

## R1new Green Space Policy

Proposer: Grön Ungdom, Grønn Ungdom, Vihreät  
Nuoret  
Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

#### Introduction

As the only species on this earth with the ability to think long-term - even if we are not always so good at using this ability - we have a responsibility to ensure that life goes on, as well as the responsibility to preserve and protect nature and the climate. We can only achieve this, in the really long term, by working together with other countries to spread life to other planets. No matter what Sweden, no matter what Europe does, this will happen. But we can decide if it's the logo of a company on the side of the spacecraft that lands on Mars with humans, or if it's a flag that represents humans and not money.

#### Climate

On the other hand, in the short term, space science is a great help in the fight against climate change. It is only through large Earth observation programs such as the Copernicus satellites that we can measure exactly where, when, how and why climate change is taking place, and it is the same satellites that are used to assist with detailed maps and images during natural disasters, which we know have already become more and more usual. Much of the early research on solar panels that has led to the efficiency they have today was done by NASA for use in space. The same applies to hydroponic and vertical agriculture. Space gives us time, breathing space and tools in the fight against the climate crisis. Therefore, we propose:

**that** more money is spent on climate-related space research.

#### Reusable rockets

The space industry is much like the electric vehicle industry. Both are mineral and rare earth metals heavy industries. Both are also industries of the future. But if the industries want to be part of the 'green future' they will have to

stay within the planetary boundaries. To do so they need to become a part of the circular economy. Reusing and recycling EV batteries are now becoming mainstream, the space industry still has a lot of catching up within this area. But last year SpaceX made a breakthrough when they launched the first astronauts on a reused rocket.

“Both NASA and SpaceX contend that reusable spacecraft are crucial for making the space industry more affordable. The concept is not new; for years, the space agency reused its small fleet of space shuttles, but reusable rockets weren’t a reality until 2021.”

So to make the space industry greener, cheaper and more circular we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable by 2035.

## **Asteroid mining**

But not all asteroids are created equal. By extracting the minerals found in extraterrestrial celestial bodies, we can completely eliminate the need to have environmentally destructive and human rights-violating mines here on earth. It is not something that will happen today, tomorrow or next year, but the technology is evolving and with more money, production could start ~ 2040. To be able to go through a fair transition, we will need batteries, and superconductors in turn need lithium, gold, platinum and endless other rare earth metals. That is why we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport.

## **New international space station**

The ISS is old and according to the original plans would have been scrapped as early as 2008. It is important for us to have a part in the work of the new international space station that is to be built next, we have the power to influence the spacecraft that will spend future decades with groundbreaking orbital research around the earth. That is why we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS).

## **Space pollution**

Space debris are the objects that we humans have left in orbit around the Earth. These are everything from dust to pens and broken satellites that are as big as buses. Which usually moves at about 27,000 km/h. In the worst case, it could be that in the future we will not be able to postpone things into space because there is too much rubbish in the way - the so-called Kepler syndrome. Already today you need to plan launches for clusters of space debris. That is why we propose:

Corporations should be accountable for the space pollution they are making, as well be accountable for the destruction of space discovery potential, especially with global systems like Starlink. Therefore, we demand that every global scale project is implemented in collaboration with scientists not to reduce the scientific potential in space discovery.

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up space debris for a better space environment

### International Cooperation

Due to long territorial disputes between different factions and France, ESA is not part of European cooperation, even when it gets most of its money from it. This stupid and resource-wasting battle must end. We therefore propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European Union.

To summarize, we propose:

- **that** more money is spent on climate-related space research;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable by 2035;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS);

- 88 • **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up  
89 space debris for a better space environment;
- 90 • **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European  
91 Union;

## **R2new Towards an agroecological Europe by 2030**

Proposer: FYEG

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

The cultivation of the Earth along with forestry activities has been vital for our survival as humankind. Unfortunately, the continuous push for the industrialization and globalisation of the world's agriculture and food supply systems threatens the future of humanity and the natural world, which are deeply interconnected. The Covid-19 pandemic and the trade implications of the war in Ukraine have made more visible the vulnerabilities of food systems across the globe that are not able to ensure a sufficient and healthy diet for everyone. In Europe, the hegemonic agro-industry model developed in the last decades has entailed a reduction in crop diversification, a depletion of soil and biodiversity, and the pollution of aquifers and water reserves due to the use of synthetic fertilisers and pesticides, along with antibiotics in animal farming. The exploitative labour conditions in agriculture of migrant workers, mainly in southern Europe, are also part of this model, a region which is the most vulnerable of the continent to desertification and the sustainability of any form of agriculture in the following decades.

Jointly addressing the challenges of sustainable food for the European and world population, the preservation of biodiversity and natural resources and the response to climate change requires a profound transition of our agricultural and food system. A shift towards an agroecological paradigm based on the phasing-out of pesticides and synthetic fertilisers, and the redeployment of extensive grasslands and landscape infrastructure would allow these issues to be addressed in a coherent manner. In this sense, there is a wide scientific consensus in the capacity of agroecology to nourish all Europe and to nourish all people better, expressed in the reports of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the former UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier de Schutter. A step from the status quo is needed to put the health of people and ecosystems first than the interest of the big landowners and seed producers in agro-industry, a shift that has to be ensured from political institutions. Hence, it is not just about rigorous ecological and social standards, but about transforming the way food is produced, distributed and consumed, giving room for local knowledge and food sovereignty, and the functioning of food systems as a source of shared prosperity.

To generalise organic agriculture is not enough, we can see it in the greenwashing made by agri-business by meeting the minimum requirements for their production to be labelled as “organic” but not making significant changes in the way food is produced and distributed. In addition, we need a structural change in a situation where consumption patterns are still far from meeting a diet that is within planetary boundaries, marked by an overconsumption of meat and ultra-processed food that damages the health of the people and the planet. We have to overcome the false dichotomy between prioritising nourishing the whole world and ensuring long-term sustainability of the soil: both are possible under agroecology, improving public health and making possible the mitigation and adaptation to the climate crisis. Under agroecological principles, farmers and peasants are agents of change, carrying out ecosystem services along with the production of healthy, organic and accessible food through short supply chains that ensure food security and are the materialisation of food sovereignty. The projects rooted on the social and solidarity economy such as cooperatives, food hubs and local associations should be the engine of these transformations.

For all these reasons, the Federation of Young European Greens makes a call to all political entities across Europe to create a legal and policy framework that fosters the up-scaling of agroecology, urgently transitioning to agroecological production and consumption and minimise food waste, while increasing the ambition and reshaping the goals of the Farm to Fork strategy. The redesign of the CAP also has to stop the discriminatory practice of countries not receiving the same amount of subsidies, mainly punishing farmers in the newest EU member states.

- Facilitate the rapid abandonment of the use of hazardous pesticides and fertilisers and the funding of research behind and use of the use of biocontrol and natural barriers and predators, biopesticides, polyculture, the phase-out of bioenergy crops and vegetable protein imports, the increase of the share of legume crops in rotation, the redeployment of natural grasslands and extension of agroecological infrastructures (hedges, trees, ponds, stony habitats). A cut in funds from intensive farming to redirect them to agroecological initiatives is also key.
- Decrease support to reductionist agricultural research and increase investments in public research on agroecology and organic farming, creating Agroecological Living Labs and learning hubs. Transitioning to agroecological systems needs a life-long learning, transdisciplinary and multistakeholder approach, in formal and non-formal education and research. Agricultural sciences curricula should be transformed into agroecological curricula. Additionally, educating on the benefits of agroecology in rural areas to empower youth initiatives should be a priority of educational policies, increasing the visibility of certification programs in agroecology, exchanges of good practices and

75 networks of support and knowledge.

- 76 • Rethink the relation between urban and rural societies and territories,  
77 taking into account the interdependence between cities and ecosystems. We  
78 need to create an alliance based on short supply chains with surrounding  
79 territories, as indicated by the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact. To link  
80 transformative production and consumption initiatives is essential for the  
81 up-scaling of agroecology.
  
- 82 • Aim for the objective of 100% organic, local and fair trade products by  
83 2027 in public restoration with vegetarian and vegan options everyday.  
84 Entities of the social and solidarity economy should be prioritised and  
85 supported by public administrations through this policy and other measures  
86 designed at all political levels. The relocalization of production through  
87 agroecological initiatives and the progressive increase in the ecological  
88 and social requirements of public purchase are central to reach this goal.  
89 The public sector has to take this leadership role for the transformations  
90 to come as soon as possible in the rest of economic and societal spheres.
  
- 91 • Agroecological laws at all legislative levels should be enacted to ensure  
92 a just transition from conventional agriculture to agroecology (up-scaling  
93 agroecology). Some Latin American countries have been pioneers in this  
94 kind of legislation, such as the case of Uruguay in 2018.
  
- 95 • At the EU level, we demand the taxation on imported commodities whose  
96 methods of production do not comply with the EU environmental and human  
97 rights standards. Determination of compliance with said standards is done  
98 by an independent body. Such an evaluation should be reassessed at least  
99 every 4 years. Where this especially harms smallholder producers, profits  
100 from such a taxation will be invested in initiatives that incentivise  
101 production meeting such standards. This is particularly important in the  
102 sector of protein crops, where the ban on imported soya in the EU could  
103 phase out synthetic fertilisers responsible for high greenhouse gas  
104 emissions and close the nitrogen cycle at the finest territorial level. A  
105 redesign of the Common Agriculture Policy is needed in order to halt the  
106 disproportionally advantageous treatment of large agricultural companies  
107 and to put small and medium organic and agroecological practices at the  
108 centre of public support, to ensure just prices for local producers,  
109 reduce the distance food travels between production and consumption and  
110 minimise food waste, while increasing the ambition and reshaping the goals  
111 of the Farm to Fork strategy.

- Develop European, state-level as well as local and regional programs to facilitate access to land for all and especially for youth through Land Banks, for instance, in the form of council land redistribution. This would generate new job opportunities and rural development and promote safe and decent working conditions and wages. A gender perspective has to be integrated in all the measures taken, as well as mechanisms to ensure equity for ethnic minorities

- Develop local and regional programmes designating public land most accessible by communities, such as those in the heart of communities, for sustainable community projects and facilitating and stimulating the cultivation of such projects. These projects, such as community gardens, are to be decided by communities themselves through local forums, councils, or other local participation initiatives.

#### To European civil society:

- FYEG supports the [Agroecology Europe Barcelona Letter](#) and any other organisation or movement working in the lines of an agroecological transformation.
- We make a call to join forces in the advocacy and action towards a truly sustainable food system that places the health of people and the planet over profit, a transformation in the food system that cannot wait if we want genuinely resilient territories for the decades to come.

## Reason

We need to envision the concrete steps towards a food system that really protects and puts the health of the people and ecosystems over profit. The agroecological paradigm, representing a step forward from organic production, reflects this transition and sets a challenge for the following years and decades if we want liveable places in Europe, mostly in the most vulnerable countries to desertification in Southern Europe, but also a more just food regime globally.



## **R3new Strengthening and Democratising Europe's Defense Policy**

Proposer: Protests, Ostra Ziele?, ?????? ??????  
???????? (Green Youth of Ukraine)  
Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 Global events once again confirm the need for a strong and cooperative security  
2 policy.

3 Unfortunately, soft, democratic policies have not worked, as a result of which  
4 we have in recent years seen armed aggressions, acts of terrorism, and the  
5 outbreak of full-scale war in Europe.

6 This once again underlines the need for a clear response and solidarity on the  
7 issue of collective security and peace, for strengthening the Eastern flank of  
8 NATO at this moment, and also starting developing a strong common European  
9 defense capacity.

10 For years the Baltic States and Poland have raised their concerns about a  
11 potential Russian invasion, which were mostly ignored and dismissed as paranoia.  
12 After the terroristic and fascist Russian regime, led by Vladimir Putin, annexed  
13 Crimea and the de facto occupation of the Donbas and Luhansk regions in 2014,  
14 the Baltic States and Poland increased their military spending to at least 2% of  
15 the GDP. This was not followed by the rest of the NATO member states. This left  
16 Baltic States and Poland feeling isolated and alone in managing their defense.  
17 Unfortunately NATO was the only viable defense mechanism available to these  
18 countries. We need to show true European solidarity and support Eastern European  
19 countries in their need for safety.

20 Moreover, FYEG understands Finland and Sweden's wishes to join NATO, as that  
21 will make the Baltic Sea region safer and condemn any obstruction and  
22 manipulation by others in realizing the right of these countries to join the  
23 alliance.

24 While Western countries continued flirting with Vladimir Putin just to continue  
25 importing Russian fossil fuels, those countries which had previously been  
26 exposed to the horrors of Russian imperialism, started preparing for the worst,  
27 while continuing to support Ukraine from Russia's war against them.

Moreover, Germany kept building the Nord Stream 2 fossil gas pipeline from Russia to Germany, while Ukraine, Poland, and the Baltic States were opposed to it due to increased Russian influence. The partial Russian occupation of Ukraine had almost completely disappeared from the public eye until Russia started yet another invasion in early 2022.

