO or the WEU	36
PA 1.26 Resolution "Welcoming Croatia"	37
PA 1.27 On the Signing of the Association Agreement and DCFTA between the EU and Ukraine	38
PA 1.28 Bringing the youth part in agenda the European elections 2014	39

PA 1.29 FUTURE FIRST! - LYMEC Electoral Manifesto 2014.....	40
PA 1.30 – For an independent ECB – monetary stability instead of economic steering	42
PA 1.31 The revised Dublin III Regulation.....	43
PA 1.32 Resolution on the Future of the European Unity	44
Policy Archive Chapter 2 – Justice and citizens right.....	46
PA 2.01 – Resolution on Freedom and Democracy in Ukraine	46
PA 2.02 – Resolution on a Liberal Asylum Policy	48
PA 2.03 Resolution on Privacy	49
PA 2.04 Strengthening and harmonizing European data protection.....	50
PA 2.05 LYMEC Condemns Recent Violence in Azerbaijan	51
PA 2.06 Stop the Political Persecution of Young Activists in Armenia	52
PA 2.07 Urgent Resolution on Turkey’s Violation of Human Rights	52
PA 2.08 Crime Knows No Borders	53
PA 2.09 Save the European Court of Human Rights	54
PA 2.10 Act on ACTA (Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.05)).....	54
PA 2.11 Towards a Common Migration Policy	55
PA 2.12 Resolution on the EU Visa Regime	57
PA 2.13 Tear Down Fortress Europe	57
PA 2.14 A Common Approach to Asylum Policy.....	58
PA 2.15 A Liberal Commitment to Common Border Management	59
PA 2.16 A Truly European Asylum System	61
PA 2.17 Resolution on a Liberal Gender Policy	62
PA 2.18 Recognition of Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights as a Policy in LYMEC	64
PA 2.19 Resolution on Ending the Discrimination of Young Gays and Lesbians in the Accession Countries	65
PA 2.20 Freedom of Expression Is Core to a Liberal Society	66
PA 2.21 No Naked Scanners!	67
PA 2.22 The situation of Human Rights in Russia	68
PA 2.23 Resolution on Belgrade Pride	69
PA 2.24 Resolution on Turkish Interference in Fosterage	70
PA 2.25 Freedom from Rape	71
PA 2.26 A Call for a Change in Vatican Policy	71

PA 2.27 Stop the Islamophobia and Respect Religious Diversity	72
PA 2.28 True Religious Freedom in the EU	74
PA 2.29 Resolution on Democracy in the Italian Republic	74
PA 2.30 On the new Hungarian Constitution Democracy	76
PA 2.31 Urgent Resolution on Bulgaria	77
PA 2.32 Resolution on Present Situation in the Russian Federation.....	78
PA 2.33 The Political Situation in the Russian Federation	79
PA 2.34 Blasphemy is a right, freedom is not a crime!	80
PA 2.35 Capital Punishment in Belarus.....	81
PA 2.36 Urgent Resolution on the Presidential Elections in Belarus	82
PA 2.37 Young Liberals for a Free Belarus	84
PA 2.38 Resolution on the Political Situation in Belarus.....	85
PA 2.39 Resolution on the Electoral Farce in Belarus	87
PA 2.40 Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression as Causes for International Protection and Asylum in the European Countries	90
PA 2.41 Recognise Same-Sex Marriage in the Entire EU	92
PA 2.42 Towards an Integration of Transsexual People	93
PA 2.43 Urgent Resolution on the Plan of the EU to Block Web Sites.....	94
PA 2.44 Stop Discriminatory Measures Regarding Romani People.....	95
PA 2.45 Aiming at Ending Female Genital Mutilation	96
PA 2.46 The Liberal-Democrat Attitude Towards Religion	98
Policy Archive Chapter 3 – Culture, education and youth, Science and technology	99
PA 3.01 – Policy paper on Youth Unemployment.....	99
PA 3.02 Policy Paper on Youth Employment	101
Policy Archive Chapter 4 – Business, Economy, Finance and Tax, Cross-Cutting Policies.....	105
PA 4.1 Pan-European Legalisation of Soft Drugs	105
Policy Archive Chapter 5 – Employment and Social Rights	107
PA 5.01 Legalize Prostitution.....	107
PA 5.02 Youth Unemployment	108
PA 5.03 Resolution on Youth Unemployment	109
Policy Archive Chapter 6 – Climate Action, Energy and Natural Resources	111
PA 6.02 Resolution on the Environment.....	111
PA 6.03 Kyoto Protocols.....	112

PA 6.04 Resolution on Basic Principles and Goals for an EC Environmental Policy .	113
PA 6.05 Resolution on Sustainable Development	113
PA 6.06 Urgency Resolution on Climate Change	114
PA 6.07 Towards a Sustainable Future	116
Policy Archive Chapter 7 – Agriculture, Fisheries and Food	118
PA 7.01 Cut the Crap, Scrap the CAP!.....	118
Policy Archive Chapter 8 – Regions and Local Development, Transport and Travel .	120
Policy Archive Chapter 9 – External Relations and Foreign Affairs	121
PA 9.01 - Recognise Western Sahara	121
PA 9.02 - Stop exploitation of occupied Western Sahara	122
PA 9.03 – Ukraine	123
PA 9.04 Resolution on the Status of Turkey as an EU Candidate Country	123
PA 9.05 Resolution on the Intergovernmental Conference of 1996	124
PA 9.06 Resolution on A Common Foreign and Security policy in the EU	126
PA 9.07 Defence	127
PA 9.08 Free Syria from Violence and Oppression.....	128
PA 9.09 – European Defence.....	129
PA 9.10 Resolution of European Liberal Youth on European New Neighbours Policy	130
PA 9.11 The resolution of Cyprus	131
PA 9.12 Resolution “Open Negotiations with Turkey Without Delay!”	132
PA 9.13 – On the European Integration of Turkey	134
Policy Archive Chapter 10 – LYMEC Internal Organisation	135
PA 10.01 Internal Motion on Fianna Fail.....	135
PA 10.02 Emergency Motion on the ELDR Group	136
PA 10.03 Resolution on Fianna Fail and ELDR.....	136

Policy Archive Chapter 1 - EU Institutions and Institutional Reform

PA 1.01. European Defense

Whereas

- the developments of international relations over the past decades have caused for a re-focus of military capacities in all EU member states, as the focus seems to continue to shift away from state-against-state aggression and digital threads have come to the stage;
- contributing to a peaceful and stable world cannot only be achieved by the EU's current focus on 'soft power';
- the financial and economic crisis have caused pressure on national budgets throughout the European Union causing cuts on national budgets reserved for defense;
- the efficiency of defense spending within the European Union is seriously limited due to the fragmentation of materials, training capacities and other expenditures between the 28 Member States.

Noting that

- defense policy, on any level, should focus on strengthening the international rule of law, fighting conflicts, maintaining peace and fight international terrorism;
- Many nations in Europe have a certain speciality in military force.

Believing that

- The EU can only fully contribute to a peaceful and stable world order if its foreign policy is strengthened by a credible military force;
- the common European defense policy should focus on
- the coordination in military education and training;
- the establishment of one single military planning capacity and one single operational headquarters in the EU;
- pooling and sharing of critical military assets on the principle of burden and risk sharing between the member states
- the EU Member States should, on short term, agree on collective defense, whereby its member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party; on long term, European cooperation should be prioritized over NATO cooperation;
- Cooperating in the field of defense on the European level in current times seems to be more of a necessity than a choice in terms of efficiency and costs optimization.

LYMEC calls upon

- MOs to promote the cooperation of defense capabilities on the European level within their organizations and mother parties;
- the Bureau to promote this common European defense policy within the ALDE Party.
- lymec and its member organisations to push alde group and its member organisations to support the creation of a European defence force

PA 1.02 Stateless Nations' right to decide their own political future

Considering:

- That legitimacy of democratic systems and of political institutions in the EU is based on political participation.
- Europe to be founded on the values of freedom, democracy and respect for human rights, including minorities' rights.
- Citizens from all of Europe's nations to have the right to express their political will by peaceful and democratic means that which must be respected.
- That the EU should stand in defense of these democratic and legitimate rights.
- The EU is an entity in constant evolution; Member States should not be seen as immobile entities.

Acknowledging:

- That some nations in Europe have not yet, for several historical reasons, achieved Statehood.
- The liberal goal of a stronger EU does not oppose the defense of different identities and cultures within it.
- The huge demonstrations lived in Catalonia, with more than 1.5 million people peacefully asking for a referendum of independence.
- That several grassroots movements claiming the right of nations such as Scotland or Catalonia to vote on their political future have gained widespread support in these countries and political parties demanding a referendum hold a clear majority in the Catalan and Scottish Parliament.
- That the UK government has agreed with the Scottish government to hold a referendum on the independence of Scotland in 2014.

- Citizens and political parties calling for the right to vote in a referendum are moved by a pro-European conviction.

Calls for:

- Recognition that voting in a referendum should stand as best practices in order to resolve territorial political conflicts.
- The Spanish government to agree with the Catalan government on the terms for a referendum of independence in Catalonia following the UK example.
- The European Commission to make any further comments on the future of new States born in Europe, based on legal terms.
- LYMEC and the EU institutions to condemn any attempt to use the judicial power against the democratic will of European citizens belonging to stateless nations and their democratically elected institutions.

PA 1.03 Resolution on the European Electoral System

European Parliament, European Democracy, European Political Parties

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Konstanz, Germany on the 20th. of December 1992.

The Liberal and Radical Youth Movement of the European Community (LYMEC):

Supports the European Parliament in its struggle to achieve the recognition of its right to elaborate a democratic constitution for the European Union.

Recalls the right clearly recognised to the European Parliament by the article 138 of the EC institutive treaty for the creation of a uniform electoral system.

Believes in a system that involves the distribution of the seats with proportional method and obliges the European organisations to act as effective parties rather than weak confederations.

Affirms that the birth of authentic European parties will speed up the transformation of the Commission into a government that is responsible before the parliament.

States that this aim will be achieved through the introduction of the system of full proportional representation in the European elections.

PA 1.04 Resolution on the Reform of the European Institutions

(Archived in London 2019 (former 1.02))

European Commission, European Parliament, Future of Europe

Adopted at the Congress on 9th April 2000 in Skandeborg, Denmark.

LYMEC:

Notes that public confidence in the European Union and its institutions has fallen drastically, due to scandals concerning mismanagement and accusations of fraud in the Commission, as well as the increased attention paid to the system with generous travel allowances in the European Parliament;

Believes that a comprehensive reform of the management and administration of all European institutions is necessary in order to establish public confidence in the European Union and its policies;

Welcomes the willingness and efforts made by the Prodi Commission, and Commissioner Kinnock in particular, to bring about a thorough reform of the Commission, aiming at turning the Commission into the best multinational administration in the world by reforming management, financial control and personnel policy;

Welcomes the publishing of the White Paper on the Reform of the Commission;

Calls on the European institutions to introduce a common code of conduct for all staff, based on the recommendations by the Ombudsman and signified by transparency and a service-minded attitude towards the general public;

Welcomes especially the introduction of a European Union Attorney, being able to investigate and prosecute crimes committed inside the European institutions, in cooperation with the anti-fraud unit OLAF.

Salutes the commitment by the Commission to increased equality between men and women by aiming to double the representation of women in senior positions in the administration;

Stresses the importance of protection of whistleblowers, including their right to remain anonymous and to prevent search for leaks, as a means to stop corruption and fraud;

Condemns the practice in the European Parliament to pay travel refunds to MEP's without proof of actual expenses, since this is extremely expensive for the Parliament, undermines the credibility of the Parliament as an institution and leads to unjust and tax-free earnings on the taxpayers' expense;

Notes that many MEP's employ staff in the European Parliament and in their constituencies without employment contracts and without paying taxes and social fees, using the special allowance granted by the Parliament;

Calls on the ELDR Group to work for a Statute for Members and Assistants in the

European Parliament, including travel refunds based on actual travel expenses and a flat-rate salary for all MEP's as well as contract-based employment conditions for the Assistants;

Calls on the ELDR Group to urge all its members to sign the voluntary code of conduct, allowing members to claim travel refunds only according to actual costs, and which has already been signed by several members in the Group;

PA 1.05 Resolution on Public Access to Documents

(Archived in London 2019 (former 1.03))

European Democracy, European Parliament

Adopted at the Congress on 9th April 2000 in Skandeborg, Denmark

LYMEC:

Notes that no regulation exists concerning public access to documents of the European institutions, except for article 255 in the Treaty of the European Union;

Notes that many documents in the institutions are kept secret without valid reason and are not given out to the public upon request, including working documents in the European Parliament;

Believes that the right of the public and the media to access documents of governmental institutions constitutes an essential part of the democratic system;

Believes that a regulation concerning public access to documents of the European institutions is necessary in order to establish public confidence in the European Union and its policies;

Welcomes the effort made by the Prodi Commission, and Commissioner Kinnock in particular, to introduce a regulation regarding public access to documents of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, and which is a sign of willingness for change;

Welcomes the initiative taken by the President of the Commission, Mr. Prodi, to publish a journal of all correspondence on the internet;

Welcomes the initiative taken by liberal MEP Lousewies van der Laan to publish all committee documents of the European Parliament on the internet, since they are not available to the public on the Parliament's website although they are distributed openly in the committees;

Regrets that the proposal put forward by the Commission is far from sufficient and contains too many exceptions that could be used to prevent the public from having access to documents;

Believes that the basic principle should be that all documents of the institutions, including incoming as well as outgoing correspondence, are public, and that all efforts to classify documents must be justified;

Believes that access to documents should be restricted only when disclosure could undermine public security, court proceedings, privacy of the individual and other similar cases;

Believes that all European institutions should make a journal available on the internet, including all incoming and outgoing correspondence;

Believes that access to documents should be granted without a formal decision, since transparency is the basic principle;

Believes that the regulation on public access to documents must be combined with the right for journalists to protect their sources and preventing search for whistle-blowers;

Believes that a comprehensive regulation on public access to documents should replace article 255 in the Treaty, in order to safeguard the public's right to information;

Calls on the ELDR Group in the European Parliament to prioritise the work for a regulation on public access to documents, based on the criteria set out above, and applying to all European institutions;

Calls on the ELDR Group to work for immediate access by the public to the European Parliament's committee documents on the internet;

Instructs its Bureau to forward this resolution to the President of the ELDR Group, the President of the ELDR Party, the President of the European Parliament and the President of the European Commission;

Calls on the ELDR Group to continue to be in the forefront for and prioritise reform of the European institutions, in order to enhance transparency and accountability for increased public confidence B putting the citizen first.

PA 1.06 Resolution on the Post-Nice Process

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.04))

European Integration, European Democracy

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 7 - 8 April 2001, Plovdiv, Bulgaria

Recalling

- the clear failure of intergovernmentalism at the EU summit in Nice in December of 2000,
- the limited results the heads of state and government have made to get the European Union to move forward in a democratic and federal decentralised direction,

- the obvious lack of willingness to show some commitment to the common European cause and the display of one big horse trading in number of votes in the Council and the number of seats in the European Parliament for the various countries,

LYMEC congratulates

- the decision at Nice to proclaim a *Declaration on the Future of the Union*, signed by all member states, as final act of the IGC opening up the possibilities for further and wider debate on the future development of the EU,

LYMEC expresses

- its commitment to continue to work for a united Europe, and a federal and decentralised European Union that guarantees freedom, democracy, human rights as expressed in our manifesto,

LYMEC notes with concern

- the growing numbers of citizens that are becoming sceptical to the development of the EU,
- the decreasing support in the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe to join the EU,

LYMEC congratulates

- the President of the European Commission Romano Prodi with his proposal to start a citizens debate across the EU,

LYMEC expresses

- the need for a debate that includes citizens, civil society, politicians, scientists, business, national and regional parliaments and the European Union institutions,

LYMEC calls on its member organisations and the ELDR

- to pressure heads of state and government leaders to focus during EU summits more on EU interest and less in the national interest,
- to focus less on summits and concentrate more on convention style methods in the debate on the EU,
- to do all in their power to start and open up the debate on the future development of the EU,
- to strongly urge for a federal, liberal democratic European Union in the spirit of subsidiarity,
- to get youngsters involved in the debate.

PA 1.07 Resolution for Speeding Up the EU Enlargement Process

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.05))

European Integration, Future of Europe

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 7 - 8 April 2001, Plovdiv, Bulgaria

Noting:

- The growing Euro scepticism in both EU candidate and member countries
- The changed focus of negotiations in the last years towards the accession of the 1 st countries
- The continuous challenges for democracy and the stable political development in some parts of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe

LYMEC Welcomes:

- The latest steps taken in the Nice Summit for abolishing the visa restrictions for Bulgaria and Romania and the commitment presented by all EU institutions towards the enlargement process.

LYMEC Urges:

- The EC to keep up the speed of the process of enlargement also with the states not likely to be in the first wave of accession.
- The candidate states to speed up their reforms to fulfil the criteria for EU membership
- The LYMEC Bureau to forward this resolution to the ELDR-Group and to the ELDR-Council
- The LYMEC member organisations and member contacts in the EU member states and applicant states to pressure their mother parties and other politicians to achieve the aims of this resolution.

PA 1.08 Towards the Brussels-Laeken Declaration

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.07))

Future of Europe

Adopted at the LYMEC Executive Committee autumn 2001 in Switzerland.

Having regard to the *Declaration on the Future of the Union*, signed by all member states in December 2000 in Nice.

Recalling that the EU Member States came up with some institutional reforms to ensure EU enlargement, though the reforms were small and not courageous.

Stressing the need to thoroughly go further than just simple reforms, and opening the wider debate on the future of the European Union.

Noting the existing awareness among most member states governments that the European project cannot continue to go ahead in the current way.

Noting the courageous positions the Belgian government took at the Summit of Nice.

Reminding that back in the fifties the Treaty of Rome speaks of the determination to "lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe."

Acknowledging that the EU should go forward in a liberal democratic, federal and decentralised way.

LYMEC Proposes:

- It is essential that the Brussels-Laken declaration will press ahead with the issues that were proposed in Nice: (I) how to “establish and monitor a more precise delimitation of competencies between the European Union and the Member States, reflecting the principle of subsidiarity”; (II) the status of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; (III) “a simplification of the Treaties with a view to making them clearer and better understood without changing their meaning”; and (IV) “the role of national parliaments in the European architecture”. These issues will clearly be an important but first step to restore trust in the institutions.
- Calls on the EU member states not to frown away from sensitive issues in the Laken Declaration such as legitimacy of the European Union and to make the “Future of the EU” debate wider and find possibilities how in the future the political life of an enlarged Union will be structured.
- Calls on the EU leaders to come up with a timetable that sincerely can be discussed with citizens, experts and thinktanks, the European and national parliaments, representatives of legislative regions and the member states. Key words are freedom, democracy, a Constitution, rule of law, active but limited EU government and a focus on cross-border issues where EU involvement is required.
- Calls on the EU presidency to remind the EU leaders of the wise words from the very beginning of European integration: European integration is not there for the interests of the member states but in the citizens' interest.
- Stresses the need for continuous feedback from the EU presidency to the citizens on the proceedings with the reforms.
- that there will be no cooling down period between the "Declaration of Brussels-La(e)ken" and the IGC in order to have the reform in a fluid wave. This will ensure that the Member State do not alter anymore the democratic solutions brought forward by the EU institutions, (candidate) member states and the European people

As the Declaration will be discussed throughout the Belgian Presidency in the second semester of 2001 the LYMEC Executive Committee asks its Bureau to inform the EU presidency of our wishes and opinions.

PA 1.09 Yes to the European Constitutional Treaty

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.08))

Our Vision for Europe, Future of Europe, Constitution

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 8-10 April 2005.

The LYMEC Congress having regard to the policy paper annexed to this resolution

Whereas:

- In the upcoming months many EU member states will undergo into a process of ratification of the ***Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe*** that was signed in Rome last year on October 29th.

Noting that this Constitutional Treaty

- *makes* the European Union more democratic, transparent, accountable and effective, and therefore it makes the European project more politically legitimate.
- *reinforces* the role of the European Parliament by extending the co-decision procedure to almost all main political fields, including the control over all EU spending, which mean that parliamentary democracy is considerably empowered.
- *strengthens* the European citizenship as it incorporates the Charter on Fundamental Rights, which forces the EU institutions and member states to comply with it when implementing EU laws and policies.
- *simplifies* enormously the legislative instruments, and therefore it streamlines and rationalises the decision making processes. It clarifies the purpose and the values of the European Union, as well as the division of competences between the EU and its member states.
- *reinforces* the principle of subsidiarity by increasing the powers of member states' parliaments to scrutinise EU draft law, as well as by respecting the regional autonomy.
- *makes* EU more influencing on global affairs. It creates the Foreign Affairs Minister as one single post that will lead the diplomatic services, represent and formulate the interests of the Union abroad. Furthermore, the EU is to be provided with legal personality in the world.
- *makes* the Commission become more accountable to the European Parliament and also more efficient based on its composition and election. The election of its President will reflect the outcome of the European Parliament elections.
- *makes* the Council become more transparent, democratic and accountable to member states' parliaments. Transparent because the Council will meet in public; democratic because it widens the scope of decision subject to a qualified majority voting.
- *provides* for reinforced integration in the field of justice and home affairs, especially on issues such as immigration and asylum, judicial cooperation in criminal matters, harmonization of penal codes,...
- *increases* the participatory democracy by allowing one million citizens to initiate EU policies.

The LYMEC Congress concludes that:

- This Constitutional Treaty, although being far from perfect, is another step towards a more liberal and federal Europe

And therefore LYMEC recommends its Members in the countries where popular referenda and parliamentary votes will take place to actively campaign in favour of this Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.

Annexe

LYMEC has formed its opinion weighing the changes the Constitution would introduce to the institutional workings of the European Union, if adopted, vis-a-vis the current institutional framework on which the EU is currently based.

LYMEC is wholly supportive of:

- 1) The development of cutting most of the overly elaborate processes and examples that govern the European Union at the moment. Out of the four procedures that concern the decision-making-process of the European Parliament, there has been an obvious choice to make the co-decision procedure as the main and most important one.
- 2) The increase in the powers of the European Parliament, especially concerning the possibilities this will present concerning the outcome of the budget – which includes the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Foreign and Security Policy – as well as the fact that the European Parliament will gain more power to influence European policy-making in several new and other areas.
- 3) The abolishment of the procedure concerning the length of the Presidency of the European Council and introducing a Presidency of 2.5 years.
- 4) The curtailing of the European Commission by letting every Member State rotate a proposed European Commissioner on an equal timely basis, which will lead to a smaller Commission that will be more capable and efficient in executing its set tasks.
- 5) The possibility for national governments to perform the subsidiary test with the proposed initiatives by the European Commission in an early stage. This will allow for an early dismissal of superfluous judicial policy changes.
- 6) The move to focus on the problems concerning the domain of Justice and Home Affairs and providing a joint European solution to the problems at hand. In particular the attention for the problems concerning the impact of asylum seekers and immigrant workers and the focus on solutions for the existence cross-national criminal networks and terrorism.
- 7) The increase in possibilities for the Council to apply the qualified majority principle when voting on certain issues.

8) The creation of the principle of participatory democracy, whereby citizens can influence European legislation by their own initiatives.

9) The proposal, when a unanimous decision regarding an issue concerning European foreign policy arises, to invite the President of the Commission and the Minister of Foreign Affairs to espouse the European view in the UN Security Council and other organizations where this might be considered useful and helpful for the situation.

10) The openness that will become obligatory for meetings of the Council and the Parliament, which will clearly improve the issue of transparency as regards to the workings of the European Union.

LYMEC is supportive of:

1) The inclusion of procedures regarding the choice for a President of the Commission, which will include a preliminary condition that the choice for any President should reflect the outcome, with regards to the political situation, of the election results of the European Parliament. However, LYMEC is concerned about the fact that the nomination procedures regarding the President of the European Commission can only be initiated and completed by the European Council. This does not contribute to a more democratic European Union, which the Constitution seeks to establish.

2) The fact that two European councils, the Ecofin and the Council for External Affairs, will be attributed their own appointed Presidents, which will remain in control over their respective Council until new elections will be held.

In the other four councils a rotating system will remain in place. LYMEC is concerned by the fact that this will give rise to two separate policies regarding the presidency of several differing European councils. LYMEC would have preferred an appointed and set President for all European councils.

3) The creation of a European Minister of Foreign Affairs, who will be able to conduct the external relations with regards to the Common Foreign and Security Policy and can be held accountable for this policy as such.

4) The creation of several new bodies, like the European External Action Service and the European Defence Agency, that will facilitate and support the execution of the Common Foreign and Security Policy by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. LYMEC would however like more attention to be paid to the structural implications of the creation of these bodies within the current framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy. More attention should also be paid to the provisions for the recruitment of the staff of these new bodies. The Constitution is found to be too vague and not lucid enough, regarding these issues.

5) The fact that the Stability Pact has not been included in the Constitutional Treaty, since the Stability Pact would be subject of improvements which would be extremely difficult to achieve within the Constitutional Treaty.

LYMEC is not supportive of:

1) The conditions that state that a candidate applying for the post of President of the European Council should have fulfilled the function of Minister, President or Prime-

Minister. This post should in actual fact be open to all people, such as for example a former President of the European Commission.

2) The lacking and missing steps that would need to be implemented to lay the foundation for a federal structure for the European Union, especially with regards to the implementation of budget of the European Union, a process that is still subject to an overruling veto by one of the Member States in the European Council. Similarly, the lack of changes concerning the Common Foreign and Security Policy is reason for concern according to JD. JD considers it an extremely untimely missed opportunity that the European Convention, in particular the heads of state that were present during the Intergovernmental Conference, did not seize the opportunity to reform and fortify the political structure of the European Union in a more democratic way.

3) The fact that on certain fields such as the financial perspectives, Common Foreign and Security Policy, unanimity is still required in the Council in order to take decision.

4) The rigidity of the Constitutional Treaty when introducing changes.

PA 1.10 Resolution “Tear down the Fortress of Europe!”

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.09))

European Integration, Future of Europe

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Zagreb, Croatia on 27th -28th of April 2004

Almost on a daily basis the news about horrifying journeys through deserts, across the Mediterranean Sea and on European motorways reach us in the shape of margin-notes in the newspapers and television broadcastings. However, this time the subject is not that of painful animal transports for endless distances. This time we are dealing with transports of people, of our fellow human beings. People are left behind to die in the Saharan Desert during rapid crossings in overloaded pickup trucks. People pay outrageous sums in US dollars in order to be smuggled to the European shores in rubber-boats in the middle of the winter. Testimonies of the horrors and the casualties that take place out there – maybe right this minute, as you are reading these lines – have frequently been presented in the media, only to be forgotten ten minutes later. That type of news-items apparently does not conquer the media market.

As long as the inequalities in the distribution of resources, in the respect of basic human rights and in the possibility to live in peace are as huge as they are today, people will migrate. Some of these refugees fulfil the requirements of the Refugee Convention (1951) to be entitled to a residence permit, but the major part of today's non-voluntary migrants do not fall within the narrow definitions of the Convention. Instead, they are often labelled “humanitarian refugees” or “economic refugees” – the choice of terms somewhat reflecting the attitude of the speaker.

The Refugee Convention was drafted in another era, primarily aiming at solving the refugee problems in Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War. This Convention has one big deficiency: it does not accord refugee status to people that might be in situations that are much worse than those of “classical” refugees. For

instance: war and warlike situations do not count in the assessment process, neither does extreme poverty. However, it is our duty to take care of those people as well. That moral duty is neglected in Europe of today. We have recently by the Dublin Convention introduced the rule of "first asylum country" as binding law, which means that refugees have to apply for asylum in the first Convention State that they enter. Thereby they lose their opportunity, in case their application is rejected, to apply in any other State party to the Convention. This rule is not so bad as it seems, *provided* that common, humane minimum standards of residence permit emerge in the whole territory in question, and *provided* that assistance and co-operation between the relevant states becomes mandatory. Which is not the case today. In fact, we – the Europeans – have combined the most negative components from two systems. Yes – only one chance to seek asylum, but no – no common minimum standards. Result: a race between nations in introducing more and more strict refugee and immigration rules in order not to become the unlucky "looser" that receives all the refugees (which is begging for problems with the national opinion). Cynicism, but nevertheless reality.

