

## PROPOSAL FOR A RESOLUTION [3.1] OF THE UEF FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN DEFENCE AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNITY: TWO FACES OF THE SAME COIN?

Submitted by Jean Marsia

1 The Federal Committee of the Union of European Federalists,

2

### 3 **In reference:**

4 - to the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Treaty of Washington of 1949;

5 - to the Treaty on the European Union, as modified by the Treaty of Lisbon;

6 - to the resolutions on Europe Defence adopted by the Federal Committee in 2013, 2014, 2015  
7 and 2016 ;

8 - to the resolution on foreign and defence policy adopted by the UEF European Congress in June  
9 2016 and 2018 ;

10

### 11 **Having regard to:**

12 - the EU-NATO Joint Declaration of July 2016 ;

13 - the European Commission EU Defence Action Plan ;

14 - the Council decision establishing PESCO and its list of participants ;

15 - the launch of the European Defence Fund ;

16 - the European Intervention Initiative (IEI), launched on 25 June 2018 ;

17

### 18 **Whereas**

19 - In the aftermath of the collapse of the USSR, the military capabilities of most of the Member  
20 States were unreasonably diminished; therefore, only a handful of Member States have  
21 significant military capabilities and can be used only for specific missions, limited in duration  
22 and field of operation. European security still relies exclusively on NATO, which in turn  
23 essentially depends on the USA and their capabilities;

24 - At present, neither individual EU Member States nor the EU nor the NATO without the United  
25 States of America (USA) have the means to protect the integrity of the European coasts and  
26 borders or to play the role of stabilizer and peacemaker in the tragically unstable regions  
27 bordering Europe;

28 - The European Union treaty (TEU), articles 4, §2, last sentence, 24 and 42, forbids now more  
29 than before 2009 the EU from having a common defense; the EU cannot therefore become  
30 one of the world powers ;

31 - Europe's security environment has changed dramatically since 2003 : formerly multilateral,  
32 the world is again multipolar, governed by the balance of forces between States ; Russia's and  
33 China's aggressiveness, persistent instability in the Middle-East, North-Africa and Sahel,  
34 terrorist threats as well as a shift in the foreign policy priorities of the USA changed the  
35 situation of Europe from a security point of view ;

36 - It requires from Europe to take its responsibility for its own security but, regrettably, the EU  
37 lacks ambition, vision and courage, because moral forces of Europeans suffer both from  
38 globalization and the resurgence of communitarianism and nationalism, it is undefended and  
39 vulnerable ;

- 40 - The fragmentation of the current decision-making capacity and the inadequacy of the  
41 intergovernmental institutional framework hamper the EU's efficiency in the field of security,  
42 defence and foreign policy and make the EU ineffective on the global stage ;  
43

44 ***Improving the European foreign, security and defence policy***

45

- 46 - The intergovernmental method prevailing within the EU can't produce a European defense.  
47 The founding treaties of the EU subordinate the general interest of Europeans to respect for  
48 a process that protects the mostly illusory sovereignty of the Member States. It leads to a lack  
49 of unity of command at both political and military levels and to a highly fragmented EU  
50 defense equipment market: the European Defense Agency (EDA) tells 154 types of weapon  
51 systems in Europe; they are only 27 in the USA ;  
52

53 ***Policy Objectives in the short term***

54

- 55 -The EU contributes to a peaceful and cooperative multilateral global order and to fill the security  
56 vacuum in its wider neighbourhood, through a broad range of policies and operational  
57 capabilities. Those efforts should become more successful if the member states become more  
58 united and if the MPCC and the CPCC merge into a permanent EU military operational  
59 headquarter, that would enable the EU, when necessary, to respond to crises without relying  
60 exclusively on NATO, to plan and run EU military and civilian missions and to help the European  
61 Border and Coast Guard Agency to control the migrant's fluxes ;  
62