Furthermore, many member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and member states of the European Union (EU) continued to export their weapons to Russia after the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014. Germany and France exported weapons worth more than 270 million euros. France's exports to Russia even increased significantly in 2015, a year after Russia annexed the Crimea peninsula. Czechia, Bulgaria, Italy, Slovakia, Finland, Spain, and Croatia also continued to export weapons, spare parts, and vehicles to the Russian military.

The Ukrainian resistance held up against the relentless terroristic onslaught of Russian occupiers. Despite Ukraine's heroic resistance, without the influx of new weaponry, Ukraine cannot hold. It is thus necessary that Ukraine will be supplied with weapons to continue its counter-offensives against the Russian war criminals.

The Baltic States and Poland have been the biggest supporters of Ukraine during this invasion. Estonia has provided Ukraine military support of about 0.8% of their GDP, Latvia 0.7%, Poland 0.2%, and Lithuania – 0.1%, while Germany has given only 0.01% of their GDP in military aid. These discrepancies in the support for Ukraine standing up against the Russian invasion are worrying and are an expression of lacking European solidarity.

In order to strengthen European solidarity and with the aim to build European defense capacities, in particular to protect Eastern European countries against aggressions of the Russian Federation, FYEG calls to urgently build a strong and resilient European Defense Mechanism. It would be articulated by strengthening the cooperation between military forces of European countries and by providing defense support to the countries exposed to the most immediate threats.

Given the atrocities committed by forces under NATO command in the past, the reliance on NATO of some European countries for their defense is not sustainable, yet we acknowledge the current dependence on NATO as a defense mechanism for the countries most threatened by Russian aggression.

FYEG therefore demands that the European defense mechanism is set up as quickly as possible as an alternative defense solution to the NATO. Whereas the EU could play an essential role, it is vital that this mechanism is not limited to EU member states, but is open to every European country except for the Russian Federation.

66 The lack of a collective regulatory mechanism has allowed individual NATO  
67 members to exploit the alliance for their own interests, which in turn has  
68 resulted in criminal actions in the Middle East and other counties. Now this has  
69 led to weak support for Ukraine, provoking a difficult political and security  
70 situation for countries in Eastern Europe, the Baltics, and the Nordic  
71 countries, which are close to Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

72 We acknowledge there is a need in NATO for fair regulatory mechanisms that  
73 prevents the USA or any other single country from taking one-sided decisions as  
74 well as ensuring democratic ways of resolving internal problems and conflicts.  
75 At the same time we demand the creation of a strong institution in the future  
76 European defense mechanism that focuses exclusively on conflict prevention and  
77 resolution as well as ensuring peace and global security.

78 We believe that a strong structure and regulatory mechanisms will also enable us  
79 to control the level of militarization of countries and avoid subsequent wars  
80 and armed conflicts. One of the core values of the Greens is non-violence, so we  
81 believe that with the great threat of aggression from a Russian (or any other)  
82 imperialist government, we must first defend peace in all countries.

## **R4new Indigenous rights are human rights!**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 Indigenous knowledge is critical in solving the climate crisis. That's why it's  
2 a bit ironic that the livelihoods of indigenous peoples have been under pressure  
3 for centuries, and still are under pressure today.

4 There is only one indigenous people officially recognized in the European Union  
5 - The Sami people - that traditionally resides in the Sapmi area in the north of  
6 Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. Even though this is the only indigenous  
7 people residing in Europe, there are many indigenous peoples being affected by  
8 our continent; the actions of the EU and European countries in the global market  
9 have a huge impact on the lives of indigenous peoples across the globe.

10 Therefore, a;

11 **Europe that is in line with indigenous rights across the globe should ensure**  
12 **that**

- 13 • All trade agreements by the EU and by European countries must respect the  
14 rights of the the indigenous communities directly or indirectly affected  
15 in the counterpart and possibly in neighbouring states. This must entail  
16 respect for ILO Convention 169 alongside core human rights conventions.  
17 Furthermore, these indigenous communities must be consulted and  
18 represented in the discussions and evaluation of the agreement either by a  
19 representative or, where possible, a collective or council representing  
20 them
- 21 • All foreign investments in industries by European countries and the EU  
22 must respect the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (ILO  
23 Convention 169)
- 24 • Indigenous peoples are an important group for funding in international

development policies and should be promoted

- Non-Self-Governing Territories' right to Independence referendums worldwide should be supported

**Europe is to ensure the rights of its indigenous populations by**

- Ensuring that the EU and its member states ratify the ILO Convention 169
- Prohibiting construction in indigenous lands if it would damage or restrict access to lands culturally or religiously important to indigenous communities, or negatively affect their environment, health, livelihood or other rights in any way. The evaluation of any project should be done in consultation with possibly affected indigenous communities either by a representative or, where possible, a collective or council representing them
- Supporting the dissemination of indigenous knowledge, culture and history in Europe and areas that are colonized by Europe
- Funding projects by the state or civil society organisations that increase the knowledge of- and usage of indigenous languages. This includes the teaching of indigenous languages as part of school curriculum.
- Allowing The Sami People to freely migrate within the Sapmi area, regardless of the official country borders
- Supporting the Nordic Sami-council and encouraging all countries with indigenous land to create an indigenous council
- Increasing funding for research on indigenous language, culture and history
- Depositing EU grants earmarked to strengthen national and ethnic minorities directly to minority organizations instead of through the

## Reason

### Background for sending in the resolution

Indigenous knowledge is critical in solving the climate crisis. That's why it's a bit ironic that the livelihoods of indigenous peoples have been under pressure for centuries, and still are under pressure today.

There is only one indigenous people officially recognized in the European Union - The Sami people - that traditionally resides in the Sapmi area in the north of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. Even though this is the only indigenous people residing in Europe, there are many indigenous peoples being affected by our continent. The actions of the EU and European countries in the global market have a huge impact on the lives of indigenous peoples across the globe.

There are also several countries currently colonized by European nations, such as Greenland that is colonized by Denmark and French Guiana. The climate crisis and destruction of nature in indigenous areas are endangering the lives of indigenous peoples, and Green Parties should therefore be at the forefront as allies for indigenous peoples in the whole world.

## Discussion

### Europe and the rest of the world

The EU and European countries must ensure that the rights of indigenous peoples are preserved within its own territory, but also when interacting with indigenous peoples and territories through trade and foreign aid policies. Indigenous policies by European countries should therefore have a global and regional perspective.

### Indigenous rights

Indigenous peoples have a lot of strengths and diverse culture, but they are also oppressed by their colonizers. That's why they should have the same right to an adapted protection such as other vulnerable groups. The UN adopted a resolution on indigenous human rights in 2007 called the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It has been ratified by most countries in south america, but only four European countries had ratified it in 2017. This is far from enough, since most countries have some form of interaction that affects the lives of indigenous peoples. It is therefore proposed that the EU and all European countries should ratify the UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples, and respect the law in national and foreign policies.

### Trade and destruction of livelihood

The Sapmi area has on multiple occasions been threatened by construction in nature that has a negative impact on the traditional livelihood of the Sami people living in the area. Most recently in the mining project by the Repparfjord in Norway, and by the proposed mining in Gállok in Sweden. It is clear that the national governments in Europe don't respect the territories and the protection of the livelihood in Europe, which the Greens should strongly oppose as allies of oppressed peoples.

Indigenous peoples have been threatened by a loss in their livelihood across the globe for centuries, and it's time to respect their wishes for a protection of their land and nature. That's why we propose to not allow construction in nature that indigenous people see negatively affects their livelihoods.

All European member states interact with the lands of indigenous peoples when they trade with countries that have an indigenous population. It is therefore likely that all European countries have power, and an impact over the lives of indigenous people in some form. Attempts to improve the lives and livelihoods of indigenous peoples should therefore not only affect the European countries and its colonies, but all counterparts in trade agreements, as is proposed in this resolution.

### **Referendums**

Some peoples have an official status as indigenous peoples, whereas others do not. Regardless of a population's official status, they should be granted the right to be free from their colonizers if they wish to do so, and the colonizer should help their colonies transit to self-govern for the period of time it takes for the colony to build strong institutions. This is why we propose that referendums must be supported so that the people in colonies can cast a voice to say whether or not they want to be independent. This is also in line with the rule of law, as defined by the European Council.

### **Strengthening indigenous peoples**

Much of indigenous culture is endangered because of colonization. That's why we should not just protect, but also strengthen the indigenous languages, culture and knowledge of their history through grants. It should be the responsibility of the governments to ensure basic rights such as teaching indigenous languages at schools. That's why we propose that grants earmarked to strengthen the practice of indigenous cultures should go directly to the indigenous councils and/or NGOs working for indigenous rights.

### **Migration**

In Europe, most people are able to travel freely within the Schengen-area with their passport, and most people are able to travel freely within their national borders. This is not, however, the case for the Sami people. Sapmi (the land of the Sami people) spans across Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia. Since Russia is not a part of the Schengen area, many Samy people can not travel freely within their land. The Norwegian Sami-president has called for free migration for the Sami people within their land. Since this was possible for the Sami people before migration policies were implemented as part of the colonization process, we propose that they should get the right to travel freely within Sapmi across the Schengen area, and Russian Sapmi area. This could be possible through (for example) the creation of a Sami passport.

### **Indigenous councils**

Many countries have national and international councils for the indigenous peoples to voice their opinions together. Most countries with a Sami-population already have this. It can be a good way for the indigenous people to find together and organize in favor of their interests. Such councils must not only be protected from harassment, but actively supported through funding to ensure they have enough resources to complete their work. We therefore propose that the EU and the European member states should strengthen the councils that already exist, as well as creating indigenous councils in the areas they are absent.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the discussion above, we propose the resolution.

## **R5new Criminalise Ecocide!**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 The exploitation of natural resources is the base of the current economic and  
2 productive model. This exploitation is not based on satisfying people's needs,  
3 but on the accumulation of wealth and power for very few at all costs.  
4 Therefore, it carries with it the destruction of ecosystems and the natural  
5 relations among wildlife and the context where all living beings thrive and  
6 grow. We must put an end to this exploitation of Earth. Climate activists and  
7 scientists have been warning about the great dangers of this exploitation and  
8 its connection to social, gender, and racial injustice across all societies.  
9 Moreover, in October 2021, the United Nations Human Rights Council recognised  
10 for the first time that having a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment is  
11 a human right, adding to the decades-long effort in international law to make  
12 the right to a healthy environment a human right – including the conclusion of  
13 the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights in 2019 that “human rights norms apply  
14 to the full spectrum of environmental issues”; and the determination of the  
15 United Nations Human Rights Committee, which decides on violations of the  
16 International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, in 2020 that access to a  
17 clean and healthy environment falls under the right to life.

18 During the last months, we could celebrate the success of environmental  
19 litigations against the actions of public and private institutions. For example,  
20 a French administrative court recognised that the French State could be held  
21 responsible for failing to meet its commitments to mitigate climate change; and  
22 the Dutch court ruled that the petrochemical giant Shell must cut its emissions  
23 and be in line with the Paris Agreement. We welcome these wins and look forward  
24 to more advances in this field. At the same time, we regret the fact that  
25 sanctions depend solely on the environmental laws at the national level. Crimes  
26 against nature know no borders, and therefore sanctions should also be  
27 prosecuted at the international level. Moreover, big polluters and corporations,  
28 following their neocolonial and imperialist agenda, harm the environment and  
29 natural resources of the Global South, taking advantage of the invisibilisation  
30 and systemic disregard of indigenous communities and their demands.

31 In this context, we consider that ecocide, following the definition of Polly  
32 Higgins as “1. Acts or omissions committed in times of peace or conflict by any



senior person within the course of State, corporate or any other entity's activity which cause, contribute to, or may be expected to cause or contribute to serious ecological, climate or cultural loss or damage to or destruction of ecosystem(s) of a given territory(ies), such that peaceful enjoyment by the inhabitants has been or will be severely diminished. 2. To establish seriousness, impact(s) must be widespread, long-term or severe.", should be included in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (hereinafter simply Rome Statute). The sanctions imposed so far have been insufficient, and in most cases, the big corporations already include in their budgets paying fines for their environmental crimes. In the current context of climate emergency, we cannot accept mass destruction in exchange for money. Our rights are not for sale. The emissions, deforestation, and pollution of air and water will not stop as long as profit is put before people. In order to protect people, we need more legal tools. Criminalising ecocide would make it possible to prosecute those who do the most damage to the environment. Its power lies in the fact that it would make big polluters reconsider their actions, as they would be put in the same box as war criminals, and that is not good for business.

With this resolution, the Federation of Young European Greens:

- Denounces the exploitation or destruction of the environment performed by public and private institutions, and state and private actors, especially those of the Global North in the Global South through practices of (neo)colonialism and (neo)imperialism, and urges the corresponding institutions and actors to initiate processes for historical compensation.
- Urges the European Union to call on its Member States to implement national legal frameworks that align national and multinational companies in their territory to the EU Climate Law.
- Calls on all European states that have ratified the Rome Statute to propose and push for the adoption and ratification of the correspondent amendment to add the crime of ecocide in its list of crimes based on the draft law proposed by Polly Higgins, wherein the jurisdiction of the ICC for ecocide is explicitly expanded to include corporations.

