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Preface to the second edition

It is our honour and pleasure that we may present you the second edition of this study. We believe the year after the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of European Democrat Students is the perfect occasion to publish a revised and extended collection of the most important historic events, debates and developments of this organisation, completed by a newly compiled chapter on the developments in the years that have passed since the first edition of this book.

The primary purpose of this study is to describe and to analyse the course of historic events. From this point of view, the book is intended to be as objective as possible, to a much higher degree as a usual salutation of the jubilee. It is therefore entirely appropriate to treat “Students on the Right Way” as an assembly of factual knowledge where each and everybody can look up the past.

It is certainly justified to take a closer look. In 1961, when this organisation was founded, Europe was divided, the Berlin Wall just about to be built and the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe locked away from the free world. The dark shadow of communism was endangering the societies, the everyday life of people and was a constant threat upon the entire continent and the world. One would say during these times you are either naïve or foolish to believe in a united and democratic Europe, but European Democrat Students did: They spoke out that our continent had to be united, communism to be driven out and the Iron Curtain cut down – 23 years before President Reagan called in Berlin to “tear down this wall”. This was also a European dream, a dream that was the anchor of a number of young people from many countries. Unfortunately, not all countries of Europe could contribute to this dream. Many of them were deprived from democracy and freedom. The liberties of the West were the dreams of the East.

European Democrat Students never took a rest in fighting for freedom, democracy and prosperity – numerous campaigns were conducted for reminding the public about those Europeans living under the constraints of communism and in persistent fear. Since the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956 was a topic with which ICCS founding fathers were dealing, they created the campaign “Remember Hungary 1956” – an event which was also one of the first political
experiences of EPP President Wilfried Martens who organised demonstrations in Belgium in 1956 to highlight the situation in Hungary.

In the seventies, the occupation of Cyprus was a constant cause for EDS, calling for a peaceful resolution of the conflict. The first organisation from the Soviet Block was accepted as a member in the early eighties, proving the integrative power of EDS. In the transition year 1990, EDS organised its Summer University in Vienna and Prague, to not only virtually open the borders, but to make this dream in Central Europe really happen. However, the campaigns of EDS did not stop with the fall of the Iron Curtain. Still, much is to do at the borders of Europe: The case of Belarus and Ukraine remains a pressing contemporary issue.

It is the Europe that we are building today in which we are living tomorrow. The ultimate goal is to have all Europeans living in a united, free and prosperous Europe. However, integration is not yet finalised; Europe is not yet united to its fullest extent. “It is time that we recognised our real identity which is European” Chairman Ian Taylor already stated in 1970. History proves EDS was always right in its strong commitment to the policies it followed: The Iron Curtain fell, liberty and democracy prevailed, European parties became the standard and the norm, a directly elected European Parliament was established in 1979, and finally the Lisbon Treaty opens new horizons in the pan-European commitment and the democratisation of European politics.

As an organisation providing ever increasing ideas and incentives for the case of Europe, we are certain that the first fifty years of EDS will be followed by many fifty years to come. EDS has so much to give in terms of providing students with an outlook on international and European politics, enabling them to form their own destiny. EDS also created the European Identity that is so much required in order to build our common house Europe and fill it with life and creativity. This organisation is outshining the usual world of international organisations and is always a thrilling experience, having contributed over the years with strong ideas to the European integration. When reading this book, the deeper roots of European politics and their background may become easily perceivable.

Last but not least a personal note: We have learned a lot from our work in EDS for life, moreover we made many friends and both found the women of our lives in this organisation. We cherish our time in EDS and we wish that the future of student leaders will seize the capacities of this organisation, let those flourish and bring them to their full extent.

We wish you a pleasant read and deep reflection about this great organisation and the European Dream of the people behind it.

Brussels, May 2012

Holger J. Thuss and Bence Bauer
Why on earth do we need a history book on EDS?” I was asked this question by a considerable number of friends of mine who had heard about this project – particularly after finding out that it was not just another university thesis. I was always convinced of the necessity of the book. The most important reason for publishing my findings is the organisation itself. EDS needs to record its own history. If EDS-activities have had any political impact, present EDS-activists should surely become aware of this. Furthermore, to reflect on and to project the achievements of the European Democrat Students over the last 40 years is a challenging but interesting task. There were years of special significance to me as almost 10 of them have represented in a voluntary and professional way my life’s work and interest. This book is therefore dedicated not only to the EDS-activists but also to my family and friends who have supported me over the years.

However there are additional reasons for this book. With the emergence of the European Parliament, research on European parties has increased. EDS is more than an interesting detail within this context. I would be more than delighted, if this book helped both political scientist and layman to learn more about the historic background of contemporary European political parties. At the same time, the history of EDS reflects the history of European youth politics. Ever since its foundation, EDS was supposed to be an organisation that embodied those students who did not wish to be represented by the international student establishment, i.e. organisations such as the IUS, the WFDY or the ISC. The background of these organisations must also be brushed in order to delineate their pre-eminent role over the decades. Since few links between student politics and government politics have so far been published, I have also included some of the more general historical challenges with which EDS was confronted. Myths had to be destroyed; rumours had to be replaced by facts. The merger of political philosophies – conservatism, liberalism and Christian social thought – was in the centre of my interest as well.

The book itself contains an introduction and four more chapters: the introduction deals with the founding process until 1961. Each of the following four chapters revolves around one of the four decades to come. I intended to focus on a balanced description of what happened: members, dates, programmes and the development of the political agenda. By collecting as much
data as possible, I took the risk of perhaps including too many details and not writing a streamlined story. The development of abstract theories or a complex methodology was however not my intention. This book is also not an account of the experiences and achievements of individuals as such; relatively few names are indeed mentioned. Since almost all EDS-activists were merely in their early twenties, I tried to refrain as well from personal critic as only a matter of fairness.

A few words to the sources of the study: Foremost I relied on the EDS-archive, which is an integral part of the Archive for Christian-Democrat Politics (ACDP) in Sankt Augustin, Germany. However this book would not exist without the kind support of former EDS-officers: Ms. Bettina Machaczek, former Chairman, Mr. Uwe Leonardy, former RCDS-International Secretary, Mr. Dieter Ibielski, former Secretary General, Mr. Johann Friedrich Colsman, former Vice-chairman, as well as Andreas von Gehlen, former Vice-chairman of RCDS, were offering me their private records. Additionally, Ms. Bente Møller Poulsen of the European Youth Foundation in Strasbourg kindly submitted records concerning the relations with her institution.

I would also like to thank Mr. Stephan Eisel and again Mr. Dieter Ibielski for taking the historic EDS-records to the archive in Sankt Augustin. Particularly Mr. Ibielski’s reports were a great help to start writing. The same is true for Ms. Eva Gustavsson and her anniversary publication of 1992. Furthermore, I would like to thank the employees of the ACDP for the excellent cooperation, most of all Mr. Hans-Joachim Klegraf, and the 2001/2002-Executive Board of EDS for encouraging me throughout the year. Since this is the occasion to express gratitude, I must also very much thank Ms. Roberta Tedesco Triccas and Ms. Tara Geraghty for their great help with the difficulties of the English language.

In a way, this book is a result of the close co-operation of former and present activists of ICCS/ECCS/EDS, which makes me optimistic for the decades to come.

_ Jena/Vilnius, June 2002_  

_Holger J. Thuss_
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Dear Readers!

As President of the European People’s Party (EPP) and its foundation, the Centre for European Studies (CES), it is my great pleasure to present the 2nd edition of “Students on the right way”, the history book covering 50 years of the European Democrat Students (EDS) organisation and a continuation of a volume of the same title written some ten years ago.

As President of the European People’s Party (EPP) I have witnessed the activities of EDS over the past decades and I would like to share with you, the European public, some of my key thoughts about EDS, its history and impact on the construction of Europe, especially regarding our political family.