On the other hand, neither the situation prior to the Dublin Convention was acceptable. Then, the ping-pong game with people, called "refugees in orbit", caused lots of suffering. European states have never been able to handle refugees in a decent manner! Therefore, the proposal of the European Convention in Brussels to refer asylum issues as a whole to the EU supranational level is a good solution. Then it will be up to the European politicians to lower the borders of Europe and thereby reduce the profitability of the smugglers' market.

In order not to raise obstacles for Member States that may want to have more generous rules concerning the adoption of refugees than those common within the EU, the latter ones should only exist in the form of *minimum requirements*.

Finally, a word about the directive concerning obligation of carriers. This directive is an unacceptable mix between the roles of state authorities and private enterprises, which in the end may stop many persons fulfilling the requirements for asylum in the target state from ever reaching their destination. Private travelling-companies' employees are obliged to assess within minutes what may take months for state authorities to conclude. The right of every individual to have his/her case tried by a competent authority has been severely compromised. Therefore, this directive must be abolished immediately.

For these reasons, the Centre Party Students' Association urges

- that refugee policy as a whole be a common European issue that should be dealt with on a supranational EU-level,
- that the common standards for assessment of residence permit be more generous and humane than the national standards of most European states of today,
- that Member States have the opportunity to keep or introduce more generous domestic rules than the common EU-standards,

- that assistance and co-operation between EU-states in the field of refugee adoption become obligatory, at least regarding refugees that fulfil the common EU-standards,
- that the directive about obligation of carriers to stop refugees that lack valid travel documents immediately be abolished.

PA 1.11 Resolution “The European Union: a State?”

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.10))

European Integration, Future of Europe

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Zagreb, Croatia on 27th -28th of April 2004

The LYMEC Congress

Whereas

- A LYMEC Seminar was held in Paris on 6-8 February 2004 on the theme “*The European Union: a State?*” and helped to raise fundamental questions as regards the essence and the future of the European Union
- An intergovernmental agreement could be reached in 2004 establishing a first “Constitution” for the European Union

Considering that

- The LYMEC Manifesto and Policy Book does not answer to the following key questions for the future of the European Union:
 - Isn't federalism entailing the need for an (democratic and decentralised) EU State?
 - Is building a democratic European Federation possible without transferring sovereignty to an EU State?
 - Should not an authentic European “Constitution” be adopted by a European Referendum, at the majority of European citizens?
 - Is a European Constitution realistic without a European People? Shouldn't the EU foster the emergence of such European People? Should a EU federal language be instituted or should multilingualism persist?
 - To what extent would an EU Member State have the right to withdraw from the EU if becoming a Federal Union?
 - Shouldn't the Convention working method be used for further revisions of the European Constitution?
 - Shouldn't there be an elected EU Head of State, in addition to an EU Government?
- LYMEC should have a clear stance on these issues

Concludes

- The LYMEC Manifesto should be urgently reviewed and updated in order to address these fundamental questions and give them a clear answer.

PA 1.12 Internal Motion of the Debate on Europe's Future

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.12))

Future of Europe

What is Europe for, where should it go, and where does it end, these questions loom large debates on the future of EU. European Liberals should take the lead and come up with a motivating liberal project for the EU by June 2006, highlighting the added values of the European Union, in order to regain trust from the citizens.

LYMEC has defined on many occasions answers to all these questions. Nonetheless, after the failure of referenda on the European Constitutional Treaty in both France and The Netherlands, it is important to engage as many young liberals as possible and give a new impetus to all these debates on a local, regional and national level.

The European Liberal Democrats and Reformers (ELDR) is in process of consolidating a policy paper that defines the liberal vision on the future of Europe both in the short but also in the long terms. LYMEC has been asked to contribute with a strong input to this paper and the bureau has decided to engage LYMEC members in this process from a bottom-top approach.

Therefore, the European Liberal Youth – LYMEC

1. Requests its Members to organise local and national debates on the future of the EU, the conclusions of which will be consolidated into a LYMEC Report to be presented and adopted at the next LYMEC Congress in April
2. Suggests that the following essential political moot points should be addressed in priority:
 - a. What is the goal of the European integration?
 - b. What are the geographical boundaries of the European integration process?
 - c. How should we define the European social and economic model (the "European dream") in the context of globalisation?
 - d. What is Europe's role in the world?
 - e. How should the EU be structured?

The absolute deadline for receiving contributions from the Members will be February 1st.

Enclosed you can find section V of the LYMEC manifesto "Strong and United Europe, deepening European democracy"

Addendum

V. Strong and United Europe, deepening European democracy

LYMEC is committed to the process of creating a closer Union among the peoples of Europe. Strong cooperation among European nations is a guarantor of stability and progress and prosperity in Europe, goals that have been too often compromised in recent past with wars and conflicts.

In a competitive and globalized world, the Europeans stand a better chance of keeping up with other nations or even leading in economic and social development when they combine their collective productivity and creativity.

The European Union represents the most successful political, social and economic framework for European-wide cooperation.

Nonetheless, the European Union feels distant to citizens. The alarmingly low turnouts at elections for the European Parliament illustrate this. The citizens in general do not understand who is responsible for which policy in this labyrinth of European legislation. Intergovernmental Conferences and EU Summits from Maastricht to Brussels have shown that EU decision-making lacks legitimacy and is not transparent, not democratic and not efficient enough.

LYMEC believes that the European Union needs to be further developed and enhanced so that it becomes a union for the people and by the people. In this respect, the adoption of a Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe is a meaningful, significant and substantial step forward, which must lead to further reforms and improvements, but in any case it cannot be considered as the final step.

1. Institutional Settings

LYMEC believes that the Union needs a democratic, federal, open and transparent decision-making system, accountable to its citizens, in order to reconnect the peoples of Europe with the decisions taken in their name. This should be based on the democratic principle of the separation of powers.

As the only directly democratically elected body, the Parliament, representing the citizens, should co-decide in all policy fields. It should have full budgetary competence and it should have the right of initiative. Brussels should be the only residence of the European Parliament and its secretariat. Furthermore, the European Parliament should have the right to propose and elect the President of the European Commission and should have the power to remove individual Commissioners and to impeach the Commission President.

In the European Parliament, LYMEC believes that national and regional electoral lists are required to retain the traditional link that exists in some Member States between elected representatives and their constituents, whilst also believes that an EU-wide element is required to enhance the reach of the EU political parties as a precursor to establishing a pan-European democracy. We thus believe that members of the European Parliament should be elected in two components: some elected in national or regional lists, and some others elected from a standardized EU "top-up" list.

The Council should meet in public. The Council should be reformed into a genuine second chamber, co-deciding together with the European Parliament on EU legislation. Decisions in especially sensitive areas can be made with a double majority of states and people, preventing the domination of big countries over smaller ones.

The right of veto should be banned in the decision-making system of the Union. The constitutional regions, in agreement with their member states, should participate in the Council of Ministers when debating what belongs to the sphere of competencies of those regions.

The European Commission is the guarantor of the European Constitution. The European Commission has to be transformed into a true European executive. It has to be fully accountable to the Parliament and the Council.

All matters within the competence of the Union should be subject to the Court of Justice. Every citizen should have the right to approach the Court of Justice.

2. Competencies of the Union

The Union of tomorrow must be based on decentralization and diversity, not on petty bureaucracy and over-regulation. This means that the EU will only be in charge of those decisions, which cannot be better achieved as well on national or regional levels. The execution of competencies should be based on the two principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, which have to be closely monitored. The principle of subsidiarity implies that decisions should be made at the lowest level of government.

3. Development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy

Foreign Policy should remain a shared competence of the European Union. The Foreign and Security policy should be integrated and decisions taken democratically by the European Parliament and Council.

The EU should pursue a comprehensive approach to promoting peace and security, based on (1) conflict prevention, (2) crisis management involving the Rapid Reaction Force (RRF), (3) post-conflict institution building. The EU must develop a Defence Identity. The Rapid Reaction Force allows Europe to partake in peace-keeping and crisis management operations. However, it is unable to function without NATO assets and has no role in defending the EU. A European Army will be more efficient economically and will be more effective militarily. No member state, however, should be forced against its will to participate in specific missions. The EU shall respect the right of any member state to participate in international cooperation agreements external to the Union.

4. Home affairs, migration and asylum

We are against a "Fortress Europe". Besides being economically beneficial, migration is a historical and natural phenomenon, and it is also a constituting character of European culture. Globalization of the market will bring globalization of fundamental rights and thus freedom of movement. We therefore want to see a harmonized immigration and refugee policy with a liberal right to asylum.

There should be no obstacles inside the EU to free trade and free movement of labour force, private capital and services. To secure the free movement of people, the social rights should be transferable in the member states.

We support the establishment of a EU citizenship, which would be complimentary to national citizenship.

5. Europe in a Globalized world

Europe's approach to relations with other regions of the world is a challenge of ensuring peace and stability. We believe that the EU must pay particular attention to Europe's new neighboring countries.

EU must recognize our eastern and southern neighbours as a cooperation priority. Increased EU involvement in these countries will support fledgling democracies, prevent the violation of human rights and help develop a free market economy. EU should be a key player in promoting global governance.

The membership in the European Union must be open to all European countries who comply with the Copenhagen Criteria. The European Union must provide assistance to pre-accession countries to achieve the necessary standards for EU membership.

PA 1.13 Resolution on the Future of Europe **(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.14))**

WHEREAS:

- The draft Treaty *establishing a Constitution for Europe* was rejected by referendum in France (29 May 2005) and in the Netherlands (1st June 2005) but was approved by a majority of Member States representing a majority of the peoples of Europe
- In the absence of a clear plan B, the European Council decided on 16-17 June to install a *"period of reflection (...) to enable a broad debate to take place in each of our countries, involving citizens, civil society, social partners, national parliaments and political parties"*.
- On 21 September, European Commission President Barroso declared that *"at least for the next two or three years, we will not have a Constitution"*, creating a row of protests.
- Andrew Duff MEP (ALDE) set out to rescue the European Constitution and presented on 13 October a draft report on the period of reflection, to be voted by the EP Plenary next December, whilst Commissioner Margot Wallström launched on the same day the European Commission's "Plan D" (for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate).

AND CONSIDERING THAT:

- It is necessary to respect the verdict of those Member States and their peoples which have ratified the Constitution as well as those which have not,
- The 'No' votes appear to have been rather more an expression of dissent at the present state of some Member States, than a specific objection to the constitutional reforms as has been shown by several polls,
- Part I of the draft Treaty strengthens EU parliamentary democracy and the rule of law, anchors fundamental rights, enhances the capacity of the EU to act effectively on the world scene, and forms a suitable constitutional framework for the European Union;
- The European Council failed to give a clear focus to the period of reflection or to define methods, and has been seen to lack both the political will and the capacity to stimulate and manage the European dialogue,
- The European Commission has lacked political leadership to help the Union emerge from its current constitutional difficulties;

THE EUROPEAN LIBERAL YOUTH – LYMEC:

- Confirms its wish to see without undue delay a constitutional settlement of the future of Europe: a fully-fledged political union cannot indeed emerge without a prior agreement on a common constitutional framework,
- Supports the Constitution rescue initiative launched and led by Andrew Duff MEP, whilst inviting the ALDE Group to sharpen as much as possible EP recommendations - sometimes too lukewarm - on the possible way out from the period of reflection.
- Calls for a ratification of the constitutional part of the draft Treaty (essentially Part I, which contains a reference to Part II) by popular vote at the occasion of the European Parliament elections of 2009, thereby constituting the first Constitution of Europe's history
- Calls for a separate ratification by national parliaments of the non-constitutional parts of the draft Treaty (essentially Part III, which provides an excellent in-depth summary of the *acquis communautaire*),

- Maintains its long-term vision of a European Federation, with a clear European Government and a bicameral Parliament representing on the one hand the European citizens and on the other hand the European Member States.
- Proposes that a European Constitutional Assembly is elected in 2014 in order to shape a European Constitution that responds to the challenges of the 21st century and the coming enlargement of the EU to Turkey.

AND FURTHERMORE:

- Welcomes the beginnings of a fresh debate, coordinated by the European Commission, about the controversial issues that surround the future of the EU
- Warns that uncoordinated, narrowly focussed national debates will serve only to harden national stereotypes and accentuate divisions; and an imposed dialogue without political goals will be nebulous, even vacuous, thereby giving rise to public cynicism;
- Asks the ELDR Party to take an active role, together with other European political parties, in this pan-European debate and give a European perspective to this debate

PA 1.14 Young liberals' vision for the future of the Council of Europe

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.16))

Council of Europe, European Democracy

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 1-4 May 2008 in Barcelona, Catalonia

The LYMEC Congress

Whereas:

- The Council of Europe, founded in 1949, is the oldest organisation working for European integration. It is an international organisation with legal personality recognised under public international law and has observer status with the United Nations.
- The main areas of work of the Council of Europe include the protection of democracy, rule of law and human rights, and the promotion of cultural cooperation and diversity, education, youth exchanges and fair sport.
- The Council of Europe gathers 47 European Member States, whereas the European Union now counts 27 Member States and 3 candidate countries. With the exception of Belarus, Kosovo and the Vatican, all European states have now acceded to the Council of Europe.
- Jean-Claude Juncker delivered a report in April 2006 on the relations between the Council of Europe and the European Union at the request of the Heads of State and Government
- A Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the EU and the Council of Europe on 10-11 May 2007, reinforcing cooperation between the two institutions on culture and education as well as on the international enforcement of justice and human rights.
- The European Court of Human Rights is the jewel of the Council of Europe, since every citizen can appeal to it when its basic and fundamental rights have been abused

- The EU is due to accede to the European Convention on Human Rights when the Lisbon Treaty will be ratified by all its Member States.
- There is a substantial overlap between the competences and geographical scope of the Council of Europe and European Union, notably in the context of the growing significance of the EU's Neighbourhood policy and recent EU enlargements.
- The Council of Europe is facing decreasing political relevance for EU Member States in the context of the EU's continuous enlargement
- EU's neighbours, notably in the south of the Mediterranean and Western Asia, would largely benefit from the experience accumulated by the Council of Europe over the past 60 years in the field of human rights (European Convention on Human Rights).

Concludes:

- Since the EU enlargement process is due to last and will not cover the whole European continent in the near future, the Council of Europe should remain the main and most important institution for the protection of democracy, rule of law and human rights, and the promotion of intercultural dialogue and fair sport on the European continent.
- The EU bodies should recognise the Council of Europe as the reference source for human rights and intercultural dialogue in Europe.
- The EU should take all the necessary legal steps in order to adhere to the European Convention on Human Rights as soon as possible, which inter alia passes by the swift ratification of the Lisbon Treaty by all its Member States
- The hierarchy in legal system resulting from EU adhesion to the ECHR should be transparent for all EU citizens
- The Council of Europe should consider the possibility of opening adhesion to the European Convention on Human Rights to non-European EU neighbours such as Southern Mediterranean countries

Asks the LYMEC Bureau and its Member Organisations to:

- Raise political awareness about the significance of the Council of Europe as the reference institution for human rights and intercultural dialogue, and work together with the relevant bodies of the Council of Europe to help achieving this aim
- Issue a statement at the occasion of the Council of Europe's 60th anniversary in May 2009

PA 1.15 Resolution on European citizenship – from dream to reality

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.17))

European Integration, Future of Europe

Adopted at LYMEC Congress, assembled in Rome from 8th till 10th of May 2009,

Recalling

- That citizenship of the European Union was introduced with the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992

- That it was further developed with the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999 and the Treaty of Nice 2001
- That LYMEC in the past has called for true European citizenship time and again Deeply worried
- About the response of the German consul during the Mumbai terror attacks claiming „I can take only the Germans“ when approached for help by fellow EU citizens and even MEPs.
- By the extremely bureaucratic and un-helpful response of the French consulate at the same occasion, not issuing laissez-passer documents to EU citizens
- By the discriminating treatment of EU citizens from Romania in Italy, where national laws have been changed to cater anti-Romanian sentiments

Criticizing

- The still ongoing division between “first class” EU citizens from Western European countries and “second” class EU citizens from Eastern European Countries
- Protectionist measures especially in times of crisis

Noting that

- the concept of EU citizenship is essential for the emotional connection of Europeans to the EU and therefore for the success of European integration itself
- true EU citizenship needs to become reality in a Union where internal borders become less and less relevant

Calls on EU member states, the European Commission and the European Parliament to strengthen the concept of European Union citizenship by

- refraining from privileging national citizens over EU citizens
- bringing in line the rights of all EU citizens from old and new Member States such as the right to work in all member states as soon as possible
- transforming the de iure right for EU-citizens to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of other Member States when in a non-EU Member State into reality
- apprehending EU citizens as equal to national citizens
- including it in the Stockholm Programme which will be adopted under the Swedish Presidency and will set the strategic objectives for the further development of the Union's area of freedom, security and justice from 2010 to 2014.

PA 1.16 Resolution on the Presidency of the European Council

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.18))

European Council, European Democracy

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

The Young Liberals of Europe, gathered in Sinaia, Romania,

Considering the Lisbon Treaty entered into force on the 1st of December 2009 bringing significant changes to the working of the institutions of the European Union.

Seeing that one of the most important changes is the new function of President of the European Council.

That on the 19th of november 2009, Herman Van Rompuy, the former prime minister of Belgium was appointed the first ever President of the European Council.

Knowing that this mandate, that lasts for a two and a half year term and is renewable once, is meant to strengthen the EU's position on the international scene as well as to facilitate the cooperation between Member States.

Taking into account that the role of the President of the Council is still unclear for many people and that this lack of clarity is enhanced by the fact that there is still a rotating 6 month presidency between Member States.

The European Liberal Youth

- 1) calls on the Member States to clarify and strengthen the role of the President of the European Council
- 2) asks that the rotating presidency between Member States is put to a stop in order to provide the working of the European institutions with much needed transparency and efficiency.

PA 1.17 On the European Integration of Iceland

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.19))

EU Enlargement, Iceland

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

Considering that:

- On 24 February 2010, the EU Commission recommended opening of accession negotiations with Iceland; 2012 or 2013 as accession year seems possible as Iceland is an EEA member and therefore has already adopted large parts of the *acquis communautaire*;

- Iceland as Europe's second largest fisheries nation (after Norway) in terms of total annual catch volume and one of Europe's most innovative countries (strong research sector; leader in geothermal energy, genetics research, aluminium industry etc.) would be a valuable member of the Community;
- In October 2008, Landsbanki and its subsidiaries defaulted during the Icelandic financial crisis, marking the start of the so-called "Icesave dispute" centred around the roughly 3.2 billion Euro deposited with Dutch and British Landsbanki subsidiaries;
- Under Directive 94/19/EC, incorporated into EEA law, a minimum 20 000 Euro per depositor are guaranteed by national deposit guarantee funds. Such a fund, the Tryggingarsjóður, was established according to the provisions in the Directive by Iceland in 1999. However, it fell far short of covering even 10% of deposits;
- The main legal issue, whether the Icelandic government guarantees these deposits in last resort if the fund fails to honour the guarantees, is unresolved. The same applies to claims that Iceland breached Article 7 TFEU on non-discrimination because it honoured all deposits with Icelandic Landsbanki holdings;
- The EEA Joint parliamentary committee, consisting of four representatives of each EEA country and twelve MEPs of all major EP groups, has acknowledged the lack of clarity in Directive 94/19/EC;
- The Icelandic government, despite the unclear legal situation, always emphasized that it was ready reimburse the Netherlands and the UK. Nonetheless, negotiations on the terms of the agreement, especially the interest rate of the loan to grant Iceland for repayment, have been difficult;
- The Netherlands and the UK are influenced by the fact that the main depositors were local authorities in both countries which are exempt from their national guarantee schemes because they are seen as being capable of proper risk assessment;
- Furthermore, the UK and the Netherlands have hindered IMF emergency loans to Iceland and are threatening to link the issue to EU accession talks. This pressured Iceland into agreement under unfavourable terms. This was also criticized by the EEA Joint Parliamentary Committee;
- The repayment of Icesave deposits to the UK and the Netherlands significantly contribute to Iceland's debt rising from 29% of its GDP in 2007 to over 100%, putting a burden of tens of thousands of Euro on each Icelandic household and hampering future economic growth;
- Hence, Icelandic population has rejected the first agreement negotiated under pressure to obtain IMF loans with 93% after 23% of the population have petitioned with the President to veto it and bring it to a referendum;

- Negotiations are continuing between the Foreign Affairs committees of the three countries;

LYMEC, at its spring 2010 Congress in Sinaia, Romania:

- Welcomes Iceland's ambitions to join the European Union and calls for swift accession negotiations;
- Emphasizes that the icesave dispute is a purely bilateral issue to be resolved by the respective EU/EEA member states;
- Calls upon the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Iceland to negotiate a fair and amicable agreement to resolve the icesave dispute as quickly as possible. Its impact on the Icelandic economy should be a matter of serious concern during the negotiations. If no solution can be found, the matter should be decided upon by the EFTA Court;
- Is firmly against linking the icesave dispute to the accession of Iceland to the European Union;
- Welcomes the European Commission's efforts to review Directive 94/19/EC on deposit guarantee schemes;
- Will introduce a resolution in the spirit of this one at the ELDR congress in Helsinki, Finland in the autumn of 2010.

PA 1.18 Resolution on the "Innovation Union" strategy

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.20))

European Council, Future of Europe, Education

Adopted at LYMEC Congress in Ljubljana, November 2010.

European Liberal Students Network

The European Council recently set out the "Europe 2020" agenda – "A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth". The strategy was launched in June this year and aims, among other things, to raise the employment rate to 75 %, raising R&D investments to 3 % of GDP and improving education levels.

One important factor in the Europe 2020 agenda is the "Innovation Union" idea, which the Commission set out in early October and presented to ministers from the member states on October 12th (see IP/10/1288).

The Innovation Union strategy includes both positive and negative proposals. However, our concern is that the role of universities – and in that, universities with *autonomy* in particular – has largely been left out of the strategy.

Therefore,

Recognizing

- that the aims of the Commission's "Innovation Union" strategy are largely positive,

- that the support for and independent ranking system for universities, the completion of the European Research Area and the increase of R&D investments are particularly positive,
- that there also are proposals in the strategy which are problematic, in particular the Commission setting up a "checklist of the features of successful innovation systems", steering funds towards certain types of innovation ("social innovation", "public procurement of innovative products and services") and using state aid to promote innovation,

Believing

- that the recent financial crisis calls for the development of a more innovation-friendly economy in Europe, to strengthen the EU's competitiveness,
- that higher education and research are essential elements in forming fruitful innovation,
- that universities with autonomy to form their own strategies, curricula and fields of specialization are essential arenas for research and innovation to take place,
- that political steering of markets generally hampers the growth of the economy,

We propose that LYMEC calls upon ALDE and the Commission to

- more clearly define the role of universities for research and innovation in the "Innovation Union" strategy,
- not use the said strategy as a tool for further central planning of higher education and research in European countries,
- more clearly recognize in the strategy the need for competition and diversity in the innovation process and as foundations for economic growth.

PA 1.19 Urgent resolution on the Noble Prize for Peace awarded to the European Union

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.22))

Democracy, Freedom, Civil Liberties, Croatia, Cyprus

Adopted at The Congress of European Liberal Youth, gathered in Sofia, on 12th-14th, October 2012

– Considering that

In the past sixty years, the European Union has been representing the most successful attempt to establish peace, liberty, democracy, rule of law and protection and promotion of human rights on the entire European continent, through establishing peace and reconciliation in the first place among France and Germany;

The European Union has played a very important role as factor of stability in the Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Communist Empire in 1989, opening its doors to the democracies that were born in the next years;

The inclusion of Federal Republic of Germany in the hard core of European Union has clearly helped the reunification of that Country;

Next year Croatia is going to become official member of the European Union, that has demonstrated to be a democratic pole of attraction for the countries of Balkans, giving end to tensions and conflicts in this area;

– Remembering that

the European Union it is not just about the internal market and economics, but it is about promoting the best conditions of life for every of its individual citizen;

every achievement in establishing peace, freedom, democracy, rule of law and protection of human rights could not be considered as perpetual by itself, but requires constant attention and will of politics and civil society to be preserved and enhanced;

in times of economic crisis peace, freedom, democracy, rule of law and protection of human rights could be put not at the top of political agenda, especially by populist and nationalistic parties, like it is happening in Greece with Golden Dawn and could happen everywhere in the Union;

All has been proved recently by the worrying outcomes of the illiberal policies of Hungary;

Nowadays Cyprus is still split in two parts, with no appreciable steps forward on the path of reconciliation and reunification;

The entire liberal family should pay particular attention in avoiding every nationalistic, not democratic and populist involution of EU Member States;

The Mediterranean neighborhood has tackling the difficult process of affirmation of democracy, freedom, rule of law and protection of human rights, and the European Union has the precise duty to accompany and sustain every effort towards an open society in those States, after decades of bloody dictatorships;

Expresses its deep appreciation

for the decision of the Nobel Prize Committee to laureate the European Union for Peace, proud of being among them who support the European Union as political, economic and social ambitious project to end violence in Europe, as well as example set for the rest of the world, but even conscious of internal and external obstacles that will be faced.

PA 1.20 No double standards – the EU needs a frugal budget that invests into the future!

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.25))

Adopted at LYMEC Congress, assembled in Ljubljana from 26. -28. November 2010,

- Noting the recent discussion about the EU budget both for the next year as well as for the upcoming multiannual budget timeframe,
- Concerned about the sole focus on raising the income side of the budget rather than reducing the spending side,
- Ashamed by the idea to raise the EU budget in a time when citizens have to endure cuts and austerity budgets in their Member States,
- Dismayed by the fact that the EU still spends over forty percent of the whole budget on agricultural subsidies,
- Knowing of the advantages of lean administration and a state that focuses on its core tasks,
- Convinced of the concept of tax competition in order to provide citizens and companies with the best conditions,
- Certain that the acceptance of the European Union as a whole is closely linked to the public perception it creates about its spending habits, especially in times of austerity,

Reaffirms its commitment to a fiscally responsible European Union.

The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) calls

- For a responsible budget that reflects the need to save taxpayers money. The total amount budgeted thus should stay the same for the nearer future.
- Demands the phasing out of subsidies the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the Common Fishery Policy (CFP) and investing these funds in education, research, and environmental responsibility, thereby establishing a commitment of the Union to intergenerational fairness
- The phase-out of any rebates for any member states.

PA 1.21 Resolution on the European Elections 1994

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.27))

European Parliament, European Democracy, European Political Parties

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress in Konstanz, Germany, 20 December 1992

The Liberal and Radical Youth Movement of the European Community:

Asserts that young liberals and radicals are often exploited during the electoral campaigns for the mere purpose of affixing posters or distributing leaflets;

Recalls the need to guarantee a full citizenship and equal opportunities for everybody;

Binds the ELDR party members to reserve at least 5% of their lists to the candidates appointed by liberal and radical youth organizations and ratified by the next LYMEC Congress;

Sets up a committee composed of five members with the aim of picking up pre-nominations and organizing campaigns for young liberals and radicals candidates to the European Parliament.

PA 1.22 Give power to the Parliament - the representatives of the people

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.28))

European Parliament, European Democracy, European Political Parties

Adopted at the LYMEC Seminar "Challenge Democracy" in St. Gallen, Switzerland 16th – 19th of October 2001 and readopted at the LYMEC Executive Committee meeting in St. Gallen, Switzerland the 20th-21st of October 2001.