## R6new Deep-sea mining

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

Mining resources comes with negative impacts on the environment that should be reduced to a minimum. At the same time, a just transition to a carbon-neutral society is only possible when key parts of our infrastructure are renewed. However, this transition requires mining resources in itself; cadmium is for example needed for the construction of solar panels. Some methods of mining are more harmful to the environment than other methods. Underwater mining is especially harmful to the environment and should therefore be prohibited.

According to [“Seas to risk” report](#): “Areas approved for deep-sea mining (DSM) exploration now cover over 1.3 million square kilometres in the Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans. Of the 30 exploration contracts the International Seabed Authority (ISA) has established so far, European contractors hold a total of nine. Countries sponsoring or holding contracts include Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, France, Germany and the UK”.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has launched a moratorium on deep-sea mining. It has called on its member states to implement a moratorium on deep-sea mining and the issuance of contracts for exploitation and exploration. Environmental and biodiversity NGOs have welcomed this measure.

But many European countries continue the race to exploit the mineral resources of the seabed even though this has devastating consequences on the 250,000 known living species and on the millions we do not yet know of and the fact that mining releases huge amounts of carbon, which reduces the capacity of the oceans to slow down climate change.

We can mention the [Solwara 1 project](#) planned to mine mineral-rich hydrothermal vents in the Bismarck Sea, part of the Pacific Ocean, not far from Bougainville Island. This is the first deep-sea mining project at the international level that was approved but then brought to a halt because of environmental destruction. Other tentative projects are the ones planned near the Canary Islands. The so-called “grandmothers of the Canary Islands” are composed of more than 100 seamounts that cover the bottom of the sea, located about 269 miles

south of the island of El Hierro. They are extinct submarine volcanoes with important mineral deposits of manganese crusts, polymetallic nodules, and phosphorites. The European Union has formally declared that the grandmothers of the Canary Islands are a strategic reserve of raw materials necessary for the energy transition.

On the other hand, European countries and the EU have made the security of the supply of raw materials one of their priorities. It encourages the exploration of new frontiers and innovative mining methods under the pretext that the ecological transition requires the use of rare minerals such as cobalt used for the batteries of electrical devices.

We refuse to use the ecological transition to go and exploit and destroy the seabed!

The "Sustainable Blue Economy" strategy adopted by the European Commission foresees that the EU defends the conditional exploitation of seabed mineral resources in the international area after sufficient research has been carried out on the impact on the marine environment, biodiversity, and human activities.

The Federation of Young European Greens (FYEG) is unambiguous: our biodiversity has to be protected – whether on land or underground.

We must make our continent a global leader in sustainable development. When building a sustainable Europe, we cannot forget to protect our seabed.

### **WHAT WE STAND FOR:**

- Ban on deep-sea mining in European waters as well as on the continent.
- Ban on processing minerals from the seabed in Europe and ban on importing products containing minerals from the seabed into Europe (similar to the ban on conflict minerals).
- Ban private deep-sea mining research projects and those for economic purposes, and only fund public deep-sea science research projects, such as those by academia and international institutions, that look into sustainable methods and contribute to our understanding of deep-sea ecosystems, in order to form a scientific consensus that deep sea mining can be done sustainably.

- Increase waste recycling rates to 80% to recover raw materials and facilitate recycling across Member States, by giving Member States with the capacity to mass-recycle the possibility to buy disposed material from other Member States. Special attention is given to the recycling of e-waste, thus precious minerals and metals used for the production of technology in order to phase-out mining. To increase and improve waste recycling, European legislation should require producers to design products so that they can be easily recycled, for example by not mixing plastic with paper packaging.
- Producers have to sell products designed to last as long as possible. Producing products that stop working after an artificially short amount of time is not only a burden for the consumers, but also the environment since it increases demand for new products, and therefore resources. To alleviate the pressure on our environment, and to reduce the need for underwater mining, artificial lifetime limitations, including negligent or avoidable obsolescence, must be banned across Europe. To stimulate the production and purchase of sustainable products, the lifespan of consumer technologies has to be included on its packaging.
- Enabling a local and decentralized repair industry on national and European level, by providing financial and educational incentives to create local repair shops that can perform repairs on the widest range of goods possible at the lowest prices possible.
- Ban the design of products that can exclusively be repaired by the manufacturers of the product.
- The right to repair must be enshrined in European law. All consumer technologies should be able to be repaired by consumers themselves when needed. This includes creating legislation that sets minimum design requirements to ensure easy disassembly and replacement of key components. Similarly, producing products that are difficult or impossible to be repaired is a burden for consumers and the environment as it leads to unnecessary excess demand.

We call for respect for the biodiversity of the seabed and respect for the right of marine biodiversity to develop freely without human intervention.

Through this motion, we want to affirm our refusal to participate in this race for scarce resources which is destructive to our marine biodiversity and which brings nothing.

## **R7new Tax the Rich to Save the Climate**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 While the rich are disproportionately responsible for the climate emergency and  
2 environmental degradation, it is mainly the poor who are suffering their  
3 consequences. The links between the climate, environmental and social crises  
4 must be recognized. They are not three separate crises, but manifestations of  
5 one single problem: capitalist exploitation.

6 Between 1990 and 2015, the richest decile of the world's population was  
7 responsible for more than half of greenhouse gas emissions. Greenhouse gas  
8 emissions from the "richest 1%" of our planet have increased since the Paris  
9 Agreement was signed and are likely to increase even more by 2030<sup>1</sup>. These  
10 striking disparities are the result of completely different lifestyles, as  
11 evidenced, for example, by disparities in airplane use. One percent of the  
12 world's population is responsible for half of the emissions caused by aviation,  
13 while 90% of world's population have never flown<sup>2</sup>.

14 These environmental inequalities take many forms and are present at all scales.  
15 On the one hand, the habits of the most affluent are more harmful to the  
16 environment and contribute more to climate change than those of the least  
17 affluent. On the other hand, exposure to environmental pollution and climate  
18 change is unequal. Poorer people live in neighborhoods with higher pollution of  
19 nitrogen dioxide<sup>3</sup>, a gas produced during the burning of fossil fuels that  
20 worsens symptoms of asthma and reduces lung function growth<sup>4</sup>. Worryingly, the  
21 World Health Organization notes for Europe that: "although air pollution levels  
22 have decreased over recent years, inequalities in exposure persist"<sup>5</sup>. In the  
23 French Île-de-France region, for example, waste treatment facilities, such as  
24 incinerators, are often located in low-income neighborhoods<sup>6</sup>. Similarly, the  
25 poorest have fewer opportunities to adapt to climate change; they tend to have  
26 less access to green spaces that could help to cool off during heat waves, and  
27 it is more difficult to move away from high risk areas, such as regions  
28 threatened by rising sea levels and flooding. Nothing justifies that those who  
29 contribute most to climate change and the destruction of our environment can  
30 escape the consequences, for example by living in air-conditioned houses in  
31 areas where the impacts of climate change are less.

The Federation of Young European Greens works for a better recognition of environmental inequalities. These should be taken into account systematically by public authorities. Public authorities in Europe must fight any form of environmental inequality at all scales. Their efforts must go beyond encouraging individual consumer action. We need a paradigm shift.

Moreover, we must be extremely vigilant with regard to products that promise to have a lesser environmental and climatic impact. In response to the awareness of the climate and environmental emergency, more and more products have been put on the market that promise to be good for the planet and humanity. Organic food, fair trade products, electric vehicles, and carbon offsetting programmes often have a lower environmental and climate impact and are produced under better working conditions, but they are by far too expensive for the majority of the population. Thus, they are only accessible to the most affluent who can afford the luxury of ethical and environmental consumption choices. Worse, the promotion of these products conveys the idea that one must belong at least to the middle class to save the world. Even if it is imperative to reduce the impact of consumption on the planet and to improve the conditions of production, this cannot be achieved by adding a few more fair trade products to the shelves of our supermarkets. It must be a systemic change that includes helping the poor and raising social and environmental standards dramatically. The wealthy don't save the world. They destroy it. Capitalism relies on the exploitation of workers and nature and creates these massive inequalities. To fight inequality at its root cause, we need to fundamentally change our economic system. Taxing wealth can only be a first step in creating an equal society.

FYEG is fighting against all forms of inequality, for climate justice and environmental justice. Since these struggles are intimately linked, we cannot fight the climate emergency without fighting social inequalities and vice versa. We must fight against environmental inequalities, notably by making the wealthiest pay:

- Taxes on income and capital must be more progressive, including by an introduction of a wealth tax for the whole of Europe.
- We call on the European Union, or its Member States by lack of such EU power, to levy a higher carbon tax rate for luxury products and on European states outside the EU to introduce such analogous measure. The rental, purchase and maintenance of yachts, for example, should be heavily taxed according to their environmental impact. The EU should push for such a Union-wide tax to be implemented as soon as possible.
- European countries should close their airspaces to private jets. The

Single European Sky initiative should support this prohibition. European countries should also close their ports to luxury private yachts.

- Environmental and climate policies must be subjected to rigorous scrutiny by an academically diverse, independent authority to identify their potentially regressive impacts. We must avoid at all costs that the poorest and disproportionately people of colour already exploited by the capitalist economy, are disproportionately impacted by these policies.
- Revenues generated by the above-mentioned measures must be used to combat the effects of environmental inequalities and to support the poorest. Environmental and climate policies should not be a burden for poor people and people of colour; they must be designed so as to benefit them.
- Environmental inequalities are also occurring in other parts of the world. While environmental standards in Europe are slowly rising, we must make sure that polluting activities are not simply moved to other parts of the world, which would increase environmental inequalities. Carbon offsets are not a solution and should be phased out. Firstly, they come with the inherent risk that they are used by the wealthy as letters of indulgence; having the financial means to be able to buy carbon offsets, those wealthy can thus continue their carbon-intensive lifestyles. Secondly, carbon offset projects have very frequently negative impacts on the local and regional level. For carbon offsets in the Global South for example, forests frequently become inaccessible to the local population, so that tree growth is not hindered. Whilst such projects can have a positive value on the environment, they must be a sufficient balancing of the individual and collective rights of peoples, especially marginalised peoples. Only when the reliability of the carbon offset project is verified by an independent external organ and evaluated on the basis of minimum human rights standards, can its operators sell their commodified carbon certificates. Such balancing is necessary in order to ensure these practices do not induce the poorest to have to pay for the carbon emissions of the wealthy
- The EU needs to re-design its trade and foreign economic policies, to ensure that when receiving crucial resources such as metals to enable the green economic transition, both EU firms and countries, and those countries that provide the EU with the natural resources needed are appropriately compensated. This would entail expanding and ensuring protections and compensation of workers in countries where the resources

are extracted, through setting greater worker rights requirements on natural resource products that enter the EU single market. The EU should support investment to construct natural resource processing infrastructure to ensure that they gain larger shares of the value-added in the global product value chain. Finally, in the process of creating or expanding natural resource extraction projects, the communities affected by these projects should be involved in the decision-making processes in an equitable manner.

- The EU needs to reduce and potentially phase-out in the short- to medium-term the use of carbon offsets to compensate for carbon emissions by both the private and public sector. The use of carbon offsets can ameliorate the effects of cap-and-trade, such as when polluters double count an emission reduction. In the case of carbon offset programs deemed necessary such as the UN's CORSIA scheme the EU needs to ensure that the necessity and use of carbon offsets is reduced. Furthermore, that the carbon offsets are part of EU certified projects, that the EU makes sure that they have little to no externalities, that land prices do not rise disproportionately, that the offsets are able to actually offset the carbon in the short- to medium-term, and that any groups and communities affected from the carbon offset projects are not excluded from the decision-making processes.
- Environmental inequalities are also occurring in other parts of the world. While environmental standards in Europe are slowly rising, we must make sure that polluting activities are not simply moved to other parts of the world, which would increase environmental inequalities. The EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism would be a first step in the right direction, but needs to be complemented by policies for other types of activity.

The Climate emergency, environmental degradation and economic inequalities are intimately linked. Let's fight against all three at the same time, let's tax the rich!

- The Climate emergency, environmental degradation and economic inequalities are intimately linked. Let's fight against all three at the same time, let's tax the rich!

1. <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621305/bn-carbon-inequality-2030-051121-en.pdf>

2. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378020307779>  
(Gössling, Humpe (2020): « The global scale, distribution and growth of aviation: Implications for climate change »)



145 3. [https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/unequal-exposure-and-unequal-](https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/unequal-exposure-and-unequal-impacts)  
146 [impacts](https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/unequal-exposure-and-unequal-impacts) (page 19)

147 4. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-\(outdoor\)-air-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-(outdoor)-air-quality-and-health)  
148 [quality-and-health](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-(outdoor)-air-quality-and-health)

149 5. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325176/9789289054157-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325176/9789289054157-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
150 [eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325176/9789289054157-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) (page 57)

151 6. Ludosky & Toussaint (2020): “Ensemble nous demandons justice. Pour en  
152 finir avec les violences environnementales”

## **R8new No Discrimination on Migration**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 According to the latest data from the UNHCR, more than 4,000,000 Ukrainians left  
2 their country since the beginning of the Russian invasion, seeking asylum in  
3 nearby European countries. With the European Union and European countries openly  
4 denouncing the war, a wave of solidarity has risen in Europe, with thousands of  
5 European citizens having mobilised to welcome and help the Ukrainian refugees,  
6 including through donations and the provision of accommodation.

