

DiEM25 Policy Paper Proposal on the establishment of a European Asylum and Migration policy

Preamble

DiEM25 is an internationalist, progressive movement that stems from democratic and humanist traditions. It is these values that guide our vision. And it is these values that guide our approach to the issue of forced migration and determine our policies.

As a Union we have committed ourselves to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as to the EU charter of fundamental rights, and the Geneva Convention. We intend to honor our legal commitments.

As a Union we are committed towards

- a) open borders, hosting refugees and migrants and allowing them equal rights – including political rights,
- b) playing an active role internationally in fighting causes of flight and
- c) supporting operationally and financially other host countries and communities.

These commitments stem fundamentally from who we are. As an internationalist, humanist movement we follow a *rights-based approach*.

More so, we acknowledge both our current and historical roles in contributing to the current migration flows. We played a key role in causing forced migration through

- a) our colonial history – which still has to this current day dire ramifications on the developing world, and has set many countries in a form of path-dependency that has greatly influenced their development,
- b) the ongoing postcolonial corporate assault and exploitation of resources that left many communities impoverished,
- c) unfair trade relations imposed by the EU and its Member States hindering the development of so-called developing countries and destroying local markets,
- d) supporting dictators that served Western interests while pushing aside democratic aspirations of many populations around the world,
- e) the ongoing manufacturing and export of weapons which are persistently used in armed conflicts and war,
- f) the role and responsibility of the Member States of the European Union in creating climate change and environmental disasters which are hitting poorer countries harder across the globe.

We fully acknowledge that while these actions of Europe have impoverished many communities across the globe, they have simultaneously led to our prosperity. As the consequences of these actions and developments are finally knocking at our doorstep we intend to take full responsibility. Justice instead of charity as guiding principle accurately refers to our perception of this issue.

Any policy in EU countries should **overcome the distinction between political and economic migrant/refugee**. This fictive distinction leads to discriminatory policies that deprive arriving people of agency and end up relegating them into underemployment and exploitation. The economic factor (e.g.

conditions in which people are no longer able to provide themselves and their families) can be an extreme circumstance that pushes people to migrate. It is in fact **FORCED migration**, and not a voluntary choice. We therefore recognize that it's push (not pull) factors that generally drive migration. Of course, this does not mean the abolishment of the fundamental right to asylum.

Intensifying armed conflicts in the Middle East, human rights violations, environmental disasters and bleak economic prospects in various regions of Africa and Asia will continue to drive refugee and migration patterns for years to come. Migration patterns within Europe will also remain highly dynamic. All of these push-factors to migration are still ongoing.

Meanwhile, Europe is in denial of these geopolitical and environmental developments in the world today. The people leaving behind poverty, famine and war to arrive to Europe, a part of the planet mostly spared these high levels of violence, are met with barbed wire, soldiers, cold seas, and a political establishment incapable and unwilling of untangling its cynical processes.

The term "Refugee Crisis" proposes a false narrative. We remember that Europe is going through a period of multiple crises ever since its economic crises of 2010, beginning with the financial crisis in the US and deepened as a result of structural defaults in the architecture of the EU.

Our current European crisis manifested by ever increasing unemployment figures, lack of investment in both the private and public sectors, cuts in social security and social services is the result of artificial austerity imposed by the Troika. Therefore, we intend to fight the narrative of scapegoatism, which blames newcomers for our self made problems, and say no to the poisonous politics of fear.

Another essential part in any complete migration policy framework concerns host communities. Their rights, needs and everyday realities. While ignoring our legal and moral duties to many of the newcomers as a union, we placed them in a state of need and disempowerment in regions of increasing economic deterioration already taking shape since 2010. This includes regions in the periphery of Europe that suffered cruelly under austerity measures, or even poor communities in surplus member states that have been in a process of decline nonetheless. This applies to a greater extent to communities affected by the EU's implementation of "Hot spot systems".

It is those people who are more susceptible to embrace the politics of fear preached by some of our ruling political class as well as right-wing, fear mongering politicians.

Such dangerous political sentiments are a result of the EU's economic policies just as much as the result of its migration policies. Under a rational policy framework, host communities should not have to become more economically strained as a result of migration flows. In fact, under a rational policy framework they should not be economically strained in the first place.