Very early on, in the beginning of the sixties, EDS created the objective of striving for a free and responsible Europe. When the Berlin Wall was just about to be built, and Europe was about to be divided for the next several decades, students from five countries started to establish a forum for mutual exchange, international cooperation and a future in a non-communist world. They sought a united Europe at peace: with justice, freedom and democracy characterised by tolerant and pluralistic societies. What began as a small group developed over the years to become the biggest political student movement on the continent, creating the framework for how Democrats would strive for integration in Europe. The ONE EUROPE programme in 1964 was especially ground breaking at that time for evoking the idea of a united Europe.

EDS has always been a frontrunner for future developments. Reflecting on how a better future could be created, EDS activists worked to contribute to the
shaping of European integration. For example, EDS were already advocating direct elections to the European Parliament at the beginning of the seventies and the organisation of national parties at the European level while representing the perspectives of the centre-right. In the eighties, just as Communism was about to fall, EDS organised its summer universities in divided Berlin in 1988 and in Vienna and Prague in 1990; demonstrating that they were in favour of working towards a unification of Europe and of tearing down the Iron Curtain, which at those times was both outspoken and courageous. In the nineties EDS continued to advocate EU enlargement and encouraged democracy, with the inclusion of student member parties, in Central and Eastern Europe to grow in a reunited Europe.

*EDS has offered new models of inclusion and dialogue.* Since the very inception of European politics, EDS has fostered collaboration among all the centre-right parties, ranging from Christian-Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals to Centrists. Its aim has been to be united in the struggle for a free and united Europe. Moreover, in geographic terms EDS opened its gates for the Democrats from the eastern side of the Iron Curtain, enabling them to grasp from the liberties of the West, what were at those times the dreams of those in the East. In the course of history, EDS broadened its scope even further. EDS was integrated into the EPP fifteen years ago and is celebrating its jubilee in 2012; during this time EDS has contributed to the EPP’s goal of a full unification of the centre-right.

*Integration and Identity in Europe have been deliberated on by EDS.* EDS has promoted a united and more integrated Europe and they continue to contribute to important debates of our times in this area. European identity, the future of our democratic community in Europe, the roles assumed by European parliaments and the future of a European electorate are topics that need careful reflection, intensive deliberation, exchange among people and fresh ideas and approaches. In all these fields EDS have offered worthy suggestions. In particular, European identity and the future of political debate on the European stage are developments, which were discussed by EDS and identified as important by the EU. The young generations of today, therefore, occupy a precious role in shaping these important trends.

EDS as a model student organisation contributes towards shaping policies and politics to make them European, by fostering European answers and creating a place for exchange among Europeans, moderated and generated by Europeans. EDS with its views and opinions on a broad range of topics offers a European approach. The spirit of many EDS generations has always been a European one, setting an example as to how to live in a unified and prosperous new Europe.
The year 2011, and especially the 50th Anniversary of EDS in Brussels, where I had the opportunity to address almost 300 EDS activists, alumni and friends of the centre-right in Europe, was a historical point for EDS. This year confirmed the compassion and commitment of EDS to the European project, verified the ideas and policies EDS had and finally proved that the multiple student leaders whom the EDS brought to Europe have arrived in a forum of European ideas, with truly European politics and European answers. And all those sceptics, past and present, had to learn and understand that European Integration can perhaps be delayed, but never hindered; maybe challenged, but not obstructed; maybe criticised, but not avoided. In this sense European Democrat Students promoted the Europe we believe in, the Europe we want and we struggle so much for. My respect and acknowledgement goes to all generations of EDS members, all of whom constantly shared the motto of my home country of Flanders: “Luctur et Emergo – I struggle, I overcome”.

I hope the readers of this publication will retrace and reiterate the compassion for our united Europe, which is ever more important in this time of crisis and eurosclerosis. By retracing how young leaders promoted and shared our common destiny, we see our own struggles and results. EDS has assumed an important role, in advancing its activities and visions, to make it successful and the strongest political student organisation in Europe.

I wish EDS a bright future, many more achievements and another 50 years of helping shape our truly remarkable Europe. There will be challenges, but may we continue to be brave and courageous, as many EDS generations have been before us; may we seize these opportunities by working together.

Brussels, February 2012

Wilfried Martens
Foreword by
Dr. Hans-Gert Pöttering, MEP
President of the
European Parliament ret.
Chairman of the
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung

The unification of Europe is the greatest achievement of peace in the history of our continent and the entire world. This historical reflection may seem exaggerated to some observers, especially in light of the ongoing international debt crisis, but yet it remains a true fact. People tend to forget that we have come a long way from a continent of antagonism towards a union, which is based on common values and principles, in which today almost 500 million people of 27 countries live together “unified in diversity”. Only if we know where we have come from, we may know where we are and may decide on where we want to go. The preservation of our historic memory, the passing down of our past especially to younger generations who will once shape Europe, is of utmost importance, so that our experience from history will be a fundament to our future paths. EDS takes on a great responsibility by doing this exactly: As societies in Europe have become multi-cultural, it engages not only young Europeans, but young people from all over the world with the question of how mutual life in a society of peace and tolerance can be achieved by means of political tools.

Indeed Europeans live in peace with each other today: The 27 countries of the European Union are close partners. After the gruesome Second World War, caused by the Germans, some brave statesmen had the courage, the strength and the foresight to give Germany a hand and to start the unification process of Europe. The Schuman Plan set the pavement of a long and successful road, which was accompanied by severe setbacks. Yet everyone knew that the idea of a European Union is not a goal to achieve but rather a constant work in progress. Therefore small steps are just as important as big decisions.
What is significant accordingly is that we are moving in the right direction: Not a Europe of national parliaments - an intergovernmental Europe - but a union, which commits itself to solidarity and strong, collaboratively acting institutions, shall be our European principle. Jean Monnet once truly said: “Nothing is possible without men, but nothing is lasting without institutions”.

One of these institutions is the European Parliament. Once solely been a “gathering of people” it step-by-step grew to be a full co-legislator together with the Council. Without the European Parliament the European Union would not be what it is today! It has always understood itself as solicitor of a new Europe, acting on the grounds of democracy.

Being the only Member of the European Parliament continuously serving since the first direct elections in 1979, and in my functions as Vice-Chairman and Chairman of the EPP-ED-Group, and later as President of the European Parliament, I witnessed recent changes in Europe from a “front-row-seat”. One of the most moving experiences of the last decade has been the welcoming of several former communistic countries from Central and Eastern Europe to the European Union on 1st of May, 2004. Freedom has triumphed over a totalitarian system! This has been the most magnificent European wonder of all times: We have overcome a divided Europe, because Europeans in the West kept hold of their values, hence Europeans in the East recognised their desire for these principles, and demanded them peacefully for themselves. Today, as the Berlin Declaration, of March 25th, 2007 states, “Wir Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union sind zu unserem Glück vereint”. (“We, the citizens of the European Union, have united for the better”).

For the European People’s Party (EPP) and for EDS the challenge for the next decades to come is to preserve our Christian-Democratic convictions, politically and also morally, and to stay devoted to our values: The unification of our continent, based on the dignity of the human being, human rights, freedom, democracy, rule of law, principle of solidarity and subsidiarity.

The book “Students on the Right Way – European Democrat Students 1961 - 2011” is a direct follow up of the prior edition of the first 40 years and deal with the recent years of 2002 to 2011. The aim was to create a general book of reference, which illustrates information about EDS’s activity. Genre-wise this is a history book, collecting historical evidence, but in crucial instances it also offers interpretation. EDS is a vivid and reliable partner to the EPP, and its rich history of over 50 years of existence has made a vast contribution to build, maintain and strengthen civil society in Europe.