7 Although this wave of solidarity is admirable and has helped hundreds of  
8 thousands, it is developed jointly with a problematic discourse: indeed, we have  
9 heard that these refugees would be of “quality”, and that our proximity with the  
10 Ukrainian people justified the welcoming efforts, as they are “like us”. This  
11 problematic discourse assesses that non-European refugees would be of “bad  
12 quality” since they are not “like us”: this is uninhibited racism, and it is  
13 unacceptable.

14 All of us thus must fight this discourse, and underline its racist character:  
15 this can no more be the main discourse in the European media, as the FYEG has  
16 previously done, with the #NoDiscriminationOnMigration.

17  
18 Furthermore, we must acknowledge the various marginalised groups made invisible  
19 and swept under the rug in our discourse on asylum. In the Ukrainian context  
20 alone, people of colour, immigrants, ethnic minorities and LGBTQIA+ refugees  
21 faced disproportionately high obstacles in fleeing. In the broader asylum  
22 context, systemic, systematic and social discrimination and obstacles are faced  
23 on the grounds of religion, beliefs, cultural and ethnic origin, gender and  
24 sexual orientation and identity, disability and class. The asylum system within  
25 Europe needs exhaustive and comprehensive reform in order to guarantee the right  
26 to asylum for all peoples.

27 Therefore, following this communication campaign, the Federation of Young  
28 European Greens calls on the European Union and the governments of all European  
29 States to:

- 30 • Welcome and guarantee the right to asylum to all refugees, with special  
31 consideration to the extra obstacles faced by marginalised minorities  
32 whether from Ukraine or any other place in the world, and to accommodate  
33 for these obstacles.
  
- 34 • Stop all pushbacks at the border as well as the deportation of those who  
35 have crossed the border, acknowledging the necessity of humanitarian duty  
36 instead of the construction of "Fortress Europe".
  
- 37 • Replace Frontex and the concept of "Fortress Europe" with a humanitarian  
38 alternative focused on saving and welcoming refugees.
  
- 39 • Immediately stop the criminalisation of people and non-governmental and  
40 civil society organisations devoted to welcoming and helping refugees and  
41 facilitating the movement of these peoples across international waters,  
42 and to finally support these organisations.
  
- 43 • Rather than the persecution of refugee traffickers, combat refugee  
44 trafficking by providing real and legal alternatives to traffickers for  
45 refugees to flee to the EU, especially for refugees fleeing conflicts, or  
46 refugees for whom the journey is too costly and dangerous.
  
- 47 • End as soon as possible EU refugee cooperation treaties with Turkey and  
48 Libya as well as the externalisation of the EU border regime via such  
49 treaties and the funding of autocratic regimes in Africa to stop migration  
50 corridors, which keep out refugees on the basis of their background and  
51 which put the most vulnerable refugees in even more dangerous situations.
  
- 52 • Facilitate and ensure the provision of basic rights and needs to those  
53 seeking asylum such as humane accommodation pending approval of their  
54 asylum process and Europe-wide coordinated processes to ensure asylum  
55 seekers are not left in limbo for years in camps.
  
- 56 • Continue this facilitation and guarantee of basic rights and needs upon  
57 having their application processed and the refugee relocated including but  
58 not limited to language, housing, humane temporary accommodation in  
59 facilities, right to work, healthcare and mental healthcare.
  
- 60 • Within the EU, implement an EU-wide framework truly based on the  
61 principles of solidarity and responsibility sharing for the shared  
62 funding, processing and relocation of asylum seekers and refugees, wherein

the Dublin regulation is abolished, Member States with the most resources live up to their commitments to relocate refugees with an enforcement mechanism to ensure this, as well as mechanisms that provide funding for the processing of asylum seekers and coordinate the relocation of refugees in a manner that is finally fairly and justly divided between Member States based on their capacity.

Together, we must stand up against racism. Always. Everywhere.

## **R9new On solidarity with Ukraine**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 Russia launched a full-scale military invasion of Ukraine on 24th February 2022,  
2 after years of hybrid aggression starting from 2014. The invasion has been  
3 widely condemned internationally, and the actions inflicted by the Russian  
4 Federation have been nothing short of war crimes.

#### **An urgent and coordinated international response**

5  
6 We call for full commitment to ending the war. The ruling of the International  
7 Court of Justice (ICJ) on 16th March 2022 has made it clear that the Russian  
8 Federation is in breach of international law. The ICJ must now have the process  
9 accelerated to have the Russian Federation tried for genocide. We also call for  
10 Putin to be tried for war crimes at the International Criminal Court. We demand  
11 the immediate withdrawal of all Russian troops from the territories of Ukraine,  
12 as well as from Georgia and Moldova.

13 We condemn the political leaders who are delaying the supply of arms to the  
14 Armed Forces of Ukraine by spreading misinformation about their help or denying  
15 Ukraine's requests even for defensive weaponry, specifically by German  
16 Chancellor Olaf Scholz. We call for the sanctioning of openly pro-Putin  
17 politicians in Europe, in particular Viktor Orban and the Hungarian government,  
18 as well as Aleksandar Vučić and the Serbian Government who do not agree to  
19 impose sanctions on the Russian Federation by breaking the common European front  
20 and repeating Russian disinformation in the state media.

21 We also call for equal sanctions for Belarus. Lukashenka and all his allies  
22 involved in cooperating with Putin, participating in war crimes in Ukraine, and  
23 torturing civilians in Belarus must be held accountable. Lukashenka's support  
24 for Putin's actions must be classified as aiding, abetting and otherwise  
25 facilitating deliberate or indiscriminate attacks against the civilian  
26 population of Ukraine.

27 After the urgent end to the conflict, the reconstruction of Ukrainian  
28 infrastructure must be financed from Russian reparations. If this is not

achieved, the European Union, the States participating in the EEA and Schengen should finance, and the costs should be distributed in proportion to the expenditure on Russian gas, oil and uranium, which financed the Kremlin's activities. The European Union must also accelerate the process to grant EU candidate status to Ukraine with accession to closely follow.

### **Long-term peace and security**

As Young Greens we stand for a broad and inclusive approach to establishing peace, through the protection of human rights, rule of law, and international justice. When these principles are compromised and lives are at risk, the international community must come together to end the conflict. To this end, we call on the EU for the rapid deployment of interoperable EU military forces with the aim of peace enforcement and civilian protection, and to restore the legal borders of Ukraine with Crimea and Donbas, granted in the Budapest Memorandum in 1994.

FYEG supports the oil, gas, coal and uranium embargo on Russia to stop financing Putin's war. The embargo must come hand in hand with a just transition to renewables for a democratisation of Europe's energy with social protections to prevent the cost being burdened by citizens. At the same time, Europe must not transfer any materials for weapon production to Russia. We condemn Western companies that continue operating in Russia thereby supporting the stability of the Putin's regime by paying taxes to the repressive machine, and helping to circumvent sanctions imposed by democracies to reduce military aggression against Ukraine.

As Ukraine is a major exporter of grains and the world's largest supplier of sunflower oil, the war has led to supply shortages. This has resulted in increased prices in Europe and risks amplifying famine in Africa and the Middle East. It is urgent for the international community to intervene to end the conflict, to prevent an elongated period of food insecurity brought on by the war. A way to do so is to indefinitely suspend all trade duties and tariffs charged to Ukraine to help them get through the conflict and reconstruction.

### **No one left behind**

The EU must also provide and support the distribution of humanitarian aid to Ukraine. Currently, Russian troops are reported to be blocking the transit of civilians and aid. Safe passage must be granted to civilians and for the transportation of medicines and other forms of aid. We also call for the supply of veterinarian aid and food for animals to be fairly distributed. Action must be taken to preserve the cultural heritage from destruction through military action

The war has brought increased sexual violence against women both in Ukraine and those displaced. And yet, many are denied necessary sexual and reproductive healthcare services such as abortion either in Ukrainian hospitals or in Poland. Every European country should provide the necessary healthcare to all Ukrainians arriving in their country, including sexual and reproductive health services and psychological support.

Human trafficking has also increased, particularly of women and children. The EU should work with humanitarian organisations to provide a safe passage to those crossing borders and to prevent children from being separated from their families.

More than 11 million people in Ukraine have fled the country and over 7 million have become Internally Displaced Persons (IDP). Meanwhile, horrifying stories have emerged that some Ukrainians are being illegally deported to Russia, who must immediately be retrieved and taken to a place of safety. While we support the EU's decision to welcome refugees from Ukraine, European leaders must not forget refugees fleeing war and oppression from elsewhere. We demand a humane EU asylum and migration policy with safe passage to the EU for all refugees and migrants.

From the aspect of bigger inclusion in society, we would like to suggest to European local communities and institutions opening free and official language courses for refugees from Ukraine who will be able to learn the language of the country where they are in. Language is something that people need every day and with free language courses, everyday life will become easier for refugees in European countries.

### **Conclusion**

The Federation of Young European Greens wholeheartedly expresses its solidarity with the people of Ukraine. We strongly condemn the violence and horrors inflicted by the Russian Federation. The whole of Europe must stand together with Ukraine to provide support to civilians and ensure that justice is brought.

## R9original On solidarity with Ukraine

Proposer: ?????? ?????? ???????? (Zelena molod?  
Ukrayiny), Protests, Ostra Ziele?, Jong  
Groen, DWARS, Groenlinkse Jongeren,  
????????????? ???????? ???????? (Belarusian  
Young Greens), Democracy and Inclusion  
Working Group, FYEG Executive  
Committee

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

1 Russia launched a full-scale military invasion of Ukraine on 24th February 2022,  
2 after years of aggression starting from 2014. The invasion has been widely  
3 condemned internationally, and the actions inflicted by President Vladimir Putin  
4 have been nothing short of war crimes.

### 5 An urgent and coordinated international response

6 We call for full commitment to ending the war. The ruling of the International  
7 Court of Justice (ICJ) on 16th March 2022 has made it clear that the Russian  
8 Federation is in breach of international law. The ICJ must now have the process  
9 accelerated to have the Russian Federation tried for genocide. We also call for  
10 Putin to be tried for war crimes at the International Criminal Court. We demand  
11 the immediate withdrawal of all Russian troops from the territories of Ukraine,  
12 as well as from Georgia and Moldova.

13 We condemn the political leaders who are delaying the supply of arms to the  
14 Armed Forces of Ukraine by spreading misinformation about their help or denying  
15 Ukraine's requests even for defensive weaponry, specifically by German  
16 Chancellor Olaf Scholz. We call for the sanctioning of openly pro-Putin  
17 politicians in Europe, in particular Viktor Orban and the Hungarian government,  
18 as well as Aleksandar Vučić and the Serbian Government who do not agree to  
19 impose sanctions on the Russian Federation by breaking the common European front  
20 and repeating Russian disinformation in the state media.

21 We also call for equal sanctions for Belarus. Lukashenka and all his allies  
22 involved in cooperating with Putin, participating in war crimes in Ukraine, and



torturing civilians in Belarus must be held accountable. Lukashenka's support for Putin's actions must be classified as aiding, abetting and otherwise facilitating deliberate or indiscriminate attacks against the civilian population of Ukraine.

After the urgent end to the conflict, the reconstruction of Ukrainian infrastructure must be financed from Russian reparations. If this is not achieved, the European Union, the States participating in the EEA and Schengen should finance, and the costs should be distributed in proportion to the expenditure on Russian gas and oil, which financed the Kremlin's activities. The European Union must also accelerate the process to grant EU candidate status to Ukraine with accession to closely follow.

### **Long-term peace and security**

As Young Greens we stand for a broad and inclusive approach to establishing peace, through the protection of human rights, rule of law, and international justice. When these principles are compromised and lives are at risk, the international community must come together to end the conflict. To this end, we call on the EU for the rapid deployment of interoperable EU military forces with the aim of peace enforcement and civilian protection, and to restore the legal borders of Ukraine with Crimea and Donbass, granted in the Budapest Memorandum in 1994.

FYEG supports the oil, gas and coal embargo on Russia to stop financing Putin's war. The embargo must come hand in hand with a just transition to renewables for a democratisation of Europe's energy with social protections to prevent the cost being burdened by citizens. At the same time, Europe must not transfer any materials for weapon production to Russia.

As Ukraine is a major exporter of grains and the world's largest supplier of sunflower oil, the war has led to supply shortages. This has resulted in increased prices in Europe and risks amplifying famine in Africa and the Middle East. It is urgent for the international community to intervene to end the conflict, to prevent an elongated period of food insecurity brought on by the war.

### **No one left behind**

The EU must also provide and support the distribution of humanitarian aid to Ukraine. Currently, Russian troops are reported to be blocking the transit of civilians and aid. Safe passage must be granted to civilians and for the transportation of medicines and other forms of aid. We also call for the supply of veterinarian aid and food for animals to be fairly distributed.

The war has brought increased sexual violence against women both in Ukraine and those displaced. And yet, many are denied necessary sexual and reproductive healthcare services such as abortion either in Ukrainian hospitals or in Poland. Every European country should provide the necessary healthcare to all Ukrainians arriving in their country, including sexual and reproductive health services and psychological support.