Therefore, a migration policy framework is incomplete unless it includes policy proposals to induce positive change in the socio-economic realities of people. Hence, local economic development is essential to DiEM25's approach. This approach is sketched in the movement's complementing policy papers of the economic new deal and green transition.

Unless there are structural changes in the architecture of the EU, economic competition between groups of people is inevitable. This does not only apply on dynamics between people with and without a migration background, but also between people from different member states. The EU will be democratized, or it will disintegrate.

And finally, we stress the value of democracy as the base of our policy. It is civil society and local populations who engage in the fight for rights and overcoming the institutional barriers of inclusion. As for the concrete policies and measures that are to be implemented – no successful approach is possible other than a participatory one. It is those engaged on the ground that are aware of the challenges and needs of their localities. And so they are the ones who know what needs to be done and how to do it. DiEM25 emphasizes that forced migrants are not beneficiaries of help. They are political actors on equal footing to host community actors. Without their participation no analysis of community needs, proposal of concrete measures, or their implementation can be effective or complete.

In a nutshell, DiEM25 takes a holistic approach to the issue of migration. This entails granting people their rights; dealing with the external causes of forced migration; dealing with internal structural defaults of our union; and economic development of our host communities.

We therefore propose a migration and asylum policy grounded in a respect for human rights and the full assumption of responsibility – a policy that provides a clear political foundation for the coexistence of both those fleeing and the society that receives them.

Our outline addresses short-term and long-term policies in order to 1. immediately end the humanitarian crisis taking place on European soil right now and stop the dying at sea and 2. to have an immigration policy that addresses the social, economic and political developments of a demographically changing society.

Complex migratory fluxes require a migration policy that goes well beyond static regulatory policy. A modern immigration policy that can keep pace with the dynamics of migration and integration must be transparent, adaptive, and interconnected with other policy areas. We therefore outline under the section of the long-term strategies policies to properly address root causes of migration, from trade deals to climate change, to the Common Agriculture Policy of the European Union.

Short-term

We hereby identify measures which could be taken by tomorrow in order to immediately improve the situation of forced migrants on the ground and to mitigate the ongoing humanitarian crisis. By this we simply urge the European Union and its Member States to ***implement and comply with the existing treaties and humanitarian policies already in place***. This would already have a tremendous effect on the ongoing situation and it would save lives tomorrow.

In detail, ***complying with existing law and obligations*** means:

1 Respect the internationally protected **fundamental right of non-refoulement** by member states of the EU, as well as countries in partnership or collaboration with the Union (e.g. in the case of Libya).¹

2 **Inadmissibility** of asylum applications based on the concept of “safe third country” or “first country of asylum” **shall not be imposed**, as this means the de facto end of the right to asylum in the EU.

3 **The immediate implementation of legal and safe passage**

Every person forcefully migrating shall be able to access safe and legal routes to reach protection, but today millions of people fleeing conflict are trapped in harm's way with no safe and legal escape. Children are stuffed in suffocating lorries, families climb into sinking boats, desperate adults try to scale barbed wire fences. All in pursuit of something they often already have a legal right to: whether it is to reach their family members or to be resettled away from conflict.

Every person forcefully migrating has the right to access safe and legal routes to a place where they can lead a dignified life and the European Union and its Member States have the obligation to fully comply with the European Convention on Human Rights, the Geneva Convention and Article 18 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights.

We therefore propose the implementation of these elements:

3.1 Establishing free and legal paths for migration: Implementation of EU-visa and EU-asylum for forced migrants issued in their countries of origin or neighbouring countries (a temporary humanitarian visa issuance code is already envisaged within the EU legislation. It allows the creation of temporary humanitarian visas to those people who are in the countries of the southern shore of the Mediterranean).

3.2 Resettlement: The Commission’s proposal for an EU Framework for Resettlement was part of the second package of proposals that came in July 2016. It is the only proposal in the Asylum Package that opens up any legal way into the Union, and is thus of great relevance. Resettlement has to be established as a tool for the human right to asylum and not for migration control. The decision of a starting point for each newcomer needs to factor in both the preferences of the newcomers as well as the capacities of host communities and the opportunities they offer. The preferences of asylum-seekers based on family ties, extended community links, language and cultural ties, past studies or professional experience on one hand need to be harmonized with the practical requirements of the local context on the other.