63 ***Defence Budget and European industry***

64

- 65 -In defence, Europe must not necessary spend more, because the budgets allocated to our  
66 defence (200 billion € per year) are considerable; it must spend better, more efficiently; it is not  
67 the case, due to the fragmentation of the European decision making, to the exorbitant part of  
68 the defence budgets allocated to the salaries of our 1.5 million soldiers, compared to the part  
69 devoted to the re-equipment, and to the fragmentation of the defence equipment market;  
70 -The creation of a European Defence Fund by the Juncker European Commission is a long-awaited  
71 progress. For it to become a step-change in the way defence is financed, it should be  
72 concretized, financially supported and substantially increased; the 13 billion in 7 years of the  
73 EDF are to be compared to the 1400 billion that Member States will spend at least for their  
74 defence over the same period. To move away (at least partially) from a system of national  
75 contributions, it could be financed partly by a "defence tax" or the issuance of "defence bonds";  
76 -The single market on defence equipment is far from achieved: the European Commission should  
77 more actively call to order Member States that don't apply EU's internal market rules (namely  
78 competition law and the misuse of Article 346 TEU) to national defence procurement and  
79 prosecute the recalcitrant in the Court of Justice ; combined with an EU-level public  
80 procurement by the EDA and OCCAR, and with research and technology development funded at  
81 European level, it would greatly incentivise the creation of a truly European defence industry  
82 and a robust single market for defence ; this should contribute greatly to the reindustrialization  
83 of Europe;  
84

85 ***In the medium term (2025)***

86

- 87 - A federal state, that could be named “the United States of Europe (USE)”, is essential to promote  
 88 our values, which must more than ever be promoted and defended in today’s globalised world,  
 89 to reinforce the European pillar of NATO, to enable Europe to speak with one voice in  
 90 international relations and in international institutions, to define a truly European foreign,  
 91 security and defence policy, to create a European defence ;  
 92 -The constitution of the EUE would respect the democratic principles, especially the separation  
 93 of powers: it would establish real legislative and executive powers; it would be based on our  
 94 values, but also on a multicultural identity, on the rule of law, internally and internationally, on  
 95 the diffusion of European culture and critical thinking, on justice, on solidarity, on social market  
 96 economy and on care for the environment ;  
 97 - It would make the EUE legitimate and give them the means to establish a security and defence  
 98 policy worthy of the name, what is a condition *sine qua non* to conduct a credible foreign policy;  
 99 - The shift to federalism should initially be supported by a small number of small states, ready to  
 100 give up a new share of their sovereignty; this is mostly theoretical: their independence is limited,  
 101 because they are members of the NATO, the EU, the Schengen zone, the euro zone, etc. ;  
 102 - According to the very probable success of this original nucleus, others, perhaps not responding  
 103 to all those criteria, would join this avant-garde, as it has been the case for the Schengen zone  
 104 and the eurozone;  
 105 - Within the scope of the USE, Europe could validly face the security challenges of the 21st  
 106 century.

### AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSAL FOR A RESOLUTION 3.1

Amendment n.	<b>1</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>	
Line number(s):	General comment		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
		Postpone the resolution	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	The resolution is very technical and need to be further discussed within the organisation		

Amendment n.	<b>2</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>	
Line number(s):	General comment		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
		Erase all mentions of numbers	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We want this resolution to be valid regardless of the numbers and how they might evolve in the future.		

Amendment n.	<b>3</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	After line 14		

Original text	Amended text
DEFENCE AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNITY: TWO FACES OF THE SAME COIN?	DEFENCE AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNITY: <b><i>ON THE ROAD TO STRATEGIC AUTONOMY</i></b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	A question is not the right title for a resolution.