Human trafficking has also increased, particularly of women and children. The EU should work with humanitarian organisations to provide a safe passage to those crossing borders and to prevent children from being separated from their families.

More than 11 million people in Ukraine have fled the country and over 7 million have become Internally Displaced Persons (IDP). Meanwhile, horrifying stories have emerged that some Ukrainians are being illegally deported to Russia, who must immediately be retrieved and taken to a place of safety. While we support the EU's decision to welcome refugees from the Ukraine, European leaders must not forget refugees fleeing war and oppression from elsewhere. We demand a humane EU asylum and migration policy with safe passage to the EU for all refugees and migrants.

## **Conclusion**

The Federation of Young European Greens wholeheartedly expresses its solidarity with the people of Ukraine. We strongly condemn the violence and horrors inflicted by the Russian Federation. The whole of Europe must stand together with Ukraine to provide support to civilians and ensure that justice is brought.

## **R10new Barcelona vs Lobbies — Stop Lawfare, Protect Our Right to The City**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 During the last years, the political landscape in many institutions at different  
2 levels has changed, bringing the option of developing and putting forward real  
3 progressive, transformative and green policies. The possibilities, limits and  
4 potentialities of progressive and green organisations in government, including  
5 compromising or keeping the relations with social movements, has been triggering  
6 a great debate within the Green Family. We consider that being able to bring  
7 real ambition and being brave in policy-making is something to celebrate, and we  
8 should make the best of the trust that electors put on our proposals. Political  
9 parties and organisations thrive with the development of political and  
10 ideological debates in the context of policy-making and the creation of  
11 proposals, and we also welcome these experiences in the context of legislative  
12 chambers at all levels and other cross-party spaces. Sadly, we have witnessed  
13 how trying to start certain debates or implement specific policies which  
14 challenge the status-quo has prompted the reaction of elite groups that hold  
15 lots of economic and social power. These groups do not have anything to do with  
16 democratic representation of the people: big corporations that make profit of  
17 people's rights, seeing that their privileges are at risk, are (mis)using legal  
18 tools with the aims of political thuggery and damaging the image of the  
19 institutions and trying to put an end to the policies and legal frames that  
20 protect the rights of the citizens.

21 These practices, called lawfare, are persistently being used by big corporations  
22 that make profit of basic rights, such as housing, access to water and breathing  
23 clear air, in Barcelona as a response to the proposals of the progressive and  
24 green local government of the city. Once the institutions started tackling the  
25 privileges of big private corporations and putting forward a set of proposals in  
26 line with the general interest and the right to the city, those lobbies started  
27 legal procedures against the government of the city as political weapons. This  
28 follows a clear agenda of trying to stop the public servants from fulfilling  
29 their commitments. During the last seven years, the members of the local  
30 government of Barcelona received 11 lawsuits, and 10 of them have already been  
31 dismissed.

All these lawsuits are always being put forward by legal entities that are closely related to real estate corporations, vulture funds, the multinational company in charge of the management of the water of the city, but also the automotive sector and the tourism lobby. During the last two mandates, Barcelona has been a leader in developing policies that contribute to achieving the right to the city: housing policies and putting an end to the privatisation of the water to manage it as a common good. Also, green policies have been implemented to reduce the air and noise pollution due to cars, foster the use of public transport and active mobility (walking and biking) and increase the healthy and green areas in the city. In this sense, mass media, in general not independent from these economic powers, is also joining this campaign of delegitimation. Traditional media and online pamphlets are spreading fake news and feeding the anti-political narrative, putting at the same level politicians facing charges for corruption with this legal abuse.

With this resolution, the Federation of Young European Greens:

- Welcome the brave proposals put forward by Barcelona en Comú at the Barcelona City Council government for the past 7 years and welcome such proposals in other local governments.
- Endorse the green and progressive organisation in the upcoming 2023 municipal elections and similar organisations in other elections in the future.
- Show its solidarity with Mayor Ada Colau and the Barcelona en Comú councilors as well as government officials across the Member States in the local government, who are being victims of this prosecution solely for prioritising the rights of Barcelonians
- Urge the corresponding institutions to put an end to the privilege of big corporations that are making profit of our rights, including housing, water supply, and healthy cities, and stop them from employing lawfare schemes against political parties and organisations which are developing progressive policies to move forward into equal access to the right to the city
- Calls for initiatives on both national and European levels to enact legislation limiting the maximum amount of money that can be spent on lobbying by individuals or (corporate) organisations, eventually with a ban on corporate lobbying, and the facilitation of lobbying by and

67 consultation of civil society organisations and academia.

### **Reason**

The 2023 Spanish municipal elections are coming close. Fortunately, in Barcelona we have had the pleasure of having a fearless, progressive local government that has implemented the most ambitious, innovative policies towards a greener, more equal city. This has, however, come at a cost—the wealthy ruling class and all major lobbies have begun a lawfare strategy, targeting individual Barcelona en Comú councilors. The only reason behind it: prioritising policies that benefit all Barcelonians in major issues such as housing and the right to a greener city.

## R11new No To Airport Expansions — Not in Barcelona, Not Anywhere

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

1 In the context of climate emergency, when science and activists worldwide are  
2 urging for the decarbonisation of the global economy, the transport sector plays  
3 a major role. Specifically, air transport requires a massive reformulation  
4 effort. Despite the warnings –and obviousness– regarding the high impact of  
5 aviation on the environment, the operators of several major European airports  
6 are putting forward expansion proposals. Scaling up these facilities is in line  
7 with a strategy of growth in the aviation sector that is in clear contradiction  
8 with the need for decarbonisation. These are consequences of our economic system  
9 and policies that are based on the exploitation of people and the environment.  
10 In this system, corporations are making profit at the expense of our rights to  
11 live in a healthy environment.

12 In Spain, the national airport operator AENA has put forward plans to expand  
13 virtually all major Spanish airports. In the case of Barcelona - El Prat  
14 Airport, the expansion project envisions a new terminal and the extension of one  
15 the airport's three runways, with the goal of reaching 70 million passengers per  
16 year by 2030. The airport is located right by the Llobregat Delta, a space of  
17 critical ecological importance within the dense, heavily urbanized Barcelona  
18 conurbation. There are several swamps and two main lagoons around the airport  
19 area, one of which would be removed to allocate the runway extension. Overall,  
20 the Barcelona Airport expansion project would generate the following negative  
21 impacts:

- 22 • Massive biodiversity loss, as 43 protected bird species, fish and reptiles  
23 would be deprived of their natural ecosystem
- 24 • Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions coming from airport operations would surge  
25 by 33%, which go in the opposite direction of international agreements to  
26 reduce drastically overall emissions by 2030
- 27 • Direct health impact due to air and noise pollution generated by airport

activity, such as cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, as well as an impact on the mental health of airport workers, passengers, and nearby residents; also, an indirect, global health impact from increased GHG emissions contributing to climate change worldwide should be considered.

- 10 million additional tourists would visit Barcelona annually, further increasing pressure on public services, and speeding up gentrification, directly impacting on the inhabitants' housing rights
- A model based on an unstoppable growth which benefits big companies fostering ecocide capitalism, undermining the very universal right to live in a habitable planet
- 1.7 billion euro would be lost to an unupdated and unsustainable transport system; instead this budget should be allocated to improve and expand the local rail network, with a focus on night trains and international connections—as of 2019, 54.5% of airport passengers could be provided with competitive rail alternatives

With this resolution, the Federation of Young European Greens:

- Call on the appropriate authorities and institutions to protect the environment and health by halting all expansion plans of all European airport operators, which constitute a threat for a green and just transition.
- Urge all European countries and institutions, specially those that are members of the European Union, to develop a competitive intra-european train network, creating new cross-border services through high-speed and night trains, with the goal of reducing airplane use.
- Urges the European Commission to revise the 2014 Aviation Guidelines, adopting new rules halting state aid to airlines, airports, and airport expansion and nonessential infrastructure investment projects of already developed airports, with the continued exemptions of 'very small airports' meeting the criteria to constitute a Service of General Economic Interest (SGEI) insofar a competitive train or sea alternative is not feasible

- Urges national European governments and European institutions to put forward a ban on air routes where a competitive rail alternative exists, as was already approved by France on national air routes where an alternative rail service with travel times under 2.5 hours is offered. Competitiveness shall also include an assessment based on costs alongside duration
- Call on the European Commission to create an air carbon tax that may be dynamically adjusted depending on the distance and the existence of competitive rail alternatives over the same route; the obtained revenue should be used to further develop competitive rail alternatives, with the intention to discourage frequent flying.
- Call on civil society and local governments on showing their discontent with such projects and claim for a green and just transition

## Reason

It may look like science fiction, but national administrations across Europe are still pushing for airport expansions. As air traffic is a major greenhouse gas (GHG) emitter, it makes no sense to keep subsidizing airlines and funding airport expansions; instead, all European institutions should coordinate to provide competitive rail alternatives on all major air routes across Europe. In the case of Barcelona Airport, the proposed expansion project envisions removing an entire lagoon in the Llobregat Delta, an area of the outmost ecological importance in the Barcelona metropolitan area.



## **R12 End the Fossil Fuel Economy. Now.**

Proposer: FYEG Executive Committee  
Agenda item: 4. Resolutions  
Status: Withdrawn

### **Motion text**

Energy prices are rising exponentially, while fossil fuel companies are making record profits. Governments spend millions of tax money on subsidizing them. At the same time, the increasing inflation makes basic needs a luxury, while wages are drastically losing value. At this moment, many people cannot pay for their basic needs, don't know how to pay their energy bills and homelessness is on the rise. Meanwhile, the fossil fuel dependence of the European Union continues to fill Russia's bank accounts for continuing the war in Ukraine, causing unspeakable destruction and losses. And on top of that the European Commission contributes to the green washing of fossil fuels by labeling fossil natural gas as "sustainable investment". Furthermore, policies on phasing out fossil fuels are being blocked by the Energy Charter Treaty that allows energy corporations to put forward compensation claims to states if the former deem their investments and expected profits have been damaged by policy changes. This has led to climate friendly policies becoming a financial risk for all states as big fossil fuel companies are currently suing European states for fossil fuel phase outs and demand several billion euros.

The economic system is deeply rotten, providing more and more money for the richest companies that massively destroy our planet and human lives, while the majority of peoples' living situations become more precarious than ever. This can only be tackled by a drastic revolution of our energy system. Only by phasing out fossil fuels by 2030 and massively increasing subsidies, jobs and resources in renewable energies, the earth overheating can be limited, while at the same time ensuring a democratization of the energy system and the European independence from authoritarian regimes that are a serious threat to human lives and human rights. Fossil fuel companies will never stop exploiting the earth and working with oppressive regimes, unless we don't remove their profit by nationalizing them and replacing them as an energy source.

Therefore, we demand all European Countries

- to immediately stop all fossil fuel subsidies

- to immediately stop the import of oil and gas, especially coming from dictatorships and LNG production
- to drastically increase the taxation of fossil fuel companies
- to put a cap on profits in the energy sector
- to nationalize all fossil fuel companies with the goal of closing them down
- to massively expand renewable energy production
- to redirect all current fossil fuel subsidies into renewable energy projects
- to put in place effective measures that keep energy prices affordable for everyone
- to immediately pull out of the Energy Charter Treaty and stop its further expansion

Furthermore, we ask the European Commission to immediately withdraw its declaration of gas as sustainable.

## **R13new Red Card for Sportwashing**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

One of the principles of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity. We understand that human dignity should neither be exclusive to nor withheld from any ethnicity, gender, language, religion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Unfortunately, sports have been instrumentalised by certain countries and regimes to hide their record of grave human rights violations and at times glorify a personality cult to serve as a distraction. This is called sportwashing. A very notorious case is the 1936 Summer and Winter Olympics hosted by and held in Nazi Germany. Going into recent times, more and more cases of sportwashing are being committed: the 2018 FIFA World Cup in Russia, the 2022 Winter Olympics in China, and the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar to name some. The preparations for the latter are being plagued by cases of migrant workers working under dangerous conditions with little to no pay, extremely low standards of living, and deaths caused by preventable workplace accidents.

We young greens believe that no country which engages in severe human rights abuses such as forced labour, genocide, and war crimes may be allowed to host major international sport tournaments such as but not limited to Olympic Games and world championships. Furthermore, similarly severe human rights abuses such as forced labour, forced displacement, and persecution of national and cultural minorities in the process of preparing for these games are unacceptable and should lead to the host country being changed or the games suspended, as well as other sanctions (e.g. fines or bans from future competitions).

Therefore we, the Federation of Young European Greens, call for:

- a reform of the International Olympic Committee's Code of Ethics where severe human rights abuses in the process of preparing for the games should lead to the host country being changed or the games suspended, as well as other sanctions where necessary (e.g. fines or bans from future competitions);

- 30 • a reform of the Rule of Conduct for Host Countries and the hosting process  
31 where human rights abuses in the process of preparing for the games must  
32 at all times be avoided, where countries with history of human rights  
33 violations must closely consult and be supervised by the International  
34 Olympic Committee, and in case of violation an appropriate sanction can be  
35 put on the host country;
  
- 36 • to apply these provisions analogously to international sports federations  
37 with their respective international sporting events and competitions;
  
- 38 • Sports clubs to be prevented from being acquired by states for the purpose  
39 of sportswashing;
  
- 40 • the revival of the Olympic Truce as an absolute requirement during the  
41 Olympic Games. It means no country will engage in an armed conflict seven  
42 days before the start of each Olympic Games and until the eighth day after  
43 the conclusion of the Paralympics. Its violation by any aggressor or  
44 attacking state should also be sanctioned forcefully.