3.3 **The launch of a *European Search and Rescue Operation* replacing Frontex**

Instead of cancelling Frontex, it shall be renamed and redefined, and the manpower and resources of the agency shall be used for the launch of a European Search and Rescue Operation in the Mediterranean, which should exceed the size of Italy's Mare Nostrum Operation (even with Mare Nostrum in place, thousands of people lost their lives drowning in the Med) and ensure the full responsibility and dedication of state actors to fulfil their mandate in saving lives at sea. Non Governmental organisations are filling the gap of SAR missions since years and face harsh criminalisation and limitations towards their live-saving missions. Only through the commitment of the European Union to save lives at sea as a top priority in the

¹ Non-refoulement is a fundamental principle of international law which forbids a country receiving asylum seekers from returning them to a country in which they would be in likely danger of persecution based on "race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion".

Med, the current situation can be coordinated in a humanitarian spirit by meeting the obligations under maritime law.

Any military or coast guard intervention in the Mediterranean aiming to target the boats of smugglers shipping migrants has to be stopped, as the best fight against smugglers is the opening of safe passages. The example of the Greek-Turkish border shows that increased border surveillance supported by Frontex has actually led migrants to take more dangerous routes.

3.4 The externalisation of EU borders and migration controls has to be stopped immediately

Externalization of migration controls describes extraterritorial State actions to prevent migrants, including asylum-seekers, from entering the legal jurisdictions or territories of destination countries, or regions, or of making them legally inadmissible without individually considering the merits of their protection claims. These can include direct interdiction and preventive policies as well as more indirect actions, such as the provision of support for, or assistance to, security or migration management practices in and by third countries.

Over time, the phenomenon has expanded to commonly include the systematic enlistment of third countries in preventing migrants, including asylum-seekers, from entering destination states. States enlisted in the prevention of onward movement of forced migrants are encouraged to prevent them from entering their territories or to apprehend and return them (e.g. EU-Turkey Deal, EU-Sudan-Agreement; EU-Libya Cooperation).

We therefore call for the immediate suspension of any externalization of EU borders and migration controls, reject the global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) and to fully comply with the EU's responsibility of allowing people to ask for protection on European territory, developing a sustainable long-term strategy based on human rights in consultation with civil society and experts.

Any kind of cooperation with Libyan militias has to be suspended immediately, as this fuels the ongoing conflict in Libya and supports the devastating human rights situation of migrants trapped in illegal Libyan camps.

3.5 The criminalization of humanitarian aid has to be stopped immediately. For example fishermen or firefighters who rescue forced migrants should be rewarded instead of being punished, ships from private search and rescue NGOs such as the Iuventa should be released immediately to ensure more life-saving boats along the route.

4 Family reunification: States have an obligation to protect the family under international and European law.

On the basis of non-discrimination, holders of subsidiary protection (unrecognized refugees) have to have access to the same rights as recognised refugees. Another major obstacle for beneficiaries of international protection to effectively access family reunification relates to the significant amount of documentation Member States can require when submitting an application. States must take into consideration the special status of beneficiaries of international protection and the difficulties they faced in reaching safety, with

the result that is not always possible to obtain the documents required. UNHCR could play a role in organizing the necessary documentation.

The right to family reunification has to be respected, therefore states shall apply a broader definition of family members to include non-nuclear families.

5 Relocation of asylum-seekers by a centralised system to communities across the European Union. The decision of a starting point for each newcomer needs to factor in both the preferences of the newcomers as well as the capacities of host communities and the opportunities they offer. Regard for the preferences of asylum-seekers based on family ties, extended community links, language and cultural ties, past studies or professional experience on one hand need to be harmonized with the practical requirements of the local context.

6 European countries shall facilitate **mutual recognition of positive asylum decisions** and the swift transfer of protection statuses within the EU. This would not only facilitate the relocation and resettlement procedures but it would also contribute to the non-discriminative application of the principle of freedom of movement so that asylum seekers can settle where they have better integration prospects, family members, language knowledge etc.

7 Improvement of reception facilities: The current situation tries to make reception facilities more flexible by lowering standards across the Union. Instead of streamlining European reception facilities around the lowest common denominator, new legislation must introduce minimum standards of quality to be implemented directly across all Member States.

8 Large scale creation of housing for all people with limited resources

We need social housing provided for forced migrants and host communities alike to prevent divisions and foster contact.

9 Detention centres must be closed down.

10 Access to physical and mental healthcare for all forced migrants: We need equal and full access to healthcare not connected to the administrative burden.