This book shows in which ways EDS brought these values closer to the young generations of the European Union: During the years of 2002 to 2011 EDS brought several thousand students together, provided them with in-
formative events and by that created a platform for exchange on cultural and academical level. Within this scope enthusiastic and committed youngsters from all over Europe and beyond were united in their effort to maintain and strengthen our fundamental ideals of democracy and freedom in Europe and the rest of the world. In order to be also successful in the future, we have to measure up to these values, this gives us the opportunity to win the European citizens for our Christian-Democratic cause.

I want to sincerely congratulate EDS on the impressive work of the past half century and especially the last decade of advocating our democratic principles as well as for the interest in students within the European Union and strongly encourage you to pursue your work with the same enthusiasm in the future.

Europe needs EDS because of its important contribution to the formation of a European identity: You help strengthen Europe’s perception among the future generations. EDS unites 1.600.000 students in 44 member organisations from 35 countries in Europe and beyond in this spirit. This book reflects your accomplishments highly.

*Brussels, 7th February 2012*

Dr. Hans-Gert Pöttering
Chapter 1

Centre-right Student Co-operation prior to 1961
Roots

In 1961, the “International Christian-Democratic and Conservative Student Union” (ICCS), the predecessor of European Democrat Students (EDS), was founded. The new association was a response of students holding moderate conservative and Christian-democratic views to the increasing international student activities of other political, religious, professional and other movements. Their objective was to create a more coherent international co-operation of national student organisations leaning towards the political centre-right.

However, even though ICCS was designed to be an independent organisation, its foundation and development always have to be seen as part of a broader picture. In claiming this, we are entering the sphere of political ideas, since EDS, under its various names, has always had an interest, in one way or another, in Christianity, the ideas of the American and French Revolutions, conservatism, liberalism, Christian-democracy, socialism, communism and environmentalism. As EDS never limited itself to a student-affairs-only-approach, all of these ideas and the movements following them were never limited to one region or nation.

It is a well understood historical fact, that these ideas provided a fertile ground for the growth of political parties and modern parliamentarism. Considering the international dimension of political thought, the long history of international cooperation of political movements comes as no surprise. It was the international socialist and anarchist movements, were the first to institutionalise their political co-operation on the international level (or at least they tried to). As early as 1864, the first “International Worker’s Association” or “First International” was established, but was dissolved in 1872. In 1889, the Social-Democrats established the so-called “Second International”, which was dissolved during the First World War and re-established in 1919/20 only to break down again during the Second World War and to be resurrected in 1951. A “Third International” was established in March 1919 by the (Russian) Communists in Moscow (“Komintern”) only to be dissolved in 1943. Primary aims of these organisations were to create a world-wide movement for the promotion of “socialist” ideas or even “world revolution”, to influence Western civil societies, and to create international reputation for its member parties and their leaders.

Non-socialist or “centre right” parties found it more difficult to benefit of international party co-operation. On the one hand, they always assumed the role of defenders of the national interest. Furthermore, the churches with their international orientation provided sufficient substitutes for the institu-
tionalised international co-operation of politicians. This picture changed only slightly after the First World War when Pan-European ideas led to the first attempts to institutionalise the co-operation of European Christian-Democrat parties. In 1925, the Italian priest Don Luigi Sturzo together with Alcide de Gasperi initiated the “Secretariat international de liaison et d’information” in Paris. This liaison committee enjoyed only slightly significant political influence. The destructive result of the Second World War encouraged centre-right parties to co-operate more closely once again. Fuelled by the ideas of Count Coudenhove-Kalergy, leading Christian-Democrat politicians established the “Nouvelles Equipes Internationales” (NEI) in 1947. This organisation was the predecessor of the European Union of Christian Democrats (EUCD, since 1965) and the EPP. That same year, the liberal “International World Union”, predecessor of the “Liberal International”, was founded as well.\footnote{Gehlen (2000), pp. 30-32, 82.}

However, the founding of ICCS was of course not only influenced by ideology-driven party politics but also by the evolution of the European universities and developments in student and youth politics (which were in turn influenced by party politics). Already in the Middle Ages, the Latin-speaking students and scholars were considered a highly internationally oriented and a very mobile social group. Every student was a member of a fraternity. Another factor was a genuine youth activism, which emerged in the more advanced European countries around 1890 as a cultural movement motivated against the perceived pessimism of the establishment. Even though this movement was apolitical and not very well organised, greater political implications were felt later on because this was the first attempt at defining “youth” as a social interest group. It was only a matter of time, that the first of these youth groups acquired political status.

One of the consequences was the discovery of “youth” by the politicians and the introduction of youth wings in the political parties. These branches were also given the competence over higher education issues.

The international co-operation between these youth wings progressed along the same lines of international party co-operation. Again, socialist and communist youth co-operation was first. In their words, the original reason to set up separate socialist youth organisations was that the “Socialist parties and the trade unions paid no attention to the movements [problems] of the working youth.” The first socialist youth organisations were founded in Italy (1901), Norway (1903) and Sweden (1903). The first International (Social Democratic) Youth Congress and the establishment on the International Union of Socialist Youth (IUSY) took place in 1907 (in Stuttgart, Germany),
initiated by the German Karl Liebknecht. The Communist Youth International followed in 1919. Ironically enough, some of the founders of the IUSY were among leading Communists of 1919 as well.

Though most of the centre-right parties had also introduced youth departments such as the “Junior Imperial League” in 1906 by the British Conservatives, the international co-operation of centre-right youth organisations only started after the Second World War. An explanation might be the presence of strong non-socialist “bourgeois” youth and student organisations independently from political parties. Many student fraternities made no secret of their support for catholic, liberal or conservative causes. Christian student organisations in particular offered a significant number of international activities, given the political and technological limits of the time. The World Student Christian Federation, established in 1895, is probably the oldest international student organisation. Another important player in international youth and student co-operation that belongs in this category was the international boy-scout movement. By 1935, the International Scout Association had 2.5 million members. And then there were the national student unions, such as the British NUS, established in 1922. Their international co-operation started in November 1919 with the foundation of the “International Student Confederation” (ISC). This association developed major activities in areas such as youth exchange, travelling, sports and publications. The ISC was dissolved in 1940, after the German police had confiscated its headquarters in Brussels.

Writing the history of youth and student movements also reveals another important factor of youth and student politics – totalitarian ideology. Socialism, fascism or communism had strongly influenced the younger generations. Many Italian Fascists and German National Socialists of the 1920s were students. Their Communist enemies also enjoyed a lot of support by students and manipulated international youth and student co-operation for their own purposes. In 1933, under the disguise of “anti-fascism” and “anti-imperialism”, a first Moscow-oriented “Youth World Congress against Fascism and War” was organised in Paris. In 1936, the same party was initiating the establishment of the “World Congress of Youth”. This organisation was part of the Kremlin’s infamous “people’s front policy”, officially adopted by the Communist International in 1935.

The aim was to influence and destroy the civil society of other countries by means of manipulation, propaganda and infiltration. The youth and the students and their national and international organisations were among the

---

2 However it is a matter of interpretation whether this organisation is identical with the present IUSY. Cf. Eppe/ Uellenberg (1977), pp. 6-7, 9.
primary targets in this battle. Soon, the Communists were successful: many secret members of Communist parties represented national youth councils, students, labour unions and others on the international level. By that, Communists had secured their majorities at congresses, and could eventually succeed in the elections for key-positions in the emerging organisations. From the very beginning in 1935, the presence of a tiny group of Conservatives, Christians and Liberals was only acceptable as long as it served the goal to pretend pluralism and to deliver some legitimacy.

If they did behave “improperly” – as e.g. the Danish Conservative Youth in 1947 in the WFDY – they were slandered as spies or “enemies of peace” and unanimously expelled. Since this strategy proved to be so very effective - only a few of the idealistic youth and student activists had discovered the strong links of their idealistic organisations to the Communists in Moscow early enough – Stalin even decided to dissolve the Communist Youth International in 1943.