## **R14 Let Trans People Play!**

Proposer: Jong Groen, DWARS  
Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 During its General Assembly in 2020, the FYEG unanimously adopted the resolution  
2 "Trans Rights Are Human Rights." As a complement, this present resolution wishes  
3 to tackle an area where trans people are gradually discriminated against, and  
4 where (uninformed) prejudices against them still prevail: sports.

5 In sports, the category of women is defined as people with certain physical &  
6 physiological characteristics, so as to maintain fair competition. However, this  
7 does not justify the discrimination against trans women who want to take part in  
8 sports. Australia's Laura Hubbard and the USA's Lia Thomas are at the forefront  
9 of the current struggle of trans athletes to be able to participate in high-  
10 level sports events.

11 It is a grave misconception that people would go through a fundamental  
12 transition like gender affirmation for any other reason than their gender  
13 identification. It is plain false to claim that trans women are dominating  
14 women's sports or trans women have undergone their transition to win and  
15 dominate women's sports. This is simply transphobia and it has no place in our  
16 society.

17 A recent literature study shows that there is no conclusive evidence for trans  
18 athletes who have undergone or are undergoing hormone replacement therapy,  
19 especially trans women athletes, to have a significant, let alone  
20 disproportionate advantage over their cisgender counterparts in the same  
21 discipline. Moreover, every person has a different body type and thus there  
22 exists a wide physiological diversity even among trans athletes, much as there  
23 is of the same among cis athletes. Therefore, it is absolutely not justified to  
24 ban transgender athletes from sports.

25 Genuine concern for women in sports entails that issues concerning equal  
26 treatment of women in sports clubs, organisations, leagues, and federations  
27 should be addressed, such as but not limited to unequal pay between men and  
28 women in the same sports discipline whether elite, professional or amateur, and  
29 equally meaningful participation of women athletes in sports governing bodies

starting from the sports clubs going up. Women athletes and women's clubs should be set on equal footing with their male counterparts.

Furthermore, a societal shift with regards to the perception of trans people in sports is necessary – for example, better education about trans issues in schools and sports organisations, and consistent punishment of transphobic behaviour within sports (for both fans and athletes).

We, the Federation of Young European Greens, reaffirming our commitment to uphold transgender rights as human rights and to end discrimination against transgenders, while recognising the limits within the realm of sports:

- stand by the International Olympic Committee's policy of allowing all trans women who have undergone or are undergoing hormone replacement therapy, who meet the required hormone levels, to participate in women's sports, sports federations and lower-level competitions, taking into consideration physical safety concerns upon exercising a certain sport discipline, until a more comprehensive policy is made based on scientific evidence;
- reiterate our call for (better) education on transgender issues to clear up misconceptions on and promote the inclusion of transgender people, not only in sports but also in our society as a whole;
- call on the European Union, its Member States, and international sports federations to promote and facilitate more research into transgender people in sports, so as to better balance inclusivity and fairness in sports policies;
- call on sports organisations to treat women athletes on equal footing with their male counterparts, including but not limited to paying women athletes and teams equally as their men counterparts on the same discipline and level;
- call on sport organisations to react properly on transphobic behaviour in sports, by fans, athletes, staff and anyone else involved, through specific codes of conduct and regulations, with appropriate sanctions such as stadium bans, disqualifications etc.

## **R15new The Manifesto of the Generation in Crisis**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 At the end of 2021, in agreement with the European Parliament and the Council,  
2 the European Commission declared 2022 as the European Year of Youth.

3 We are worried. We are the generation that has been living from crisis to a  
4 crisis. When we were born, the world was already in crisis. When we were born,  
5 the world was already 0.5 degrees warmer. When we were born, we were already  
6 beyond 350 ppm; which is the “safe” level of carbon dioxide.

7 This generation has witnessed several economic crises, record levels of  
8 unemployment, a housing crisis, a global pandemic and wars in Europe. All while  
9 grappling with the effects of the climate crisis.

10 We are not the “Next Generation Europe”, we are THIS Generation Europe and we  
11 are in a crisis.

12 **We lost two years of our education, work, mental health and life to the poor**  
13 **political decisions made in this pandemic!**

14 The EU has declared 2022 the Year of Youth, saying it is in recognition of the  
15 sacrifices the younger generation had to make during the pandemic. However, the  
16 proposals they have made so far fall short to respond to the real sacrifices we  
17 made during the pandemic.

18 Our schools closed down. Not all of us had the means to participate in remote  
19 learning, especially those of us from marginalised backgrounds. Some of us have  
20 dropped out of education and will not return. For those that stayed, it was very  
21 hard to find the incentive and energy to focus on our studies, with no end in  
22 sight to the pandemic. Yet we were expected to deliver the same results.

23 Those of us staying in a different place than our homes had to either return  
24 home or stay in towns where our universities were and pay ever increasing rents  
25 and dormitory fees. For example, in September 2020 the University of Manchester

encouraged the students to go to the campus and promised them face-to-face classes that were finally canceled two days before the course started. The students were trapped and forced to pay for accommodation that was in bad condition.

We, students, rely on part-time jobs to pay our tuition fees and sustain ourselves while studying. During COVID-19 restrictions bars and restaurants were closed and many students were unable to find part-time jobs. In France, students had to queue for food handouts.

Since the onset of the pandemic, the youth unemployment rate in the EU has risen from 15.8% to 19.5% (Eurostat). Those who didn't lose their jobs saw a reduction in their income. According to the research done by the European Youth Forum, one in every four young people reported a decrease in their income (Beyond Lockdown - the pandemic scar on young people).

Young people were hardest hit in the 2008 global financial crisis. That crisis has not only led to very high youth unemployment rates in Europe but also a stance among political decision-makers that "any job is better than none". That left us with unpaid internships, gig-workers, zero hour contracts. The current generation of young people were already worse off than their predecessors and now we are facing the biggest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Additionally, we are in a mental health crisis. Young people all over Europe are sounding the alarms for the drastic rise in mental health and wellbeing issues. The crises we have witnessed ever since we were born and the current economic system driving them have greatly impacted this generation. The rising levels of young people living with burn-out, anxieties and depression show that we have yet to receive the much needed essential aid that was promised to us. With the greater waiting times and overloaded health care, we need more than just raising awareness.

We were promised a good life. And we have been denied. Especially the racialised youth, gender and sexual minorities, disabled youth, migrant youth have been denied.

One year of youth is not going to solve our problems.

**We do not need festivals. We need real change!**

As FYEG we are concerned that this Year of Youth will result in a lot of stylish campaigns, but very little substance. We are worried that decisions about young people will be made without consulting us at every step of the way. We are worried that the leaders will invite young people to meetings only to listen to



us, but not to take the much needed action afterwards. We want to see outcomes from the European Year of Youth exist beyond 2022.

Without concrete actions, the European Year of Youth will only remain as youth washing and we have seen enough of that. What young people really need is hope. Hope that there is a way out of these crises and that the people in power do not only care about their position, but about our future.

This Manifesto therefore demands:

- The European Year of Youth should not be limited to young people from EU member states but should also involve young people from the UK, the Western Balkans and EU Partnership countries.
- The civil space for youth organisations in Europe has been shrinking. We are very worried that the words of the European Commission are not followed by concrete actions. A strong youth sector is key to ensure that young people from all backgrounds can have access to a safe space to engage and grow as active citizens.
- The increase in the overall Erasmus+ budget should be reflected in the operating grants that youth civil society organisations receive. Even though the Erasmus+ budget has been doubled, the operating grants have remained the same. In a European Year of Youth, we need strong European youth organisations. The operating grant support should be tripled and distributed to more organizations. Especially youth organisations that target marginalised young people should be given a priority.
- The European Commission should provide small funding opportunities to formal and informal youth organisations to organise “pilot” activities, much similar to the Council of Europe’s European Youth Foundation (EYF) Pilot Activities. The application and reporting should be simple so that new organisations without professional secretariat can easily apply and report.
- Russia has left the Council of Europe. That means they will not pay their membership fee, which will decrease the overall funding. Last time Russia didn’t pay its membership fee, the CoE immediately cut funds from the youth sector. We can not let this happen again. The EYF has been providing support to young people all across the continent for 50 years and they

must be protected at all costs.

- The European Commission should start a more formalised research regarding the marginalised young people taking part in the activities organised or funded by the Commission grants, with an aim to understand and prioritise their needs and to remove barriers to their participation in European youth events.
- We are calling on the European Commission and the Member States to put forward a common binding legal framework for an effective and enforceable ban on unpaid internships, traineeships and apprenticeships and providing a minimum standard of rights concerning working conditions.
- We do not think the European Commission's new program ALMA (Aim, Learn, Master Achieve) will be a relief to the systematic youth unemployment and precarity. We are worried that this initiative would be limited to privileged few who would already have a good chance in getting short-term work experience in a different member state. Instead, the efforts should be directed towards immediately introducing an EU minimum wage scheme, with minimum wages based on the cost of living in a particular country or region and a mechanism to progressively harmonise them.
- The Commission President Von Der Leyen said "This Next Generation EU recovery pack is a lot of money that the next generation will have to pay back". We reject the premise that young people should be indebted because of the poor political choices that were made before them.
  - The Next Generation EU should be funded through EU level wealth tax, kerosene tax, and tax on tech giants.
  - Youth organisations should be consulted in the delivery of national plans for the deployment of Next Generation EU Funding.
- We propose a one-time COVID relief to all European young people (age 14 - 30) to help them overcome the challenges they currently face, due to the sacrifices they had to make in the past years.
- The European Commission should initiate a crisis Mental Health plan targeted at policy change in the Member States. This plan should include,

but not be limited to:

- increasing accessibility and the funding of (mental) healthcare facilities, making sure that everyone gets the help they need
- investing in training of mental health professionals, equipping them with tools to help people from marginalized communities
- making (mental) healthcare free
- investing in already existing, bottom-up community-building initiatives
- increasing the financial support provided to civil society organisations (CSOs) who work on mental health
- mainstreaming mental health into all social, economy and climate policies

**IT IS OUR FUCKING FUTURE.**

## **R16new ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Towards a truly interconnected and sustainable energy market**

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

1 Since the creation of the European Union, energy has been a crucial aspect of  
2 the European integration process, to the point that two of the three founding  
3 Treaties revolve around the energy sector. In Articles 114 and 194 of the Treaty  
4 on the Functioning of the European Union it is stated that Union policy on  
5 energy shall aim, in a spirit of solidarity between Member States, to ensure  
6 security of energy supply in the Union and promote the interconnection of energy  
7 networks. The European Union (EU) also believes that the promotion and  
8 protection of human rights around the world is a legitimate concern of the  
9 international community. The EU is bound by its Treaty to promote human rights,  
10 democratization and development.

11 Currently, the European energy market is regulated according to the TEN-E  
12 regulation, which allows the Union to meet its core energy objectives by laying  
13 down rules for identifying and the developing Projects of Common Interest  
14 (PCIs). These will ensure the interoperability of trans-European energy  
15 networks, the functioning of the internal energy market, the security of supply  
16 and the integration of renewable forms of energy.

17 Despite this, however, the current energy markets in Europe are still very  
18 regionalized. In part, this is due to a lack of energy infrastructure connecting  
19 Member States. Improving the interconnectivity of the energy market has several  
20 benefits: improved security supply, increased efficiency and increased  
21 competitiveness. This aligns well with the energy strategy that EU has stated  
22 previously, which is based on the pillars of securing an expanding supply of  
23 energy from both domestic and foreign sources, developing a more competitive  
24 internal energy market, and encouraging and supporting environmental protection  
25 and development of clean and renewable energy sources. Additionally, the new  
26 energy market of the EU is expected to encourage diversification and flexibility  
27 to react to market conditions across the countries. It also provides a more  
28 powerful bargaining position for European energy companies when sourcing energy  
29 in global markets, since there is a larger range of options available with  
30 regard to supply routes and there is better access to customers.  
31

However, there are still many contradictions within EU energy policies and fossil fuels phase out is being blocked by the Energy Charter Treaty. This allows energy corporations to put forward compensation claims to states if the former deem their investments and expected profits have been damaged by policy changes. This has led to climate friendly policies becoming a financial risk for all states as big fossil fuel companies are currently suing European states for fossil fuel phase outs and demand several billion euros.

It is acknowledged that the EU has committed to comply to standards of democracy and to support human rights in foreign relations, in accordance with the founding principles of the Union itself, that is the principles of liberty, democracy and respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law. Given its current dependence on multiple energy suppliers, however, the EU's ability to promote its interests and values risks to be limited when energy imports are supplied by countries with different values, even countries that violate human rights. Human rights are considered of vital importance to the EU, but when it comes to energy imports suddenly not.