11 Fast and fair asylum proceedings without undermining the legal safeguards of the asylum seekers. The bureaucratic separation of asylum claims and asylum application has to be abolished.

12 Legal representation for forced migrants: access to legal support from the day they enter the EU.

13 Access to language courses and qualification from the beginning without any distinction between forced migrants with "good" or "bad" prospects of remaining.

14 Access to education and vocational training, recognition of foreign degrees and vocational diplomas.

15 Access and right to work

Recognizing the principle of unrestricted access to work must be followed up by the following measures: speeding up the process of recognition of foreign degrees and vocational diplomas, offering professional trainings, language courses that are tailored for the labour market integration, strengthening intercultural competencies of the labour agencies staff as well as the employees in the companies, dismantling the legal and administrative obstacles for getting work permissions for asylum-seekers.

The economic growth must not be fostered by the means of subordination of migrant work within the national economies. All migrant workers must be entitled to the same rights, benefits and protection as the domestic workers. It is not migrants who are dumping wages, but a system that keeps them as illegal, unskilled and in a constant threat of being deported.

Increasing the public investments and including the asylum-seekers into the system of minimum wages should be promoted on the EU level and on the level of member states as well.

There should be no exceptions to minimum wages. But at the same time we have to take into account that there is a necessity of some type of *bridging mechanism* for forced migrants to the labour market. The positive integrative effects of work are beyond doubt (e.g. language learning, getting acquainted with people, culture and the labour market, building up experience and contacts). So on the one hand we have to enable short term apprenticeships and internships, on the other hand we need regulations that prevent the exploitation of that bridging mechanism for getting around the minimum wage and for recruiting cheap labour forces.

16. Strengthening the capacities of local authorities:

16.1 Cities and NGOs shall be able to pledge for receiving forced migrants from governments.

16.2 Local people lack information and participation, therefore local schools and authorities have to constantly inform the local population on [what?].

16.3 Migration funds should be accessible to local authorities directly (and not only to the governments).

16.4 The involvement and support of the local authorities and communities should include the creation of incentives for these communities to apply for receiving forced migrants, like for example the maintenance and/or restoration of local infrastructure (close link here to DiEM's European New Deal: creating jobs, Job Guarantee, support of the communities to prevent forced migration).

17. Strengthening the rights of children and unaccompanied minors: Refugee and migrant children have been facing an extremely difficult and vulnerable situation in the European Union. Increased funding for national child protection systems and building mechanisms to protect children across borders is necessary. Furthermore, it has to be ensured that children get access to guardians, education and family reunification.

18. A reform of EU migration and asylum policies and procedures needs to include gender-sensitive measures:

18.1 Introduce gender reasons for political asylum and refugee status.

18.2 gender-segregated sleeping and sanitation facilities shall be established as common standard in the EU;

18.3 female interviewers, translators and interpreters shall be provided for every women seeking protection in Europe;

18.4 trauma counselling for persons who have experienced gender-based violence;

18.5 childcare during screening and asylum interviews;

18.6 legal assistance for women on their right to lodge an asylum claim, independently of their spouse, and to have a legal status independent of that of their spouse;

18.7 gender-specific training for staff

19 Local economic development of economic of host communities

Our problems are the result of the EU's lousy migration policy implemented on top of its even lousier economic policies.

As a consequence, host communities in the peripheries, austerity regions, hot-spots, and even poorer communities in surplus regions are being negatively affected by migration flows. These communities are reacting by moving politically to the right and some are tilting towards xenophobia.

A migration policy framework must consider the rights and needs of host communities just as much as those of the migrants. No successful inclusion or integration process is possible otherwise. Integration is a two-sided process.

While a reasonable relocation and resettlement policy will certainly mitigate the pressure on host communities, a migration policy framework is not complete unless it is integrated in a holistic policy framework. The economic reform envisaged in DiEM25's new deal and green transition is fundamental to the economic development of host communities.

Local economic development is a broad concept. This includes job creation, social housing, micro-financing, increasing both public and private investment, as well as funding the social solidarity economy. Public investment would include investing in infrastructure, energy, water and electricity.

20 Participation

Our movement was founded on the objective of putting the Demos back in Democracy. This is because democracy is not merely a value, but is more importantly a working-principle that is essential in organizing our society.