Amendment n.	<b>4</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 15	
Original text	Amended text	
	Add: "and the Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)"	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>5</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 17	
Original text	Amended text	
	Add: - The franco-german Meseberg Declaration;  - The European Commission' Communication on "A stronger global actor: a more efficient decision-making for EU Common Foreign and Security Policy"	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>6</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	After line 18	
Original text	Amended text	
(New)	<b><i>Recognising the historical role of NATO as provider of peace and security in Europe and the need for cooperation with the EU in the area of security and defence;</i></b>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Important to highlight the relevance of NATO.	

Amendment n.	<b>7</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 19-23		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
<p>- In the aftermath of the collapse of the USSR, the military capabilities of most of the Member States were unreasonably diminished; therefore, only a handful of Member States have significant military capabilities and can be used only for specific missions, limited in duration and field of operation. European security still relies exclusively on NATO, which in turn essentially depends on the USA and their capabilities;</p>		<p>- <del><i>In the aftermath of the collapse of the USSR, the military capabilities of most of the Member States were unreasonably diminished; therefore, only a handful of Member States have significant military capabilities and can be used only for specific missions, limited in duration and field of operation.</i></del> European security still <b>largely</b> relies <del>exclusively</del> on NATO, which <del>in turn</del> essentially depends on the USA and <b>US military</b> capabilities. <b><i>This limits EU Member States' strategic autonomy in its military capabilities and often leads to a duplication of basic military systems which in turn gives them a lack of interoperability and makes for more difficult coordination.</i></b></p>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	The problem is the lack of coordination of defence expenses in the EU. The new drafting clarifies this point and avoids going into historical arguments.		

Amendment n.	<b>8</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 24-27		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
<p>- At present, neither individual EU Member States nor the EU nor the NATO without the United States of America (USA) have the means to protect the integrity of the European coasts and borders or to play the role of stabilizer and peacemaker in the tragically unstable regions bordering Europe;</p>		<p>- At present, neither individual EU Member States, nor the EU, nor NATO <b><i>in the absence of US military and financial support, would</i></b> have the means <b>reliably</b> to protect the <b>territorial</b> integrity of the <b>EU Member States and countries in the European Neighbourhood Policy programmes;</b></p>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Clarifying language.		

Amendment n.	<b>9</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 28-29-30		

Original text	Amended text
	Delete the three lines and substitute: “With the Treaty of Lisbon, the share competence on foreign and security policy has been extended to defence”
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	

Amendment n.	<b>10</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 28-30	
Original text	Amended text	
- The European Union treaty (TEU), articles 4, §2, last sentence, 24 and 42, forbids now more than before 2009 the EU from having a common defense; the EU cannot therefore become one of the world powers	<b><i>It is not possible to establish a European common defence under the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty;</i></b>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Simplifying language.	

Amendment n.	<b>11</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 28-29	
Original text	Amended text	
The European Union treaty (TEU), articles 4, §2, last sentence, 24 and 42, forbids now more than before 2009 the EU from having a common defense; the EU cannot therefore become one of the world powers;	Deletion of this paragraph	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We disagree with the interpretation of these articles 4, 24 and 42. If the Member states are willing to build a common defense, the Treaty allows it. Furthermore article 4 last sentence speaks about national security.	

Amendment n.	<b>12</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 31-35	
Original text	Amended text	
- Europe’s security environment has changed dramatically since 2003 : formerly multilateral, the world is again multipolar, governed by the balance of forces between States ; Russia’s and China’s aggressiveness, persistent instability in	<b><i>- Europe’s security environment has seen a shift away from a multilateral, rules-based international system and is now characterised by unilateral and sometimes aggressive actions, such as</i></b>	

the Middle-East, North-Africa and Sahel, terrorist threats as well as a shift in the foreign policy priorities of the USA changed the situation of Europe from a security point of view ;	<b><i>in the case of Russian aggression towards Ukraine and Georgia as well as repeated violation of European air space. This is aggravated by the arms race stemming from China and Russia, persistent instability in the Middle Eastern and north African regions, growing terrorism threats and also a shift in American foreign policy vis-à-vis the European Union which shows that American support cannot any longer be taken for granted;</i></b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Clarifying language.