LYMEC recognises a democratic deficit at the European level in form of a lack of accountability. In the EU, the most important decisions are primarily negotiated by the Council of Ministers. Instead of being taken by the European Parliament, negotiating and voting takes place behind closed doors. An individual's possibility to influence the political direction of the EU is therefore limited. In addition, the very complex EU institutional structure, which is not easily understood, has a negative impact on the Europeans' interest in the integration project.

To publish the voting results in the Council of Ministers would partially solve the problem. In the long term, however, the solution must be a more powerful European Parliament. The proposal should go from the Commission to the Parliament and then to the Council of Ministers. As today both the Parliament and the Council of Ministers shall vote in favour of a proposal in order to get it carried through. The Parliament should have the right of initiative that gives more power to the people's representatives and enables them to realise the ideas that they were elected for.

A stronger European Parliament would increase the media's coverage of European issues and thereby broaden the public engagement in common affairs.

PA 1.23 Internal motion of European Parliament elections of June 2009: European liberal youth's top 3 issues

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.29))

European Parliament, European Democracy, European Political Parties

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 1-4 May 2008 in Barcelona, Catalonia

Whereas:

- Elections to the European Parliament will be held around the month of June 2009 in the 27-member states of the EU, using varying election days according to local custom.
- Provided that the Treaty of Lisbon is ratified, 496 million Union citizens will elect 751 MEPs, topping the 2004 election which was the biggest trans-national election in history.
- If ratified the Lisbon Treaty will also substantially increase the power of the European Parliament and therefore the relevance of the elections.
- The internal motion approved by the ELDR Congress in October 2007 invites European liberal democrats to put forward a common candidate to the presidency of the European Commission in 2009 and mandates the ELDR Bureau to submit at the next ELDR Congress in 2008 a proposal of political platform on which ELDR member parties could campaign jointly for the European Parliament elections of June 2009.

Considering that:

- European citizens generally lack interest for EP elections, as illustrated by the low levels of turnout, because EP elections have no clear stake: the political party which wins EP elections is not the party that will have the lead over the formation of the European Commission and over its political agenda, and it is not clear who are the European leaders of each political family.
- A political organisation needs to make clear its priorities if it wishes to be clearly identifiable on the political scene: long wordy manifestos of European political parties are not read by the average European citizen and are less effective than a limited list of top priorities on which they would develop a pan-European campaigns
- LYMEC must play a key role in influencing the agenda/manifesto of the ELDR Party for the 2009 EP elections

The LYMEC Congress voted on its top three issues for these elections:

- Reform the EU Budget: scrap the Common Agricultural Policy, set new priorities for the EU budget (specifically: energy security, sustainability, innovation) in preparation for the EU Financial Perspectives 2013-2020
- Promote civil rights across Europe: promote individual rights (minorities, abortion, gay rights, cultural/linguistic rights ...) across borders, strengthen EU data protection policy, make sure that the EU joins the Council of Europe and European Convention on Human Rights
- Build a strong and credible EU foreign and trade policy: a strong and visible EU foreign policy (in the framework of what allows the new Reform treaty), accompanied by a strong EU trade policy

The LYMEC Bureau will focus its political work until June 2009 on these top 3 issues and will develop campaign material related to them. It will also attempt to put these issues as high as possible on the agenda of the ELDR Party for EP elections.

PA 1.24 Urgency resolution on the future of the Euro

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.33))

Euro, EMU

Submitted by: JOVD

Acknowledging the prosperity, peace and integration that the Euro has brought to the participating member states.

Acknowledging the Euro as an essential tool in European market integration.
Considering the recent government debt crisis throughout the European Union with average debt approaching 100 percent of GDP.

Considering the recent election results in Greece where anti-European parties on both extreme left and right have gained massive support, as Greece is facing the biggest debt and solvency crisis of all European countries.

Considering the recent election of Francois Hollande as president of France and his unwillingness to comply with earlier made agreements.
Considering the high unemployment in general and especially the increase in youth unemployment creating a generation lacking opportunities to develop and participate in the European market.

Considering we are on a crossroads in the history of the European experiment, where we have run out of money to lend and are running out of time to prevent a collapse of our monetary system.

Considering the bailouts and European Financial Stability Facility have not solved any problem, but have merely created the opportunity for essential reforms to be instated.

Calls on the LYMEC bureau to press ALDE and ELDR to strive for balanced budgets and revitalize the European project through the European stability measures.
Calls on member organizations to strive for a European future in their respective country

Calls on all Euro member states to work towards a free market monetary system, fiscal solvency and stop further bailouts and financial aid.

PA 1.25 Resolution on NATO or the WEU

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.34))

European integration, EU's foreign affairs, European Democracy

Adopted at the Congress of LYMEC held in Paris, France on the 17-19 of January 1992.

The European Community will include in its treaty a common foreign policy. The EC will co-operate in a structure of defence in co-ordination with NATO which must be open for future member states. NATO will strive for a common security system within the CSCE framework.

But before all this, firstly the EC should become fully democratic and federalistic:

- at first a constitution should be made,
- the parliament gets defined larger power,
- there will be two parliaments: a parliament chosen by the people and a parliament chosen on a national level,
- the possibility to leave the community should be constituted,
- the possibility to enter the community will be constituted as well as how to apply for it and by what "rules".

According to this last point the Eastern European countries should be able to join the European free market (more than is the case right now); the EC should maintain their policy of helping the Eastern European countries towards European integration, both economically and politically, so that they're free to join the EC.

PA 1.26 Resolution "Welcoming Croatia"

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.35))

EU Enlargement/Pre-Enlargement, Future of Europe, EU's foreign affairs, Croatia

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Zagreb, Croatia on 27th-28th of April 2004

Recognising

- that the Republic of Croatia is a young European state that became independent in 1991;
- that Croatia suffered terrible human losses and material destruction in a war that took place on her territory in the first half of the 1990's;

Deploring

- the abuses of human rights and the undemocratic political climate that existed in the country under the late president Franjo Tudjman, which made impossible for Croatia to engage in negotiating its EU membership sooner;

Encouraged

- by the democratic processes and reforms that have taken place in the country since year 2000 and proud of the important role the liberal parties in Croatia played in the democratic development of the country;

Supportive

- of the path of EU accession and compliance with the EU criteria the Croatian governments have adopted since year 2000;

Considering

- the application for EU membership that Croatia submitted to the European Union on 21 February 2003, and the impetus Croatia's accession to the European Union would give to other countries of South East Europe in achieving the same goals;

The European Liberal Youth – LYMEC – calls

- upon the European Union to grant Croatia the status of an EU candidate country in the course of this year and leave open a realistic chance for Croatia to join the Union as soon as the country complies with the Copenhagen Criteria.

- upon the European Union to respect and obey to the decision that each country applying for EU membership should be judged on the basis of its own merits, regardless of the date of its application and of earlier indications.

PA 1.27 On the Signing of the Association Agreement and DCFTA between the EU and Ukraine

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.38))

Noting that...

- absolute majority of the Ukrainian people share European values and see themselves as a part of the European democratic family;
- Ukraine has undergone significant political transformation since the Orange Revolution and it is important that it continues its way toward a true liberal democracy;
- Ukraine's geopolitical position and its significance to the EU as a strategic partner in the region;

Considering that...

- the Fule conditions put forward by the EU in February 2013 have not been met in full, in particular a new election code and a new law on prosecutor's office that would limit its repressive powers, have been not adopted;
- the Ukrainian Parliament delayed the voting on the bill on the treatment of prisoners abroad that would allow President Yanukovich to let the Ukraine's former Prime Minister Julia Tymoshenko go to Germany for medical treatment;

nevertheless

- a number of political prisoners, including the former Interior Minister Yury Lutsenko and some other members of the Tymoshenko government have been released;
- the Ukrainian government has addressed all the reforms of the Association agenda and the justice system reforms
- Ukraine has put considerable efforts to decrease its energy dependency on Russia Concerned with the growing pressure from Russia on Ukraine, including embargo on the products of the key Ukrainian industries
- a threat to the European integration of Ukraine

LYMEC Calls on...

- its Member Organizations to encourage their respective mother parties to lobby in support of the signing of the Association Agreement and DCFTA between the EU and Ukraine

- the ALDE party and LYMEC Bureau to lobby within the ALDE Group of the European Parliament to support the signing of the EU Association Agreement and DCFTA with Ukraine and to foster the European integration of Ukraine.

PA 1.28 Bringing the youth part in agenda the European elections 2014

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.39))

Considering:

- Less and less young people exercise their voting rights in elections;
- Recent polls show, that the participation rate among young people is half and less the average in European elections;
- More and more people feel alienated from European institutions;
- Youth unemployment is a major issue for all EU member states and EU candidates and potential candidates;

Regretting:

- EU institutions decisions tend not meet the transparency expectancy of EU citizens;
- EC decisions directly affect and increase the alienation of people from the EU decision making process, which reflects on the participation at the EU elections;
- The outcome of all this is the raising mistrust in the European idea as a whole;
- The liberal parties and the liberal ideas are being targeted as a cause for the economic crisis;
- Many populist movements all across Europe exploit these issues for stigmatizing non-locals and fostering xenophobia through hate speech;
- These events are putting an unjustified shadow on the process of EU enlargement;

Acknowledging:

- youth unemployment and correlated youth migration are caused by non-liberal policies and decisions, particularly highly inflexible labour markets;
- Only a liberal approach taking in account all aspects can solve these issues and prevent the stigmatization of old and new Europe and the misuse of hate speech in elections', referenda and various campaigns, which will render the European citizens immune to populist propaganda
- During the European elections 2014 campaign we will face a boom of populist speech, hate speech and anti-European propaganda;
- Many young and qualified people are looking for the best job, that fits their education and qualification outside their homelands;

The European Liberal Youth:

- Welcomes the European Youth Forums' initiative "League of Young Voters" and calls upon its Member Organizations to be more active on national level promoting the national Leagues of Young Voters;
- Calls upon European Parliament, European Commission, Council of EU and other respective stakeholders to bring the European agenda closer to young people and introduce measures for increase of youth participation in the upcoming European elections;
- Call upon ALDE Party and its respective Member organizations to encourage its candidate MEPs regardless their age to be engaged with more youth issues during the European elections campaign and their work in the European Parliament;

PA 1.29 FUTURE FIRST! - LYMEC Electoral Manifesto 2014

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.41))

LYMEC is a youth organisation that bases its ideas on the philosophy of liberalism. This means that freedom and responsibility are the core principles that guide us in our political thinking. Citizens should be free to make their own decisions and decide about their own future. The national governments and the European Union are there to take care only of what cannot be done by individuals themselves and to enable them to control their own lives.

The period of economic crisis in Europe shifted the focus of the political sphere from future development to debate about the causes of the crisis and current reduction of debt. LYMEC urges the Union to change the perspective and create far-sighted policies aiming at the establishment of an environment that creates opportunities for the young citizens of Europe to live, work and grow.

Let's put future first!

In the light of the upcoming European elections, LYMEC asks the leaders to change and adapt the European Union to our times! So....

Do you know what bothers us the most about the EU?

1. Bureaucracy and procedures

LYMEC calls for institutional reform that increases the power of citizens and reduces the unaccountable bureaucracy and negotiations behind closed doors. The EU needs a small, efficient and democratically legitimate executive in the Commission and accountable and transparent legislature of a single-seated Parliament, the Council and European Council. Such reforms are independent of any further reduction or enlargement of EU powers.

The duplication of bureaucratic procedures should be reduced for the EU to act in a more efficient manner, and the democratic accountability of institutions should be reinforced to increase legitimacy.

2. EU budget pie-chart

LYMEC calls upon a cut on CAP subsidies, redirecting resources to growth and jobs, enabling the creation of European markets for energy and ICT. Direct subsidies to agriculture still consume about 30% of the Union's budget. In times of crisis it is unjustifiable that we concentrate so many resources in measures that contribute so little to our economies. Furthermore, such subsidies hinder the effective functioning of a proper market economy. Applying subsidiarity to budget policies, and policy priorities, demands that we focus on sectors in which the EU can bring added value, for instance research and development, education, and infrastructures which enable the emergence of a European market on sectors such as energy and ICT. This will bring more jobs, innovation in fast-growing sectors, energy security and better environment, allowing a greener energy-mix.

Direct subsidies to agriculture must be phased out and resources must be redirected to market-enabling measures with positive impacts on jobs, growth, sustainability, innovation and consumer rights.

3. Irresponsible spending

LYMEC call upon the reduction of debt, further avoidance of deficit and focus on a balanced budget. Decades of debt accumulation had a catastrophic effect on our continent's finances. Debt is not only unfair to younger generations, but also unproductive for the economy. Furthermore, it feeds risky financial institutions and threatens the sovereignty of states. Driven by a simple credo - "Saving is investing" - we believe the EU can recover from the crisis and increase its competitiveness on the global market.

The EU should adopt incentives and rules to encourage States to reinforce responsible budget policies.

4. Hyper-regulation

LYMEC calls upon the deregulation of the internal market and removal of the burdens to production, trade and investment. The enabling of free market, combined with the final completion of the single market will boost the European economy and strengthen the climate for investment. Laws should also be drafted in an increasingly clearer manner, allowing greater legal certainty for citizens, civil society and companies.

Deregulation and legal simplification will boost the efficiency of SMEs, as a key engine of European economy, and reduce the development of interest groups that use political powers to their benefit.

5. Lack of jobs

LYMEC calls upon a deep and comprehensive reform of labour laws that remove obstacles to young workers and entrepreneurs and will support higher investment in R&D and vocational education, providing the much needed technical skills for our economies. The economic crisis left large parts of Europe with high unemployment rates, especially among the young. To revert this situation we should focus on innovation, labour market reform and education.

The conservative view of employment and excessive restrictions need to be replaced by flexicurity, wider range of employment types, flexible working time and place, and liberalisation of the labour market.

6. The occasional attacks on our individual rights and freedoms

LYMEC continuously calls upon the legal protection of the moral sovereignty of the individual and the non-discrimination principle - these principles will remain at the very core of our activity. Liberty is not enough, we need rights. Europeans today are not only diverse in nationality, but also in the way they pursue their own lifestyle. Europe needs to protect this diversity.

We shall remain vigilant on any violation of gender, sexual orientation, reproductive, religious and political rights in the Union and Europe at large.

7. Careless approach to cyber-security

LYMEC strongly defends the freedom of information and expression, privacy, and individual sovereignty associated with personal data and is aware of the dangers to national security posed by espionage and cyber-warfare. The internet is a fundamental reality in most of the fields of our lives. The advent of the internet unleashed creative forces and opened amazing roads for freedom and prosperity. It also challenged old concepts dear to us such as privacy, intellectual property and security. This is the area where borders can protect neither states nor individuals. The subsidiarity principle clearly leads us to demand trans-European policies in this area. A particular example is cyber-security, where European states are too small to fight back the currently growing attacks coming from major global players.

We call for the creation of a European cyber-security strategy leading towards common protection services as an integral (and pioneering) part of a future European defence force.

PA 1.30 – For an independent ECB – monetary stability instead of economic steering

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.42))

Keywords: ECB, EMU

Observing that

- the European Central Bank has lowered their interest rates from 0,25 to 0,15%
- the ECB has introduced a negative income of -0,1% on ECB deposits

Stressing that

- by using measures of boosting economic stimulus, such as negative interest, and the ECBs past actions of reallocating public debt by buying bonds, the ECB no longer operates as an independent manager of monetary stability
- fighting a crisis of public debt will only worsen the situation by creating an economic bubble based on enforced private debt
- enablement of an upkeep of high public debt, through interest rates considerably below the interest needed for a target of moderate inflation and acquisition of bonds through the ECB, will cause new financial problems in the Eurozone and among European Governments in the long run

LYMEC Youth, at its Congress June 6-7, 2014 in Zagreb, Croatia, appeals to the member parties of ALDE to push for:

- an independent ECB, which focuses on its prime goal of monetary stability and does not abuse it's power for economic or fiscal influence on public and private debt.

PA 1.31 The revised Dublin III Regulation

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.49))

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Berlin, Germany, 6-8 April 2018.

Noting that:

- On 16 November the European Parliament voted in favor of the reform of the Dublin III Regulation
- The Dublin Regulation provides a mechanism for determining which Dublin State is responsible for examining an application for international protection

Considering that:

- In 2015 and 2016 over one million people came to the EU and it has revealed significant structural weaknesses in the design and implementation of the Dublin III Regulation
- Some Member States have avoided to register refugees according to the first country of entrance criterion leading to secondary movements and thus an unpredictable shift of responsibility
- Some Member states have decided to close their borders due to the disproportionate distribution of applicants
- The current system threatens the rule of law by lacking predictability and a guarantee of safety
- The right to apply for asylum is laid down in the Geneva Convention, which all EU member states have signed
- The revised Dublin Regulation that the European Parliament has proposed aims to correct these shortcomings by establishing a central collection of applications at Union level and a distribution based on the population and GDP of each Member State

LYMEC calls for:

- The Council to agree to the revised Dublin Regulation proposed by the European Parliament

PA 1.32 Resolution on the Future of the European Unity**(Archived in London 2019 (Former 1.01))***Future of Europe, Economic and Monetary Policy, European Integration*

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Konstanz, Germany on the 20th. of December 1992.

1. Failures a change of the European policy - We have to proceed to new ways

LYMEC supports the unification of Europe and calls for the ratification of the Maastricht treaty by all the members of the European Community. It would be a major step towards this unity.

The lack of information about the further steps towards the European unity as well as the insufficient participation of the citizens at the elaboration and the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty is responsible for the people's rejection of the Treaty. Also the propensity of many EC-countries to dump their unsolved problems at Brussels and divert from their own incapability by blaming the EC acts in the same way. In addition comes the failure of the responsible politicians who strengthen doubts by to anxious arrogant behaviour.

In order to secure the process of the European unification LYMEC calls for an open minded and unprejudiced dialogue with the citizens and for their broad and early participation on all matters and on all levels. The daily practice shows the danger that the citizens distance themselves from the EC and its political aims because of a lack of communication. Therefore LYMEC supports strongly a free European media initiative in order to develop an European public opinion.

LYMEC salutes the outcomes of the Edinburgh Summit with some reserve on the roll of Denmark as second class member. In the same time it calls on Denmark and the United Kingdom to ratificate the Maastricht Treaty as quick as possible. LYMEC considers that the Treaty should not be re-negotiated and that countries who do not subscribe to it should leave the EC. LYMEC calls on rapid negotiations with the countries of the EFTA in order to ensure their entry in the EC directly after the political reforms within the EC will be carried out.

LYMEC regrets the decision of the Swiss people not to step in the EES but rejects all special bilateral agreements aimed to overcome this situation.

2. The lack of democracy how to develop the participation of citizens

The economic unification is inseparably linked to the political unification. LYMEC criticises the insufficient specifications on the shape of the political union in the Maastricht Treaty especially concerning the reform of the European institutions and democratisation of European decision making processes. The image of an incomplete treaty endangers the success of the unification process.

An unequivocal and transparent assignation of competencies is an important contribution to more democracy. It has to appear clearly distinguishable who is responsible for which policies. On each level decision makers have to be controlled by a parliament.

3. Where to go the political union as target

LYMEC calls on the immediate convocation of an EC governmental conference in order to formulate the aim of the political union by developing a proposal of a European constitution.

The European parliament has to receive the full parliamentary rights especially in taking initiatives in elaborating laws and for all matters concerning the budget of the EC. Decision making powers should be given to the regional committee. Beside the regional authorities, it should also include provincial and local corporations.

The regional diversity should be secured and emphasised by a decentralised administration. Majority decisions should always replace consensus decisions in the European Council. The European Commission should be replaced by a European Government elected by and responsible to the European Parliament.

4. The economic and monetary union a consequence of the European idea

The economic and monetary union (EMU) is a logical consequence of the ongoing integration of Europe. Previous to an entry the mentioned convergence criteria of the Maastricht Treaty must be adhered strictly. Exceptions due to political reasons should not be allowed in any circumstances. The decision if the criteria are really fulfilled should not only be taken by the national governments.

The EMU gives an impulse to all member states to really fulfil those criteria in foreseeable time. It also enables an enlargement of the EC by states who agree on the economic and political aims of the EC. LYMEC points out that the EMU not only helps to save costs on money exchanges and to remove risks on exchange rates for trades and capital. LYMEC also stresses that the fall away of the risk premium due to uncertain exchange rates helps to reduce interest rates in order to promote investments. Higher transparency on prices improves the position of the consumers.

The independence of the European monetary policy has to be guaranteed. This is the only way for member states to break through the vicious circle of inflation due to wage and money policy. Politicians and employers as well as trade unions are urged to act more responsible by orientating the wage and fiscal policy on the given monetary policy.

LYMEC calls on effective mechanisms in order to sanction countries with exceedingly high budget deficits and shadow budgets after having entered the third step of the EMU.

The possibility of the European Council to decide alone on the exchange rates with the currencies of other countries allows a serious attempt on the independence of the money policy. Therefore LYMEC calls on changing the right to consult towards a right to veto for the European Bank concerning monetary decisions of the council.

5. The role of Europe in the world in favour of free trade

The Maastricht Treaty does not correct the tendency to rise trade barriers against non EC countries. LYMEC strongly rejects such tendencies. Only a liberal foreign trade policy can counteracted the long term loss of welfare due to protected markets. Therefore LYMEC calls on a more open trade policy towards the East European states. The "European Agreements" must be extended to all Goods.

LYMEC supports the asymmetric reduction of European trade barriers and calls on abolishing the import restriction on Steel and other Goods The GATT is an important agreement in order to ensure the free trade and the welfare as well as for Europe as for the rest of the world. The compromise of November Reached between the USA and the EC is an important step towards a successful ending of the Uruguay round. Therefore LYMEC calls on all countries not to endanger the discussions with the regard on national elections or the protests of some electors.

In this connection LYMEC strongly rejects the criminal acts and threats to commit criminal acts by the farmers and their organisation in protesting against these agreements. LYMEC emphasises that the agricultural policy of the EC is too expensive for the citizens (and prevents other countries from having fair chances to sell their agricultural goods). On the other hand LYMEC rejects the attempts of the USA to pressurise the EC by rising taxes.

Policy Archive Chapter 2 – Justice and citizens right

PA 2.01 – Resolution on Freedom and Democracy in Ukraine

Freedom of Expression/Media Freedom, Democracy, Ukraine

Considering that since the last presidential election the Ukrainian government has reaffirmed on several occasion their dedication towards promoting European integration of the country and has shown extensive interest in closer cooperation with the European Union.

Considering that the European Institutions thinks of the Ukraine as "a country of strategic importance to the EU" and has taken intensive steps to push forward cooperation, especially through the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), the Eastern Partnership Initiative and the ongoing negotiations on a new Association Agreement.

Considering that the European Union has coupled these measures with the demand of continuous improvement of the situation of human rights as well as the extensive promotion of democracy and the rule of law in Ukraine.

Whereas the re-establishment of a presidential system of governance in late 2010 has been followed by several measures undertaken by President Janukowitsch to centralize power within the presidential administration and his own party, the Party of Regions, undermining effective power-sharing and checks and balances within the political system.

Whereas it is clear that especially since the presidential elections politically motivated activity by Ukrainian law enforcement agencies and security institutions and the misuse of administrative and judicial resources for political purposes is a serious threat to the development of the rule of law and liberal democracy in Ukraine.

Whereas the organization "Reporters without borders" reported that there have been intensive blows against the freedom of press throughout the last year including direct pressure of the Ukrainian state security service SBU on several TV- and radio stations as well as threats against journalists linked with the political opposition.

Whereas the frequent monitoring of the Kharkiv Institute for Social Research showed that human rights abuses by Ukrainian law enforcement agencies have significantly increased during the year 2010 and are still at an unacceptable high level today.

Taking into account that changes to the electoral law put forward by the presidency of Viktor Janukowitsch have caused a hindrance to the engagement of new established parties in local elections as well as questionable procedures.

Taking into account that President Janukowitsch personally initiated legal persecution against several leading members of the former government already accumulating in a harsh sentence against former Prime Minister Yulia Timoschenko that is in large parts politically motivated. It is particularly worrying that these persecutions are conducted under provision in the criminal code of the country that dates back to Soviet times and are in no way conform to the legal standards promoted by the EU.

The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC), deeply concerned about the recent curtailing of democracy in Ukraine:

Condemns the sentencing of the opposition politician Yulia Timoshenko as a ridiculous approach by the government of Viktor Janukowitsch to mute political opponents by the usage of judiciary as a tool of political suppression and urges the Ukrainian officials to guaranty fair, independent and transparent in the case of the appeal by Yulia Timoschenko and also in the case of other processes against members of the former Ukrainian Government

Demands from the Ukrainian government to proof its dedication towards a further European integration of the country by taking immediate measures to guarantee freedom of media, freedom of political participation, freedom of assembly and freedom of expression as well as by taking decisive steps to prevent and investigate human rights violations by law enforcement agencies and

the state security service.

Urges the Ukrainian government to follow the recommendations of the Venice Commission and OSCE in the process of drafting a fair and transparent election law and to cooperate with EU institutions on the issue of judicial reform in a more effective way.

Welcomes the 7th June and 25th October resolutions of the European Parliament on the issue of the deterioration of democratic political and juridical processes in the country and the support which the ALDE group has given in the European Parliament.

Calls on the European Institutions to constantly remind the Ukrainian government of their obligations towards implementing a fair, democratic and transparent political system in all possible diplomatic ways and suggests more direct measures such as the temporary suspension of EU programs and consultations with Ukrainian institutions in case there is no improvement of the situation in the near future.

Calls on the LYMEC member organizations to use their political networks to raise support for the causes of democracy, human rights, freedom of speech and political freedom in Ukraine.

Calls the LYMEC Bureau to ensure our concerns are heard in the ELDR Party

PA 2.02 – Resolution on a Liberal Asylum Policy

Refugees and Asylum Policies

Adopted by the LYMEC Congress, 7th-8th April 2001, Plovdiv, Bulgaria

- Regretfully, as citizens of the EU have gained in freedom new walls have been built against countries outside.
- When proposing a liberal policy for refugee and immigration policy in the EU, actions should be taken to promote the possibilities to move freely inside the Union and to enter and leave the Union as easy as possible. The vision is to have no borders at all, all refugees should get adequate protection and immigration should be open for all individuals.
- Stressing the importance of asylum seekers having access to the refugee determination process. The current trend with visa requirements and carrier sanctions the fundamental right to seek asylum, which is prerequisite of being granted refugee status, is being denied.
- Noting that immigrants and refugees do not have the same background and the same needs. Therefore these two groups must be dealt differently. Today many people who are immigrants do not have a legal possibility to enter an EU country and must either resort to the help of smugglers or pretend to be

refugees. This is very negative for the public support for receiving refugees, but this does not mean that EU and its member states should increase their efforts to stop immigrants.

LYMEC:

Calls on the member states to respect the Geneva Convention on Refugees.

Persecution originating from non-state actors should be recognized by all EU member states. The Dublin convention cannot be used as an excuse to transfer refugee seekers in violation of international standards. Sending states should be obliged to use the sovereignty clause available in the Dublin convention and process the refugee claim when the responsible, receiving state uses a higher threshold on the definition of refugee status.

Calls on the EU to abolish demands on visa for potential refugee seekers. Visa requirements should either be abolished or be replaced by temporary refugee visas available at embassies in the country of origin.

Calls on the EU and its member states to refrain from carrier sanctions, forcing transportation companies to act as refugee authorities. They are not skilled to perform refugee determination and it is not proper that privately employed personnel will act as government officials.

Calls on the EU to introduce a common system of asylum policy. The Dublin convention does not promote burden sharing, the effect of the convention is that border states will have increased responsibility.

Acknowledges the fact that no country is safe. All states have the potential of violating human rights. The emerging practice of labelling states as safe must be abandoned by the EU and its member states. The Spanish Protocol should be declared as no longer binding.