An ongoing and inclusive participatory process is essential in creating the necessary measures to achieve all the goals we set in our policy framework. This includes all stakeholders - host communities, local authorities, civil society organizations and migrants themselves of course. Those are the real experts on the ground - they understand their needs, the challenges in their localities, and are best in place to create and implement solutions.

For democracy to be put in practice, an institutional infrastructure has to be in place and clear communications channels between the different stakeholders must exist. Local authorities, that are operationally and financially strengthened, must be able to implement changes in direct consultation with all other stakeholders.

DiEM25 proposes the implementation of institutional changes that facilitate the practice of direct democracy on the local level and empowers stakeholders as political players.

21 Empowering civil society by supporting the social solidarity grassroots economy with funding, facilitation and full-time, qualified support and coordination, especially in communities which host forced migrants.

European civil society and citizens have been inspirational in their reaction to the migration flows in terms of offering support on numerous levels to the newcomers. Such local and decentralized actions, both by locals and the newcomers themselves, are key to the inclusion process. As a matter of policy we must support the grassroot / solidarity economy both financially, institutionally and operationally. This includes all sorts of social enterprises (such as social cooperatives, associations, NGOs, clubs...) as well as informal voluntary initiatives. The relation between this sector of the economy and the public sector should be that of mutual support and cooperation.

Long-term

Speaking of *Long-term demands* doesn't mean "we don't have to deal with it right away" but rather: "these are topics which will take some time because they involve other institutions, regulations and fields as well as deeper structural change". We have to tackle the following issues the sooner the better, but, or rather: precisely *because* it will take some time to resolve them.

1 Repealing of the failed Dublin system

It is important to state that any action undertaken by a Member State, within the framework of EU law, must be read and applied in line with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. This means that when authorities at the national level are implementing EU law, they must ensure that this is done consistently with the Charter. This is currently far from being the case.

EU action on migration must be based on the principle of solidarity (Article 80 of the TFEU: Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union) which includes asylum, immigration and border control policies. The legal basis for its application in these areas can be found in [art. 77 to 80 of the TFEU](#).

We need a system based on justice in Europe, that does not condemn a country on the basis of its geographical location within the Union. The current Dublin system prevents the development of any such system.²

2 Abolition of the hot-spot system

The implementation of different generations of Dublin systems made it necessary to establish a so-called “hotspot” system to cope with the influx of people especially on the islands of Greece and Italy. As clearly shown by the first assessments of this “hotspot” system, its implementation is not in line with EU asylum law and legal standards. Moreover, fundamental rights of forced migrants are not respected. Many newly arrived migrants have been trapped in prolonged detention without access to asylum, have not received the right information in order to do so, or have been swiftly returned as a result of the hotspots approach.

The hotspots have certainly not helped in relieving the pressure from Italy and Greece as was their stated objective: instead, they have led to an increase in the number of asylum applicants waiting in Italy and Greece, consolidating the challenges and shortcomings already inherent in the Dublin system. Moreover, as it was the responsibility of the Member States to implement and run the hotspots, the pressure on the Member States led to the implementation of the EU-Turkey deal and the recent cooperation with the LCG.

3 Migrating people in the EU should be considered as citizens and guaranteed civil, social and political rights, irrespective of their reason for migration, their country of origin and their socioeconomic status. This includes the provision of democratic rights for everyone (based on residence, not on citizenship).

4 EU should sign the UN International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICMW). Driven by their political interests, none of the EU members states adopted the Convention until now since its ratification would oblige countries to provide the same rights to all migrants regardless of their status. DIEM25 recognizes importance of taking the vulnerability of the migrant workers into account and pledges for more cooperation between the member states and the Union in finding the ways to overcome the barriers for the adoption of the Convention.

5 Transparency in Budget and Funds related to migration and refugee policy (EU budget), is crucial. If states receive money it should be obligatory to check if actions are in line with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

² The Dublin regulation was originally designed to determine which Member State is responsible for examining an individual asylum application. It aims to prevent multiple applications by one person in several different Member States by establishing a series of criteria which, in general, allocate responsibility for examining an asylum application to the Member State that permitted the applicant to enter or to reside in the territories of the Member States of the European Union. That Member State is responsible for examining the application according to its national law and is obliged to take back its applicants who are irregularly in another Member State.