Amendment n.	<b>13</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 36-39	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
- It requires from Europe to take its responsibility for its own security but, regrettably, the EU lacks ambition, vision and courage, because moral forces of Europeans suffer both from globalization and the resurgence of communitarianism and nationalism, it is undefended and vulnerable ;		- <b><i>This shift in the EU's security environment accentuates the need for</i></b> Europe to take its responsibility for its own security;
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Deletion of unclear language. Reference to the lack of EU ambition moved into the following paragraph.	

Amendment n.	<b>14</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 40-42	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
- The fragmentation of the current decision-making capacity and the inadequacy of the intergovernmental institutional framework hamper the EU's efficiency in the field of security, defence and foreign policy and make the EU ineffective on the global stage;		- The fragmentation of the current decision-making <b><i>processes</i></b> and the inadequacy of the intergovernmental institutional framework <b><i>which remains unchanged as a result of a lack of EU ambition</i></b> hamper the EU's efficiency in the field of security, defence and foreign policy and make the EU ineffective on the global stage ;
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	See above.	

Amendment n.	<b>15</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 44	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	Improving the European foreign, security and defence policy	<b>Urges for the improving of</b> the European EU foreign, security and defence policy
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We propose to transform the under-titles into UEF demands to have a coherence with the beginning of the resolution “the FC ...”.	

Amendment n.	<b>16</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 46	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	The intergovernmental method prevailing within the EU can't produce a European defense.	The intergovernmental method prevailing within the EU can't produce a European defense <b>and prevents any democratic control of a European force.</b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	It has been a long federalist reproach	

Amendment n.	<b>17</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 46-51	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	- The intergovernmental method prevailing within the EU can't produce a European defense. The founding treaties of the EU subordinate the general interest of Europeans to respect for a process that protects the mostly illusory sovereignty of the Member States. It leads to a lack of unity of command at both political and military levels and to a highly fragmented EU defense equipment market: the European Defense Agency (EDA) tells 154 types of weapon systems in Europe; they are only 27 in the USA;	- The intergovernmental method prevailing within the EU can't <b>create a functional</b> European defence. The <del>founding</del> treaties of the EU subordinate the general interest of Europeans to respect <del>for</del> a process that protects the mostly illusory sovereignty of the Member States. <b>This</b> leads to a lack of <b>political unity and</b> unity of command at <del>both political and</del> military levels and to a highly fragmented EU defence equipment market, <b>resulting in unnecessarily high development and procurement costs as well as a lack of strategic autonomy in the procurement of certain weapon classes;</b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Making the problem of a fragmented defence market explicit.	

Amendment n.	<b>18</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 53	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
Policy Objectives in the short term		<b>Calls for the following</b> policy objectives in the short term
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We propose to transform the under-titles into UEF demands.	

Amendment n.	<b>19</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Line 53	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
Policy Objectives in the short term		The FC of the Union of European Federalists:
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Maintaining the usual structure of UEF resolutions.	

Amendment n.	<b>20</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 55-61	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	-The EU contributes to a peaceful and cooperative multilateral global order and to fill the security vacuum in its wider neighborhood, through a broad range of policies and operational capabilities. Those efforts should become more successful if the member states become more united and if the MPCC and the CPCS merge into a permanent EU military operational headquarter, that would enable the EU, when necessary, to respond to crises without relying exclusively on NATO, to plan and run EU military and civilian missions and to help the European Border and Coast Guard Agency to control the migrant's fluxes;	- <b><i>Calls for the establishment of a permanent EU military operational headquarter, enabling the EU to respond to crisis through a partnership with but not an exclusive reliance on NATO by being autonomously able to plan and run civilian and, when necessary, EU military missions, contribution to a peaceful and cooperative multilateral global order;</i></b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Reformulation, clarifying the text and removing suggestion that the border guard becomes a military operation. Maintaining the usual format of UEF resolutions.	