**Options in the Cold War: IUS and ISC**

Immediately after the war, Stalin started a second attempt to install “like-minded” international organisations according to the model of 1935. And again, these tactics were successful and thus became one of the paradigms of international youth and student politics until the breakdown of the Iron Curtain in 1989. In November 1945, the “World Federation of Democratic Youth” (WFDY) was established, also Moscow-sympathetic. In 1946, several national student unions started to discuss whether to revive the International Student Confederation. For the summer of 1946, a preparatory congress was foreseen for Prague. But a certain Joseph Grohman, Czech Secretary General of the “International Preparative Committee” and communist “submarine”, managed to convert the preparatory congress to a “constituting” congress and to organise a sufficient communist majority.

His strategy during the congress in August 1946 was simple but compelling: those delegates supporting communist proposals were in favour of “progress” and “democracy”. Those against – for whatever reason – were shouted down as being “fascist”. Grohman also became first IUS-president. Secretary General was Tom Madden, a British medical student officially representing the British Medical Student Association, who only later on admitted to being a communist. Immediately after the congress, a secretariat in Prague was established which was mainly working according to their directives. Thus, from its very beginning in August 1946, the International Union of Students was under the complete control of Moscow-orientated communists.
and a close ally to the WFDY, even though they claimed to only comprise such national student unions that are “democratic in constitution and practice” and “open to all students in the country regardless of race, religion, political affiliation, or social status”.  

However, for the sake of good will moderate Western student unions did not hesitate to co-operate for the time being. But until 1950 several political developments motivated them to eventually withdraw: the communist takeover in Prague (1948), the exclusion of the Yugoslavs of the IUS – carried out in a surprisingly aggressive manner (1949), and finally the proceedings of the IUS-Congress in 1950 which included vilification, physical attacks and humiliations on Western moderate delegates: “hysteria was the order of the day and there was no logical debate or discussion.” Thus in late 1950, Stanley Jenkins, president of the British NSU – who considered the IUS “a complete failure” – and Olof Palme on behalf of the Swedish NSU initiated negotiations leading to the establishment of the second international student organisation, the “International Student Conference” (ISC) as the response to the Communist infiltration of the IUS.

Its “Co-ordinating Secretariat of the National Unions of Students” (COSEC) was situated in Leiden (The Netherlands). The new global youth organisation co-operating with the ISC was called “World Alliance of Youth” (WAY). And at least in theory, this organisation was a potential partner for centre-right students as well. But soon, this organisation was considered to be Social-Democratic – no surprise considering the political background of its founders and the strong (financial) support by the British Labour Party. Though the new ISC in general supported pro-Western policies, the hidden but strong links of any politics to party politics became more obvious. For the centre-right, both IUS and ISC remained left organisations rather serving specific government policies than student interests.

By this, they were both part of the great game called Cold War: “Each side systematically exploited the weaknesses of the other. Propaganda and subversion ranked high among the array of weapons deployed; all sections of society were targeted, and perhaps none more than youth and students.” Too close contacts to a government were also the reason for the inglorious end of the ISC: Revelations of a magazine in 1966 showed the heavy financial support of the ISC by the CIA. This was lethal: in March 1969, the ISC was disbanded.

---

Thus until 1960, the one-sidedness of both organisations prevented centre right students to feel represented on the international level. As well towards the moderate ISC, these feelings did not decrease: a visit of Jochen Denzo to the 9th ISC-Conference in Klosters (Switzerland) in September 1960 was most certainly organised in order to investigate a possible co-operation of RCDS with this organisation. But the study trip revealed severe conflicts between ultra-left groups from Latin-America and moderate North-Americans and Europeans on the other side. Apparently, the communist strategy of infiltration had again succeeded in the ISC: on demand of the delegation from Cuba – where Castro had established its regime in 1959 – the conference decided to reopen the debate of standing orders which paralysed the conference for about three days, and another debate about voting rights for a further two days. The meeting had to be prolonged by two days in order to achieve at least some results. At this of all meetings, it was also decided to introduce a “student as pioneer citizen” policy, making general political statements on behalf of the COSEC possible.

On the other hand, RCDS and other non-socialist student organisations were always struggling against general politics in student unions (the “student as such”-approach). Since there were also rumours about a possible merger between ISC and IUS, the necessity of international and independent centre right student activities became even more evident. This was also reflected by the name of the first international centre-right student activities, which were also International Student Conferences but exclusively of “Christian-Democratic and Conservative Students”

Cover page of an anti-festival magazine distributed in 1959 (clipping)
In 1959, WFDY and IUS announced that the “7th World Youth Festival” was to take place in Vienna, from the 26th of July to the 4th of August. The aim of the festival was to influence youth activists from former European colonies to support communist ideas. Six huge “World Youth Festivals” had already taken place since 1947. The political dimension of these festivals was obvious: according to both IUS and WFDY, about 34,000 delegates attended the 6th festival in Moscow, 18,000 participants were catered for in Vienna (these figures might have been exaggerated, the “Guardian” knew of about 16,500 participants). The extended activities of the IUS motivated others more and more. Democratic organisations increasingly initiated activities against the communist infiltration of the free West by organisations manipulating students “to serve the post-war policies of the Soviet state.”

In their objective to counter both IUS and WFDY, they were supported by western governments. The anti-communist “Arbeitsgemeinschaft Junges Leben” (“Action Committee New Life”) was observed by the East German Security Service since March 1959. This group was consisting of not only centre-right, but also centre-left groups. The aim of the “Action Committee” was to “use the festival for talks with its participants, without officially participating in the festival as fellow travellers of the communist organisers of the festival.” It also declared that nobody had asked the Austrian youth and student organisations to host the event or to participate in it. Therefore, it had been decided to organise “alternative” events parallel to the communist meeting, in order to distract festival participants from the official programme and to shine a light on the communist background of the festival.

For this, the action committee invited several international youth organisations to assist, among them the IUYCD and the IUSY. A key role in organising the “anti-festival” played however the Austrian Youth Federation, the umbrella organisation of all the major non-Communist youth and student organisations. As a result, several national youth councils sent delegations to support the “anti-festival”. Several members of centre-right student organisations joined these delegations.

11 AG “Junges Leben” to IUYCD, December 1958, ACDP IV-007-136; VII. Weltjugendfestspiele – ohne uns. Ein Tatsachenbericht zur persönlichen Information (official brochure of the action committee “young life”). According to the IUSY itself it had „great difficulties to explain the difference between its organisation and the reactionary and Fascistic [...] organisations which tried to disturb the festival” and were (as in 1962) „not successful” with this. In fact, the activities of IUSY, IUYCD and others were officially co-ordinated by „Neues Leben”, Gloria Steinem and the „Independent Research Service”, and financed by the CIA. Obviously, after the CIA-links had been revealed (1966), IUSY had its reasons to deny these alliances; cf. Eppe/ Uellenberg (1977), pp. 82-83, and Kotek (1996); cf. Youth Festival At Vienna, The Guardian, July 26, 1958, p. 2.
At least 30 members of the German anticommunist delegation came from RCDS. Among them was for example Manfred Klein, who had belonged to the Christian Democrat resistance in East-Germany and thus had spent nine years in a communist prison. Another participant was the RCDS Vice Chairman Dietrich Nemitz.\textsuperscript{12} Others were representatives of the Christian-Democratic exile organisations of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Lithuania in the International Union of Young Christian Democrats (IUYCD).\textsuperscript{13}

The committee created 38 groups ideally consisting of four (two from Western Europe, two from exile-groups) to get in contact with the participants of the official festival.\textsuperscript{14} They had success with students from Hungary and Poland in particular, as one carefully reported to the East German security service. Some Polish students had even openly expressed their interest in getting in contact with RCDS and to learn more about their anti-communist ideas. One of them joined the “Action Committee”.