6 Tackling the underlying sources of migration

Forced Migration stems from many overlapping factors, which culminate into war and conflict, poverty, and famine. Scarcity and conflict will only be made worse by ongoing climate change.

As a principle such global topics should be solved in the most inclusive manner possible through the use of multilateral diplomacy.

To meet the *systemic causes of flight and forced migration* we propose the following:

6.1 Non-intervention-politics and stop European participation in wars and military conflict;

DiEM25 calls on all European governments to end their direct and indirect involvement in wars and military conflicts.

Instead, nonviolent conflict resolution between communities needs to be promoted and actively supported by the EU. Efforts must be redoubled to democratize and revive international fora as the United Nations to bring warring parties together to resolve conflicts nonviolently.

6.2 EU-wide stop of weapon exports and regulation of the arms trade

In accordance to EU laws there cannot be any exports of arms to countries that violate human rights or are engaged in conflict. Weapons exports need to be supervised centrally within the EU and involve all subsidiaries of European corporations based outside EU territory.

6.3 The EU should implement effective and sustainable **policies against global climate changes**, since climate change increasingly will be a main cause for forced migration. This point is closely linked to DiEM25's Green Transition policy paper, which will address the issue.

In principle those historically and currently responsible for CO2 emissions need to be held accountable to fund climate mitigation and adaptation.

6.4 Stop the exploitation of mineral resources by overseas corporations and land grabbing

Monocultures, the exploitation of mineral resources and all other activities conducted by corporations based in the EU can no longer externalize the costs of environmental degradation to host communities but must compensate local communities. Furthermore the use of large-scale agriculture for the production of biofuels or animal feed and the global issue of deforestation must be re-evaluated in the light of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda and the Paris Agreement on climate change.

6.5 International development

The lack of economic development is another root cause of forced migration and needs to be addressed in the reform of economic relations at a state and corporate level. Recognising that there is a net drain of resources from so-called developing countries towards so-called developed countries, DiEM25 proposes to work in cooperation with receiving countries, ensuring that those countries are able to develop economically. Concretely this entails the renegotiation of bilateral trade agreements and the support and cooperation with regards to country-by-country reporting and the closing of tax havens and opaque financial flows. This would ensure that profits are taxed where they are made.

European nations should create **an international development fund**, with sufficient funds and the clear emphasis that such development aid is decoupled from any conditionality based on migration control indicators.

6.6 The EU should make efforts to enable transnational institutions like the International Court of Justice to hold transnational corporations accountable for their actions. The EU must support initiatives such as the UN negotiations on a binding treaty on transnational companies and other corporate actors with respect to human rights

6.7 International trade and bilateral- and multilateral trade agreements

In the 17 years since the WTO pledged in the context of the Doha Development Round to deliver pro-development changes, so-called developing countries have been completely sidelined by the global powers.

The WTO has failed to clarify the deliberately ambiguous rules on concluding trade agreements that allow the poorest countries to be manipulated by the rich states. In Africa, in negotiations with the EU, countries have been forced to eliminate tariffs on up to 90% of their trade because no clear rules exist to protect them. At the same time they kept their side of the bargain and enforced the protection of Intellectual Property rights, effectively restricting their access to affordable medicine such as HIV treatment.

True and lasting solutions to global economic problems can only come when the model of global competitiveness between countries becomes one of genuine cooperation.

DiEM25 is calling for a trade system which understands trade as a means to achieving broader social, environmental and development goals. Multilateral trade negotiations need fundamental reform, to be based on fair negotiations, not power play, so that developing countries have an equal place at the table. Genuine consultation with civil society in both the global north and south is key to that process.

The disastrous impacts of liberalisation on the global financial and food systems are clear to see. Yet supporters of the so-called free trade system continue to push for deep and fast liberalisation across the bilateral and multilateral trade agreements and praise the current trading system as the answer to problems as wide-ranging as human rights abuses, climate change and food security.

Free trade-agreements and development aid programs run by the EU and its member states should be replaced by fair trade-agreements: Europe should re-negotiate those agreements for mutual benefit.

6.8 Revision of the Common Agriculture Policy of the EU

2018 is the year of the next CAP negotiation round in the EU. DiEM25 is calling for a commitment to a foreign, trade and agricultural policy focused on preventing and unlocking protracted crises.

Therefore, we call for a stop of the export of subsidized agricultural products from the EU to African and Asian countries which destroys local markets and the livelihoods of small scale farmers worldwide.