While the Treaty on the European Union states that foreign policy should 'consolidate and support democracy, the rule of law, [and] human rights', the European Union has been criticised for putting its needs for energy imports before the aforementioned values: in accord with a study by the NGO Freedom House, Norway is the only country out of the EU's main oil and gas suppliers to meet international standards of democracy, unlike the remainder (Nigeria, assessed as "partly free", and Russia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Qatar which are defined as authoritarian states). Moreover, some if not most of these countries have been known to violate human rights, in the energy sector, but outside of that as well. By importing energy from these countries, these regimes profit from European money, which does nothing to stop the abuse of human rights by these regimes. However, it is possible to change the EU energy market. For example, the European Parliament has instated several sanctions against Russia and is debating issuing even heavier sanctions, but is yet to accept an energy boycott at the moment of writing. Clearly, it is possible for countries in and outside the EU to take action against authoritarian governments when it comes to upholding our values, including the respect for (fundamental) human rights.

Not only would the European Union benefit from an increased energy independence in reference to human rights and democracy, it would also strengthen energy security and contribute profitably to the project of decarbonisation of the energy sector. It is time to clearly condemn dependence on energy imported from countries with authoritarian regimes and that contribute to the violations of fundamental human rights.

The current situation does not only imply the EU is financing authoritarian regimes as well as the Russian war against Ukraine, but it is also allowing Energy Companies to attain huge profits at the expense of consumers. Energy prices are rising exponentially, while fossil fuel companies are making record profits. Governments spend millions of tax money on subsidizing them. At the same time, the increasing inflation makes basic needs a luxury, while wages are drastically losing value. At this moment, many people cannot pay for their basic needs, don't know how to pay their energy bills and homelessness is on the rise.

The economic system is deeply rotten, providing more and more money for the richest companies that massively destroy our planet and human lives, while the majority of peoples' living situations become more precarious than ever and energy poverty spiking dramatically among countries. Although there is not one common definition of energy poverty between Member States, it is generally described as a situation in which households are unable to access essential energy services. This can only be tackled by a drastic revolution of our energy system. Only by phasing out fossil fuels by 2030 and massively increasing subsidies, jobs and resources in renewable energies, the earth overheating can be limited, while at the same time ensuring a democratization of the energy system and the European independence from authoritarian regimes that are a serious threat to human lives and human rights. Moreover, stronger and better-connected energy infrastructure can go a long way in reducing energy poverty.

This can only be tackled by a drastic revolution of our energy system. We need comprehensive European-wide reform of our energy policy - one that intersectionally addresses both the energy transition and energy poverty - via sweeping phase-outs of fossil fuel by 2030, the stopping of subsidies, and comprehensive environmental taxes, complemented by pioneering action to revolutionise and connect the European energy grid, redirect subsidies and funding to renewable energies, limit and stabilise prices, and ensure all households have access to affordable energy. Unprecedented times call for unprecedented action, only in so doing can the earth overheating be limited, while at the same time ensuring a democratisation of the energy system - one that is coordinated, green, interconnected and based on solidarity; that is independent from authoritarian regimes that are a serious threat to human lives and human rights; and that ensures the right to energy is a right for all.

**The Federation of Young European Greens, with regards to the goals expressed in the EU Green Deal, calls on the EU and the governments of Member States to:**

1. Develop a legislative and policy framework to create a more interconnected European energy market to assist and support the energy transition towards renewable sources, with the aim of further improving storage and transfer capacity and reducing costs and therefore prices in order to achieve

energy independence, by:

1. Granting the European Parliament, Commission and Council the legislative authority to regulate the energy market and energy infrastructure supranationally through EU legislation;
2. Initiating the grounds for legislation to regulate the international European energy market and improve supranational connection between energy markets of Member States, for example by establishing an independent body to compile and assess the current bilateral energy trade agreements between Member States and third countries, and to assess the deficits and strengths in the energy infrastructure of each Member State;
3. Pulling out of the Energy Charter Treaty as soon as possible and stopping its further expansion
4. Enshrining the right to energy within the European Charter of Human Rights and in European energy law.

2. Based on this framework, to implement and develop an interconnected and improved energy infrastructure in Europe, as achieving this is an essential step to ensure a functional and efficient European energy market, as well as a necessity for more sustainable energy supply, by:

1. Investing in and facilitating the building of more energy infrastructure in and between Member States with significant infrastructure deficits to enable improved storage and sharing of energy, such as but not limited to flexible power grids, better demand-response technology, electric vehicle charging, and energy storage;
2. Investing in improving energy infrastructure where it already exists;
3. Implementing the connection of energy infrastructure across Member States in order to facilitate the creation of a European energy network;
4. Investing in and stimulating research on sustainable technologies such as, but not limited to, energy reduction, energy storage and energy production;
5. Offering targeted assistance and investment support to ensure energy infrastructure has similar quality across Member States.

3. Based on this framework, to implement and develop a Europe-wide energy strategy for a transition to a green and just energy system policy that addresses energy poverty by:

1. Developing just transition plans which rapidly phase out fossil fuel usage while minimising the socio-economic disruptions to workers and communities;

2. Ensuring that all people, especially those with lower income, have access to energy by implementing effective measures that keep energy prices affordable as well as energy supply sufficient, such as a moratorium on energy bills until energy supply and inflation rates are stabilised, a cap on energy prices, and comprehensive storage and connection infrastructure as proposed above;
3. Redirecting all fossil fuel subsidies into renewable energy projects on state as well as consumer-level, while ensuring that this is complemented by measures that guarantee access to energy, especially of low income households, such as those proposed in 3.2;
4. Implementing Europe-wide taxes. Firstly, increased taxes specifically on fossil fuel companies as well as a windfall tax and caps on their profits. Secondly, more broadly, a carbon tax on corporations throughout Europe for their emissions within and outside Europe. The resulting funds should be directed to measures addressing energy poverty, energy infrastructure and the energy transition.

With regards to the violation of human rights by the governments of states such as, but not limited to, the Russian Federation, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, FYEG calls on the EU and the governments of European countries to:

1. Condemn in the strongest terms the violation of human rights by authoritarian governments of energy-exporting states;
2. Based on these violations of human rights to aim for independence from importing energy from these states via the ending of current energy trade agreements as soon as possible;
3. Henceforth ensure that any future energy trade agreement is contingent to a set of minimal standards including but not limited to respect of human rights and rule of law wherein:
  1. States which breach the most egregious violations of human rights will no longer be considered as viable options to import energy from, whereas
  2. States which fall short of meeting the minimal standards yet abiding by a commitment to improve their respect for, among others, human rights and rule of law will be considered, and
  3. The assessment of the fulfilment of said criteria will be conducted by an independent body.



## R17new A full reset of relations with China

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

*Note: the resolution was drafted with support of the Taipei Representative Office in the Netherlands.*

The current state of political affairs has made it immeasurably clear the importance of international solidarity in the enforcement of international law and the right to sovereignty and self-determination of peoples. Now more than ever must we uphold the protection of human rights and the principles of democracy and international rule of law, condemning the oppression, subjugation and bullying that global superpowers exert unto their own peoples and on smaller states.

The People's Republic of China's (hereinafter PRC) authoritarianism continues to remain unabated as reports of abuses, if not atrocities, committed by the state grow.

#### **The crimes against humanity and genocide of Uyghurs.**

Over a million Uyghurs remain arbitrarily detained in internment camps, wherein they are subjugated to forced labour, systematic sexual abuse and rape, and torture; a further number of at least 600.000 Uyghurs have been forcefully relocated under the PRC's forced labour system. The Uyghurs are also subject to extreme restrictions on freedom of religion and expression and the erasure of their religious, ethnic and cultural identity, as the state has systematically destroyed Muslim buildings including mosques and cemeteries, banned religious practices and forced renunciations of faith, forced the separation of Uyghur children for re-education, and brainwashing. It is now beyond reasonable doubt that the PRC has implemented policies including mass forced sterilisations, forced contraception, and forced abortions. Reports have also surfaced of forced medical experimentation and mass deaths in camps.

It is thus clear that this is no longer simply a situation of cultural genocide, but of crimes against humanity, including torture, and of genocide committed against Uyghurs according to the definitions provided for respectively in

Article 7(1) of the 1998 Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court, the 1984 United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and Article II of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Similarly there has been a clear breach of the right to (internal) self-determination of the Uyghurs.

The right to self-determination, prohibition of crimes against humanity, torture and genocide are *ius cogens* (peremptory) norms under customary international law, and thus binding regardless of the PRC's reservations; as well as *erga omnes* obligations (owed to the international community as a whole) that fall under universal jurisdiction. Although the ICC does not exercise jurisdiction over PRC territory, the Court has held that "the Court may exercise jurisdiction over crimes when part of the criminal conduct takes place on the territory of a State Party".

The formal recognition of the situation in PRC as a genocide is therefore of significant legal importance as the first step to holding the PRC accountable.

#### **PRC neo-imperialism.**

Despite the lofty promises of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), the project has evolved into a framework in which the PRC implements various foreign policy tools in order to manoeuvre and expand its sphere of geopolitical influence across the globe. This includes various forms of economic and neo-imperialism entailing the exploitation of the economic and/or political vulnerability of countries in order to attain this expansion, such as its exercise of debt trap diplomacy on less economically developed countries. Furthermore, the expansion of cross-continental infrastructural development and natural resource extraction through the BRI without sufficient provisions for the protection of the environment and human rights has not only been devastating to the environment and livelihoods, of especially rural populations, but entrenches a system of asymmetrical reliance on natural resources and exploitative economic control across the Global South when economic diversification, modernisation and independence should be supported instead.

The PRC has further continued to increase military tensions and aggression toward its neighbouring states, from its military interventions at the China-India border to the ever increasing military pressure in the South China Sea. The PRC has furthermore continued to exert pressure on any opposition abroad, from its threats against Lithuania for establishing the Taiwanese Representative Office, to sanctions of officials of states that criticise it.

#### **The isolation of the Republic of China.**

Despite the Republic of China (ROC, hereinafter Taiwan) fulfilling the criteria of a state according to Article 1 of the Montevideo Convention of 1933, the people of Taiwan are prevented from exercising their right to self-determination and self-sovereignty by the PRC. Taiwan is also significantly limited in meaningfully participating as a sovereign state within the international political order, as it is prevented from membership or attendance of most international organisations.

As a result of the PRC's One-China principle, all states are forced to choose between the PRC or Taiwan, as formal diplomatic relations with the PRC is contingent on the severing of any formal relationship with Taiwan and therefore the non-recognition of the Taiwanese government.

Furthermore, China has significantly intensified their aggression against Taiwan and military pressure across the border over the past decade, going as far as sending warplanes into Taiwan's air defence zone. The PRC has also threatened military action against any independence attempts of Taiwan, and throughout the COVID-19 pandemic has continued to block Taiwan's membership of WHO. Based on the ICJ Wall Advisory Opinion 2004 and Reference Re Secession of Quebec, it could be argued that the increased aggression and militarisation and international isolation indicate a significant breach of the meaningful exercise of the right to self-determination of the people of Taiwan.

#### **A full reset.**

Europe needs to re-evaluate its ties with China. We need a full reset of EU-China relations – deviating from a focus of maximalising economic gain to maximalising the respect for human rights, democracy, international law and the international rule of law.

**The Federation of Young European Greens reiterates R06 Standing up the Chinese Authoritarianism of the 2020 General Assembly, and with regards to the crimes against humanity and genocide of the Uyghurs, calls on the European Union and the governments of European countries:**

1. To formally recognise and declare the situation subjected to the Uyghurs as a genocide;
2. Based on this breach of international law,
  1. For member states to start universal jurisdiction investigations of the crimes against humanity and genocide committed by the PRC against the Uyghurs in order to pursue prosecution of the PRC within national regimes, and/or

2. For the European Union to file a lawsuit against the PRC in the International Court of Justice and to pursue charges against the Chinese Communist Party in the International Criminal Court;

3. To implement Europe-wide trade sanctions on products originating from the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region or associated with the forced labour of Uyghurs;

4. To implement Europe-wide diplomatic sanctions on PRC officials of the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, and eventually of Xi Jinping.

**With regards to the neo-imperialism of the PRC, calls on the European Union and the governments of European countries:**

1. To denounce in the strongest possible terms the aggression of the PRC in the South China Sea and the debt trap diplomacy in the African and Asian regions;

2. To provide a feasible alternative to the BRI contingent on, amongst other aspects, respect for human rights, including:

1. The adoption of the Build Back Better World (B3W) initiative, with EU-wide funding of the initiative,
2. The ending of the externalisation of the EU border regime and thus the funding of authoritarian regimes in Africa via the EU Trust Fund for Africa and to replace this with intensified funding of pre-existing Official Development Assistance (ODA) mechanisms contingent on minimum standards and principles relating to, amongst others, human rights and environment and climate, such as that of the Blue Dot Network,
3. Further expansion and intensification of the Global Gateway strategy, such as via further expansion of the European Fund for Social Development Plus (EFSD+).