But the committee also organised Jazz concerts, exhibitions portraying the oppressed churches of the communist world, the uprising in Hungary in 1956, and the life in Austria after the departure of the Russian army. Furthermore, some one thousand pins bearing the slogan “Remember Hungary 1956!” were produced and distributed. Activists tried to steer delegates to book stands displaying translated editions of Pasternak’s “Shivago” and “The New Class” by Milovan Dijas, magazines, news sheets, and even the “Vienna Daily News”, produced in 7 languages. Even the Dalai Lama had accepted an invitation “as one of the several counter moves” to the festival.\textsuperscript{15}

The result of these activities was the total separation of the communist participants for that time being, carried in locked buses from event to event to prevent them from escaping, but also the beating up of anti-communist activists and journalists alike by “Communist commandos”.\textsuperscript{16}

After that, both IUS and WFDY exercised more care. The 8\textsuperscript{th} festival took place in the much “safer” Helsinki, and the participants there were even more separated from the locals (e.g. accommodation in far away suburbs or on ships in the harbour). Even in a communist publication, 19 years later it was admitted, that the Viennese “anti-festival” took place.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{12} Participants’ list, ACDP IV-007-151/1.
\textsuperscript{13} Cf. U.I.J.D.C., Minutes, Die Kommission für Mittel- und Osteuropa, 02-11-59, ACDP IV-007-151/2.
\textsuperscript{14} U.I.J.D.C., Minutes, Die Kommission für Mittel- und Osteuropa, 02-11-59, p. 4, ACDP IV-007-151/2; BStU, MfS-BdL, Nr. 000624, note of 23-03-59; Walter Konrad, Report (German), RCDS-Brief 11, 11-12-59, p. 7-9, PAL.
\textsuperscript{17} Cf. footnote 6. BStU, MfS-BdL, Nr. 000624, report of 09-09-59, MfS AP 3193/68; Bewerunge, Lothar: Frieden, Freundschaft - keine Freiheit, in: Civis (RCDS-magazine), 05-10-59, p. 60.
Centre-Right Student Co-operation 1951-1959

In 1959, the need for more international exchange was widely accepted among centre-right students. However, the establishment of a common centre-right student structure was not yet a matter of debate. But of course they had had an idea of what was going on in the ISC and WAY on the one side and the increasingly active international association of the fraternal centre-right youth organisations on the other, the International Union of Young Christian Democrats (IUYCD), since 1951. Unlike the constant political in-fighting of ISC and WAY, the activities of the international young Christian-democrats were certainly attractive. Their presence at the 1959 Vienna festival did not go unnoticed by the students. After the Vienna festival, the IUYCD even promoted the further co-operation “of those youth organisations that co-operated Vienna.”

Another development certainly made an impression as well: pan-European ideas and economic pragmatism had led to the establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel (ECCS) in 1951, the starting point of the E.E.C. After 1955, when European issues seemed to be replaced by other issues, dissatisfaction among students with this situation grew. When the Treaty of Rome was signed by 6 European governments in March 1957, the public interest in European issues once again increased. The founding of the EFTA in 1960 – the year of the first two centre right student conferences – led to public debate on the future integration of the E.E.C and EFTA.

That in turn led to a significant increase of international activities on the side of the future member organisations of EDS. Considering those activities until 1961 and the foundation of the ICCS, four periods of centre-right student co-operation can be identified. A first period started around 1954, when RCDS organised an international meeting during Pentecost. Since around that time, sporadic political contacts of the German RCDS to the Swedish SKSF, to the Austrian FÖSt, to Belgian and Dutch student groups have been reported. Since then, it was one of the main objectives of RCDS to establish political relations to like-minded student organisations everywhere in Europe, even though it was claimed at the same time “that in foreign countries we can only rely in the fewest cases on student organisations, which are comparable with RCDS in reference to their programme and structure”. A journey in August 1955, when a group of RCDS-members went to Sweden to meet SKSF-members,

18 U.I.J.D.C., Minutes, Die Kommission für Mittel- und Osteuropa, 02-11-59, p. 1, ACDP IV-007-151/2.
20 Federal Board of RCDS, Minutes, 21-11/22-11-53, p. 5, PAT.
21 Federal Council of RCDS, Minutes, 26/28-04-56, p. 5. Hans-Joachim Moldenhauer, report (German), October 1956, PAL.
might have reversed this opinion. With this meeting, the first period of European centre-right student co-operation ended, characterized by unsystematic and infrequent bilateral encounters.

A second period started in 1956 with an initiative of Uwe Leonardy, then a 21 years old law student from Kiel, Germany, member of the German-English Society, who later became the International Secretary of RCDS (1957-1958). In the course of a few years, his idea of establishing a more regular exchange with other centre-right student organisations, most notably with the British Federation of University and Conservative Unionist Associations (FUCUA, established 1931), would develop into a vivid network of like-minded organisations from several European countries. As Leonardy’s project was the spark that ignited a flame burning to this day, he should be considered as the “founding father” of the organised centre right student co-operation in Europe, perhaps together with his British partners, Robert Milne, head of the overseas bureau of the Conservative Party, and Geoffrey Finsberg (1926-1996), later Baron Finsberg of Hampstead, until 1957 National Chairman of the Young Conservatives.\(^2\)\(^2\) Kai-Uwe von Hassel, Prime Minster of the state of Schleswig-Holstein and one of the architects of European People’s Party, also belonged to the early supporters of Leonardy’s project.

Leonardy explained his motivation in a 1956 report, emphasising his “growing dissatisfaction with the fading impact of European conceptions in politics” and the “search for a revival” of the European idea in order to “motivate the political forces in this direction”\(^\text{23}\). In order to get closer to his vision, he realised the “necessity of a British co-operation in the development of the European idea”, the necessity of a British involvement in Europe. Since the renaissance of the European idea was to rely on the result of intensified talks particularly between the Community of the Six and Britain, Leonardy tried to come in contact with some FUCUA activists. Substantial results of these efforts were not only several mutual British-German visits, but also many personal friendships and his membership in the Conservative Society of the London School of Economics (1960/61).\(^\text{24}\)

For the first time, Leonardy presented his idea of a political visit to Britain in the evening hours of 23 February 1956, in a coffee bar (Café Hagen) in Kiel (Germany). Already the next day, Leonardy sent his letter to the FUCUA-
leadership, inviting them to establish “political contacts” since “we do think, indeed, that our two clubs have very much in common in their views and conceptions of the ways, in which the European peoples should organise their domestic and their common affairs.”25 Eventually, after writing many letters to Britain, Leonardy was successful: 12 students from Kiel and 9 from Hamburg travelled to London – at that time an incredible journey which used to last about 24 hours – to participate in the 1st RCDS-FUCUA seminar, to be held in London, 21-26 September, 1956. Among them was Hans-Uwe Erichsen, who would become the first Secretary General of the ICCS in 1961.

The British hosts had prepared an exciting programme: Beside a number of official receptions, common attendance of church services, and tea, the participants used the possibility to exchange information on an informal basis. Mutually similar positions in each others’ political programme were soon discovered. Moot topics included constitutional questions (Are there possibilities to introduce the monarchy in Germany?), Europe, the Commonwealth, world communism, student affairs, the German question and comparative analyses of the two countries. The “western idea of freedom” was analysed extensively. On the other hand, there were differences: “One should not expect of Great Britain any agreement to join a European federation with the continent: ‘You will waste your time on that.’”