6.9 We have to find ways to differentiate between pure speculation with food and real, sustainable investment in the cultivation, processing and distribution of food and stop the former. In accordance with *foodwatch*³ we therefore propose the following:

The influence of financial investors on price developments in commodities must be thwarted. The absolute number of futures contracts available for speculation must be limited, which means that **effective limits on positions for trading with commodity futures must be defined and imposed**. Whether defining limits on positions is enough to curtail speculation is by no means certain. To use limits effectively, regulatory authorities must be able to reliably distinguish which transactions are subscribed only for speculative purposes, and which serve to hedge prices in trading with physical goods. Since financial groups like Morgan Stanley, Deutsche Bank and Goldman Sachs have begun trading with physical goods, while oil groups like Shell and BP and major grain trading companies like Cargill, Bunge and ADM have for their part gone into selling the services needed for speculative investment on commodity markets we need to **dry up sources of capital for commodity speculation** and put a **ban on investing in commodity derivatives**.

The issuers of commodity index funds and certificates should be at least prohibited from investing in agricultural and energy commodities.

Major banks like Goldman Sachs and Deutsche Bank were key actors in setting up commodity indices, which among other financial products contribute to harmful price rises at commodity exchanges while at the same time stating: “Our second priority as a good corporate citizen is to earn money in a manner that is both socially and ecologically responsible.” (Deutsche Bank, 2010 CSR Report 2010).

7 We demand the possibility of a **European citizenship** for every forced migrant who comes to the EU and wishes to stay.

A European is usually born in a certain nation, therefore she/he becomes a french, a german, a swedish, etc. But why should every person who enters the EU and wishes to stay, be obliged to choose a specific nationality? DiEM25’s vision is a transnational Europe of regions (to be confirmed by the constitution policy paper as official DiEM25 policy). The possibility for migrants to acquire the European citizenship could be a step towards this direction.

8 The topic of **(forced) migration within the EU** should be addressed: equal rights and conditions of EU citizens in other countries (health insurance, social security, pensions) (link to DiEM's New Deal demand to support local communities and the topic of economic integration).

9 Education: acknowledgement of the duty of general education to **create a broad awareness of the European history of colonialism up to the present**. That is the history of colonialism should be given appropriate space in compulsory school curricula in every EU member state.

It is essential that all EU countries deal with their colonial past at an institutional level. Education policies and the media should not promote the trope of EU society as white, Christian, homogeneous and static, but give space to historically grounded accounts of it. For example, compulsory school curricula should give appropriate space to the importance that non-Christian cultures have had on the cultural, economic

³ https://www.foodwatch.org/fileadmin/foodwatch_international/reports/2011-10_foodwatch-Report_The-Hunger-Makers.pdf

and political development of Europe.

10 Change of public discourse on migration

Movement of people is an integral part of the human history and needs to be seen as chance for thinking beyond limited, homogenous national frameworks and identity politics which spreads the fear of the strangers. We insist on the change of narratives that victimize forced migrants by representing them as the passive victims in need of charity, as criminals who are also stealing our jobs. Instead, forced migrants should be seen as the political agents putting into the question the injustices and dysfunctionality of the current global geopolitical order. Differentiation between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ migrants needs to be altered, as well as the discourse that differentiates between the citizens, migrants and refugees. These divisions legitimize selectiveness in granting the right to protection and asylum and enable the continuation of the narrative in which the freedom of movement is seen as a privilege of small well off minority rather than a right and a possibility available to every person regardless of their national background and their social status.

Elimination of the xenophobic, racist and eurocentric narrative of “us” vs. “them” needs to be pursued on a level of public as well as political discourse. Getting closer to the vision of one world and free movement for all requires the rejection of the “*clash of cultures*”- narrative, the acceptance of difference, diversity and a cultural and religious dialogue.

11 We have a vision: a world without borders

We as DiEM25 will work towards the dismantling of barriers preventing the movement of people, while at the same time we will put policies in place that allow people to remain in their place of origin, or settle in a different place, at any time they desire.

We would like to recall the birth lottery argument here, which has been used by philosophers such as John Locke, Thomas Hobbes or Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Since no one chooses where and into which circumstances she/he is born, people should not be held responsible for it. Therefore everyone should be able to decide where she/he wants to go.

"Every human being is free and equal in her/his rights!"