Given that the results of this debate in a EU level will be discussed during the Belgian Presidency in the second semester of the year 2001, the LYMEC Congress asks to its Bureau to forward this resolution to our liberal leaders.

PA 2.03 Resolution on Privacy

PNR, Privacy, Civil Rights, Data

LYMEC Congress, assembled in Rome from 8th till 10th of May 2009,

Since 9/11 and with the so called 'war on terror' we have seen an escalation in the violation of our privacy rights. There are increasing numbers of cameras in streets, ships, in public buildings and even on buses. The mobile phone, internet and financial

transactions of all European citizens are recorded and retained by law. Cameras can be used for security reasons, but if we put up cameras with no limitations we risk that video being recorded for other purposes than security.

In the EU, the retention of airline Passenger Name Records (PNR) has already violated our right to privacy. Files are created for each journey that any passenger books. They are stored in the airlines reservation and departure control databases that different agents from the air industry can access. In addition, the passenger's reservation data is available for investigation.

This LYMEC congress:

- Calls on decision-makers at all levels of power to respect privacy as an individual right, to respect the rule of law and to strictly apply the principles of proportionality, necessity and subsidiarity in designing rules affecting the privacy of individuals and organizations.
- Calls on the LYMEC bureau to fight against any EU regulation that would not follow these principles, and asks LYMEC Member Organisations to do the same at national and local level.

PA 2.04 Strengthening and harmonizing European data protection

Keywords: Data protection, privacy, digital economy

Considering that

- EU regulations on the use of personal data were last updated in 1995.
- Companies can currently shop around to place their headquarters in EU countries with the weakest regulations on data protection.
- The EU is currently negotiating the legislation on data protection, which was a LYMEC top priority for the EP of 2009-2014.
- The potential of boosting the EU economy with 2.3€ billion annually by harmonizing data protection rules.

Believing that

- Personal data is sensitive knowledge about an individual, and is thus both private property and a part of protecting the privacy of individuals.
- Digitalization has enormous potential for growth and welfare, but that there is also an increased risk of abuse and fraud.
- The use of data can be very useful for research and such data should be available for scientific purposes.
- The ongoing negotiations between the EU and the US on a free-trade agreement are of crucial importance for EU and US consumers.

Stressing that

- 92% of Europeans say they are concerned about mobile apps collecting their data without their consent (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-186_da.htm).

- Data is a fundamental resource in the digitalized economy.

LYMEC therefore calls upon the ALDE Group to work for

- Ensuring that personal property in the charter of human rights include personal data.
- The use of data should be extremely limited when it comes to services that you cannot practically live without, given digitalization.
- Ensure that medical data is anonymized and available for research all over the EU.
- The right to be forgotten should be respected as much as practically possible.
- When merging companies, the amount of personal data they own should be considered from a monopoly perspective.
- Establish a common regulation for the protection of personal data in all member states.
- That effective data protection must be a result of the negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.
- When a company is hit by a leak of user data, it must inform users of the leak.
- Establish a standing committee in the European Parliament that continuously evaluates and scrutinises the legislation in the area of data protection.

PA 2.05 LYMEC Condemns Recent Violence in Azerbaijan

Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Azerbaijan

Deeply concerned by the use of violence against an approved rally on the 26th November 2005 by the Azeri police,

Recalling our Election Observation Mission to Azerbaijan that included 33 international observers,

Noting that the conclusions of our Election Observation Mission were in line with those of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE),

Troubled by European governments' failure to take a firm stance on the legitimacy of the elections and the rights of opposition groups to political expression,

Saluting the courage, determination and responsibility of the leaders and activists of the democratic bloc,

1. Strongly condemns the use of violence against a peaceful demonstration of democratic activists;
2. Calls upon the Central Election Commission to implement the recommendations issued by the Election Observation Mission;
3. Demands the immediate release of democratic opposition activists under detention by the Azeri security forces;
4. Further demands that the Azeri authorities discontinue all illegitimate pressure upon youth organisations and their members, especially in educational institutions;
5. Urges the continuation of the democratic bloc of Azadliq, YeS and the National Unity Movement;

6. Further calls upon the European Union to use all non-violent means to pressure the President and Government of Azerbaijan into complying with international standards of democracy and political rights;
7. Encourages the Bureau and Member Organisations to further develop relations with liberal groups in Azerbaijan;
8. Resolves to deepen engagement in Azerbaijan towards the goal of ensuring democratic Presidential elections in 2007.

PA 2.06 Stop the Political Persecution of Young Activists in Armenia

Political Prisoners, Civil Liberties, Justice, Armenia

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress on 12th-14th of October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

Stop the political persecution of young activists in Armenia

- Underlining the importance of political pluralism for the development of a free society in Armenia;
- Stressing the continuous detention of young Armenian National Movement Youth Association Board Member Tigran Arakelyan and the ongoing political persecution of three other Armenian activists;
- Emphasizing the commitment of LYMEC to the preservation of European values.

The European Liberal Youth:

1. Calls on the Armenian authorities to release Tigran Arakelyan immediately and unconditionally and to stop political persecution against three other young activists Artak Karapetyan, Sargis Gevorgyan and Davit Kiramijyan;
2. Calls on ELDR and other parties in Europe to treat this issue as priority in meetings and dialogues with the Armenian authorities;
3. Encourages LYMEC member organizations to call on their mother parties to raise this issue when dealing with representatives of the Armenian authorities.

PA 2.07 Urgent Resolution on Turkey's Violation of Human Rights

Human Rights, Turkey

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Helsingborg, Sweden on the 14th-16th of March 1997.

Stating that:

- Turkey has been accepted as a member of the customs union with the European Union with the restriction that Turkey would improve the human rights situation immediately.

Considering that:

- Turkey is still violating human rights.
- The situation has become worse instead of better since Turkey entered the customs union with the European Union on 13 December 1995, exemplified by the situation with the Kurds.

Noting:

- The adopted resolution on Turkey by the European Parliament on 24 October 1996.

The Congress:

- Strongly supports the freezing of financial support of the European Union to Turkey to establish the customs union.
- Support the resolution of the European Parliament.
- Implores the European Parliament to remain critical and strict in financial help to Turkey until the human rights situation has improved and to suspend the customs union if the human rights situation will not improve.
- Can not envision Turkey becoming a full member of the European Union until all human rights violations are stopped.
- Calls on Turkey to improve the human rights situation immediately.

PA 2.08 Crime Knows No Borders**(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.01))***Organized Crime*

Adopted on the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Vilnius, Lithuania, 4 - 6 April 2003.

ascertains,

- the approaching enlargement of the European Union (EU)
- the fact that possibility for pursuing of criminals beyond the own borders is dependent on bilateral agreements,
- the lack of these bilateral agreements between many EU countries,
- a EU without borders,
- that criminality more and more transcends national borders,

considers,

- that security is an important political subject, especially in the current political climate,
- that internal security does not stop at the national borders
- that without security citizens can't feel free,

having regarded these considerations, LYMEC declares,

- that there should be a common EU policy concerning the pursuing of criminals beyond national borders.

PA 2.09 Save the European Court of Human Rights

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.03))

Civil Liberties, Democracy

Lymec would like to express its deep concern at a number of measures currently being proposed to reform the European Court of Human Rights. Some suggested measures are most welcome, including enhancing state responsibility for implementing the Court's judgments and improving the procedures for selection of judicial candidates at national level.

However, other proposals currently contained in the draft declaration to be agreed at the Brighton Conference from 18-20 April pose a serious risk to the ability of the Court to safeguard democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. In particular, restricting the right to access the Court runs contrary to the very purpose of EU accession to the European Convention on Human Rights, which is to improve accountability and to ensure that victims unable to get redress at the national level can have an effective remedy.

The impact of such measures will be particularly detrimental for victims in those countries without independent and effective judiciaries. While the number of applications awaiting a decision by the Court is unacceptably high, reforms introduced by Protocol no. 14 to the Convention have surpassed expectations in accelerating the resolution of cases. Several reforms which could further increase efficiency have yet to take full effect.

In view of these considerations we urge governments not to proceed with further reform of the Convention at this time. Rather we encourage them to allow existing reforms to take full effect and support the Court by providing the necessary resources to ensure their complete success. We also urge governments to pay greater heed to their existing legal obligations under the Convention. The number of victims requiring recourse to the Court will be significantly reduced by properly implementing Court judgments, and by creating effective national protection mechanisms.

PA 2.10 Act on ACTA

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.05))

Civil Liberties, Privacy

Submitted by: LLJ, LVSV, LUF, RU, JOVD

Considering that:

- ACTA has brought a widespread concern for the state of internet privacy and property rights all over Europe
- Public involvement in drafting the treaty was not sufficient, as some countries have signed, others some refuses and some countries even regret their signature
- The creation of a new governing body outside existing structures for the protection of the IP would bring an additional financial burden for the EU
- Protection of intellectual property rights are currently being watched by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the World Intellectual Property

Organisation (WIPO)

Recognizing:

- The importance of private property for Europeans and their ability to create wealth
- Authors' right to be rewarded for their work
- The changing internet environment which requires a renewed approach towards intellectual property rights
- The EU should speak with one, strong voice when talking part in multilateral agreements
- The protection of intellectual property rights can never compromise the fundamental values forming democracy and the right to privacy

LYMEC, at its congress in Copenhagen, Denmark, calls for:

- United efforts by liberals within the frameworks of the international liberal organizations to protect civil liberties, such as privacy, internet privacy and property rights
- Its member organisations to bring the topic into discussion in their respective mother parties and countries
- The European Parliament to vote against the treaty in the upcoming EP session
- A broader ideological debate amongst liberals on the future of intellectual property rights
- Ensure all European citizens are granted with the same rights in order to view that content around Europe

PA 2.11 Towards a Common Migration Policy

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.08))

Migration & VISA Policies

Adopted by the LYMEC Congress, 7 - 8 April 2001, Plovdiv, Bulgaria

The Liberal and Radical Youth Movement of the European Union (LYMEC)

Having regard to the Article 63 (Title IV) of the Treaty establishing the European Community in a consolidated version with the incorporation of changes made by the Treaty of Amsterdam, signed on 2 October 1997.

Having regard to the conclusions of Tampere European Council, which sets out for the development of a common EU policy in the separate but closely related issues of asylum and migration.

- Whereas the demographic situation in the EU has changed significantly, but in contrast to the overall world situation, two trends are particularly striking: a slowdown in population growth and a marked rise in the average age of the population. That general trend is also produced among all the Central and

Eastern European countries. In that situation, across the EU as a whole, it is net migration that has become the principal component of population growth

- Stressing the need to focus on a worrying growth in skills shortages and mismatches in supply and demand for labour, and the fact that immigration can be in itself an effective way to deal with labour market imbalances, including skill shortages; although the number of migrants in the labour force with low or no qualifications has been increasing since 1992 because they are meeting a demand in some specific sectors
- Noting the existence of traffic and exploitation of Human beings within the EU
- Reminding that immigration is in most cases beneficial for all parties. With increasing regulations and discrimination on the labour market immigrants have been marginalised and trapped by unemployment and dependency on the welfare state. With a liberal policy for the welfare state and the labour market this would change.
- Acknowledging that the free movement of people regardless of former borders between European States is one of the most remarkable and positive achievements of the European Union.

LYMEC Proposes:

- It is essential to co-ordinate, to achieve and to ensure the transparency, within a EU framework, of migration policies and actions which at the moment are carried out by Member States since they have an effect on other areas of EU policy (abolition of controls at internal borders...). That will provide a background for the formulation of commonly agreed aims for channels of legal immigration. The European Parliament must acquire a central role in the definition of this immigration policy and the Commission in the achieving process.
- Calls on the EU to approximate its 15 national legislations in a liberal direction on the conditions for admission and residence of third country nationals. The law should be based on a shared assessment of the economic (labour demand) and demographic developments within the Union, as well as the situation in the countries of origin.
- Calls on the EU to ensure fair treatment of third country nationals and irregular people who reside on its territory. A more intensive integration policy should be achieved, so that it could be guaranteed their rights and obligations comparable to those of EU citizens. It should also enhance non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural life. Calls the EU to take steps in order to prevent and combat racism and xenophobia and consolidate an area of freedom, security and justice.
- Calls on the EU to strengthen the partnership and co-operation with countries of origin, developing co-operation programmes for local and regional development
- This more open and transparent immigration policy would be accompanied by strengthening of efforts to combat smuggling and trafficking, especially by ensuring the application of labour legislation with respect to the third country nationals.

Given that the results of this debate in a EU level will be discussed during the Belgian Presidency in the second semester of the year 2001, the LYMEC Congress asks to its Bureau to forward this resolution to our liberal leaders.

PA 2.12 Resolution on the EU Visa Regime

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.09))

Freedom of movement of persons

Adopted by the LYMEC Congress in Barcelona, 3 December 2000

The Liberal and Radical Youth Movement of the European Union

Believes that free movement between countries is one of the most basic elements of European integration.

Believes that free movement of people between the candidate states and the European Union should form a natural part of the enlargement process and that it must be promoted.

Notes that the European Union opened membership negotiations with Bulgaria and Romania in February 2000 and that Turkey was recognised as a candidate state in December 1999.

Notes that a visa is still required for citizens of these countries to visit the European Union, whereas the visa regimes for all other candidate states were lifted already a long time ago.

Considers that the current visa regimes towards Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey show a clear lack of willingness on the part of the member states to proceed with the enlargement.

Notes that it is extremely difficult for many citizens of the candidate countries to obtain a visa for the EU member states, as embassies are reluctant and the application process very time-consuming.

Calls on the member states of the European Union to immediately lift the visa regime for Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey.

Calls on the member states of the European Union never to impose visa regimes on countries that are candidates for membership in the Union.

PA 2.13 Tear Down Fortress Europe

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.10))

Migration & VISA Policies

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Berlin, Germany, 20-22 April 2007

Whereas

- Migration has always been a part and fundamental right of human nature.
- Europeans within the European Union have benefited greatly from the four freedoms of movements, allowing free movement within the Union.
- During the first three decades of the 20th century 19 million Europeans were allowed to migrate to the USA in pursuit of a better life for themselves, but Europe today remains closed to those who are now seeking a better life in Europe.

Observing that

- Europe has a declining population and is facing a labour shortage.
- Migrants seeking happiness in Europe are met with walls and coast guard patrols.
- Thousands of people die each year trying to reach European shores.
- Those who make it to Europe must live as illegals in a society which benefits from their contributions but refuse to give them rights as citizens.

Considering that

- Only a small increase in labour migration could generate 150 billion USD per year worldwide, according to the United Nations Human Development Report 2005.

Declaring that

- The pursuit of happiness is a fundamental liberal right.
- Borders are nothing but barriers for human activity.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls for the European Union to

- Introduce a job-seeker visa, allowing people to come to Europe in order to look for a job.
- Develop a plan for reducing visa restrictions and the number of countries that need a visa to enter the EU.
- Open up for free labour migration, granting everyone who is offered a job in Europe work and residence permits.

PA 2.14 A Common Approach to Asylum Policy**(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.11))***Refugees and Asylum Policies*

LYMEC Congress, assembled in Rome from 8th till 10th of May 2009,

Considering that:

- There is currently quite different conditions for asylum in EU member states, both in terms of the fundamental aspects of entitlement to seek asylum, but also differences in which groups are entitled to asylum.
- There are great differences concerning rights - and the extent to which rights applies - to receive education, healthcare, language training and the right to work.
- The Dublin II Regulation – that currently governs the European Asylum Policy – stipulates that it is possible to seek asylum only in the EU-country where the asylum seeker first arrives.

- Even though a European refugee definition exists there is great variance in the way this definition is applied.
- There are still great disparities in the psychological and physical environment for asylum seekers between EU member states.

Believing that:

- Migration is a historical and natural phenomenon, and it is also a constituting character of European culture.
- It is illogical that persecuted people must be forced into a second game on their future.
- A national competition on strict rules in order to discourage asylum seekers from choosing one country over another cannot be tolerated within the European Union.
- Circumstances for asylum seekers must be bettered in the countries where the conditions are worst.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth concludes that:

- The rules in the Member States with regards to conditions for asylum should be harmonized.
- EU Member States must follow the same practice on the criteria for the rights seek asylum.
- The EU should work towards a common asylum policy and a standardization of minimum rights which must contain rules on:
 - The right to education and access to the labor market as long as the claim to asylum is being processed
 - Minimum housing
 - The right to health care and psychological assistance.

PA 2.15 A Liberal Commitment to Common Border Management

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.12))

Migration & VISA Policies, FRONTEX

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

Considering that:

- currently the responsibility of managing the external borders of the EU is very unevenly distributed especially in terms of dealing with migration to the EU from non-member states
- Italy has fought the problem on its own, by making a bilateral agreement with Libya, making it possible to return all immigrants to Libya before they make it to Italy
- The EU have already laid the cornerstones for a common management of the external borders and immigration through FRONTEX and the Dublin II regulation

Believing that:

- Although the Dublin Regulation is an honest effort to harmonize the EU asylum process, it has failed to work. The law looks upon EU as a whole, but the practice of the law doesn't. This puts refugees in a legally unsafe position, where equality of law doesn't exist.
- Both EU border control and immigration are responsibilities of the EU as a whole
- Migration is a historical and natural phenomenon
- Managing the EU borders should not be delegated to non-EU countries
- All immigrants are assets to the EU
- There has been an increase in the number of detention centres for foreign nationals in member states and at their borders, and a growing number of reports of frequent human rights violations within these detention centres.
- According to Eurostat, there were, in 2008, nearly 240,000 asylum applicants registered in the EU. This translates to 480 applicants per million inhabitants. The country with the largest number of asylum applications per million inhabitants was Malta (6,350), followed by Cyprus (4,370), Sweden (2,710), Greece (1,775), Austria (1,530) and Belgium (1,495). Out of 193,690 first instance decisions on asylum applicants, there were 141,730 rejections (73% of decisions).
- The pursuit of happiness is a fundamental liberal right
- Migration is beneficial not only for the migrants themselves, but also for both the country they arrive in as well as the country they left behind.

Concerned about

The fact that, since 2002, readmission clauses have been included in most bilateral agreements concluded by the EU with third countries, including trade agreements, thus resulting in increasing externalisation of the Union's migration policy

Defending

The principle of non-refoulement, as enshrined in the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees; that is that no refugee shall be expelled or returned, against his or her will, in any manner whatsoever, to a territory where he or she fears persecution.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls on:

- The EU to abolish the Dublin Regulation
- The EU to work together to even out the differences in financial responsibility of member states in managing the external border in order to make sure that no country feel that it is necessary to outsource border control to non-EU countries.
- All EU member states to contribute financially to the task of managing immigrants and asylum seekers
- Urges the respective governments and the EU to work towards an end of opt-outs from Justice and Home Affairs, such as the UK and Denmark currently have, and to extend the Schengen zone to all EU member States in order for a Common Border Management to be effective.
- The EU to form an immigration policy that views immigrants as assets, considering the shortage of labour force that will happen in the future.

- The Commission and the member states to introduce effective, long-term legal migration policies, as well as ensure genuine access to EU territory and to a procedure for more flexible and coordinated rules governing asylum seekers, rather than focus all their efforts on preventing illegal immigration.
- All EU member states to monitor the living and integration conditions of individuals repatriated to countries of origin and of transit and to take measures to provide those individuals with appropriate assistance.
- All EU member states to adhere to Council Directive 2003/9/EC on minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in member states, and for the Commission to rigorously enforce these standards.
- The setting up of an independent verification body at a European level with responsibility for supervision of detention centres as regards the protection of human rights, in accordance with European Parliament resolution 2007/2145(INI) on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union 2004-2008.

PA 2.16 A Truly European Asylum System

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.15))

Refugees and Asylum Policies

Proposed by: JuLis – Junge Liberale

Considering the right for asylum a fundamental human right;

Being convinced that its functioning implementation can only be accomplished within a truly European policy framework;

Noting that the approaches made towards European asylum policy, especially the Dublin-II regulation, were but a manifestation of national asylum policies;

Noting with deep concern that the situation of refugees in Greece is becoming worse and worse and can be called a humanitarian crisis;

Recognizing that the latest decision of the European Court to forbid deportations of refugees to Greece, has accounted for this circumstance. Contradicting with the "one state only" principle manifested in the Dublin-II regulation, it has further exposed the weaknesses of the Dublin-II regulation and European asylum policy in general,

LYMEC therefore,

Demands for the abolishment of the Dublin-II regulation and an end to the nationalization of asylum policy in general;

Proposes the constitution of a European Agency for Asylum and Migration responsible for the examining of asylum applications. This agency has the responsibility to coordinate the national asylum agencies, increase the efficiency and grant for the rights of refugees by consistently applying existing European

standards. In an area with common borders and freedom of movement, there is no need for 27 different asylum procedures and agencies;

Concludes the replacement of the “one state only” principle with a more flexible system for asylum policy. Situations like the one in Greece must be avoided in the future. In no other way can the European Union comply with its own standards.

PA 2.17 Resolution on a Liberal Gender Policy

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.18))

Gender and Sexual Rights, Civil Liberties, Social Rights

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Executive committee in Stockholm, Sweden on the 28th – 30th of November 2003

We, as young liberals, **believe** that in a liberal society, equal opportunities are an important part of democracy. We therefore stress the need for a liberal gender policy.

There is a clear need for having *fair representation* of genders in different areas of life - research, business, labour market and not least in decision-making.

Gender equality and respect is a way towards more liberal and open-minded values in our society.

LYMEC believes that equality is best achieved by **putting gender policies in the mainstream of politics** where it is made an objective of policies in all areas.

A truly liberal gender policy should therefore take its starting point at the individual human being and her or his rights, regardless of gender.

A liberal gender policy should cherish the differences, not try to apply a **stereotype** of gender.

A liberal gender policy shall set clear goals for how to ensure a better representation of the least represented gender in **all** spheres of life.

Labour market

We, as young liberals, feel that there should be no stereo-typing between genders. Equal work is equal pay. *Financial independence* is important for individuals.

We encourage the European governments to introduce a burden-shared maternity/paternity leave policy that ensures that all companies support the policy regardless of the gender of their employees. We further encourage that the possibility for paternity leave is increased; this is another important step and signal on the way towards gender equality.

Sexual autonomy

We believe in the right to sexual autonomy and the sovereignty of the individual of his or her body. Rape and other violation of this right should not only be punished, but also fought against by increasing awareness and changing attitudes.

We strongly condemn all discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation in any aspect of society.

We believe that it is important to guarantee open access to reproductive health services for everyone. We further believe that everybody should be considered for child adoption regardless of their family structure. No one should be discriminated on *a priori* and the decision should be determined by the best interests of the child, not by prejudice.

Genderpolicies in a Global perspective

Drawing on the statistics from the United Nations Development Projects (UNDP) it is obvious that women are underrepresented in the democratic process and are less valued in many countries.

We have to underline that it is crucial that we in these societies start a new and revitalised debate about equality, otherwise the patriarchal nature of society will be reproduced for generations. *Equal education and empowerment of women* is crucial in this respect.

We believe that the UN Millennium Development goals constitute a valuable basis for moving towards a liberal gender policy in the world.

We believe that education is a key for achieving gender equality. Therefore we strongly support the convention of the child that calls for the right to education for all children.

We believe that the empowerment of women will play a crucial role in the process of elimination of poverty. An elimination of poverty, a general economic and social development and democratization is in our view an important first step towards gender equality.

Furthermore it is necessary that the legal framework of many of these countries are changed in the near future so that they will be based on individuals.

Political life

We stress the importance of an active presence of both genders in politics. There is a need for participation and representation of both genders in decision-making bodies in order to ensure well-balanced decisions that reflect those societies they legislate for.

We therefore encourage and urge a promotion of fair representation at all levels of society, as we believe that the encouragement and the belief in any persons ability to fill a certain function in the political system is much more important and successful in the long term than quotas or positive discrimination.

A clear 'No' to quotas

For a liberal gender policy quotas are a contradiction. We believe that people should be chosen according to their merits not because they do or do not belong to a certain gender, ethnic group, sexual orientation or other related significance.

We as young liberals believe that encouragement and tolerance is the best way to ensure an implementation of a liberal gender policy based on equal opportunities and fair representation.

In our own member organisations

Therefore, LYMEC calls upon member organisations to:

- encourage and promote the least represented gender within their organisations as it makes politics more representative, the political outcome more balanced and the results more sustainable.

PA 2.18 Recognition of Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights as a Policy in LYMEC

(Archived in London 2019 (Former 2.19))

Gender and Sexual Rights, Civil Liberties, Social Rights

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

Considering that:

- 1) MDG 5 (to improve maternal health by 75% by 2015) is the most off track of all the millennium development goals (MDGs). No significant progress has been made since 1990. By 2006 the ratio of maternal mortality declined by only 6%; (*UNFPA-Guttmacher - adding it up 2009*)
 - 2) About 20 million have unsafe abortions each year, and three million of the estimated 8.5 million who need care for subsequent health complications do not receive it. 70000 women die of the consequences of unsafe abortions every year; (*UNFPA - Guttmacher adding it up 2009*);
 - 3) There are 33 million people in the world living with HIV, and there is an annual 8 million shortfall in condoms needed to provide adequate protection (*IPPF - contraception at a crossroad 2009*);
 - 4) Even though HIV/AIDS and sexual and reproductive health and rights are interlinked, it seems that budget allocations have favoured HIV/AIDS and neglected sexual and reproductive health and rights;
- Sex education and access to family planning is integral to reducing maternal mortality rates and the number of unsafe abortions;

Believing that :

- Everyone, including young people, has the right to make free and informed choices about their sexual and reproductive lives. this includes the right to information, services, and supplies necessary to implement those choices;
- Youth participation in decision is essential, taking into account the largest youth population in the world's history - one in four people are under 25 years old and 1.06 billion people are aged between 19 and 25;
- It is not possible to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), especially the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, if we do not tackle reproductive health issues; as a crucial part of economic

development. This means intensifying efforts to promote women's rights, gender equality and implement greater investment in education and health, including reproductive health and family planning; and promoting the economic independence and empowerment of women;

- Everyone, independently of his/her sexual orientation, is entitled to attain the highest standards of sexual and reproductive health and express his/her sexual identity free from coercion and criminalisation;

Concludes that:

- Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights should be promoted as well as an element of equal opportunity and development;
- Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) should be eradicated entirely where it exists worldwide;
- Meeting the unmet need for Family Planning and providing the recommended package of maternal health care is cost effective: It saves the life of the mother and the child, and saves society money for medical care.

Calls upon :

- The LYMEC bureau to properly propagate the Cairo Programme of Action (where goals and demands on Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights are described and explained) at ELDR Congress in Finland,
- The LYMEC bureau to publicly promote Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights policies through campaigns

PA 2.19 Resolution on Ending the Discrimination of Young Gays and Lesbians in the Accession Countries

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.11))

Gender and Sexual Rights, Civil Liberties, Social Rights

Adopted by the Congress in Romania in March 2002.

LYMEC:

NOTES, that the situation concerning the discrimination of gay, lesbian and bi-sexuals in many of the current European Union member states has greatly improved and progress has been made to reach equality for the law.

TAKES NOTE, that some of the European Union candidate countries continue to violate through laws and policies the human rights homosexuals and bisexuals.

FURTHER NOTES, that Joke Swiebel MEP, the Chair of the European Parliament Intergroup on Gay and Lesbian Rights in a recent meeting of the International Gay and Lesbian Youth Organisation in January in Ljubljana has repeated a warning that the European Parliament will not ratify accession agreements of the candidate countries that "through its legislation or policies violates the human rights of lesbians and gay men."

FURTHER NOTES, that LYMEC's manifesto clearly states that through our main value of liberty we favour: "equal rights and equality towards the law; the sovereignty and inviolability of the individual; tolerance" and not to forget "respect for fundamental human rights."