The German participants noted with surprise, that the communist influence on British campuses was so highly visible. Finally, both organisations agreed on a continuation of the bilateral contacts. As a result, FUCUA was invited for a visit to Germany: “The meeting was benefiting for both parts. The most positive: The ice between the British and the German political student groups in the area of European affairs was broken, some taboos were eliminated”.26

---

25 Minutes, RCDS Kiel, 23-02-56, p. 1, PAL; Leonardy to FUCUA, 24-02-56, p. 1, PAL.
26 Uwe Leonardy, Report, November 1957, p. 1, ACDP IV-007-161/3.
11-17 July, 1957, a delegation of 18 FUCUA and Young Conservatives members under the leadership of Councillor Geoffrey Finsberg visited RCDS in Bonn. “One satisfying feature was the availability of excellent beer for a most modest sum.” The programme was similar to that of the London event: Topics were the programme of the CDU/CSU, the division of Germany, student history, and the European integration. One of the most prominent speakers was Mr. Westrick, Deputy Minister (Staatssekretär) in the German Foreign Office. Joint discussions were held on “the Common Market, and the proposed Industrial Free Trade Area, as well as the relationship between Great Britain, Germany, Europe, and the Commonwealth.” Visits were “paid to the Ministry of Economics, the [federal] Press and Information Office, the British Embassy and the Bundestag. The meetings, addresses, and discussions were informal and whilst no conclusions were reached – nor were they intended to be - much good cause from the frank exchange of opinions.”

The reason to emphasise the lack of conclusions was, that “the relations reached a critical point”, when the Daily Telegraph of 17 July 1957 published information about the meeting. In its report, the newspaper “indirectly imputed to RCDS, the initiation and maintenance of such contacts were aimed at the intellectual establishment of an ‘International of Right Wings’. This went against the ideas of FUCUA: “The pragmatism of the British Conservatives

27 Uwe Leonardy, Report, October 1957, PAL; Press release, 17-08-57, PAL; FUCUA (ed.), Report, Overseas Visits, Bonn, 12th – 17th July 1957, PAL.
would not allow such strong links of the Conservative Party to foreign political organisations.” Both the Young Conservatives and FUCUA felt obliged to emphasise they would not have such intentions. But by this, the I-word was in the air: when Leonardy reported of the meeting in the RCDS-magazine Civis a few weeks later, he dedicated a long reluctant passage to it. For him the close co-operation of all non-socialist parties on the European level was inevitable. Both Christian-Democrats and Conservatives were relatives to each other, though not identical. The existing political differences should prevent the centre right parties from establishing the “boredom of standardisation through a counterpart of the egalitarian socialist International”. The centre-right parties would not embarrass themselves by “pretending unanimity for the sake of the organisation”. Hence, for the time being he suggested “permanent ad-hoc talks” and to avoid the impression, the promotion of the European idea by the NEI could take place only behind the closed doors of their own club.28

28 Uwe Leonardy, Christliche Demokraten und Konservative, in: Civis 32/33, August/September 1957, pp. 95-96.
Another result of the Bonn talks was an invitation to Leonardy to observe the Annual Congress of the Conservative Party of October 1957 in Brighton.\textsuperscript{29} The programme was to be exhausting: attendance of local party meetings, receptions, a visit in Cambridge, informal talks with various Conservative MPs and officers, and finally the attendance to the Party Congress. Leonardy was impressed by the professionalism of the Conservative Party, its traditions, and the various speakers. Viscount Hailsham, the party leader was speaking on “Toryism and Tomorrow”. Even Harold Macmillan, the Prime Minister, wanted to see the German guest in order to share his views on the German elections. A debate on Britain’s participation in a “European Partial Free Trade Area” was of particular interest. Finally, he declared FUCUA and its mother party’s strong interest in establishing stronger relations with the continent: “It is for sure, that the Conservatives today much more than previously appreciate the communication with similar parties of foreign countries, however not in whatever type of organisation.”\textsuperscript{30}

Since October 1957, study trips of centre-right students increasingly went to Berlin. Unlike any other place, the divided city provided practical lessons on European history, economics and Western political thought: “Here pulsing live and reconstruction, there still ruins and landscapes of wreckage, besides the Potemkin-like front sides of the Stalin-alley.”\textsuperscript{31} On 1-9 March 1958, the 3rd German-British Seminar took place in Berlin as well: “Berlin is quite obviously the key to any future settlement of Europe, and without having visited

\textsuperscript{29} Uwe Leonardy, Report, November 1957, p. 2, ACDP IV-007-161/3.
\textsuperscript{30} Uwe Leonardy, Report, November 1957, p. 24, ACDP IV-007-161/3.
\textsuperscript{31} Minutes, 9th Annual Meeting of RCDS, 1959, p. 15.
Berlin it would be somewhat difficult to assess the conditions and feelings in Germany”. For this reason, Young Conservatives and FUCUA considered their visit to Berlin “of great value.”

Both parts of the town were visited. The topic was “Berlin as Mediator for Unification”. Speakers dealt intensively with the preconditions for the reunification of Germany. Some British comments however illuminate the difficulties of such student co-operation only 10 years after the war: “A speech on a very intellectual plane was given by Professor Schack, and one received the impression that many Germans enjoyed philosophising without recourse to practical reality and, by this, might talk themselves into almost anything.” But trying to understand the ideology of the East German regime was existentially important for the Germans.

Other critical remarks by the British referred to German war crimes: “For many middle-aged Germans it appears that history began in 1945 and several of them reproached us because we had not turned on the Russians in 1945 to prevent them from occupying certain parts of Germany. It was only diplomatic to point out that at the time the Russians were our allies. Hitler is glossed over; in conversations people will admit that he was bad and they personally did not know anything of the crimes being committed by him in their names.” This report by FUCUA – which was published – caused even more dissatisfaction among the German organisers, since it also criticised the Germans for being “somewhat self-centred as their views on certain subjects showed. When asked about compensation for the Jews, one reply given was that Germany wished to belong to the Western alliance, and as Britain and the USA obviously attach great importance to the question of Jewish compensation, the German Government is now paying substantial compensation! The Germans appear to place much emphasis on democracy and at times one felt that they were overkeen to show that they understood what this really meant, and were more keen on the form of democracy than on the contents.”

In his reply to Leonardy’s complaint, Finsberg emphasised that this was not only his personal view but of several participants: “I am sure, also, that none of your generation would have said or thought such things but I do not think we can ignore completely the signs which one can read.” He concluded “we must all look forward” but “it would be wrong if we were all to ignore facts which seem clear.”

11-17 September 1958, another German delegation travelled to the United Kingdom for the 4th Joint Seminar of the British Young Conservatives, FUCUA,

---

32 FUCUA (ed.), Overseas Visits, Berlin, 1st – 9th March 1958, p. 1, PAL. Most of the quotes on this visit were taken from this report.
33 Geoffrey Finsberg to Uwe Leonardy, 29-08-58, PAL.
and RCDS. While a smaller part of the German delegation went to visit the Unionist students in Scotland, a larger part went to London. Again, all facets of the Anglo-German relations and the different party programmes were debated. The British participants once more asked their German guests for their position on the Second World War: “In public life and in the press, both World Wars against each other are not yet forgotten.” Councillor Moltmann of the German embassy emphasised the importance of the FUCUA-RCDS relations to reduce existing resentments. Among the speakers was Edward Heath, who would later become British Prime Minister and (almost as important) ECCS Honorary President. He discussed British foreign affairs with the participants. In their final statements, both Uwe Leonardy and Ian Orr-Ewing emphasised their will to intensify the mutual contacts. Orr-Ewing even declared to organise up to two mutual events per year.

On the other hand, Leonardy warned in his report that the speeding up of the mutual talks would probably be injurious. “An institutionalisation as in the form of a common secretariat or an umbrella organisation is not intended as before. This view was confirmed in private conversations by the conservatives again. However, both parts agreed entirely to never interrupt the commenced discussion and to continue it in the previous way.” As a result, “the idea of a ‘right-wing international’ remained as far as ever, as it would probably even be detrimental.”34 In 1958, the time was simply not yet ripe. The British public opinion, but also the fear of too much bureaucracy prevented both organisations from acting faster. We know that at least one participant

34 Uwe Leonardy, Bericht über das IV. Gemeinsame Seminar der Vereinigungen Britischer Junger Konser vativer und Konservativer Studenten ... und dem Ring Christlich-Demokratischer Studenten Deutsch lands, 1958, pp. 12, 18, ACDP IV-007-161/3.
of this meeting thought differently: Dieter Ibielski, newly elected federal Vice Chairman and one year later Chairman of RCDS, who was to become one of the driving forces behind the establishment of the ICCS, serving as its second Secretary General.