**With regards to the isolation of the Republic of China, calls on the European Union and the governments of European countries:**

1. To denounce in the strongest possible terms the increasing aggression and military build-up of the PRC against Taiwan;

2. To formally recognise the sovereignty of Taiwan and push for the full membership of it in the institutions of the institutional order, primarily the four core international agencies Taiwan is currently pursuing, WHO, Interpol, ICAO and the UNFCCC, and eventually the UN;

- 138 3. To further enhance engagement and broaden partnerships with Taiwan,  
139 including a reset of the European countries' One China Policy and the  
140 broadening of the scope of interaction with Taiwan beyond purely economic  
141 engagement such as the further collaboration of European and Taiwanese  
142 ministers;
- 143 4. To increase European foreign investment into Taiwan, for example by  
144 further intensifying the terms of the EU Bilateral Investment Agreement+  
145 with Taiwan, with a particular focus on Taiwan's expansion of offshore  
146 wind energy;
- 147 5. Based on this, to eventually establish formal diplomatic relations with  
148 Taiwan:
  - 149 1. By recognising the official diplomatic missions of Taiwan with the  
150 EU and with the various European countries no longer as  
151 representative offices serving as *de facto* embassies, but as *de jure*  
152 embassies and diplomatic missions,
  - 153 2. And by doing the same for the representative offices of the EU and  
154 of the various European countries in Taiwan.

## R18new An ASEAN-EU future

Proposers:

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### Motion text

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is the counterpart of the European Union (EU) in the Southeast Asian region, consisting of 10 member states: Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. ASEAN has since its formation continued to pursue the increased integration of Southeast Asian nations, establishing amongst other things the ASEAN Vision 2020 in 1997 and ASEAN Charter in 2008 to pursue the realisation of a single ASEAN community and free-trade area; as well as establishing the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) in 2009, and adopting the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration in 2012. ASEAN is expected to be the world's fourth largest economy by 2030.

ASEAN-EU ties date back to 1972, where the then European Economic Community was the first international entity to establish informal ties with ASEAN, followed by formal ties as a Dialogue Partnership in 1977 which was institutionalised by the ASEAN-EEC Cooperation Agreement of 1980. Since then, ASEAN-EU ties have continued to blossom, with the EU in 2012 being the first regional organisation to accede to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia and in 2015 establishing a diplomatic mission to ASEAN. As a result of the 23<sup>rd</sup> ASEAN-EU Ministerial meeting in 2020, the EU and ASEAN have since improved their Dialogue Partnership into a Strategic Partnership.

The influence of the EU on ASEAN is undeniable, with the EU being the third largest trading partner of ASEAN (and ASEAN as well being the third largest extra-EU trading partner), the third largest provider of Foreign Direct Investment in ASEAN, the largest collaborator in development cooperation and lobbying of the EU amongst other states leading to ASEAN for the first time in its history declining to invite a political leader of a member state to its October 2021 summit.

With 2022 marking the 45<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the partnership of the two unions, it is now more relevant than ever to further blossom the relations between the two unions in order to strive for a truly inclusive and sustainable Strategic Partnership with each other and for an inclusive and sustainable global

community.

**The Federation of Young European Greens calls on the European Union:**

1. To further expand its economic cooperation with ASEAN, including:

1. the establishment of a region-to-region (EU-ASEAN) free trade agreement,

1. The further facilitation and stimulation of foreign direct investment that prioritises sustainable development in ASEAN contingent on, among others, respect for human rights, labour rights, rule of law, sustainability, and climate and environment, by, for example, pushing for transparency, predictability and security for investors alongside stringent corporate social responsibility rules and responsible business practices,

2. The advancement of clear EU-ASEAN trade-related regulatory frameworks, as well as the promotion of EU rights, standards and policy frameworks such as the Eurocodes;

2. To increase efforts in improving regional security and stability, including:

1. The sharing of information, intelligence and technology to combat transnational and cybercrime,
2. The initiation of security summits and other diplomatic means to foster discussion in which the EU could act as an independent conduit for dialogue amongst the claimant states in the South China Sea dispute,
3. The continued strong denouncement of authoritarianism, the breach of rule of law and human rights in the region, particularly in Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos and through Indonesia on Western New Guinea, and the continued urging for the immediate and unconditional release of political prisoners;

3. To broaden the scope of collaboration and socio-cultural cooperation with ASEAN, including:

1. The active involvement of the EU in the various ASEAN summits of which it is a member of,
2. The organisation of cultural and social exchanges, and the fostering of the collaboration of artists and media producers and organisation of joint-exhibitions and cultural projects,
3. The organisation of academic and research exchanges, the increased

provision of scholarships and trainings, and further cooperation in terms of research, technology and investment therein,

4. The further involvement of civil society and youth in the processes and discussions of EU-ASEAN, such as the more frequent organisation, if not yearly, of the EU-ASEAN Young Leaders Forum.



## **R99 Green Space Policy**

Proposer: Grön Ungdom, Grønn Ungdom, Vihreät  
Nuoret  
Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

#### **Introduction**

As the only species on this earth with the ability to think long-term - even if we are not always so good at using this ability - we have a responsibility to ensure that life goes on, as well as the responsibility to preserve and protect nature and the climate. We can only achieve this, in the really long term, by working together with other countries to spread life to other planets. No matter what Sweden, no matter what Europe does, this will happen. But we can decide if it's the logo of a company on the side of the spacecraft that lands on Mars with humans, or if it's a flag that represents humans and not money.

#### **Climate**

On the other hand, in the short term, space science is a great help in the fight against climate change. It is only through large Earth observation programs such as the Copernicus satellites that we can measure exactly where, when, how and why climate change is taking place, and it is the same satellites that are used to assist with detailed maps and images during natural disasters, which we know have already become more and more usual. Much of the early research on solar panels that has led to the efficiency they have today was done by NASA for use in space. The same applies to hydroponic and vertical agriculture. Space gives us time, breathing space and tools in the fight against the climate crisis. Therefore, we propose:

**that** more money is spent on climate-related space research.

#### **Reusable rockets**

The space industry is much like the electric vehicle industry. Both are mineral and rare earth metals heavy industries. Both are also industries of the future. But if the industries want to be part of the 'green future' they will have to

stay within the planetary boundaries. To do so they need to become a part of the circular economy. Reusing and recycling EV batteries are now becoming mainstream, the space industry still has a lot of catching up within this area. But last year SpaceX made a breakthrough when they launched the first astronauts on a reused rocket.

“Both NASA and SpaceX contend that reusable spacecraft are crucial for making the space industry more affordable. The concept is not new; for years, the space agency reused its small fleet of space shuttles, but reusable rockets weren’t a reality until 2021.”

So to make the space industry greener, cheaper and more circular we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable by 2035.

### **Asteroid mining**

But not all asteroids are created equal. By extracting the minerals found in extraterrestrial celestial bodies, we can completely eliminate the need to have environmentally destructive and human rights-violating mines here on earth. It is not something that will happen today, tomorrow or next year, but the technology is evolving and with more money, production could start ~ 2040. To be able to go through a fair transition, we will need batteries, and superconductors in turn need lithium, gold, platinum and endless other rare earth metals. That is why we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport.

### **New international space station**

The ISS is old and according to the original plans would have been scrapped as early as 2008. It is important for us to have a part in the work of the new international space station that is to be built next, we have the power to influence the spacecraft that will spend future decades with groundbreaking orbital research around the earth. That is why we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS).

### **Space pollution**

Space debris are the objects that we humans have left in orbit around the Earth. These are everything from dust to pens and broken satellites that are as big as buses. Which usually moves at about 27,000 km/h. In the worst case, it could be that in the future we will not be able to postpone things into space because there is too much rubbish in the way - the so-called Kepler syndrome. Already today you need to plan launches for clusters of space debris. That is why we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up space debris for a better space environment

### International Cooperation

Due to long territorial disputes between different factions and France, ESA is not part of European cooperation, even when it gets most of its money from it. This stupid and resource-wasting battle must end. We therefore propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European Union.

To summarize, we propose:

- **that** more money is spent on climate-related space research;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable by 2035;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS);
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up space debris for a better space environment;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European

Union;

## **R99new Green Space Policy**

Proposer: FYEG

Agenda item: 4. Resolutions

### **Motion text**

#### **Introduction**

As the only species on this earth with the ability to think long-term - even if we are not always so good at using this ability - we have a responsibility to ensure that life goes on, as well as the responsibility to preserve and protect nature and the climate. We can only achieve this, in the really long term, by working together with other countries to spread life to other planets. No matter what Sweden, no matter what Europe does, this will happen. But we can decide if it's the logo of a company on the side of the spacecraft that lands on Mars with humans, or if it's a flag that represents humans and not money.

Space exploration has clear scientific and cultural benefits but we also acknowledge that it is enormously resource-intensive which makes it very attractive to private individuals and companies. All space exploration should only be done when necessary, especially if private companies are involved, and has to serve the public interest. Space is not a playground for billionaires.

#### **Climate**

On the other hand, in the short term, space science is a great help in the fight against climate change. It is only through large Earth observation programs such as the Copernicus satellites that we can measure exactly where, when, how and why climate change is taking place, and it is the same satellites that are used to assist with detailed maps and images during natural disasters, which we know have already become more and more usual. Much of the early research on solar panels that has led to the efficiency they have today was done by NASA for use in space. The same applies to hydroponic and vertical agriculture. Space gives us time, breathing space and tools in the fight against the climate crisis. Therefore, we propose:

**that** more money is spent on climate-related space research.

#### **Reusable rockets**

The space industry is much like the electric vehicle industry. Both are mineral and rare earth metals heavy industries. Both are also industries of the future. But if the industries want to be part of the 'green future' they will have to stay within the planetary boundaries. To do so they need to become a part of the circular economy. Reusing and recycling EV batteries are now becoming mainstream, the space industry still has a lot of catching up within this area. But last year a breakthrough was made, when the first astronauts were launched on a reused rocket.

"NASA contend that reusable spacecraft are crucial for making the space industry more affordable. The concept is not new; for years, the space agency reused its small fleet of space shuttles, but reusable rockets weren't a reality until 2021."

So to make the space industry greener, cheaper and more circular we propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable as soon as possible.

### **Asteroid mining**

Not all asteroids are created equal. By extracting the minerals found in extraterrestrial celestial bodies, we can completely eliminate the need to have environmentally destructive and human rights-violating mines here on earth. It is not something that will happen today, tomorrow or next year, but the technology is evolving and with more money, production could start around 2040. To be able to go through a fair transition, we will need batteries, and superconductors in turn need lithium, gold, platinum and endless other rare earth metals. That is why we propose:

that while we firstly prioritise the sustainable extraction and recycling of resources on Earth, and the reduction of resource use (e.g. the right to repair, the fight against negligent or avoidable obsolescence, sustainable product design), the European Space Agency (ESA) conducts research on asteroid mining, while always taking into consideration its environmental and economic impact, and only pushing for it once it becomes a viable and sustainable alternative in the future.

that the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport.

### **New international space station**

The ISS is old and according to the original plans would have been scrapped as early as 2008. It is important for us to have a part in the work of the new international space station that is to be built next, we have the power to influence the spacecraft that will spend future decades with groundbreaking orbital research around the earth. That is why we propose:

that the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS).

### **Environmentally friendly space transport**

Further to our calls on 'Reusable rockets', zooming through space isn't at all sustainable. As research into space continues, it is inevitable that the flow of 'traffic' from Earth to our stations in space and of our spacecraft within space will increase significantly. The amount of fuel necessary to transport resources and our astronauts from our stations on Earth to our stations in space and possibly vice versa is insurmountable, notwithstanding the amount of minerals and resources necessary to build the rockets and other spacecraft already iterated above.

Even if we manage to develop reusable spacecraft, we must acknowledge the astronomical amount of energy they will consume and the environmental impact of that. Therefore we propose:

### **Space pollution**

Space debris are the objects that we humans have left in orbit around the Earth. These are everything from dust to pens and broken satellites that are as big as buses. In the worst case, it could be that in the future we will not be able to postpone things into space because there is too much rubbish in the way - the so-called Kessler syndrome. Already today you need to plan launches for clusters of space debris. In order to reduce the amount of defunct and functional satellites and, therefore, reduce the current and future space pollution, we must make all scientific data collected from these satellites open-source. That is why we propose:

Corporations should be accountable for the space pollution they are making, as well be accountable for the destruction of space discovery potential, especially with global systems like Starlink. Therefore, we demand that every global scale project is implemented in collaboration with scientists not to reduce the scientific potential in space discovery.

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up space debris for a better space environment

### International Cooperation

Due to long territorial disputes between different factions and France, ESA is not part of European cooperation, even when it gets most of its money from it. This stupid and resource-wasting battle must end. We therefore propose:

**that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European Union.

To summarize, we propose:

- **that** more money is spent on climate-related space research;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) works together with NASA and other international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable by 2035;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) develops a strategy for environmentally friendly and carbon neutral (within the atmosphere) space transport;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) continues its work with international partners for a successor to the International Space Station (ISS);
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) strengthens the work of cleaning up space debris for a better space environment;
- **that** the European Space Agency (ESA) is integrated into the European Union;
- **that** while we firstly prioritise the sustainable extraction and recycling of resources on Earth, and the reduction of resource use (e.g. the right to repair, the fight against negligent or avoidable obsolescence, sustainable product design), the European Space Agency (ESA) conducts research on asteroid mining, while always taking into consideration its environmental and economic impact, and only pushing for it once it becomes a viable and sustainable alternative in the future.