Amendment n.	<b>21</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 59	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
		Add, after “permanent EU military operational headquarter”, “with the responsibility of executive (peace enforcing) missions”
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>22</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 62	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
		Add: France and Germany, for the first time, with the Meseberg declaration, supported the goal of the majority vote on foreign and security policy matters, paving the way for the Communication of the European Commission on “A stronger global actor: a more efficient decision-making for EU Common Foreign and Security Policy”. This proposal has already been supported by Pedro Sanchez, the Spanish Prime minister, before the European Parliament. If necessary, available EU members must be ready to launch an enhanced cooperation on foreign and security policy and be used to the “passerelle clause” in order to move to the majority vote
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>23</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 63	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
Defence Budget and European industry		<b>Stresses the importance of a revised Defence Budget and a stronger European industry</b>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We propose to transform the under-titles into UEF demands.	

Amendment n.	<b>24</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 65-69		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
<p>- In defence, Europe must not necessary spend more, because the budgets allocated to our defence (200 billion € per year) are considerable; it must spend better, more efficiently; it is not the case, due to the fragmentation of the European decision making, to the exorbitant part of the defence budgets allocated to the salaries of our 1.5 million soldiers, compared to the part devoted to the re-equipment, and to the fragmentation of the defence equipment market;</p>		<p>- <b><i>Demands that the considerable amount of defence spending in the European Union (about 200 bn EUR per year) is spent more efficiently on the European aggregate level, avoiding increased payments while still obtaining a better equipped military and reducing the fragmentation of the defence equipment market;</i></b></p>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Maintaining usual structure of UEF resolutions and clarifying language.		

Amendment n.	<b>25</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 70-75		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
<p>-The creation of a European Defence Fund by the Juncker European Commission is a long-awaited progress. For it to become a step-change in the way defence is financed, it should be concretized, financially supported and substantially increased; the 13 billion in 7 years of the EDF are to be compared to the 1400 billion that Member States will spend at least for their defence over the same period. To move away (at least partially) from a system of national contributions, it could be financed partly by a “defence tax” or the issuance of “defence bonds”;</p>		<p>- <b><i>Welcomes the establishment of a European Defence Fund as a means to enhance the strategic autonomy of the EU in the field of defence procurement and to reduce costly duplications of development expenses by EU member states in cooperation with nationally preferred partners in the fragmented European defence industry;</i></b></p>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	<p>Maintaining usual structure of UEF resolutions. Explanation of why we welcome the Defence Fund and what it is expected to do. Removal of the misleading comparison with national defence budgets as the Defence Fund is not designed currently to replace normal defence expenses and legally cannot be a tool for the establishment of European battle groups or a EU army and it is important to be precise on the goals of the Defence Fund. Also removal of the notion of a defence tax or defence bonds as we generally do not support earmarking in the EU budget. The UEF’s position that we need to move away from national contributions to the budget is detailed in different resolutions where they fit better and can be detailed.</p>		

Amendment n.	<b>26</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	After line 75		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
(New)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><i>Reminds however that the Defence Fund can only achieve those objectives if there is considerable political will of Member States to pool development and procurement investments and if the project selection rules of the Defence Fund focus on common procurement priorities of the Member States rather than acting as a tool to subsidise the economically healthy European defence sector by financing development costs for products designed for global export markets;</i></b></li> </ul>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Qualifying our support to the European Defence Fund by specifying the objectives.		