Because of the some “irregularities” in one of the seminar reports, the relations of RCDS to FUCUA “unfortunately cooled down” after the 4th joint seminar.35 Meanwhile, Uwe Leonardy had resigned from his post as RCDS-International Secretary. His successor, Hans-Uwe Erichsen, another law student from Kiel, had however promised to continue the international work according to the plan once presented by Leonardy. In his first letter to the members of RCDS, he was also mentioning “certain incidents” abroad, and warned prospective participants of international student seminars that they will be always seen as political representatives of their country. Apparently, the misbehaviour of some had led to the cool down of the British counterparts.36 Another result of Leonardy’s restless efforts was the presence of Peter Smithers MP as the first official observer ever of the British Conservatives at the annual convention of the CDU.37

---

35 Hans-Uwe Erichsen, Minutes, 9th Annual Meeting of RCDS, 1959, p. 17.
37 RCDS-Korrespondenz, autumn 1958, PAL.
But Erichsen was the one who revived the friendship to SKSF in Sweden: When in July and August 1958 a group of Swedish conservative students travelled through several central European countries (“SKSF-Sommarresa”), they also attended the 8th Annual Meeting of RCDS in Berlin. Among the visitors was Carl Henrik Winqwist, who was to become the second ICCS-Secretary General in 1962. In November 1958, RCDS also started friendly relations with the Danish Conservatives when the first bilateral seminar took place in Copenhagen, mainly to learn more about each other. Again it became evident to what extent the destruction of the previous war still overshadowed even student meetings. However, at these meetings it must have become obvious to every participant that the next step had to be multilateral student meetings of all the like-minded centre-right student groups from all over Europe. It was also agreed that “visits” should become more like “seminars”. This second generation of international student officers also discovered the problem of efficiency, and was no longer entirely against further institutionalisation. A second period of international centre-right student co-operation had come to an end. Now, the aim was to intensify the international activities by organising multilateral seminars.

Berlin became once again the preferred venue for these events. In 1959, three international seminars with altogether 150 participants from Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands and Germany took place. “The lectures showed the conflicting nature of the communist thought and the ideology of the West on the one hand, and made the participants familiar with the political conditions in the Soviet occupation zone”. This was thought to be a “great success”, since the “international guests appeared to be very open minded towards the German problems of Berlin.” A good example for these kinds of events is a seminar on the “German question” held in July 1960, which was at the same time the 5th RCDS-FUCUA seminar. 16 of the participants came from the Conservative Youth and the Conservative students (FUCUA) of the United Kingdom. The new generation of activists such as Terry Higgins and Mr. Carson from Britain, and Dieter Ibielski from Germany had overcome the little crisis of 1958. The programme included a speech by Heinrich Vockel, representative of Germany in West-Berlin, followed by a “quite open discussion on among others the Oder-Neisse-border, and the problems of a guarantee of the UN for Berlin.” A lecture by the British Vice-consul, T. A. Dick dealt with the historic background of the division of Berlin since 1945. The participants were also

38 Svensk Linje (FMSF-/SKSF-magazine), 1958; Minutes, 8th RCDS-Annual Meeting, Berlin, 30-07/02-08-58, p. 3, PAI.
informed of the political and economic situation of the students in Eastern Germany, and Soviet attempts to infiltrate and to influence the situation in West Berlin. Finally, a camp for East German refugees was visited.41

The 1st International Christian Democratic and Conservative Student Conference

After the communist World Youth Festival in Vienna of 1959, the efforts to organise multilateral meetings increased. It had become evident that there had to be more than just meetings in Berlin or elsewhere. The IUYCD stated that “our side was not enough educated and informed” on economics and ideology, that there was a lack of centre-right propaganda, and that the preparations had to be improvised too much. Without the work of the “Young Life” committee, not even the communist character of the World Youth Festival could have been exposed. Only if they were active in an “organised way”, the young Christian Democrats would be able to challenge the communists.42 An alternative to the activities of the IUS and others had to be developed. From now on, centre-right students were aware of the importance of well-organised international political activities and a solid ideological background.

“It is not – and it can not be said enough – the task of the International Secretary to organise holidays and sight-seeing tours. But it has to be his task to get in contact with foreign political student and non-student organisations, which leads to the possibility for participants of these conversations to discuss issues and questions which exceed the limits of the national level. With this it is also said, that the justification and the reason for this activity are different than those of the activities of the RCDS in the higher education area”, explained the International Secretary of RCDS, Hans-Uwe Erichsen at the annual meeting of his organisation in 1959.4 Since the multilateral meetings under these circumstances had to be more than meetings of the international secretaries of interested centre-right student organisations, the agreement of 1958 between SKS and RCDS to summon a separate meeting of foreign relations officers had to be modified. With the decision to establish regular meetings, a third period of international centre-right student co-operation had started. The irregular meetings were converted into more official and regular “International Student Conferences”

41 Civis 67/68 (RCDS-magazine), 31-07-60, p. 56.
42 U.I.J.D.C., Minutes, Die Kommission für Mittel- und Osteuropa, 02-11-59, p. 8-14, ACDP IV-007-151/2.
The first “International Conference of Christian Democratic and Conservative Students” took place in Stockholm and Copenhagen on 20-24 April, 1960. Participants came from Sweden (SKS), Germany (RCDS), Norway, Denmark (DKS), Finland and the United Kingdom. “Problems of Trade in Europe” were on the agenda, which might have been provoked by the parallel existence of EFTA and the EEC since 1960. The first part of the seminar, hosted by Danish Conservative Students took place in Copenhagen, 20-21 April 1960. It included a lecture by Prof. Brandstroem about Danish culture, as well as receptions by the Carlsberg brewery, the mayor of Frederiksberg, the Conservative group of the Folketing, and the German embassy. In Stockholm, the head of the press office of the Swedish Foreign Ministry, Sven Backlund, opened the second part of the conference with an analysis of Swedish foreign policy. Other lectures were delivered by Wilhelm Paues and Gunnar Andre on EEC and EFTA issues. Folke Bjorkman spoke on Swedish social policies. A highlight of the conference must have been the speech by Jarl Hjalmarsson, Chairman of the Conservative Party. Finally, Göran Hedin talked about “modern Sweden”

Even though the first “International Conference of Conservative Student Organisations in Europe” was not yet the place to establish a common organisation, the debate whether and how to institutionalise the international activities, was however there. Records of this meeting are apparently lost, but only a few weeks after the conference RCDS-Chairman Dieter Ibielski mentioned having talked about a “closer co-operation in the future” or even an “association” (“Zusammenschluss”) in a magazine article. At the RCDS Annual Meeting in August 1960, the increasing importance of international organisations was again emphasised: “The policies of RCDS exceed higher education policies, in a time, when international and supranational alliances actually need a global reference and perspective.” The policies of RCDS would therefore need an orientation beyond the national perspective. Several options were on the table: co-operation with the EPP-predecessor NEI and its youth section IUYCD, the establishment of a new international student organisation, or to continue with business as usual. In the end, the delegates only adopted a resolution urging the Federal Board of RCDS to “invite like-minded student organisations of other countries to a more intense co-operation. The delegates urge the Federal Board to explore how to co-operate more close and more regular among Christian-Democrat and Conservative student organisations.”