CONSIDERS, that often youth issues, including those of gay, lesbian and bi-sexual, are not taken into account when human rights are discussed in the accession process. FURTHER CONSIDERS, that liberals are not in favour of special rights but demand human rights for all.

FURTHER CONSIDERS, that discrimination of any social group is the concern of all who believe in and fight for equality.

ACCORDINGLY WE URGE, the governments of the accession countries to repeal ALL existing discriminatory laws and provide new laws to actively protect lesbian and gay youth from discrimination.

WE FURTHER URGE, that the European institutions enforce and enlarge its existing anti-discrimination policy and not accept any candidate country for accession which doesn't respect the basic human rights of lesbian and gay youth.

AND FINALLY THE CONGRESS OF LYMEC MANDATES, the Bureau and the Executive Committee of LYMEC to forward this resolution to the Presidency of the European Council and the ELDR Group in the European Parliament.

PA 2.20 Freedom of Expression Is Core to a Liberal Society

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.12))

Freedom of Expression, Civil Rights, Democracy

THE CONGRESS OF LYMEC,

Deeply concerned by the violent protests directed against Denmark and other European states over the publication of cartoons depicting the prophet Mohammed in the Jyllands-Posten and other newspapers,

Recalling our fundamental belief in the principles of freedom of expression and freedom of the press,

Noting that the price of freedom of expression is the publication of material that may be offensive to some groups,

Believing that offence cannot justify violence but that mutual respect is a prerequisite of a liberal society,

Troubled by the muted response of European governments when Member States citizens and diplomatic missions came under attack,

1. Strongly condemns the resort to violence of protests around the world, particularly that directed against European citizens, diplomatic missions and businesses;
2. Strongly supports the refusal of the Danish government to intervene in the free press
3. Condemns the failure of European governments to show greater support and solidarity with Denmark and other members states;
4. Calls upon governments in those countries that have seen violent protests, notably in Syria and Iran, to take greater steps to fulfil their obligations to protect European citizens, diplomatic missions and businesses now and in the future;
5. Reaffirms that the appropriate way to fight an offence is through the judicial system;
6. Urges all those in a position of responsibility in the media to show respect for the beliefs of all citizens;
7. Further calls upon the European Union to show greater leadership in defending the freedom of Expression in the future;
8. Resolves to continue to fight for freedom of expression, one of the foundations of a liberal society, in Europe and the wider world.

PA 2.21 No Naked Scanners!

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.12))

Security, Civil Rights, Privacy

Adopted at LYMEC Congress, 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

LYMEC Congress, Assembled in Sinaia from 1st to 2nd May 2010,

reacting to the public debate about so-called “full body scanners”, also known as naked scanners, that enable operators to see a naked-like picture of the person scanned,

aware of the necessity to protect air passengers,

taking into account that naked scanners not only show concealed objects, but also breast enlargements, prostheses such as artificial limbs, body piercings and a clear black-and-white outline of passengers' genitals,

taking into account the fact that the sometimes mentioned "new generation" of those scanners does not show certain parts of the body simply by obfuscating them by software rather than by hardware, and that in those parts naturally no hidden objects would be found, therefore these "new generation" scanners are no improvement in security at all,

taking into consideration that the long term health effects of both technical types of naked scanners developed (millimetre wave scanners and backscatter scanners) on persons exposed to them on a regular basis, such as frequent flyers, are not known at all,

aware that the money that would be spent on these extremely expensive scanners could be used to employ many additional security officers,

considers the obligatory use of naked scanners on airports (and other public spaces) in the European Union as intrusive, unproportional and not helpful.

Rather than exposing citizens to such devices, LYMEC calls for a true improvement of airport security standards by more and better trained security personnel, rigid external testing and assessment of the measures applied as well as for allowing more time to actually do meaningful checks.

Therefore, LYMEC calls on the ALDE group in the European Parliament as well as the ELDR party and its members in national parliaments to vote against the introduction of before-mentioned devices. Our clear message is: No naked scanners!

PA 2.22 The situation of Human Rights in Russia

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.18))

Human Rights, Civil Rights, Russian Federation

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress on the 12th – 14th October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

Whereas

- the Russian Federation repetitively violates basic human rights that have been agreed upon in the European Convention, including right of assembly and freedom of speech;
- the Russian Federation is an important trade partner to the European Union;

Noting that

- the preparations for the Winter Olympics 2014 worsen the situation for many individuals in the Sochi region;

Recognizing

- the important role of the Council of Europe ensuring dialogue and safeguarding of human rights;

Aware of

- the fact that Pussy Riot's arrest should not be considered as a single case, but as one of many related to the violations of human rights and decent rule of law;

Considering that

- civil society is increasingly playing a bigger role - trying to start a dialogue with the government;
- is however not greeted warmly, but with several new regulations limiting their options;
- the Russian Federation seems to slowly turn its back on the cooperation in the Council of Europe.

Stresses out

- that European political engagement should include economic, legal and *humanitarian* cooperation.

LYMEC Calls upon

- the European Union to keep repeating their concerns on human rights violations;
- the European Parliament to continue and expand their support to civil society in the Russian Federation
- the IOC to address the human rights violations to the government of the Russian Federation during the preparations of the Winter Olympics 2014
- LYMEC MOs to raise awareness of the situation within their organizations.

PA 2.23 Resolution on Belgrade Pride

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.19))

Sexuality, Civil Rights, Serbia

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress on the 12th – 14th October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

By MLDP, MHNS, MLD, YMRF, TNL, CSL, LIDEM, LPYO

Having in mind

- that Belgrade pride was cancelled in 2011 and 2012 and that during Belgrade pride in 2001 and 2010 pride opponents demolished Belgrade city center and organized attacks on pride supporters;
- that the attacks on members of LGBT community is in constant increase;
- the lack of communication between institutions and members of LGBT organizations.

The European Liberal Youth:

4. Urges on respective governments of EU member states to use more diplomatic efforts influencing the Serbian government to open dialogue with the representatives of LGBT organizations.

5. Urges on respective government of the Republic of Serbia to find a sustainable model for promoting and protecting LGBT rights through legislation;
6. Urges on respective LGBT organization to show more commitment towards common goals and engage in join action and cooperate on organizing Pride events.

PA 2.24 Resolution on Turkish Interference in Fosterage

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.20))

Human Rights, Sexuality, Civil Rights, Turkey

Summary: a recent case of Dutch-Turkish relations calls for a focus on basic human rights, including equal rights and equal chances for all.

Background information A Dutch boy, Yunus, was placed under care of foster parents by order of the Dutch Court, due to child abuse by his biological parents. The foster parents are two lesbian mothers. The biological mother is supported by the Turkish government in the legal battle to reclaim Yunus. LYMEC should condemn the behaviour of the Turkish government, especially in the light of potential EU membership.

Noting that:

- Yunus was placed under care of foster parents due to child abuse by his biological parents;
- Yunus is a full member of the Dutch society, that he has the Dutch nationality and that he is subject to Dutch law;
- there is a shortage of foster parents in the Netherlands and in Europe as a whole;
- the Turkish prime minister Erdogan has demanded the removal of Yunus from his gay foster parents;
- the Turkish government has demanded to be involved in all future cases regarding foster children with Turkish roots;
- Erdogan has called upon the European Court of Human Rights in an effort to have him returned to his biological parents;

Considering that:

- equal rights are fundamental in a liberal society;
- as long as they apply to the general rules, couples should have the right to be (foster) parents, regardless of sexual orientation;
- children should not be abused by political or diplomatic struggles;
- the Turkish government has disrespected the sovereignty of a foreign entity;
- **Stressing out that the child's rights and protection should be the only concern of State's authorities in case of fosterage**

LYMEC, gathered in Tallinn on 27 April 2013, condemns the actions of the Turkish government, expresses its admiration for every foster parent inside and outside Europe, and emphasises the pursuit of equal rights for everyone, regardless of sexual orientation.

PA 2.25 Freedom from Rape

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.22): New Resolution Introduced)

Campaign, Human Rights

LYMEC condemns sexual attacks on girls and women. Several cases of sexualised violence against women have recently emerged and created outrage. The rape of women who have not been able to protect themselves has led to death in several cases. This in at a time where human rights and equality is considered universal.

The gang rape of a 23 year old student in the beginning of December 2012 sparked protests in India to call for the police to be more vigilant and sensitive towards assaults. The violence of the attack was so severe that the victim died of her injuries in hospital shortly afterwards. This shocked Indian society and has led to a raised awareness of human rights violations against women, especially the many cases of sexual violence.

Women have experienced sexual harassment while using public transportation in countries such as Egypt and Japan. The problem transcends economic development issues, and is in essence a human crisis.

This problem is not exclusively in India. In Egypt and Japan women have had problems using public transportation whilst being sexually harassed. Many European countries, including Norway rank high on the international rape statistics. This shows that the problem is not in India but worldwide.

Although rape is a worldwide issue, LYMEC reaffirm our claim that the particularly critical situation in India has to change. Indian society will need to intervene in order to stop these horrifying attacks. The acceptance of violation of women's rights needs to be stopped.

We call on European society to raise awareness and to play an active part in showing dismay with the violation of women's rights. We must remove the stigma so that it is easier to speak about the issues related to sexual violence and harassment. More resources should be allocated to the rehabilitation of sexual abuse victims. Women should not have to live in fear of being raped.

LYMEC calls upon

- LYMEC /ALDE Women's Network to work with sister organisations in India to respond to the crisis of rape
- IFLRY to launch a specific campaign on women's rights and rape prevention
- LYMEC Bureau to prepare postcards and send these to Indian Embassies across the EU

PA 2.26 A Call for a Change in Vatican Policy

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.24))

LYMEC Congress, assembled in Rome from 8th till 10th of May 2009,

In March 2009 the Vatican found itself once again surrounded in controversy. On the 4th of March, a nine year old girl in Brazil had an abortion after being raped by her stepfather. The church responded by having the girl, her mother and the doctors who participated in the procedure excommunicated while allowing the stepfather to stay in the Church.

Considering that

- The incident of the treatment of the nine year old girl and the other involved parties is just one of many manifestations of the Catholic Church's unbending stance when it comes to abortion.
- The Catholic Church's stance on abortion becomes more and more out of touch with those of its members and of public opinion in general.
- The Catholic Church still holds considerable influence over public policies and people's lives, especially in Africa and Latin America.

Believing that

- Each person has the right over his or her own body.
- By pursuing the Catholic Church to review its position on abortion and adopt a more accepting stance, women's rights in terms of individual autonomy would be forcefully advanced throughout large parts of the Catholic world.

Therefore LYMEC

- Thoroughly condemns the Catholic Church for its treatment of members who participate in abortions.
- Criticises the Vatican position on abortion.

PA 2.27 Stop the Islamophobia and Respect Religious Diversity

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.25))

Religion, Modernization of Society, Rejection of Anti-Liberal Policies

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

Considering that

- respect of freedom of thought and religious diversity is a core liberal value, as

- well as freedom of expression;
- about 1,5 billion Muslims in the world cannot be generalized nor blamed for the horrific terrorist attacks by radical Islamists in recent times. Many Muslims in the Western world have felt hatred towards them originating in the failure to realize the important distinction between a Muslim and a radical Islamist.
- many European countries have experienced a great increase in the migration from Muslim countries in the last decades, and Europe has become a more multireligious society, however, struggling with xenophobia;

Whereas

- 57 percent voted for a minaret ban in Switzerland in a referendum with a 53 percent turnout;
- Minarets inflict no harm, however, the hazardous populists used a ban of minarets as a part of their anti-Islam campaign;
- the anti-Islamic sentiment is increasing in the public debate in Europe;
- France is banning religious symbols, and several European nations are currently discussing similar propositions;
- multireligious countries such as Norway, United Kingdom, Denmark, and Iceland still have a state religion;
- the freedom of expression and freedom of religion allows government employees in many European countries to wear religious symbols at work, such as in schools, in the military, in the police and in the bureaucracy, as long as it does not prevent them from executing their tasks;

Believing that

- the state should be secular, individuals have the freedom of expression and religious freedom as long as it is not harmful against others;

Noting that

- minarets, hijab and Muslim faith as such, do not damage fellow citizens, therefore no one should have the right to restrict individual Muslims' freedom as long as they do not harm others;
- there cannot be a successful coexistence in Europe without mutual understanding between religious believers of any confession, as well as atheists and agnostics;
- scapegoating by targeting one specific religion is a highly unacceptable practice as all religions in Europe should have the same standing before the law.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls upon

- 1) nation states and the EU to go against ban of religious symbols that are not harmful to fellow citizens;
- 2) governments and the EU to adhere from institutional display of religious symbols in public schools and universities, while recognising the right of any individual to display their private religious affiliation;
- 3) nation states to emphasize education on religion as a historical, and cultural phenomenon and general discussions on ethics, free of any preaching, in order to create mutual understanding;
- 4) the LYMEC Bureau to promote towards ELDR and ALDE, the importance for liberals to work against anti-Islamic sentiment in Europe, or any other religion, and promote a Europe where religious diversity is respected.
- 5) the EU and the nation states to respect the freedom of expression and freedom of

religion for their government employees, therefore allowing them to wear religious symbols at work, such as in schools, in the military, in the police and in the bureaucracy, as long as it does not prevent them from executing their tasks in a normal way;

- 6) countries to respect the religious diversity and become a secular state, therefore refraining from state religions and separate the state from the church (or any other religious bodies);

PA 2.28 True Religious Freedom in the EU

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.26))

Religion, Modernization of Society, Rejection of Anti-Liberal Policies

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 12th October – 14st October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

Considering that

- An increase in discrimination and violation of the principle of religious freedom is occurring in Europe
- A number of countries within the European Union, have passed laws regulating the right to wear religious symbols

Believing that

- Freedom of religion is a fundamental human right
- The right to carry religious symbols is an essential part of this freedom
- The prohibition of any religious practice that is of no harm to other individuals or society in general cannot be justified in a liberal and democratic society
- No European citizen shall be discriminated through prohibitions in the labor market or educational system

LYMEC calls for

- The European Commission to bring those countries before the European Court of Justice on account of breaking with the Charter of Fundamental Rights for the European Union (§1 and 2 of article 10)
- The governments of these countries to abolish these discriminating prohibitions and adhere to the fundamental principles of a modern, secularized and liberal society

PA 2.29 Resolution on Democracy in the Italian Republic

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.27))

Democracy, Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Italy

Adopted at the LYMEC Executive Committee Meeting, held in Gummersbach, Germany on the 2nd of July 1994. (Was sent to the Italian Government, the "Progressive" coalition, the "Pact for Italy" centre coalition, the European Parliament and the ELDR Party)

A spate of politically motivated physical attacks, mostly directed against Communist militants and offices, is the most recent example in a series of worrying signs from Italy, following the accession of the Fascist party - the renamed Alleanza Nazionale - to power.

Following an all too familiar pattern, grassroots extremism and political violence, which the government will not repress promptly, go hand in hand with formal disavowment of violence and token declarations of allegiance to democracy on the part of party officials.

Nevertheless, even statements by senior Fascist officials and leaders are growing less and less cautious. Statements to the effect that homosexuality should be criminalized and gays and lesbians put into concentration camps. The glorification of Mussolini's family policies as "the best thing an Italian politician ever did for women", or of his overall work as that of "the greatest statesman Italy had in this century". Calls for revision of Italy's national borders. These claims range from the illiberal to the outright barbaric, can not be justified and show just what the National Alliance mean when they call themselves "post-Fascist": something wholly indistinguishable from Fascism.

At the same time, the self-styled "Liberal-democratic" wing of the government Forza Italia, is doing nothing to counter accusations that it is improperly handling the media. After using his virtual monopoly of private television networks to win two elections, Mr. Berlusconi is trying to gain direct control over the state television RAI, which he resents being "too critical" towards his government. In these attempts, he pays no heed to either the laws on media promulgated by the Ciampi government, or the EU directives on media.

LYMEC Executive Committee, meeting on the 2nd of July 1994 in Gummersbach, Germany:

EXPRESSES

- its worries for the state of democracy in Italy

DECLARES

- That it is morally and politically unacceptable for Democrats, particularly "Liberals", to work with Fascist or Racist Forces in any circumstances;
- That all men and women are born free and equal, and that Fascism is not simply "outdated", but it is to be rejected wholeheartedly and uncompromisingly;

AFFIRMS

- The right of all political forces and activists to organise and campaign using democratic and peaceful means without fear of violence;
- Its solidarity to all democratic Italian political forces committed to the cause of liberty, democracy and the freedom of information, regardless of their political orientation;

STRESSES

- The vital role of pluralistic media;

CALLS ON

- The European Parliament to monitor closely the state of democracy and the state of the freedom of information in Italy, and to expect a strict application of the EU directives in this field, notably with regards to limits to concentrated media ownership and to concentrated advertising revenue control;
- European Liberals and radicals and their political organisations to:
- Support the European Parliament in this task in any possible way. · Demand respect of the democratic principles and of the freedom of information in Italy and everywhere
- Avoid active co-operation with the Berlusconi government until this condition is satisfied
- Reject any attempt of Fascist forces to be legitimised and seen as potential partners in a democratic government
- Isolate Fascist and avoid co-operation with those who co-operate with them actively
- Actively support the independent media in Italy

PA 2.30 On the new Hungarian Constitution Democracy

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.28))

Political Rights, Freedom of Expression, Hungary

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Utrecht, Netherlands on 6th -8th of May 2011

Considering that on 17 April 2011 the Hungarian Parliament passed a new constitution according to which a new budgetary council is to be elected for a nine-year period by the parliament;

Alarmed by the fact that this budgetary council can declare a budget passed by parliament to be null and void at any time;

Also alarmed by the new powers given to the president to dissolve parliament if the country has not passed a budget by 30 March of each year;

The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC):

Is convinced that that through these rules, the national-conservative party FIDESZ, undermines the democratic institutions of the country by manifesting its power far beyond this legislative period as the new budgetary council would be in power until the end of this decade;

Is worried that the new constitution will worsen the rights of minorities in the country;

Is concerned	that the new constitution also limits the possibilities of the constitutional court for judicial review as from 2012 on, not every Hungarian can call upon the constitutional court and the constitutional court will also be stripped of its powers to deal with matters concerning the budget;
Is also concerned	that the dubious preamble could be used as pretence against the freedom of expression by defining god, Christianity and the pride in a millennium of Hungarian history as legally binding symbols;
Strongly believes	in Article 2 of the Treaty of Lisbon stating that the EU is "founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity, and equality between women and men prevail;"
Calls upon	Member States, the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council to initiate procedures according to Article 7 of the Treaty in order to determine "the existence of a serious and persistent breach by a Member State of the values referred to in Article 2" and to take further measures if such a breach is identified; and finally
Calls upon	the LYMEC Bureau to submit a resolution in the above spirit to the next ELDR congress against independent judiciaries deprived of their function and against democratic principles being significantly undermined in the case no action is taken by the European Institutions during the next months.

PA 2.31 Urgent Resolution on Bulgaria

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.29))

Democracy, Electoral Competitions, Bulgaria

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Helsingborg, Sweden on the 14th-16th of March 1997.

Noting:

- The political tensed situation in Bulgaria
- The recent peaceful protests against the regime of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP)
- The support and active participation of the Bulgarian Liberal Parties (the Radical-Democratic Party, the Union "New Choice" and the party "New Democracy")
- That the early national elections will be held in April 1997

We are convinced that:

- The protest against the usurpation of the whole power by the ruling majority of the Bulgarian socialists is a sacred liberal right.
- The formation of the next cabinet by the BSP would have been impossible taking into account the drastic violation of the social contract between the rulers and voters.
- The Bulgarian Socialist Party has not only delimited itself from their predecessors - the communists - but has accumulated a new and large managerial and political guilt vis-à-vis the people after 1989.
- After the national elections in April 1997 local elections are necessary.
- Prior to the elections a programme government has to be formed.
- This cabinet should ensure the start of the economic stabilisation and should create optimal conditions for the running of the elections.
- The programme cabinet could obtain a mandate only after a political agreement to break out of the crisis.

We Support:

- The Bulgarian liberal parties to participate as a liberal coalition in the next elections.

We Demand:

- Technical and financial support of the European Union to help with the upcoming elections and to built up the country afterwards.

PA 2.32 Resolution on Present Situation in the Russian Federation

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.30))

Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Russia

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Executive committee in Stockholm, Sweden on the 28th – 30th of November 2003

The Executive Committee:

Welcoming the award of the Liberal International Prize for Freedom to Grigory Yavlinsky, the leader of the Russian liberal party Yabloko,

Concerned by the lack of transparency in local and regional elections,

Worried about the prospects for free and fair national elections,

Deeply concerned about the growing influence of security agencies in the political process,

Further concerned by the lack of independent media in Russia and political pressure applied to the remaining independent media organisations,

Noting the continuing conflict in Chechnya and international concerns about continuing human rights violations,

Further notes the arrest and detention of Mikhail Khodorkovsky and concerned that this may be determined by political motivations,

Condemns the confiscation of election materials from the headquarters of Yabloko and harassment of its members and leadership;

Calls for greater transparency in local, regional and national elections and the use of international monitors;

Strongly urges the ELDR group to raise the issue both in the European Parliament and the Council of Europe;

Requests that the ELDR group consider proposing the temporary suspension of the Russian Federation from the Council of Europe if concerns about the democratic process are not adequately answered.

PA 2.33 The Political Situation in the Russian Federation ***(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.31))***

Civil Liberties, Democracy, Russia

Resolution adopted at the Executive Committee in Rome, 3-5 December 2004

The LYMEC Executive Committee

Deeply concerned by the move away from democracy in the Russian Federation,

Noting the shift towards an authoritarian regime under President Vladimir Putin,

Further concerned by the concentration of political power in the Kremlin,

Disturbed by the disintegration of civil and political opposition,

Worried by the deterioration of civil liberties and the strengthening of political control of the media,

1. *Declare* their solidarity with Yabloko Youth in their protests against the present government;
2. *Support* civil opposition action in the face of police repression;
3. *Condemn* the persecution of Yabloko Youth by the Russian authorities;
4. *Call upon* all international youth organizations to exert all possible pressure on the Russian authorities to end their campaign of persecution against Russian opposition members.

PA 2.34 Blasphemy is a right, freedom is not a crime!

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.43)) (Updated through adoption of Freedom of Belief)

Approved in the Congress of Rotterdam, May 2015

Keywords: blasphemy, religious freedom, terrorism

Considering:

- The attacks directed both at free speech and Jewish population in early 2015 in Paris (against a satirical magazine and a kosher supermarket) and in Copenhagen (against a public debate on freedom of expression and a synagogue);
- The growing waves of Islamophobia in Europe, with clear examples such as the PEGIDA demonstrations, and the persistent Christianophobia in Muslim countries;
- The return to our continent of an aggressive anti-Semitism;
- The re-appropriation of several Christian conservative and radical movements of the Charlie Hebdo tragedy, and the alliance of forces of several religious confessions against the right to criticize religion under the disguise of cultural respect;

Remembering:

- That religious freedom is a cornerstone of Liberalism and was a constitutive element of the Enlightenment movement that gave birth to our modern, democratic, pluralistic and secularized societies;
- That religions are social ideologies, no better or worse than any other political or economical schools of thought, or philosophical lines of thinking, such as Liberalism, Socialism, Conservatism, Capitalism, Communism, Ecologism, etc.;

- That criticizing religions, and ridiculing them, cannot be forbidden in a Liberal society;
- That criticism may never incite violence.
- Non-followers of any religion are under-represented and are not heard in social consultations by governments and international organizations.

Stating that:

- A Liberal state is a state with absolute and unequivocal organic separation of state and religion, where the state does not determine the content of religion and religion does not affect the governance of the state;
- A Liberal society is one where everyone is absolutely free to believe in whatever one might choose, which does not imply that such choices should be imposed on others;
- Religious freedom does not mean the right to attack with physical violence, or appeal to others to exert physical violence;
- The law must be equal for all, and that religions and religious believers are not entitled to request legal privileges or impose them on others; parallel legal systems of religious nature must not be recognized under national law.
- There is a growing number of non-religious individuals who do not have an adequate representation and recognition of their right not to believe.

LYMEC, the European Liberal Youth, gathering at its Spring Congress of 2015 in Rotterdam:

- Calls on States not to fund any religious organization, or, alternatively, if so doing, fund all religious and non-religious groups alike, on the basis of clearly scrutinizable criteria (such as national census) and with clear requirements with regards to the respect of basic human rights and acceptance of peaceful interaction with other social groups, forbidding any funding coming from States that do not respect religious pluralism;
- Calls on States to guarantee freedom of speech in Europe, by removing legal restrictions, on religious grounds or otherwise, including but not limited to blasphemy and lese-majesty laws;
- Affirms that freedom of conscience and freedom of expression are not manifestations of a supposed Western culture, but universal aspirations to freedom of all rational beings and rejects any return of blasphemy laws under the false premises of cultural relativism;
- Appeals to European institutions to cease giving a privileged position to religious groups and integrate representatives from non-religious international organizations in social dialogue.

PA 2.35 Capital Punishment in Belarus

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.17))

Democracy, Human Rights, Civil Rights, Belarus

Submitted by: JD, JOVD, JuLis, IMS Kseniya Shedova

Appalled by

- the recent execution of the death penalty against Dzmitry Kanavalau and Uladzislau Kvalyou in Belarus in March 2012 for their supposed involvement with the 11th of April subway-bombing in Minsk, 2011

Concerned with

- the decency of the trial received by these men that was not conformal in any way with the European Convention on Human Rights
- the rush the capital punishment was performed in
- the fact that the convicted did not have the right for appeal, for a more detailed revision of their case

Believing that

- since the complaint of Uladzislau Kavaliou has not yet been considered by the UN Committee on Human Rights, the execution of the death penalty was a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified by Belarus.
- the death penalty is an ineffective and absolutely unacceptable form of punishment.
- each suspect has the right to a decent and transparent trial with sufficient time for appeals and an independent justice system that holds up to basic international standards.
- these sentences are one of the many things happening in Belarus at the moment that show that the regime of President Lukashenka is determined to continue its authoritarian and inhuman policies.

Recalling

- LYMEC Resolution on the situation in Belarus from the Congress in Utrecht, May 2911
- the IFLRY Resolutions on the situation in Belarus from the Executive Committee in Timisoara, July 2011 and the General Assembly in Istanbul, December 2011.

Calls upon LYMEC and its member organizations to:

- speak out against and raise awareness for the injustice of the capital punishment performed in Belarus on a regular base and specifically in March 2012.
- keep a close eye on the evolvement of the situation in Belarus.

PA 2.36 Urgent Resolution on the Presidential Elections in Belarus **(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.32))**

Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine, Russia

The Congress of LYMEC ,

- having regard OSCE Election Observation Mission Statement of preliminary findings and conclusions on the presidential election in Belarus, 19 March 2006, declaring that the elections are unfair and flawed with harassment of opposition activists, biased media coverage and obstruction of independent monitors;
- having regard that LYMEC Election Observation Mission participants were not granted visas or were refused entry into the country;
- whereas the official statement by the observer mission from the Russian-led Commonwealth of Independent States stated that the election was open and transparent;
- whereas the referendum of October 17, 2004, eliminating presidential term limits, and enabling Lukashenko to run for the third term, was announced fraudulent and not fulfilling the international standards by the opposition and international observers;
- whereas on the eve of the election, the climate of fear and insecurity was created by KGB making a statement associating the opposition and civil society groups with terrorism and resulted in physical assaults, fraud of opposition activists, their arrests and imprisonment –
- whereas the election campaign was conducted in restricted conditions with lack of media access for opposition campaigners;
- points out that democratic principles and constitutionally guaranteed rights of freedom of expression, association and assembly were largely violated by Belarusian authorities, abandoning democratic principles and engaging in human rights abuses;
- condemns the government's pressure applied to state employees and students, with regard to their right to engage in the political process, including cases of threatening such as loss of employment or expulsion from university;
- condemns the obstruction of LYMEC Election observation mission participants and views it as an endeavour to avoid international scrutiny and suppress democratic opposition;
- condemns the arrest of peaceful pro-democracy protestors from October Square on March 24th, 2006 and calls on EU to pressure Belarus to release all political prisoners, and to end all violations of freedom of expression and of the right of peaceful assembly;
- points out the efforts of Russia in striving to retain influence in Eastern Europe, supporting Lukashenko regime as a guarantee to keep Minsk in Moscow's sphere of control and congratulating Lukashenko with the results of the elections and the triumphant victory of the dictator
- calls EU to support the development of a conscious civil society by encouraging and supporting NGOs and pro-democracy activists; more European and

international NGO's should to establish in Minsk; cultural and educational exchange between youth from Belarus and EU should be promoted, EU should create more targeted programmes of scholarships, visits and placements for NGO's, human rights and minority activists;

- calls on EU to support independent media by investing in the development of radio and TV broadcast to Belarus, independent media organizations and printing of independent newspapers inside and outside Belarus;

- endorses the EU to impose stronger restrictive sanctions by applying visa restrictions for the representatives of the regime, also targeting chairs and members of electoral commissions, heads of military, police and etc. The list of the banned persons should be made public via EU and independent websites.