Amendment n.	<b>27</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	Lines 76-83		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
<p>-The single market on defence equipment is far from achieved: the European Commission should more actively call to order Member States that don't apply EU's internal market rules (namely competition law and the misuse of Article 346 TEU) to national defence procurement and prosecute the recalcitrant in the Court of Justice ; combined with an EU-level public procurement by the EDA and OCCAR, and with research and technology development funded at European level, it would greatly incentivise the creation of a truly European defence industry and a robust single market for defence ; this should contribute greatly to the reindustrialization of Europe;</p>		<p>-<b><i>Calls on</i></b> the European Commission <del>should</del> more actively <b><i>to</i></b> call to order Member States that don't apply EU's internal market rules (namely competition law and the misuse of Article 346 TEU) to national defence procurement and prosecute the recalcitrant in the Court of Justice ; combined with an EU-level public procurement by the EDA and OCCAR, and with research and technology development funded at European level, it would greatly incentivise the creation of a truly European defence industry and a robust single market for defence, <b><i>which in turn</i></b> contributes <del>greatly</del> to the <b><i>reindustrialisation</i></b> of Europe;</p>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Bringing the resolution in line with the UEF resolution format and language washing. Consolidating the European defence market will likely result in productivity increases but unclear to what degree this would contribute to reindustrialisation.		

Amendment n.	<b>28</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	After line 83		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
New		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Recalls that while efficiency gains can be made through a more important role of European financing and deepened cooperation between Member States in terms of the pooling in and sharing of resources including the setting up of an intelligence agency, interoperability and procurement of defence products, only a genuine European army can reliably provide for lasting peace in Europe, defend the territorial integrity of the EU and fill the security void that has been created as a result of the ambivalent signals from the current US administration;</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Self-explanatory.		

Amendment n.	<b>29</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	After line 83		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
New		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Calls for the immediate introduction of operable EU battle groups at the disposal of the EU upon a decision by the Council;</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Self-explanatory.		

Amendment n.	<b>30</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>	
Line number(s):	After line 83		
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>	
New		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Calls for regular meetings of defence ministers chaired by the High Representative, to ensure a closer coordination of defence policy among EU</i></li> </ul>	

	<i>member states, on the eve of the Foreign Affairs Council meeting; Underlines that these meetings should take place in the framework provided by the treaties and that by no means the detrimental experience of informal meetings in the Eurogroup in the field of economic and financial affairs can be repeated in the field of defense;</i>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Self-explanatory.

Amendment n.	<b>31</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	After line 83	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	New	- <i><b>Calls for Treaty changes allowing qualified majority voting on foreign affairs and defence in the Council and allowing for the introduction of a genuine European army, controlled by the European Parliament and the Council.</b></i>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Self-explanatory.	

Amendment n.	<b>32</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 85	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	In the medium term (2025)	<b>Recalls the federalist demands</b> in the medium term (2025)
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	We propose to transform the under-titles into UEF demands.	

Amendment n.	<b>33</b>	<i>submitted by Emma Farrugia, JEF Europe</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 85-106	
	<b>Original text</b>	<b>Amended text</b>
	<i>In the medium term (2025)</i>	<i>Delete</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A federal state, that could be named “the United States of Europe (USE)”, is essential to promote our values, which must more than ever be promoted and defended in today’s globalised world, to reinforce the European pillar of NATO, to enable Europe to speak with one voice in international relations and in international institutions, to define a truly European foreign, security and defence policy, to create a European defence ;</li> <li>-The constitution of the EUE would respect the democratic principles, especially the separation of powers: it would establish real legislative and executive powers; it would be based on our values, but also on a multicultural identity, on the rule of law, internally and internationally, on the diffusion of European culture and critical thinking, on justice, on solidarity, on social market economy and on care for the environment ;</li> <li>-It would make the EUE legitimate and give them the means to establish a security and defence policy worthy of the name, what is a condition <i>sine qua non</i> to conduct a credible foreign policy;</li> <li>-The shift to federalism should initially be supported by a small number of small states, ready to give up a new share of their sovereignty; this is mostly theoretical: their independence is limited, because they are members of the NATO, the EU, the Schengen zone, the euro zone, etc. ;</li> <li>-According to the very probable success of this original nucleus, others, perhaps not responding to all those criteria, would join this avant-garde, as it has been the case for the Schengen zone and the eurozone;</li> <li>-Within the scope of the USE, Europe could validly face the security challenges of the 21st century.</li> </ul>	
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	This is not the right place to spell out the functioning of the European Federation. Relevant content is moved into the previous amendment.