- encourages the EU to identify and freeze the bank accounts and other assets of senior officials of the Belorussian regime; however the economic sanctions and targeted trade restrictions should be only applied with careful analysis, not to harm the ordinary people of Belarus;

- states that EU should focus also on further development of its Neighbourhood policy in Ukraine and Moldova in order for the Belarussian's to acknowledge what improvements might be achieved in closer relations with EU as an alternative to present isolation.

PA 2.37 Young Liberals for a Free Belarus **(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.33))**

Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Belarus

Whereas:

- The situation in Belarus is highly worrying with the further increasing restrictions of the Lukashenka's regime to the opposition activists.

- The general elections are anticipated to be held in 2008. However the uncertainty about the exact date of the election restrains the opposition to act on the campaign for the elections.

- LYMEC has two member organizations being applicant members in Belarus, as well as many organizations working with partners in Belarus. However the different activities of member organizations in Belarus have not been coordinated enough recently.

Noting that:

- Discussions took place in line with LYMEC Congress in Berlin in May 2007 regarding the possibilities to coordinate young liberals support for the liberal opposition in Belarus. These discussions were followed by a meeting in Vilnius August 2007 that

gathered many of the liberal youth organizations that are active in helping the opposition.

- The meeting including the liberal Belarusian opposition represented by Civil Forum has indicated the following problems that the Belarusian opposition face in their work:

- Since most of the activities so far has been focused on raising awareness we all agreed that it is important to focus more on strengthening liberal youth organizations inside Belarus;
- The society in Belarus cannot freely access the unbiased information through independent media, which causes lack of political awareness and knowledge of the society and political youth activists;
- In order to effectively reach the grass roots in the society the Belarusian opposition has expressed a need of trainings on public relations and media technologies;
- A better information float through different channels of information and information offices are necessary;
- There is a need to work on human right protection especially through permanent political monitoring;

Therefore the Executive Committee of LYMEC – European liberal youth:

- Proposes to create a „*Young Liberals for a Free Belarus*” Forum. The forum will be run by a board consisting of representatives of the most active organizations working on Belarus, as well as by one representative from the LYMEC bureau and one representative from the IFLRY bureau. This Forum will be aimed at coordinating the work of LYMEC and IFLRY member organizations with regard to Belarus.

The tasks of the crated forum shall include the following:

- Facilitating the member organizations work in Belarus through a database with activities
- Organizing meetings twice a year focusing on possibilities for joint initiatives in Belarus
- Facilitate continuous discussions on how to help the liberal youth of Belarus
- Spreading information about our partners in Belarus to the member organizations
- Organizing joint fact finding missions to Belarus

- Asks the LYMEC bureau to start taking the first steps towards formalizing such a forum.

PA 2.38 Resolution on the Political Situation in Belarus

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.34))

Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Belarus

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Utrecht, Netherlands on 6th -8th of May 2011

CONSIDERING THAT	the Belarusian government pledged to consider recommendations made by OSCE and ODIHR for the improvement of the electoral process and the electoral law to make it compliant with international standards prior to the 2010 elections.
CONSIDERING THAT	representatives of the Lukaschenka regime promised free and fair elections as well as equal rights for the opposition candidates to representatives of the European Union and its member states on several occasions.
CONSIDERING THAT	the European Union took steps to deepen its relations with Belarus reaffirmed by the Prague Declaration of the Eastern Partnership summit and pledged to take further initiative based on Belarus' commitment to a free and fair electoral process.
WHEREAS	the OSCE/ODIHR statement made clear that while some minor improvements were reached the elections didn't meet basic compliance with international standards and were overshadowed by grave irregularities especially during the Election Day.
WHEREAS	the government reacted on peaceful demonstrations against on the eve of elections with a violent crackdown by special police forces and KGB when more than 700 participants were detained including 6 of the opposition candidates, some of them severely injured from beatings and stabbings by security forces.
WHEREAS	Repression and violence against candidates, opposition- and civil society activists and human rights defenders continued throughout the next days and was still taking place on several occasions during the last weeks, notably on the Belarusian Freedom Day on the 25 th of March.
WHEREAS	several opposition- and civil society activists still remain in prison awaiting trials for "participation in actions of mass disorder and armed resistance", including former presidential candidates Mikalai Statkevich and Andrei Sannikov.
WHEREAS	several participants in the demonstrations, including youth activists Zmitser Dashkevich and Eduard Lobau, were already sentenced to prison sentences of up to 4 years while others are facing sentences of up to 15 years in maximum-security prisons.
LYMEC in support of a free and democratic Belarus:	
CONDEMNS	the bold irregularities and pure frauds that led to the reelection of Aljaksandr Lukaschenka as Belarusian president.

CONDEMNS	the brutal crackdown on opposition- and civil society activists during the election night and the repressions that took place ever since.
DEMANDS	the immediate release of all political prisoners and the nullification of the verdicts already spoken against opposition- and civil society activists.
URGES	the Belarusian government to take immediate steps to bring the electoral law in compliance with international standards and to guarantee legal status of opposition parties.
WELCOMES	the 20 th January resolution by the European Parliaments and the sanctions declared against Belarusian government officials as well as the freezing of financial assets.
WELCOMES	the readiness of the European Institutions to intensively improve political and financial support for Belarusian Civil Society and independent media.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe, the European Commission and the EU High Representative for an extensive review of the EU policy which should also include possible smart economic sanctions to increase the pressure on the Belarusian regime.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe and the European Commission to specially provide intensive support to youth- and student organizations in Belarus and to develop a mechanism of registration for NGO's that are denied registration by the Belarusian government.
CALLS	on its member organizations to increase awareness for the Belarus cause within the liberal family and in society and to support the struggle of the Belarusian youth for a democratic future.

PA 2.39 Resolution on the Electoral Farce in Belarus
(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.35))

Civil Liberties, Electoral Competitions, Democracy, Belarus

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress on 12th-14th of October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

Proposed by: IMS Anna Halavina, Johannes Knewitz, Kseniya Shvedova, Tanya Lyubimova; Ermanno Martignetti; Daniel George; JOVD (The Netherlands); JD (The Netherlands); GIV (Italy); JuLis (Germany)

- CONSIDERING THAT** the Belarusian government pledged to consider recommendations made by OSCE/ODIHR for the improvement of the electoral process and the electoral law to make it compliant with international standards and invited OSCE/OHDIHR under the assertion that it would guarantee free and fair elections.
- CONSIDERING THAT** despite amendments that were introduced into the Belarusian electoral code in 2010 and 2011 the electoral process is still not in line with OSCE commitments and international standards.
- WHEREAS** the OSCE/OHDIHR statement made clear that while some minor improvements during the early voting could be observed, the elections didn't meet basic compliancy with international standards and were overshadowed by irregularities especially during the Election Day.
- WHEREAS** the OSCE/OHDIR statement also deplores that by denying possibilities for usage of media and political campaigning to independent candidates while privileges were granted to other candidates affiliated with the regime, the elections were in no way competitive.
- WHEREAS** independent election observers also observed grave irregularities that represented the whole arsenal of electoral fraud.
- CONSIDERING THAT** the electoral commissions were made up of individuals loyal to the regime and that independent observers were not able to observe the vote count.
- CONSIDERING THAT** extensive state propaganda was used to support candidates affiliated with the regime, culminating in incidences where the Central Election Commission was openly favoring and supporting such candidates.
- WHEREAS** the regime used massive repression against political organizations and civil society organizations in general throughout the last two years and implemented changes into Belarusian law that allow for harsh measures against the smallest impulse of independent thought and free speech.
- WHEREAS** several political- and human-rights activists remain in Belarusian prisons including the leader of the Human Rights Center "Viasna", Ales Byalyatski, and political youth activist Dzmitry Dashkevich, among others.
- LYMEC supporting the fight of the Belarusian people for freedom and liberty:**
- CONDEMNS** the bold irregularities and pure frauds that accompanied the parliamentary elections, which ended in a mere farce.

CONDEMNS	the latest actions against opposition and civil society activists and the repressions against Belarusian independent media and foreign journalists throughout the election week as well as the harassment and detention of several independent election observers.
DEPLORES	the groundless expulsion of a delegation of the International Federation of Liberal Youth (IFLY) during the election week after Belarusian security personal ended a peaceful workshop on youth cooperation.
DEMANDS	the immediate release of all political prisoners and the nullification of the verdicts already spoken against opposition- and civil society activists.
URGES	the Belarusian government to take immediate steps to bring the electoral law in compliance with international standards and to guarantee legal status of opposition parties.
URGES	the Belarusian government to ensure the registration of all eligible candidates for the upcoming local and presidential elections, to guarantee open campaigning and equal access to state controlled media, and to allow the representatives of democratic parties and movements to be represented in electoral commissions.
REMINDS	the European Institutions on statements made after the 2010 presidential elections to intensively improve political and financial support for Belarusian Civil Society and independent media, which were only in parts followed by concrete actions.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe, the European Commission and the EU High Representative for a strong stand against the electoral farce and intensified measures, including economic sanctions, that are specifically directed against the Belarusian regime.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe and the European Commission to improve support to youth- and student organizations in Belarus and to finally develop a mechanism of registration for NGO's that are denied registration by the Belarusian government.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe and European Commission to continue and intensify the promotion international exchanges, scholarships for visits and advanced professional training programmes for leaders and members of the democratic organizations, students and scholars.
CALLS	on the Council of Europe and European Commission to put a special focus on supporting unbiased broadcasting through independent media in exile in order to overcome the government's monopoly on information with a view to overcoming the informational isolation of Belarus.

- CALLS** on the member states of the European Union to simplify application processes for visas and abolish visa fees for Belarusian citizens.
- CALLS** on the LYMCEC Bureau to raise awareness for the situation through all possible political channels in the European Union.
- CALLS** on its member organizations to actively increase awareness for the Belarus cause within the liberal family and in society and to support the struggle of the Belarusian youth for a democratic future.

PA 2.40 Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression as Causes for International Protection and Asylum in the European Countries

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.09))

Gender and Sexual Rights, Civil Liberties, Social Rights

Submitted by Svensk Ungdom

The attention given to LGBTI rights in the processes connected to international protection and asylum has developed significantly in recent years. It has been acknowledged that sexual orientation could be considered as grounds for asylum. According to article 2(c) in the European Union directive 2004/83/EC, which provides minimum European standard for qualification of third country nationals or stateless persons as refugees: 'Refugee means a third country national who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reason of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership of a particular social group, is outside the country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country'.

In the "Qualification Directive", the EU has recognized that sexual orientation may, depending on the circumstances of the country of origin, provide the basis for a claim for asylum based on persecution based on membership of a particular social group. As of 2009, asylum has been granted to LGBT persons in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Czech Republic and the United Kingdom.

On October 27, 2011, the European Parliament adopted a directive on *standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted*. According to

article 10 (d) reasons for persecution may include membership of a particular social group, which might include a group based on a common characteristic of sexual orientation. It also states that "Gender related aspects, including gender identity, shall be given due consideration for the purposes of determining membership of a particular social group or identifying a characteristic of such a group".

However, there are still considerable differences in the way in which European states examine LGBTI asylum applications. On a regular basis, LGBTI asylum seekers are returned to their country of origin with reference to the so called "discretion requirement", meaning they are returned because they supposedly can prevent persecution by concealing their sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

Considering that

- there are considerable differences in the way in which European states examine LGBTI asylum applications
- on a number of points, European state practice is below the standards required by international and European human rights and refugee law
- homo- bi- and transsexuality is criminalised in many countries in the world
- people are persecuted and sentenced to prison or even to death penalty because of their sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression
- the discretion requirement is, regrettably, still frequently applied in the large majority of European states

Noting that

- The European Parliament has recognised sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression as grounds for persecution
- a few member states already before that had included gender identity as a persecution ground in their national legislation or policy documents
- criminalisation of homosexuality in the country of origin is not necessarily considered as grounds for asylum, with reference to the discretion requirement
- there is a necessity to introduce common criteria (that is to be drawn from international obligations under human rights instruments) on the basis of which applicants for international protection are to be recognised as eligible for subsidiary protection

The LYMEC Congress calls for:

- The members of the European Union to implement the "standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted"

- All European states to abstain from enforcing the discretion requirement
- Criminalisation in the country of origin to be considered as persecution

PA 2.41 Recognise Same-Sex Marriage in the Entire EU ***(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.10))***

Gender and Sexual Rights, Civil Liberties, Social Rights

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress on 12th -14th October 2012, Sofia, Bulgaria

Submitted by: LUF, LLJ, VU, NUV, RU, SU

Noting that

Same-sex marriages are legal in seven member states of the European Union. Other regulated forms of partnerships, such as civil unions or registered partnerships, are available to same-sex couples in nine member states, but often not providing the same rights as marriage.

Some member states do not legally recognize same-sex relationships at all, and in four member states, the constitution limits marriage to heterosexual couples.

Only heterosexual couples are recognized as families within the European Union, providing that they are married or otherwise legally bound to one another.

Considering that

Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is incompatible with liberal values.

While the status of contractual interpersonal partnership is a fundamental concept in family law, from a liberal point of view there are absolutely no legitimate grounds to restrict the freedom of contract to enter into such an agreement on the basis of sexual orientation.

The free movement of individuals is at the core of the founding values of the EU.

All contractual interpersonal relationships deserve the same respect, recognition, rights and aid in all countries of the European Union.

LYMEC calls for

That all family legislation and all family recognition on a European level shall include same-sex couples.

The equal treatment of all contractual interpersonal partnerships by the European Union.

All member states to recognize same-sex couples who have married or entered into a civil union or similar arrangement in another member state, even if the member state does not itself perform such marriages or arrangements. This is already the case in some third countries, e.g. Israel.

LYMEC to introduce a resolution in this spirit at the upcoming ELDR congress in Dublin and to advocate this position with the ALDE group.

PA 2.42 Towards an Integration of Transsexual People ***(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.13))***

Sexuality, Discrimination, Civil Rights

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Berlin, Germany, 20-22 April 2007

Transsexualism is considered as the change of the gender identity of a person and it has been a lot studied, by the psychology and the medicine.

Medical consideration, from the aspect of the psychiatry, of transsexualism has been tied to the gender dysphoria, described like an intense feeling of discontent with the gender that one has attributed on being born.

In spite of this, the transsexualism reflects a social conflict (about the morality, the sexual and gender culture of the society) beyond a medical disorder.

Noting that

- In 1989, European Parliament urged the member states to make possible the access of transsexual people to an integral sanitary assistance.
- The hormones can modify the external look of the body and provoke enough visible changes in the look of the transsexual, achieving a similar aspect to a person of the wished gender.
- The surgery is used on occasions by the transsexuals for modifying the body itself. This can be for aesthetic purposes or for sex change (genital remodelling surgery)
- That many transsexuals never carry out a surgery of genital remodelling in their life, nor wish it.

And considering that

- Many countries hamper the adoption of a name that corresponds with the gender and sex felt as own because the change of legal name is conditioned to the change of physical sex, a surgery that not everybody wants to receive, nor everybody can pay.
- The discrimination of the transsexuals in Europe and in the world is still a big problem nowadays. The crimes against the transsexual population are

numerous, and many of the transsexuals subsist in conditions of poverty in a society that despise them occupationally and socially

- Even though the medical criteria about transsexualism have changed a lot lately, nowadays it still usually uses the recommendations of the ICD-10 (International Classification of Diseases-OMS) or the DSM-IV (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, version 4), even though all they seem in the present quite unsuitable and being in an advanced process of deep revision.

European Liberal Youth asks for

- The assignment of the legal sex and a name in order to the free development of the personality and the dignity of the people who do not identify with the gender they were inscribed initially and who have followed a gender-change process.
- The no discrimination from the health system point of view, as the more common transsexual demands (hormones, psychological help, etc.), must be solved from the point of view of the medical attention and not of the medical treatment of a disease.

The decataloging of the recommendations of the ICD-10 and the DSM-IV about the gender dysphoria.

PA 2.43 Urgent Resolution on the Plan of the EU to Block Web Sites ***(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.15))***

Civil Rights, Internet, Transparency, Freedom of expression

Adopted at LYMEC Congress 30th April – 1st May 2010, Sinaia, Romania

The Young Liberals of Europe, gathered in Sinaia (Romania),

Deeply disturbed about any case of child abuse published on the internet;

Observing the recent discussion about the possibilities of blocking web sites containing certain content like child pornography;

Regretting that this discussion is handled in a very emotional way instead of thinking about reasonable and efficient ways to avoid any kind of child abuse;

Recalling the fact that blocking web sites will not help to avoid any kind of child abuse, but will only make it insignificantly harder to reach these websites and more difficult for the authorities to find these;

Considering that necessary transparency of blocked web sites would simply accelerate and increase transfers of illegal media to other web sites;

Emphasising the importance of measures to fight child abuse effectively instead of only making it invisible to the European Union;

Fear that this discussion will open the Pandora's Box and might lead to a discussion about censorship in the internet in general so that the fundamental freedoms might not be guaranteed in the future anymore;

The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC)

- *strongly condemns* any form of child abuse and child pornography;
- *demand*s a joint effort of all European member states to fight any kind of child abuse with effective measures inside and outside the internet;
- *urges* the European Union to discuss the possibility to delete websites with content that in any kind harms children and work with world-wide governments to make it really effective;
- *calls on* the European Union to find a transparent way for these deletions in which a judge is involved in the decision about the deletion, the operator of the concerned websites will be informed and has a possibility to take legal actions;
- *demand*s the European Union and the member states to work together on this issue because the Internet is borderless and therefore crime in the Internet has to be fought by the international community;
- *Reinforces* that internet is a fundamental right in an age of digitalization;
- *Urges* the ALDE to foster the above mentioned points.

PA 2.44 Stop Discriminatory Measures Regarding Romani People

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.16))

Civil Rights, Human Rights, Minority Rights

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Utrecht, Netherlands on 6th-8th of May 2011

Referring to:

- * the systematic discrimination of Romani minorities on the territory of the European Union;
- * the discriminatory wall built in 1999, and later demolished under international pressure, in Ustí nad Labem (Czech Republic) to "[...] separate this problematic community from those people who have private houses [...]";
- * the ongoing situation of the disproportionate amount of Romani children, in for example Slovakia or Czech Republic, who are victims of separate education and are forced to attend schools meant for children with mental disabilities;
- * the situation in France where, since the forced evictions during the last months of 2010, the living conditions of Romani people deteriorated severely. Houses and camps were dismantled and destroyed, leaving people without adequate shelter during winter;
- * the fact that many Romani communities in Slovenia do not have access to sufficient and safe drinking water because they are forced to live in isolated, overcrowded and informal settlements.

Considering:

- * the fact that the countries of the European Union signed several international human right declarations and treaties like the European Convention of Human

Rights, the EU Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC) and the European Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities;

- * that European countries have a shared responsibility towards European citizens;
- * that ethnic registration and ethnically-based measures are objectionable;
- * that separate measures could promote discrimination and isolation;
- * that incentive measures must be incorporated in regular policies, accessible for all people in comparable situations;
- * that affirmative action towards Romani people in particular, could enlarge the tensions with non-Romani citizens.
- * problems should be addressed based on individuals living in a common European Union

Calls upon:

- * the European Commission, ALDE and ELDR to evaluate integration policies across the European Union to compare strategies, mechanisms and results of exceptional policy concerning Romani people;
- *
- * the European Commission to assure that Member States of the European Union respect the rights of minorities as stated in the treaties mentioned above;
- * that the Mos and the IMS **participating in the next conference on migration proceeding the next Congress** would monitor the situation of the Romani people within their own countries and report to **the event**

PA 2.45 Aiming at Ending Female Genital Mutilation **(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.21))**

Discrimination, Human Rights, Health, Civil Rights

Having regard to:

- the United Nations' Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1979) and its Optional Protocol (1999), as well as the specific;
- the convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
- the report of the UN Secretary General of 5 december 2012 "Ending Female Genital Mutilation";
- the Council of Europe Convention of 12 April 2011 on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence;
- the European Parliament resolution of 14 June 2012 on ending female genital mutilation;
- the Millenium Development Goals;

Highlighting that Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) is an irreparable abuse, intentionally causing injury to female genitals for non-medical reasons, with irreversible consequences;
 Stressing out that it affects about 140 million women and girls alive today;
 Regretting that, each year, three million girls are at risk of undergoing such a procedure;
 Whereas it also happens in European countries; with at least 500 000 victims, and 180 000 girls at risk according to World Health Organisation estimations, not taking into account second-generation or illegal migration;
 Knowing that most of these girls and women from countries with a tradition of FGM live in the following European countries: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom;
 Considering that any form of FGM as harmful traditional practice should not be considered as part of a religion as such, but as act of violence and torture against girls and women; so violating their fundamental rights;
 Considering any form of FGM as a violation of human rights;
 Considering the serious and irreparable injuries caused by FGM, in the short and long term, to the physical and mental health of the girls and women who underwent it;
 Considering that they are at risk of further infections, sicknesses and injuries in case of use of rudimentary instruments and the lack of antiseptic precautions;
 Considering the effect FGM can have on their future relations – pain during sexual intercourse, childbirth, ... - and the possible complications (haemorrhaging, shock, infections);
 Considering that countries with a tradition of FGM – almost outside of the EU – also face a high rate of AIDS transmission, tetanos and other sexually transmitted diseases; A1 – JD – Change with : Considering that countries with a tradition of FGM – almost all outside of the EU – also face a high rate of AIDS transmission, tetanos and other sexually transmitted diseases; Carried by the mover
 Considering FGM as an expression of inequality between women and men;
 Considering a global approach to fight FGM as a necessary tool in the fight towards gender equality;
 The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) Congress, meeting in Tallinn in April 2013, Welcomes the European Commission Initiative on how to prevent forced circumcision of girls and women;

Expresses its deep concerns about the fact that FGM is often practiced on girls younger than 15 years, violating as such the United Nations' 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child;
 Recalls that every Member State of the European Union are committed to protecting the Children's Rights;

Calls upon each party member of ALDE party to take any necessary initiatives within their own country to ratify the different conventions mentioned above and existing international instruments, if it is not yet the case;
 Encourages therefore every State to enforce legal measures to end female genital mutilation, including banning offenders from their migration policies;
 Urges Governments of the Member States of the Council of Europe to take preventive and protective initiatives for girls and women at risk, particularly from immigration groups;

Proposes that every European country should develop a mechanism to allow and encourage victims to report any case of FGM;
 Believes that international cooperation is needed to end female genital mutilation, not only in Europe, but on a global scale;
 Invites the ALDE group in the European Parliament to support European programs on Justice, Health and Development and Cooperation, to give them sufficient resources to face the needs and the priorities of girls in a vulnerable situation, including the ones at risk of FGM;
 Asks for the inclusion in every European or bi- and multilateral development and cooperation plan of a program aiming at gender equality, women empowerment and the fight against violence and discrimination against women;
 Asks each of its Member organisations to relay this resolution to their mother party if they have one;
 Demands the LYMEC bureau to relay this resolution within ALDE party and ALDE groups in the European Parliament and the Council of Europe.

PA 2.46 The Liberal-Democrat Attitude Towards Religion

(Archived Online Congress 2020 (Former 2.23))

Religion, Modernization of Society, Rejection of Anti-Liberal Policies

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress in Sinaia, Romania in March 2002.

Recalling that

- All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, whatever their race, colour, sex, language, religion, opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
- The freedom to choose one's religion and beliefs belongs to fundamental human rights
- All religions have, to different extent, contributed to Europe's Identity

Notes with concern that

- The events in September the 11th 2001 have put the religious issue in the foreground of world politics and international relations.
- Some confusion, social tensions and restriction of human rights have resulted from the unacceptable stigmatisation of some religions compared to others
- Some European politicians were tempted to assimilate Europe's identity (including the liberal-democrat heritage) to Christianity, by opposition to other "civilisations".

Reasserts

- The non sense of comparing religions and civilisations one with another, as well as of identifying certain religions to certain geographic areas
- The danger of a too strong political influence of Churches on the State
- The universalism of the liberal-democrat philosophy and its independence from any religious belief

Concludes to the necessity

- To build a clear separation between the Religious Institutions & the State
- To fight against religious intolerance and all religious extremism, whatever their nature and origins.

Policy Archive Chapter 3 – Culture, education and youth, Science and technology

PA 3.01 – Policy paper on Youth Unemployment

Aim of the policy paper

This Policy Paper aims to communicate the Youth Policy of LYMEC – European Liberal Youth. LYMEC is a political youth organization unifying more than 250,000 young people in Europe; it is by that means concerned with the role of young people in the Europe of the 21st century.

Definitions

Youth is regarded by both European and worldwide organizations as the group of citizens from 15-25 years of age. By analogy the YOUTH programme of the European Commission and the various other programmes dedicated for 'youth' of the European Union and the Council of Europe are implemented for this group of people. Without doubt young people are commonly regarded as the potential of Europe, not only by its citizens but also by its institutions, also in concrete demographic numbers: following enlargement to 25 member states, there will be 75 million young people in the European Union between the ages of 15 and 25. This makes about one sixth of the total population.

Demography

Between 2000 and 2020, the 65-90 age group will increase from 16% to 21% of the total population of the European Union, while the 15-24 age group will fall to only 11%. With this process of ageing, more is expected of the last group. Also the period of youth is changing. Demographers have observed that, under pressure from economic factors (employability, unemployment, etc.) and socio-cultural factors, young people are, on average, older when they reach the various stages of life: end of formal education, start of employment, starting a family, and so on. It is necessary that policies of the European Union and its member states adapt to this demographic trends.

Youth policy at the European level

LYMEC supports the White Paper on youth as approved by the European Commission on 21 November 2001. It is the first step

towards an integrated European Union policy on youth. The follow up on the White paper has been the resolution of the European Council of 27 June 2002, setting a new framework for co-operation in the youth field. In this Resolution, the Council called for the open method of co-ordination (OMC) to be applied to four priorities i.e. participation by young people, information of young people, voluntary activities among young people and a greater understanding and knowledge of youth.

At the Spring European Council of 22 – 23 March 2005, the EU Heads of State and Government adopted a European Youth Pact as one of the instruments contributing to the achievement of the Lisbon Objectives: making Europe “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world”. LYMEC supports the adoption of a European Youth Pact; we think that the Lisbon Objectives can never be achieved without a focus on the role of the youth in the process towards achievement. Adding the youth dimension to the overall Lisbon strategy is vital for its success. LYMEC asks the European Council for a sustainable commitment to the implementation of the Youth Pact as a way to achieve the Lisbon objectives.