Amendment n.	<b>34</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Line 87	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
A federal state, that could be named “the United States of Europe (USE)”		Deletion of “that could be named “the United States of Europe (USE)”
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	It is not a good idea to use USE since it gives the feeling that a federal Europe will be a copy of USA, especially when we talk about defence.	

Amendment n.	<b>35</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 88	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
		Add, after “promote our values”, “that are universal values”, ....
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>36</b>	<i>submitted by Domenico Moro</i>
Line number(s):	Line 89	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
		Move the statement “to reinforce the European pillar of NATO” at the end of the statement (at the end of line 91)
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>		

Amendment n.	<b>37</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 92, 97, 105	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
EUE or USE		Replace by “the federal Europe” or “the federal State”
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	In coherence with the previous amendment, we propose to replace USE by “federal Europe” or “federal State”.	

Amendment n.	<b>38</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 99-101	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
The shift to federalism should initially be supported by a small number of small states, ready to 100 give up a new share of their sovereignty; this is mostly theoretical: their independence is limited, 101 because they are members of the NATO, the EU, the Schengen zone, the euro zone, etc. ;		- The shift to federalism <b>could</b> initially be supported by a small number of <b>Member</b> states, ready to <b>put in common a new share of powers in order to ensure their sovereignty</b> on the global scene;

<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	1- we hope that all MS would agree on a common defence so the vanguard should be a possibility (“could”) and not the necessary path (“should”) 2- Having a common defence is not losing sovereignty by on the contrary regaining sovereignty
--	---

Amendment n.	<b>39</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 102-103	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
<p>- According to the very probable success of this original nucleus, others, perhaps not responding to all those criteria, would join this avant-garde, as it has been the case for the Schengen zone and the eurozone;</p>		<p>- According to the very probable success of this original nucleus, others, perhaps would join this <b>vanguard</b>, as it has been the case for the Schengen zone and the eurozone <b>area</b>;</p>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	1- if some new countries join, they should respond to all criteria, so we should delete this part of the sentence 2 -use of the proper wordings (vanguard and eurozone area)	

Amendment n.	<b>40</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 105-106	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
<p>Within the scope of the USE, Europe could validly face the security challenges of the 21st century.</p>		<p>- Within the scope of <b>that federal Europe</b>, Europe could validly face the security challenges of the 21st century <b>and beyond</b>.</p>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	Let’s not limit ourselves to the 21st century and be generations ahead!	

Amendment n.	<b>41</b>	<i>submitted by UEF France</i>
Line number(s):	Lines 26, 29, 38, 50, 71-72, 82	
<b>Original text</b>		<b>Amended text</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to play the role of stabilizer and peacemaker</li> <li>- The European Union treaty (TEU), articles 4, §2, last sentence, 24 and 42, forbids now more 29 than before 2009 the EU from having a common defense</li> <li>- because moral forces of Europeans suffer both from globalization</li> <li>- defense equipment market: the European Defense Agency</li> <li>- it should be concretized,</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to play the role of <b>stabiliser</b> and peacemaker</li> <li>- The European Union treaty (TEU), articles 4, §2, last sentence, 24 and 42, forbids now more 29 than before 2009 the EU from having a common <b>defence</b>; <i>(if this sentence is kept)</i></li> <li>- because moral forces of Europeans suffer both from <b>globalisation</b></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this should contribute greatly to the reindustrialization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>defence</b> equipment market: the European <b>Defence</b> Agency</li> <li>- it should be <b>concretised</b>,</li> <li>- this should contribute greatly to the <b>re-industrialisation</b></li> </ul>
<b>Explanatory statement (optional):</b>	It is better to use British English rather than American one, let's be European!