2. Towards life-wide learning

Non-formal education is an organised process that gives young people the possibility to develop their values, skills and competencies others than the ones developed in the framework of formal education. It is no longer sufficient to think only in terms of formal education. Non-formal education is an essential part of life long learning process and youth organisations as LYMEC are a space for and providers of non-formal learning.

In many communities, young people's involvement in youth work and the related skills and competencies acquired in non-formal learning environments are not sufficiently recognised. LYMEC calls upon local, national and international institutions, schools and universities, labour market organisations companies, to recognise the values of youth work. Especially the contribution of non-formal education to the development of skills, knowledge and attitudes gained through voluntary work by young people. LYMEC believes that this can be achieved by taking away unnecessary barriers

between formal – and non-formal education. Formal education programmes need to show their flexibility towards non-formal schedules.

LYMEC believes that in a knowledge-based society the skills and competencies gained by non-formal education should be visible, tomorrow even more than today. LYMEC supports initiatives taken by the European Commission to develop a passport for experiences gained through youth work.

PA 3.02 Policy Paper on Youth Employment

Employment, Social Rights

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 1-4 May 2008 in Barcelona, Catalonia

Introduction

The situation of young people on today's labour markets in Europe is a major challenge for policy shapers on all levels of governance. The participation in the labour market of all possible persons including the younger generation is an important contributor to economic growth, though the situation in several European countries is worrying. Increased participation is furthermore needed in order to limit as much as possible the negative consequences of a declining labour force in Europe from 2010 onwards.

The social consequences of high youth unemployment rates are enormous. Several researches show that having or not-having a job is a major determinant for a person's happiness. Next to that young people who are unemployed are statistically seen as a higher risk for juvenile criminality and socially unaccepted behaviour.

There are both social and economic reasons why youth employment should be on the top of the agenda. LYMEC as a youth organisation needs to have developed opinion on this matter, even more so now that we are asked to give young liberals' inputs to several discussions on this topic, like the one taking place in the Youth Forum.

Facts:

- *The ratio of youth-to-adult unemployment rate is 3.*
- *In total, with about 7,4 million unemployed young people in the EU, young people aged 15-29 represent 38,5% of the total unemployed.*
- *There is a significant gender gap in youth employment in the EU with the employment rate of young women in 2006 being 5,9% lower than of their male peers.*
- *In the age group 15-24 in 2006 the EU-15 average unemployment rate was around 16%, the EU-27 average around 17% with the highest numbers amounting up to almost 30% (Poland) and the lowest down to nearly 6% (the Netherlands).*

Background

The employment rate for young people depends on many different social – and economic issues. Policies are currently made on several different levels; the EU only has a role of coordination and can serve as a platform for best-practise exchange. In the future this should remain the same: employment policies have to be decided and executed on the national or even local level.

Policies will have to be shaped and existing ones to be improved in a larger area. With youth employment comes education, transition from education to the labour market, social security systems, age discrimination and equal opportunities.

General assessment

Participation of all different categories of people at the labour market is an important key to economic growth and a possible solution to challenges that come with our ageing societies. The full participation of youth and starters is the category that this paper focuses on.

Looking at the unemployment rate of young people it is obvious that the levels are way too high and that young people are at risk. The causes of youth unemployment are various and differ very much from state to state. There are however certain overarching problems that can be defined.

Education

The transition from finishing education to full employment is seen as one of the most important moments on a young person's life. This is the moment where knowledge acquired during a period of education (formal and non-formal) has to be transformed into employment possibilities. Often the education does not match the requirements of the employers. Even worse are the high amounts of early-school leavers that have no to little chances at the labour market

Young Entrepreneurship

Over half of the EU's young people wish to start up a business within five years according to Eurobarometer. At the same time there are severe barriers that withhold these youngsters from really starting the business. Many young people are not considering it any longer once they are faced with the enormous administrative burden and difficulties to get loans because of short credit records. Furthermore skills

required for starting up a business are not always sufficiently taught during primary and secondary education.

Age discrimination on the labour market

Today's labour markets in Europe often suffer systems that overprotect older people. Discrimination on the basis of age is done in both legal and illegal ways. These practices that are often the result of collective bargaining agreements between different social parties are very harmful for young people.

Employment costs

High employment costs are a problem for many labour markets in Europe. Employment costs generally consist of a salary, the patronal part of social security costs and taxes as well as possible secondary benefits for employees. These costs combined with an often high level of regulation make it sometimes unappealing for employers to attract new employees on long-term contracts, leading to high frictional unemployment, high levels of temporary jobs and other ways to avoid committing long-term contracts (internships etc.). More vulnerable groups on the labour market such as women and young people are affected the most by high barriers for employers to recruit new people.

Dialogue

In Europe's current societies where unionisation is decreasing fast especially amongst young people, Trade Unions can no longer be seen as the only representative voice of workers. Young workers and starters often do not longer engage themselves in Unions and this has serious consequences for their representative voices. Civil Society organisations can play an active role in discussions around youth employment, intergenerational solidarity and other social-economic challenges.

The LYMEC Congress, meeting from 1-3 May in Barcelona, concludes the following:

- When implementing the Lisbon Strategy and possible further EU coordination plans on innovation related to social-economic policies, special attention has to be drawn to young peoples' participation in the labour market as a part of boosting labour participation in general;
- The EU should develop individual targets for member states so that the EU-27 average youth employment rate goes down from 17% to 10% by 2020;
- National policies will have to be developed in order for European states to focus on early-school leaving and the transition from education to employment when improving education policies;
- European states urgently have to start cutting Red Tape for starting up businesses. Ambitious programmes in some countries where it has to be possible to set up a business in one day could serve as an example for other member states;
- The EU has to take legal steps against member states practicing policies of legal age discrimination within national labour law;

- The EU has to urge its member states to cut employment costs in order to increase employment. This can be done by absolute cuts on taxes and social charges for employers and alternatively by transforming current tax regimes from taxing labour and production to taxing consumption;
- New forms of dialogue will have to be created on all levels of governance that are concerned with youth employment. It has to be recognised that trade union cannot longer be seen as the only voice for young people in various policy discussion

Policy Archive Chapter 4 – Business, Economy, Finance and Tax, Cross-Cutting Policies

PA 4.1 Pan-European Legalisation of Soft Drugs

Tax, Industry

Resolution adopted by the LYMEC Extraordinary Congress 2-3 December 2000, Barcelona.

Considering that

- Soft drugs are less dangerous than hard drugs. Hard drugs are both mentally and physically addictive. Soft drugs are only addictive in a mental way. It is possible to die from an overdose of hard drugs, concerning soft drugs dying from an overdoses is impossible. Hard drugs makes people often aggressive and criminal, with soft drugs this is not the case.
- Many hard drugs like Alcohol and Nicotine are legal. Addiction to legal, chemical, drugs is also widespread.
- Every individual should have the right to consume whatever he or she wants as long as nobody else gets endangered. Individuals should be free to make their own choices and have their own responsibilities.
- Criminals benefit from the illegal production and trade of cannabis. Legalising soft drugs will undermine the activities of maffias, organised crime is a huge threat for Europe.
- In many countries the soft drugs dealer sells hard drugs as well. This means a big risk, people who just want to buy cannabis, will be offered hard drugs.
- There is no (state) quality control on cannabis. This endangers the health of the individual consumer, whilst the health of the individual consumer is most important.
- Legalising the soft drugs market increases official GDP and means extra tax income and a possibility for excise-duty.

The LYMEC-Congress concludes

- To support individual European countries which aim to legalise soft drugs.
- The ELDR Party should equip a strong pro soft drugs legalisation policy in the European Parliament.

Policy Archive Chapter 5 – Employment and Social Rights

PA 5.01 Legalize Prostitution

Employment, Social Rights, Tax

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Zagreb, Croatia on 27th -28th of April 2004

The LYMEC Congress

Noting with concern the goal of the Irish EU presidency to ban paying for sex throughout the EU,

Further noting that the Danish and Dutch policy on prostitution (legalisation) is not a standard policy, and would thus be overruled by an EU majority.

Recognising the fact that prostitution has existed since the settling down of the prehistoric 'hunters and gatherers', and the inevitability of its existence, in whatever form, in the future.

Considering the following advantages of legalisation of prostitution:

- Control and regulation of industry (hygiene, STD's, minimum age and permits of workers)
- Prevention of abuse and involuntary prostitution due to pulling the sector out into the open (including sexual abuse of children and illegal aliens)
- Safer industry (disentanglement of prostitution from potential criminal ties)
- Collecting taxes on the industry benefits the government.

Stressing that:

- An association, such as the Dutch trade union for prostitutes and ex-prostitutes, to whom prostitutes can address their complaints, helps insure the protection of the rights of the prostitutes, including the absolute right to say no and provides access to re-training programmes for sex workers who want to leave the industry.
- Prostitutes show a lower incidence of all sexually transmitted diseases than the general public does.
- Most national constitutions in Europe guarantee that not only can we freely practice the religion of our choice, but also that the government will not impose religion upon us. Almost all the arguments in favour of maintaining laws against consensual activities have a religious foundation. The government is then asked to enforce these religious beliefs by arresting the non-believers and putting them in jail.
- For the government to say that certain services cannot be bought or sold is a direct violation of the fundamental principles of our economic system.

- One should be allowed to do whatever one wants with one's own person, as long as one does not physically harm the person and violate the rights of a non-consenting other.
- It should not be a business of government what consenting adults are doing voluntarily.
- Sex is a positive, nurturing act, and whether it is given out of love or rendered as a service, as long as it is consensual it is still positive. Making another human being feel good for a fee is not degrading unless it is degrading to make other people feel good.
- The only way to fight crime in this sector is the total legalisation, and inclusion of prostitutes in society. It is impossible to police an illegal industry that is closed to society, and thus at the mercy of criminals and violent customers.

LYMEC is of the opinion that:

- Laws and legislation concerning prostitution should be formulated at national level in accordance with the subsidiarity principle (the sovereignty of the nation state on national issues) which is of utmost importance for a strong Union, one that is 'united in diversity'.
- Laws against consensual activities are opposed to the principles of free enterprise, the open market and the separation of church and state and create a society of fear, hatred, bigotry, oppression, and conformity; a culture opposed to personal expression, diversity, freedom, choice, and growth.
- There should be no law discriminating against prostitutes forming and joining professional associations or unions and working collectively in order to acquire a high degree of personal security.
- Prostitutes should pay regular taxes on the same basis as other independent contractors and employees, and should receive the same benefits according to the different regulations in different countries.
- The spread of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases by unsafe sex can only be eliminated through education, not by prohibition.
- Each individual should have the right to decide by oneself whether to work in the sex industry.
- To oppose the legalisation of prostitution, is to oppose the freedom to make use of one's own body, as one wishes.
- Prostitutes are entitled to all human rights and civil liberties, including the freedom of speech, travel, immigration, work, association, marriage, motherhood and the right to unemployment insurance, health insurance and housing.
- Asylum should be granted to anyone denied human rights on the basis of a "crime of status".

LYMEC calls upon the Member States to:

- Decriminalise and legalise all aspects of sex work involving consenting adults and regulate third parties according to standard business codes.
- Enforce laws against fraud, coercion, violence, sexual abuse, child labour, rape, human trafficking and racism across national boundaries.

PA 5.02 Youth Unemployment

Employment, Social Rights

Considering:

- Young men and women should focus on their dreams, hopes and aspirations. Yet the limited availability of jobs in most areas of the world limit their opportunities in the labor market.
- Achieving decent work for young people is a critical element in poverty eradication and sustainable development for future generations.
- The government has a responsibility to create a sustainable future for all.
- Intergenerational solidarity is not a priority for labor unions or political parties.
- Not being in employment, education or training is wasteful for society, as one has no outlook on change in such situation.

Acknowledging:

- The current young generation is the best educated and highest skilled youth ever.
- There is a wide spread in youth unemployment within Europe, with over 40 percent in Spain and less than 10 percent in the Netherlands.
- A general trend within Europe exists with 50% more youth unemployment than in the general population.
- Specific groups are under particular hardship based on discrimination and social exclusion, such as GLBT's, immigrants, ethnic minorities and socially disadvantaged youth.

Calls for:

- LYMEC to advocate on a European level more mobility for young workers and entrepreneurs to start business in another area or country.
- LYMEC to call for education based on market requirements. Students of applied sciences should have an outlook to applying their talents and skills.
- LYMEC to focus on the problem of youth unemployment and the broad differences within Europe, to seek a solution to this pressing issue.
- All member organizations to support the exchange of young people between European countries and support a mobile young workforce.
- LYMEC to promote in cooperation with ELDR the drafting of a joint resolution.

PA 5.03 Resolution on Youth Unemployment

Employment, Social Rights

Adopted at the 20th Anniversary Congress of LYMEC, held in Il Ciocco, Italy on the 29-31st of March 1996.

Dropping unemployed, homeless young people out of the social society is a very serious European problem. The high juvenile unemployment shouldn't be underestimated. There must be striven to ease the problems of the juvenile unemployment in the whole of Europe with different kinds of local projects financed

by the EU. All those projects, which aim to ease international juvenile unemployment must get financial help from the budget of the EU.

Projects of all social foundation and community initiative YOUTHSTART must be developed taking into consideration special needs of young people. Also developing of educational system to be preparing for lifelong learning is one of the main points of solving the unemployment in general.

Policy Archive Chapter 6 – Climate Action, Energy and Natural Resources

PA 6.01 A Call for Forceful Stands to Combat Climate Change

Renewable Energies, Natural Resources, Nuclear

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 1-4 May 2008 in Barcelona, Catalonia

During the current decade, the issues of climate change and emissions of greenhouse gases have rapidly increased in importance. In the past year, the complex issue of how to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases has become one of the top priorities today, much due to the IPCC and the Stern reports.

LYMEC calls for forceful measures in reducing emissions of greenhouse gases by the governments of Europe. Thus, LYMEC calls for the following measures:

LYMEC urges governments to stop further large scale investments in greenhouse gas producing energy sources. These sources should gradually be replaced by energy sources not producing greenhouse gases, such as wind power, solar energy, hydropower, bio energy and nuclear power.

PA 6.02 Resolution on the Environment

Natural Resources, Conservation

Adopted at the 20th Anniversary Congress of LYMEC, held in Il Ciocco, Italy on the 29-31st of March 1996.

The Binding Common Environmental Policy of the European Union

The biggest threat of European security is damage of environment. Greenhouse effect, for example, is an enormous threat of all the member states of the EU. These kind of problems can only be solved together with very binding decisions. Common pan-European environmental policy has to be created. That must be the most important issue and challenge of future in European Union.

The European Parliament has to have rights to make initiatives in European environmental policy. The EU should be effective in all such issues concerning the environment and nature conservation in which measures transcending national boundaries are required. All, member states should, amongst other things, rapidly introduce a tax on carbon dioxide. EU decisions must not prevent member states from going further in their national decisions than the common environment norms.

There must be created a common high level in a tax of energy and environment, in which all the member states will commit. With this tax money EU should give financial support to middle- and eastern ecological reconstruction.

PA 6.03 Kyoto Protocols

Kyoto-Protocol, Renewable Energies, Natural Resources

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 8-10 April 2005.

- Whereas the Kyoto protocols, aiming to curb the air pollution causing global warming, has finally came into effect, seven years after they were agreed.
- Whereas further cuts in air pollution must be made in order to stop global warming and climate change.
- Whereas the USA and some of the new developing countries, like China and India, are at present not willing to participate in battling our common environmental problems.

The Congress the European liberal youth (LYMEC) in Amsterdam from April 8th-10th 2005 states:

That as liberals and radicals we see the challenges of global warming and climate change as one of the most important political issues of Europe and the world today. That Europe needs to be a driving force for developing better environmental policies, especially in terms of developing and using new technology.

That the EU and other European countries must fulfil all their commitments under the Kyoto-protocols, and a special obligation rests on those countries presently far behind their commitments.

That liberal and radical political groups must support political and technological initiatives towards elimination of the use of fossile energy such as oil and natural gas.

PA 6.04 Resolution on Basic Principles and Goals for an EC Environmental Policy

Natural Resources, Renewable Energies

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Paris, France on the 17-19th of January 1992.

Intending to guarantee a broader environmental protection in the EC.

Acknowledging the principle that every use of nature has to have a price in the production of goods and thus thriving for an ecological market economy.

LYMEC proposes the following ideas:

- Drastic reduction of the use of energy.
- European wide combined tax on the emission of carbondioxide and energy use without any exception for certain energy branches. The tax rate shall be increased on a step by step bases. The tax income should be used for investments and support of Eastern European industry to help restructuring and decreasing pollution.
- Support of research and introduction of regenerative energy.
- The use of nuclear energy should not be extended above the level already reached, and on the long term the use of nuclear energy should be abolished.
- The EC should invest in and give incentives for private enterprise to invest into the energy producing and distributing industry in Eastern Europe in order to reduce the waist of energy and to improve the environmental situation in those countries. On the other side Russia has to give a guarantee on the delivering of energy.
- The EC countries should implement provisions into the treaties of Rome that declare environmental protection a major policy aim of the community. Also provisions should be implemented which describe instruments of a ecological market economy.
- The EC should use its influence in securing that the IMF flexibly links credits to third world countries to ecological commitments.
- Recycling of waist must have priority over dumping and burning.
- The EC countries must be able to have more restrictive regulations as protection of environmental interests as long as they are not used for protection of economic interests.

PA 6.05 Resolution on Sustainable Development

Kyoto-Protocol, Natural Resources

Adopted by the LYMEC seminar in Göteborg, Sweden, 14 - 17 June 2001 and readopted at the LYMEC executive meeting in St. Gallen, Switzerland 19th-21st of October 2001.

Noting with concern

- that ten years after the Rio Summit, we have not yet succeeded in halting the environmentally alarming trends, among which the climate threat is one of the most acute

- the alarming decrease in biodiversity within the European Union
- the failure of the United States to sign the Kyoto Protocol.

Recalling

- that the Kyoto protocol is only a first step towards a truly sustainable development
- that high environmental standards can work as an engine for new technology and innovations
- that free individual choices on a functioning market and international co-operation are two fundamentals in reaching a sustainable development
- that market prices have a powerful influence on the behaviour of individuals and businesses
- the different characteristics of the landscape, biodiversity and natural habitats between the European countries

Urges the European Union

- to take a leading role to stimulate progress towards sustainable development
- to halt its loss of biodiversity and to restore the functioning of natural systems
- to acknowledge its key role in bringing about a sustainable development also on the global level, and therefore
- to work for sustainability in all its external relations and within its internal policy-making
- to use the benefits of market economy to improve its own and the global environment, through for example setting a price on pollution using tradable permits
- to increase educational resources in order to improve environmental technology and improving consumer information
- to accept American demands of Joint Implementation and Co2-credits for planting of forests and thereby put maximum pressure on the US in order to make them sign the Kyoto Protocol.

PA 6.06 Urgency Resolution on Climate Change

Kyoto-Protocol, Natural Resources, Nuclear

Adopted at LYMEC Young Leaders Meeting held in Copenhagen on 4-7 October 2007

Adopted at LYMEC Executive Committee held in Stockholm on 7-9 December 2007

There is now scientific evidence: climate change constitutes a serious global threat and demands an urgent global response.

Global warming will indeed affect the basic elements of life for people around the world, such as access to water, food production and the environment. As a result, in addition to environmental disasters, hundreds of millions of people could suffer hunger and water shortages, prompting flows of environmental refugees.

It is essential in this context to take the necessary steps to build resilience to climate change and minimise costs. The recent Stern Review indeed estimates that, if we don't act, the overall costs and risks of climate change will be equivalent to losing from 5% to 20% of global GDP each year, whereas the costs of action (reducing

greenhouse gas emissions to avoid the worst impacts of climate change) can be limited to around 1% of global GDP each year.

Since the end-90s, the EU, responsible today for around 14% of global greenhouse gas emissions, has committed itself to play a global leadership role in tackling climate change. Under the Kyoto Protocol, all EU Member States have committed to cutting their combined emissions of the greenhouse gases to 8% below the 1990 level by 2012, an overall target which was translated into specific legally binding targets for each Member State.

To help meet its Kyoto targets cost-effectively, the EU has also developed the world's largest company-level scheme for trading in emissions of CO₂. As a result, new markets are created in low-carbon energy technologies and other low-carbon goods and services, creating global business opportunities for EU companies. The EU has also mandated that biofuels make up at least 10% of liquid fuels used and that 20% of energy supply comes from renewable sources in Europe by 2020.

The first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol is however closing in 2012 and the EU need to define its future long-term strategy to fight global warming. The feasibility of reaching certain ambitious targets has also been questioned, not to mention the reluctance of certain EU trading partners to embark in legally binding polluting-cutting targets.

In this context, European young liberal leaders call for the EU and European governments to:

- 1) Take on a firm commitment to achieve at least a 20% reduction of GHG emissions by 2020 compared to 1990 and 70% by 2050 within an international agreed framework;
- 2) Include more sectors, including transport (aviation, road, maritime) and agriculture, in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme;
- 3) Persuade all major world emitters (including the US, China and India) to commit to a legally binding pollution-cutting scheme, notably by incorporating where relevant environmental considerations into global trade rules and by further developing the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM);
- 4) Make sure that at least 1% of their GDP is devoted to environmental policies and investments;
- 5) Develop consumer awareness about climate change issues through appropriate campaigns;
- 6) Increase public and private research and development in support of sustainable development technologies, notably renewable energy (wind power, solar energy, hydropower), bio-fuels, and hydrogen, as well as in the field of nuclear waste management and fusion energy;
- 7) Consider nuclear power as one of the options available for alleviating the risk of global climate change and reducing GHG emissions and further develop

nonelectrical applications of nuclear energy (such as heat, potable water and hydrogen production):

8) Design appropriate incentives (e.g. tax reduction, eco-labelling) for the private sector and private individuals to invest in new climate-friendly technologies and solutions;

9) Avoid that biofuels production lead to deforestation and food shortage by adding a development sustainability criteria to biofuels imports and production;

10) Adapt policies to deal with the impacts of climate change, adopting a multisectoral and multidisciplinary approach, and promote green public procurement.

PA 6.07 Towards a Sustainable Future

Keywords: Climate Change; COP21; Sustainable Development

Considering that:

- An overwhelming scientific consensus confirms the climate and global temperature is unequivocally warming, as a result of human activities that increase the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere;
- The 21st Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21) is scheduled to take place in Paris from 30 November to 11 December 2015; tasked with finding a global agreement on climate change and emissions;
- Climate change policy should be central to the liberal ideology, as it is indispensable in order for all individuals to enjoy the right to equal starting possibilities;
- The issue of climate change is also critical in terms of intergenerational justice, as unsustainable consumption of resources is purported on the cost of younger generations;
- As agreed by the parties at the Durban Conference, global warming should be kept below 2°C in order to limit the most dangerous risks of climate change;

Notes with concern that:

- The amount of annual global emissions has risen continuously since pre-industrial times; the global mean temperature has to this day risen by ca 0,85°C as a consequence of climate change; already posing threats to unique ecosystems and species, irreversible effects on the polar ice sheets, and increasing the likelihood of extreme weather phenomena as well as food and water scarcity;
- Developing states are deemed disproportionately affected by the negative effects of climate change, such as extreme weather, drought and food and land scarcity;

- The business-as-usual path is estimated to lead to a 4-6°C rise in global temperatures as of 2100, causing serious, widespread and irreversible impacts globally;
- The 2°C target only bears a 50 % probability of reducing the most devastating consequences of climate change; several vulnerable states – including all African states – have demanded that warming is kept to a safer level of 1.5°C;
- Climate change is also expected to increase the risks of unrest and conflicts in areas most gravely affected, also increasing the likelihood of climate refugee. Researchers have already proven that weather phenomena, such as hurricanes and typhoons, are more powerful because of oceans getting warmer due to the climate that is warming up.
- Climate change and global warming are topics that have to be tackled at the European level to be fought efficiently

Stresses that:

- According to the IPCC 5th Assessment Report, global GHG emissions would need to be reduced by 40 - 70 % by 2050 compared to 2010 levels and close to zero by 2100 in order to reach the 2°C target;
- The remaining carbon budget needs to be well below 1000 Gt CO₂ in order to have a reasonable chance to keep the 2°C limit. With the current trend, the budget is estimated to be consumed within the next 25 years;
- The preliminary UNEP assessment of the submitted national pledges to COP21 so far suggests that the proposed reductions will not be consistent to the 2°C target, but lead to an estimated 3°C rise in temperature;

Underlines that:

- The efforts to mitigate climate change should not be seen as an obstacle to economic growth, but as a driving force to of new sustainable growth and employment;
- Fossil fuels subsidies, which according to reports reach €4.7 trillion globally and €100 billion within the EU constitute an obstacle to climate aims. Phasing out such subsidies could reduce global GHG emissions by 20%;
- A sustainable future is still in reach, but require bold decisions and political leadership by drastically reducing the global ecological footprint as soon as possible;
- Youth participation should play an essential role in climate policy, as it is the youth that will have to face the results of the decisions of today;
- All nations need to participate in fighting climate change through a just sharing of burden, taking economic development, historical emissions and natural circumstances into account;

Calls on LYMEC and its Member Organisations to:

- Act with a strong voice in environmental and climate issues, especially ahead of the COP21; as well as work towards strengthening the role of youth participation in climate policy-making and addressing the issue of intergenerational justice;

- Push for the EU governments to strive towards finding a fair, ambitious and globally binding agreement at COP21, including regular evaluations of national pledges and progress, aimed at limiting global warming to 1,5°C;
- Push for the EU governments to lead by example in the negotiations and make firm commitments in order to achieve EU's climate goals and IPCC's recommendations; EU to design a clear roadmap towards its 2030 and 2050 targets including national commitments; establishing an attractive market for green investments;
- Require the governments to mobilise just and sufficient climate financing and the proper implementation of the Green Climate Fund, in order to help most vulnerable countries mitigate and adapt to climate change; including making use of new sources of private and public funding, including the ETS;
- Urge national governments and the EU to step up their efforts in R&D, as well as in attracting investments 4
- in order to speed up decarbonisation and its competitiveness;
- Pushing the EU governments to outline a concrete roadmap for phasing out environmentally harmful subsidies, including subsidies for fossil fuels, as decided in the European Council conclusions of May 2013, as soon as possible;
- Put pressure on national governments to cooperate with one another to reach a globally binding agreement enabling a rapid transition to decarbonized, climate-resilient economies and societies;
- Promote a coherent development of other relevant initiatives on an EU and national level in order to fulfil and strengthen the above mentioned aims, for instance through the Energy Union, the ETS reform and Circular Economy initiatives.

Policy Archive Chapter 7 – Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

PA 7.01 Cut the Crap, Scrap the CAP!

Common Agricultural Policy, Subsidies

Resolution adopted by LYMEC Congress, 7-9 April 2006, Winterthur, Switzerland

Whereas:

- There are two main areas (so-called 'Pillars') of agricultural expenditure:
 - Market and income support (Pillar 1)
 - Rural development (Pillar 2)
- In 2002, an agreement was reached by EU leaders on a budget for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) until 2013, together with a new reform of EU's agricultural policy that included a shift of funds from direct aids for farmers to rural development objectives.
- The EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has recently been a source of considerable contention in both the negotiation of the EU Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 and the World Trade Organisation (WTO)'s ongoing "Doha Round", blocking any satisfactory compromise

- As part of the deal on EU Financial Perspectives 2007-2013, it was agreed that - by 2008 - the Commission should make a "comprehensive and wide-ranging review, covering all aspects of revenue and expenditure, including, inter alia, the Common Agricultural Policy, and the UK rebate", in order to allow a medium term overhaul of the EU's budget in 2008.

Considering that:

- Whilst the CAP was initially successful in encouraging better productivity and in securing a stable supply of affordable food for European consumers, it is now outdated.
- Money spent on agriculture could be better spent in areas more relevant to modern society or not spent at all and returned to the Member States.
- Globalisation and trade liberalisation are the critical to development in the third world, and also to future growth for industrialised countries
- Production subsidies in this context distort world trade and should be illegal
- Rural development, the "second pillar" of the Common Agricultural Policy, should not be dealt with at EU level: it is more appropriate for it to be dealt with at national level, in accordance with the subsidiarity principle

Acknowledging that:

- Cutting agricultural tariffs creates big welfare gains for competitive agricultural exporters like Brazil, but at the same time erodes the preferential access already extended by the EU to least developed countries.
- The Council's deal on EU Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 still needs to be approved by the European Parliament

Concludes:

- The EU Common Agricultural Policy should be disbanded and agricultural trade liberalised at worldwide level through the WTO
- Agricultural tariff cuts need to be accompanied with assistance to least developed countries in order to mitigate the negative impact and maximise the positive
- LYMEC will develop a campaign "Cut the crap, scrap the CAP!", using leaflets and e-banners that can easily be disseminated by its Member Organisations, as a way to put pressure on the European Commission in advance of the review of EU Financial Perspectives 2007-2013

Policy Archive Chapter 8 – Regions and Local Development, Transport and Travel

Policy Archive Chapter 9 – External Relations and Foreign Affairs

PA 9.01 - Recognise Western Sahara

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Berlin, Germany, 20-22 April 2007

Whereas

- The territory of Western Sahara has been under occupation by Morocco since 1975.
- The United Nations General Assembly already in 1960 declared that the people of Western Sahara have the right to self-determination.
- The International Court of Justice in 1975 ruled against Morocco's territorial claim on Western Sahara.
- Western Sahara is formally recognised under the name of the *Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic* by 85 states, but by no European state to date.
- Western Sahara is on the UN list of Non-Self Governing Territories and is considered Africa's last colony.
- Under the terms of the UN's settlement plan in 1991, Western Sahara should decide its own future status in a referendum.

Noting that

- Attempts to hold a referendum on the future stat of Western Sahara have repeatedly failed.
- Human rights agencies and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights have reported grave and systematic violations of human rights in the occupied territories.
- The people living in the occupied territories are subject to severe restrictions on their freedom of speech, assembly and movement.
- Human rights activists and pro-independence journalists and editors have been put behind bars.
- The Baker Peace Plan – calling for the establishment of a Western Sahara Authority, which would be followed after five years by a referendum – has been blocked by France in the UN Security Council.

Considering that

- The EU has signed agreements with Morocco that allow EU vessels to fish in territories that are legally under occupation. This constitutes a clear violation of international law and constitutes a de facto recognition of the Moroccan occupation of Western Sahara.

- The US-Morocco free-trade agreement does not extend to products from the occupied territories of Western Sahara.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls upon the EU and all European states to

- Formally recognise the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic as an independent state.
- Exclude from all trade agreements with Morocco products originating from the occupied territories of Western Sahara.
- Put pressure on Morocco to respect the human rights of all Sahrawis and to release all prisoners of conscience.

PA 9.02 - Stop exploitation of occupied Western Sahara

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, 1-4 May 2008 in Barcelona, Catalonia

Whereas

- The territory of Western Sahara has been under occupation by Morocco since 1975.
- The International Court of Justice in 1975 ruled against Morocco's territorial claim on Western Sahara.
- Western Sahara is on the UN list of Non-Self Governing Territories and is considered Africa's last colony.
- Under the terms of the UN's settlement plan in 1991, Western Sahara should decide its own future status in a referendum.

Noting that

- Morocco has repeatedly blocked the execution of a referendum.
- Human rights agencies and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights have reported grave and systematic violations of human rights in the occupied territories.
- The people living in the occupied territories are subject to severe restrictions on their freedom of speech, assembly and movement.
- Human rights activists and pro-independence journalists and editors have been arrested.

Observing that

- Nothing of the income from the exploitation of Western Sahara's rich fish and phosphate natural resources is diverted back to the people of Western Sahara.
- The EU has signed an agreement with the government of Morocco that allows EU vessels to fish in occupied territorial waters off the coast of Western Sahara, in clear violation of international law. The EU/Morocco fishing agreement specifies that it does not prejudice of the EU's position about the status of the territory of Western Sahara.
- The USA has specifically excluded from its free-trade agreement with Morocco all products that originate from the occupied territories of Western Sahara.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls upon

- The EU to exclude the coast of Western Sahara from its fishing agreement with Morocco.

PA 9.03 – Ukraine

EU's foreign affairs, EU Enlargement/Pre-Enlargement, NATO, Ukraine

Adopted at the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 8-10 April 2005.

The LYMEC Congress taking into consideration that:

Further enlargement of the European Union endorses spreading democracy and human rights as well as guarantees higher level of security for all European countries

The Ukrainian Society categorically opposed the attempts of Presidential Election's falsification by triggering the "Orange revolution"

Ukrainian society arduously fought for fairness, democracy and the right for self-determination and therefore proved their belonging to the family of democratic European nations

The newly elected President of Ukraine – Victor Yushchenko has clearly declared the willingness of his country to tighten the cooperation with EU and NATO

Strongly urges the European Commission and European Parliament:

To define clear perspective of Ukraine's integration with European Union

To set precise criteria, which Ukraine has to fulfil to commence membership negotiations

To endorse Ukraine in the process of implementing European legal regulations.

Declares

To observe carefully the situation in Ukraine and react properly in case of any violation of democratic rules

To support the development of Ukrainian civil society through cooperation with local NGO's

To organise joint conferences, seminars and trainings with the aim of sharing our experience with young Ukrainian liberals

To spread knowledge about developments in Ukraine among liberal politicians.

PA 9.04 Resolution on the Status of Turkey as an EU Candidate Country

EU Enlargement/Pre-Enlargement, EU's Foreign Affairs, Turkey

Adopted by the LYMEC Extraordinary Congress in Andorra, 2002.

LYMEC – European Liberal Youth:

...recalls the status of Turkey as a candidate country to the EU since the Helsinki Summit in 1999, and following Accession Partnership Program and the National Program.

....regrets the reluctance that was expressed in the European Commission's latest status report on the applicant and candidate countries. In spite of the clear progress Turkey have shown in the 'pre-negotiation', the EU have not taken serious steps to support the reforms in Turkey further.

....considers, that the lack of progress in the negotiations between the EU and Turkey is partly due to the ambivalence and reluctant attitudes within the EU towards Turkish membership of the Union.

....affirms the Copenhagen Criteria as the primary criteria evaluating membership applications instead of culture and religion.

....calls upon the European Council at the Summit in Copenhagen in December 2002 to initiate serious and fruitfull negotiations with Turkey. However it shall be made very clear, that the political criteria of the Copenhagen Criteria has to be fulfilled completely before real accession can be an issue on the table.

....furthermore calls upon Turkey to increase the pace towards reaching full compliance with the Copenhagen Criteria.

PA 9.05 Resolution on the Intergovernmental Conference of 1996

(excerpt deleted from the resolution 9.01)

VII. European Foreign and Security Policy

In this part we will describe our vision of the development of a European defence-structure. This structure must guarantee democracy, peace, human rights and individual rights. First we will briefly describe the current situation, then we will describe what we see as the best European defence-structure for the next century. This is how we see a possibility of implementing the Maastricht Treaty. We realise that it is a difficult subject and that it will provoke a lot of discussion. That is exactly what we want. We want you to think with us in order to come to a thorough paper. When the goal is clear we will state a couple of propositions which can lay the foundation for a discussion.

The Maastricht Treaty contains an article about the intention to form a third pillar of the European Union, being the common Foreign and Security Policy. In this article (Art. J.4.), the European Union requests the WEU (West European Union) to implement the decisions of the European Union. The necessary practical arrangements will be made by the European Council together with the institutions of the European Union, somewhat in the shadow of the NATO. The Treaty that formed the WEU in 1954 will end in 1998. So the WEU either will be dissolved or continued but with a different goal.

Proposal

Europe has to divide its attention between European interests and our obligations in the NATO structure. This can be done by reforming NATO into a bilateral structure between Europe and Northern America. The American pillar consists of the USA and Canada. The European pillar must consist of all the Member States of the European Union, with addition of the non-EU NATO-members (Iceland, Norway and Turkey), for whom a 'status apart' must be created. This automatically includes the fact that Europe decides which countries are to be included in the European Union and thereby in the European part of NATO. The countries that have applied for EU-membership are also positive about membership of NATO or the WEU.

In order to fulfil our obligations to NATO, it is necessary that the European pillar of the NATO has the same rigid structure as NATO has today. Amongst other things this means that once a NATO commander issues an order to a multinational European unit, none will check with their individual Ministries of Defence whether or not to follow the order.

In addition to deployment of troops within the NATO-structure, it must also be possible to deploy the respective forces of the two pillars separately. In this respect it must be mentioned that today the European forces are not able to operate without extensive help of the North-Americans. This does include the logistical side of military operations, but also striking capacity of the American aircraft carriers is unmatched by any number of European military units. This also counts for the American capability of information gathering by satellite. The WEU does have its own Space Intelligence Centre in Spain, but this in no respect matches up to the possibilities the Americans have.

Problems

To come to such a new transformation of the Defence and Security Policy of the European Union a lot of practical problems should be resolved first. First, the memberships of the different organisations are not the same. Secondly, the American pillar is divided. Thirdly, there is a tendency in Europe to cut back on defence-costs. People will not be eager to spend more on national defence in order to make it more international. The most important factor is to get the members of the European Union to see, that in order to have a common Security Policy they should first come a common Foreign Policy in all aspects.

PA 9.06 Resolution on A Common Foreign and Security policy in the EU

EU's Foreign Affairs, NATO, Security

Adopted at the LYMEC Congress, held in Helsingborg, Sweden, on the 14-16th of March 1997.

Noting that:

- The Maastricht Treaty contains an article about the intention to form a second pillar of the European Union, being the Common Foreign and Security Policy.
- In this article (Art. J.4.) the European Union request the WEU (Western European Union) to implement the decisions of the European Union.
- The necessary practical arrangements will be made by the Council of the European Union together with the other institutions of the European Union.
- The Treaty that formed the WEU in 1954 will end in 1998. The WEU will either be dissolved or continued with a different goal.

Considering that:

- Security and peace in Europe are common tasks for all countries in Europe. There is a need for the new situation to include existing structures (i.e. EU, NATO and WEU) and new structures, such as the PFP which must evolve into a complementary alliance..Europe is facing new threats to its peace and security. These include, internally, regional conflict, terrorism, environmental problems, human rights violations, ethnic and economic instability, and weak democratic structures.
- Security is not only dependent on the power and sizes of armies, but is as well a question of economic stability and treatment of ethnic minorities within and around European Union.
- In order to facilitate military actions of the United Nations around the world the member states of the European Union should build up reaction brigades who are able to go into action with very short notice, and who are trained and co-ordinated by PFP and available for UN- missions in especially Europe.
- Europe has to divide its attention between European interests and the obligations of the member states in the NATO structure. This can be done by reforming NATO into a bilateral structure between Europe and Northern America. The American pillar consist of the USA and Canada. The European pillar must consist of all European Union NATO members, with addition of the non-EU NATO-members (Iceland, Norway and Turkey), for whom a 'status apart' must be created.
- In order to fulfil our obligations to NATO, it is necessary that the European pillar of the NATO has the same rigid structure as NATO has today. Amongst other things this means that once a NATO commander issues an order to a multinational European unit, none will check with their individual Ministries of Defence whether or not to follow the order.
- It must also be possible to deploy the respective forces of the two pillars separately. In this respect it must be mentioned that today the European forces are not able to operate without extensive help of the Northern Americans. This does include the logistical side of military operations, but also striking capacity of the American aircraft carriers is unmatched by any number of European military units. This also counts for the American capability of information

gathering by satellite. The WEU does have its own Space Intelligence Centre in Spain, but this in no respect matches up to the possibilities the Americans have.

Propositions:

- All members of the European Union should become members, either full or associated, of the European defense-structure (i.e. NATO, PFP or WEU).
- The WEU will be expanded to a PAN-European defence-structure.
- NATO must be transformed into a bilateral organisation with a Northern American and European pillar.
- The European pillar of NATO should be made more self-supporting than it is today. In order to integrate a CFSP the EU should appoint a commissioner of Foreign Affairs.
- The two pillars of NATO must be able to operate separately.
- The creation and strengthening of the Pan-European defence-structure should not lead to a situation, in which any country feels isolated or threatened.
- The European Defence Pillar should be overseen in European democratic way, that means by the European Parliament. It is proposed that the WEU set up a Common European Task Force, which could be used by the United Nations or the Organisation for Security and Co- operation in Europe (OSCE) for peace-keeping and peace-making or humanitarian actions, environmental catastrophes and terrorism.

The LYMEC Congress:

- Fully supports evolution of the CFSP and future military co-operation in Europe, and the recent approach to make it possible for Central and Eastern European countries to join the various European security structures.
- Is convinced that the Alliance must be open for new members, while at the same time enhancing the strong, stable and enduring partnership with Russia and the Ukraine
- Welcomes the success of the Implementation Force (IFOR) in separating warring factions and maintaining an albeit uneasy peace, but regrets the lack of progress in re-establishing civil institutions in reconstruction's and in bringing war criminals to justice; believes therefore, that in Bosnia the conditions for the unchaperoned peace do not yet exist and that IFOR must continue until this has been established, in order to achieve the full implementation of all points of the Dayton agreement
- Urgently requests that IFOR must continue until at least the local elections have been held

PA 9.07 Defence

Military, Security, EU's Foreign Affairs

Adopted on the annual Congress of the European Liberal Youth (LYMEC) in Vilnius, Lithuania, 4 - 6 April 2003.

ascertains,

- the diversity on brands of material used by different European military forces,
- the ongoing integration in Europe on different areas,
- that the US armed forces are currently superior in technology and strength

further ascertains,

- that EU contains a growing number of neutral states,
- that certain states have chosen not to be part of a common foreign and security policy for other reasons,

considers,

- that closer military integration among member states is desirable,
- that Europe should not be competing with the USA as a military power but working with and through the UN to promote world peace,
- that attuning purchases in the future will improve the efficiency of military spending and promote further integration,

having regarded these considerations, LYMEC declares,

- that member states, remembering the aforementioned neutral states, and other states reluctant to enter such a communal structure, should be urged to co-ordinate military acquisition.

PA 9.08 Free Syria from Violence and Oppression

Peace Process, Minority Rights, Syria

Whereas

- The ruling Ba'ath party have governed Syria since 1970, without the liberty of free elections.

- From 1963 until April 2011, the emergency rule had remained in effect which gave security forces sweeping powers of arrest and detention.

234

- According to Human Rights Watch, Syria's human rights situation is among the worst in the world.

- According to Amnesty International, the government may be guilty of crimes against humanity.

- According to Human Rights Watch, both government and opposition forces have infringed on human rights

- On 26 January 2011, public demonstrations and nationwide protests against the government began, and continuing still.

Noting that

- There is no freedom of expression, association, assembly, press or protesting allowed, with random arrests, torture and disappearances being widespread.

- Since March 2012, more than 3,000 civilians have been killed by the authorities.
 - The al-Assad government is completely dependent on trade income to withhold its military regime and violence against protesters.
- LYMEC – European Liberal Youth calls upon the EU and all European states to
- take responsibility in working towards a speedy conclusion with the least loss of lives as possible to the Syrian conflict.
 - Support only pro-freedom forces, rejecting any cooperation with the Muslim brotherhood of salafit movement
 - Press opposition forces to respect religious minorities and guarantee that Allzwites, Chritians and shite minority are not going to be massacred after the fall of the regime
 - further pressure the Syrian regime and that those responsible be trialed before an international court.
 - express the possibility for the international community to consider a military intervention in order to protect the civilian population against the brutal regime, with or without a UN mandate
 - encourage European and other countries to open asylum for Syrian citizen

PA 9.09 – European Defence

LYMEC Congress, Berlin, Germany 23-25 October 2014

Considering that:

- Europe is facing internal and external threats to its peace and security. These include regional conflict, terrorism, weak democratic structures, human rights violations and economic instability.
- Security is the foundation of economic stability and democratic structures within and around the European Union.
- The development of the international system since the Cold War is characterized by a shift in focus away from traditional interstate aggression, to threats of a more varied nature among which hybrid or non-linear warfare, digital threats and fundamentalist challenges to our European values
- In order to secure European interests and promote European liberal values soft power is not enough to meet the challenges, the European Union needs to increase its hard capabilities to provide diplomatic leverage against both state and non-state actors.
- Military cooperation between member states is taking place already. Both bilaterally (Dutch-German division Fast Forces), and multilaterally within a NATO context (Baltic Air Policing mission) and within a European context (procurement coordination through the EDA)
- The efficiency of defence spending could be markedly improved by closer cooperation between member states.

Noting that:

- Many nations in Europe have a certain specialty in their military force.
- Many EU member states are currently obligated to assist other states under the NATO treaty.
- Such an obligation of assistance does not exist towards non-NATO EU member states.
- Military cooperation between member states is taking place already, without European coordination.
- Affirms that a European Union Defence Policy must be created, and that it:
- Shall stipulate that an attack against one member of the Union is to be considered an attack against the Union as a whole.
- Shall not lead to a situation, in which member states feel isolated or threatened.
- Shall be overseen by the European Parliament, European Commission and European Council.
- Shall include a strong and synergised cooperation with NATO, which is necessary for the security of the entire European continent.
- Shall have one single Headquarters for the Defence of the European Union.
- Shall focus on strengthening the international rule of law, fighting conflicts, maintaining peace and fighting terrorism, both internal and external
- Further believing that:
- Security and peace in Europe are common tasks for all countries in Europe.
- External and security policies can only contribute to a peaceful and stable world if supported by a credible military.
- The EU Defence Policy contributes to closer cooperation and shall commit member states to a shared responsibility concerning European security.
- The European Union Defence Policy and NATO can coexist and that this will only be advantageous to the security of the European continent.

LYMEC urges:

- European liberals to advocate the formation of a European Union Defence Policy that operates in line with the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union.
- Members and member organizations to advocate expanding military cooperation between European Union member states.

PA 9.10 Resolution of European Liberal Youth on European New Neighbours Policy

European Neighbours Policy, European Integration

Resolution adopted at the LYMEC Congress held in Zagreb, Croatia on 27th -28th of April 2004

Considering present historic enlargement that undoes the occupation of Eastern-Europe by undemocratic forces.

Considering the interests of European citizens to be secured of illegal immigration, hard drug and human trafficking. It is in the interest of Europe itself that the above mentioned countries develop themselves economically and in closer interaction with EU societies.

Having in mind that most countries bordering to EU still do not have liberal democracy, free market economy and rule of law, although the nations do aspire for it.

Having in mind the strong cultural and economic links and prospects over the future boarder of European Union.

LYMEC strongly supports the commission initiative of establishing New Neighbourhood policy. We consider it vital that appropriate amounts of funds are distributed to these programs to include:

- student exchange and comprehensive programs for study from these countries
- comprehensive program of twinning of government agencies of neighbouring countries
- investments into infrastructure uniting neighbouring countries with EU infrastructure
- cultural exchange (folk singing, dance; sports, arts)

PA 9.11 The resolution of Cyprus

The resolution of Cyprus

International Conflicts, United Nations, Peace Process, Cyprus, Turkey

Adopted at the LYMEC Executive Committee Meeting/ Extraordinary Congress, held in Konstanz, Germany on the 31st of October to the 2nd of November 1997

Noting:

- The situation in Cyprus, where the northern part has been occupied by Turkish military forces since 1974;
- That Cyprus has applied for membership in the European Union;
- That negotiations will start with Cyprus early in 1998;
- That the UN Secretary General has started negotiations on behalf of the UN to solve the problem;
- That the first two rounds of negotiations have not resulted in any progress towards finding a solution;
- That there has been increased tension on the island during the last few months.

Considering:

- That because of the imposed separation and division, a whole generation of Cypriots has not been giving a chance of living together;

- That ever since the invasion and occupation of the northern part of Cyprus by the Turkish troops, thousands of Turkish settlers have been illegally transferred to Cyprus;
- That the UN is planning another round of negotiations after the February Presidential elections in Cyprus;
- That Cyprus fulfils the criteria of becoming a member of the European Union and the European Monetary Union;
- That a membership of Cyprus in the European Union will contribute to the development of the European Union and Cyprus;

Stating:

- That Turkey must withdraw its military forces from the island so that reunification of Cyprus, the only remaining divided European country, could become possible;
- That all the refugees must be allowed to return to their homes;
- That the Human Rights of all Cypriot Citizens must be respected and upheld;
- That everything must be done for the Cyprus problem to be solved peacefully and on the basis of all UN resolutions for a just and viable solution;

LYMEC Supports:

- The efforts of the UN Secretary General in promoting a solution through direct negotiations between the two sides;
- Cyprus' application for full membership in the European Union, which will benefit both communities on the island;

LYMEC Urges:

The two sides to continue the negotiations for a speedy, just and viable solution;

LYMEC Welcomes:

The contacts between LYMEC and the youth organisations ONED, NEFIL and NEDIK in Cyprus;

LYMEC Hopes:

- To establish further co-operation with these organisations;
- To establish co-operation with young liberals all over Cyprus, who agree on this resolution and who preferably have contacts with one or more of the above mentioned youth organisations in Cyprus.

PA 9.12 Resolution "Open Negotiations with Turkey Without Delay!"

EU Enlargement/Pre-Enlargement, EU's Foreign Affairs, Turkey

Resolution adopted at the Executive Committee in Rome, 3-5 December 2004

The European Liberal Youth (LYMEC),

Considering that Turkey:

- has been undergoing a historical reform process since 1999, when it was granted the EU candidate status at the Helsinki Summit;
- has especially witnessed significant reforms in the past three years leading to one of the most important periods in terms of reforms since the Turkish Republic was founded;
- has almost reshaped its political and social life from scratch based on European values;
- has made significant progress in terms of implementation of such reforms, despite there are many in Europe who claims that Turkey has not managed to go through the implementation phase of the legal reforms.

Further noting that:

- the regular progressive report issued by the European Commission on October 6th has welcome these reforms and has recommended the start of accession negotiations;
- the principles of fairness, objectivity and impartiality should be the basis for the decision of the European Council regarding Turkey;
- the prospect of EU membership in Turkey has triggered economic and political reforms, taking into account that, by the time of accession, Turkey will have modernized, stabilized and restructured its political, economic and legal systems as a country committed to fulfill all the Copenhagen criteria and implement effectively the *Acquis Communautaire*;
- a decision from the EU to launch negotiations will strengthen the pro-reform circles in Turkey and will enhance a rapid progress towards becoming a genuinely European country;
- LYMEC has full heartedly supported the reforms undertaken by the Turkish government and society, with the aim not only to achieve the full membership status in the EU but also to ensure the right of Turkish citizens to live in a free and democratic society.

Calls upon:

- the European Council summit in December to decide upon the opening of accession negotiations with Turkey without delay;
- its parliamentary group in the European Parliament (ALDE) to continue supporting the accession process of Turkey into the EU.

ENDS

This resolution will be sent to the liberal Prime Ministers and Members of the European Parliament.

PA 9.13 – On the European Integration of Turkey

Considering that:

Accession talks between Turkey and the EU have been ongoing for almost ten years without significant progress for the integration of Turkey as a EU member state.

Ten chapters of the *acquis communautaire* still remain frozen due to political unwillingness by current EU member states.

Only one chapter has been successfully closed, with only three more completely in line with the EU *acquis*.

Noting that:

Turkey has made less reforms in crucial *acquis* chapters the past five years due to the stalemate in the accession talks, making Turkey less willing to pursue EU membership.

Full integration of Turkey seems to have become a symbolic goal, rather than a worthy political indispensability.

Turkey has developed an ambitious foreign policy in which it places itself as a regional leader, resulting in a diplomatic position at a similar level as the EU.

Turkey's economic progress has made it the world's 17th largest economy.

Turkey-EU relations as well as Turkey-US relations and transatlantic relations suffer under the lack of commitment and progress in the accession talks.

LYMEC urges:

The EU commission to in the negotiation with Turkey put human rights high on the agenda. Turkey cannot become a member of the EU before radically improving the situation regarding human rights.

LYMEC believes that there is no alternative to membership of Turkey in the European Union in the long term, as it is pivotal to prosperity on the continent, as well as global security.

Considering the above, LYMEC calls on the European Commission to propose an integrated economic and political space comprising Turkey and the European Union, similar to the European Economic Area (EEA), and tailored to the specifics of Turkey and its relationship with the European Union, with negotiations starting as soon as possible.

Such an economic and political space must be designed as a stepping stone towards membership of Turkey in the European Union, and not as an alternative to it. Negotiations on EU membership shall continue during the implementation of this space.

Policy Archive Chapter 10 – LYMEC Internal Organisation

PA 10.01 Internal Motion on Fianna Fáil

LYMEC – ELDR/ALDE, Ireland

LYMEC Congress, assembled in Rome from 8th till 10th of May 2009,

Whereas:

- “Fianna Fáil has become the newest member of the ELDR Party on 16 April 2009 and it is expected that Fianna Fáil will join the ALDE Group after the EP elections in June
- LYMEC respects the decision of the ELDR Council to accept Fianna Fáil as a new member
- The “Emergency motion on the ELDR Group” adopted at the LYMEC EC in Gummersbach on 2 July 1994 mentions Fianna Fáil as a party not coming from a “genuine liberal and democratic tradition” and states that it would be an “inappropriate” party “for genuine liberals to sit with in a parliamentary group”;
- Only three years ago, the LYMEC Congress in Winterthur adopted a resolution stating that “LYMEC believes that Fianna Fáil is currently unsuitable for membership of the ELDR party and the ALDE Group”;
- Fianna Fáil has traditionally had a socially conservative ideology and remains critical towards euthanasia, abortion rights, contraception, gender-neutral partnership laws and the decriminalization of soft drugs;
- The (Fianna Fáil) Prime Minister Bertie Ahern has been one of the most eager supporters of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and is opposed to its reforms claiming that the aims of the CAP set down in the Treaty of Rome were still valid;
- LYMEC condemns Fianna Fáil for trying to introduce blasphemy as a crime in Ireland.

The LYMEC Congress proposes:

- LYMEC acknowledges the decision of the ELDR Council to accept Fianna Fáil as a member but also needs to respect the decisions made at the EC in Gummersbach and the Congress in Winterthur. This means that LYMEC for the moment retains its position on Fianna Fáil but is also ready to re-evaluate it as early as at the 2011 Congress in two years in the light of the performance in and the contribution to the liberal family that Fianna Fáil will have made.
- The LYMEC Bureau shall inform the ELDR Party and the ALDE Groups in the European Parliament and the Committee of Regions of its position on Fianna Fáil.

PA 10.02 Emergency Motion on the ELDR Group

LYMEC – ELDR/ALDE, Ireland, France, Italy

Adopted at the LYMEC Executive Meeting held in Gummersbach, Germany on the 2nd of July 1994.

This LYMEC Executive Committee Meeting notes:

- That at the recent ELDR Council Meeting in Rome there were discussions concerning the future make up of the ELDR Group in the European Parliament.

This Executive Committee Meeting declares:

- That we wish to see a genuine Liberal Group in the European Parliament made up of members of parties with a genuine Liberal and democratic tradition. The French RPR, Irish Fianna Fail and Italian Forza Italia do not come from such a tradition and would not be appropriate parties for genuine Liberals to sit with in a Parliamentary Group, whether that be a technical group or a political one.

This Executive Committee Meeting calls:

- On the LYMEC representative at the next ELDR Council Meeting to make these views clear and do anything within their power or influence to prevent any proposed group co-operation with members of the three before mentioned parties.

PA 10.03 Resolution on Fianna Fail and ELDR

LYMEC – ELDR/ALDE, Ireland

Resolution adopted by LYMEC Congress, 7-9 April 2006, Winterthur, Switzerland

LYMEC believes that Fianna Fáil is currently unsuitable for membership of the ELDR party and the ALDE Group.