44 10th Annual Meeting of RCDS, 03/06-08-60, Minutes, p. 18, PAT.
The 2nd International Christian Democratic and Conservative Student Conference

The second International Conference of Christian Democratic and Conservative Students took place 5-10 September 1960, in Eichholz Manor (near Cologne/Germany). Participants came from Denmark (DKS), Great Britain (FUCUA), Sweden (SKSF), Austria (FÖSt) and Finland (Tuhatkunta, as “observer”). Various efforts of the previous months to win over French students of the MRP to join, had failed. The meeting officially dealt with the relations between EFTA and EEC. Therefore, Fritz Hellwig of the High Authority (EEC) gave a lecture about the common market. The head of the press office of the EEC-Commission, Joachim von Stülpnagel spoke about basic conceptions of the “association of the six”, and Axel N. Zarges, Vice Chairman of the Young European Federalists Germany presented his ideas on the interdependency of the economic and the political integration in Europe. Kurt Birrenbach, German MP, finally spoke on the general topic. The lectures were followed by presentations of the participants, who in turn presented the situation in their respective countries.

The federalist views expressed led to rather lively discussions. A “common position of the younger, politically active generation of conservative and Christian democratic youth and student organisations was developed on how to shape the European region.” A final statement was signed by David Penfold for Young Conservatives and FUCUA from Britain, Stellan Artin for SKSF from Sweden, Fleming Adstofte for DK from Denmark, Dieter Ibielski for RCDS from Germany and Karl Hempel for FÖSt from Austria. However, the expressed will to harmonise the relations “between the two groups” only referred to EFTA and EEC.

On the other hand, the establishment of a common organisation was an important agenda point. For one entire day, the “representatives of the student organisations discussed in detail the possibility of the institutionalisation of the co-operation.” A common organisation was considered necessary by some “in order to preserve continuity that can be relied on.”

But why did the historic agreement not take place in September 1960? Evidence for a general fear of bureaucracy and a lack of efficiency of the new structure can be found again in the minutes of the 10th Annual Meeting of RCDS in August 1960. So probably, it was the members at home that had

46 Cf. ACDP IX-003-062, no.2.
Centre-right Student Co-operation prior to 1961

to be convinced before going ahead. The minutes reveal a dilemma between irrational fears and a general will to co-operate: some delegates expressed, the umbrella organisation would not reflect the differences of the national organisations – an almost paradigmatic statement in centre right politics. It was also said, the political views of this organisation would be based on “vague compromises”. Another delegate even considered a more institutionalised co-operation to be a “bloodless and cramped, unnecessarily financial means-consuming institution.” Some were afraid of a situation with like-minded organisations inside and outside the new structure.

Eventually another motion was adopted urging the Federal Board of RCDS to intensify international co-operation. It was even supported to have a permanent Secretary to organise the regular international student conferences, but a way to finance this position had yet to be found. But the delegates had refused to adopt a paragraph considering the establishment of an international structure.49

It is obvious, that the senior officers of RCDS had noticed the poor results of the 9th Congress of the International Student Conference (of the student unions), which had taken place between the RCDS-congress and the 2nd International Conference of Christian Democrat and Conservative Students. This and its chaotic proceedings might have motivated them to reconsider their own positions.

Most certainly, the discussions in other Christian-democrat and conservative student organisations followed the same lines. Both the risk and the chances, but also the inevitability of further institutionalisation had become clear to everyone. A more intense and more regular co-operation was possible, but only under acceptable conditions, e.g. the necessary funds were made available. One also mustn’t forget the political differences: while RCDS was a supporter of the social market economy, the “left-wing officers of the F.U.C.U.A.” put forward two motions at the Conservative Party conference of 1960, calling for more government “expenditure on roads, education and health before substantial tax cuts are made” and “more Government aid to under-developed countries”.50 A more thorough discussion of the conditions for alignment was therefore of the essence. There were also rumours a final agreement was easier to accomplish if it took place outside Germany. Thus, the compromise was to wait and to continue the debate at a next meeting in May 1961 in Vienna.

49 Cf. Minutes of the 10th Annual Meeting of RCDS, Kiel, August 1960, p. 33, PAT.
Chapter 2

The Establishment of the ICCS
The 3rd International Christian Democratic and Conservative Student Conference

Vienna always was a good place to achieve political compromises. Thus, it was not only chosen by the famous Austrian Chancellor Prince Metternich after the defeat of Napoleon in 1814/15 to establish a peace alliance, but it was also the European centre-right students’ best choice to find a solution for their problem 146 years later. Hence, the third International Conference of Christian-Democrat and Conservative Students took place in Vienna on 7-15 May 1961. Participants came from two Austrian organisations (FÖSt, EStÖ), Germany (RCDS), Sweden (SKSF), Norway (DKSF), Denmark (DK) and the Netherlands (KSSF). The prominent patron of the “Third International Conference of Christian Democratic and Conservative Students” was the Austrian Chancellor Alfons Gorbach.

Though the official topic was “Problems of the East-West-Trade with reference to the European Integration”, its main objective was the establishment of an international alliance of Christian-democratic and Conservative students. Despite the rather ambitious goal the venue of the conference was not the Imperial castle as in 1814, but a rather modest hostel called “Vogelsangheim”. However, the place turned out to be sufficiently inspiring to the students.51

The new “The International Christian-Democratic and Conservative Student Union” (ICCS) adopted its Constitution on May 13, 1961. Five Western European political student organisations decided to join. The first to sign the new constitution was Gerhard Brunner, host of the founding conference and President of the constituting Council Meeting, for Freie Österreichische Studentenschaft (FÖSt) from Austria, predecessor (in a way) of today’s AktionsGemeinschaft. He later on became a ballet manager. The next signatories were Ulf Hellners for DK, Dieter Ibielski for RCDS, Halvor Bache-Halvorsen for Den Konservative Studenterforening (Oslo, Norway) and Carl-Henrik Winqwist for SKS (Sweden).52 Both the Dutch KSSF and the Austrian EStÖ decided not to join, since they preferred “debating politics rather than doing politics”, and hence “are not to be considered as political student organisations.”53

In the final document the ICCS defined itself as the “first avant-garde” fighter for the protection of the principles of liberty and individualism”. On

---

52 Cf. ACDP IX-003-062, no.4.
53 Report of the International Secretary, Minutes of the 10th Annual Meeting of RCDS 1961, attachments, p. 18. KSSF joined ICCS in 1964/65 as associated member. This development also shows the early orientation of ICCS as a party political organisation.
this ground politicians would have to increase their activities – a clear support for a more intense European economic integration.\textsuperscript{54}

ICCS voted against East-West trade for principle reasons, but accepted the impossibility to practice a total boycott. Furthermore, it “seems to be the case that the free trading economies are superior to the planned command economies, and this superiority could not be limited through east-west economic relations.” ICCS also demanded to increase the trade with developing countries instead and to not to split Europe into an EFTA and an EEC area. With this, the spirit of the time, the uncertainties resulting of the conflicts of the Cold War, but also the needs of the national economies and the beginning European integration were reflected. Additionally, the new organisation declared the “solution of political student problems”\textsuperscript{55} to be its general aim.

At last the ICCS was finally established, 15 years after the IUS, and nine years after the IUYCD. It claimed to represent 10,500 European students. Together with the British FUCUA, which had announced its will to join, it would have represented almost 20,500 students. First elected Secretary General became the German barrister Hans-Uwe Erichsen from Kiel (unanimously), later in his life a law professor and president of the conference of German rectors. Flemming Adstofte, Ulf Hellners, Hallvor Backe-Hallvorsen, Dieter Ibielski and Gerhard Brunner became members of the first Executive Committee. Curt G. Andreasson (Sweden) and Helmut Steiner (Austria) were elected to the post of accountants.

\textsuperscript{54} Translated from German by the author. Cf. ACDP IX-003-062, pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{55} FOST Korrespondenz 7, 23-05-61, PAT (first ICCS-press release).
Internal Affairs

Constitutional Development

Already at the foundation meeting of ICCS, the third International Conference of Christian-Democrat and Conservative Students, a first “Constitution” was adopted. This document of 13 May 1961 was a rather short one. In its structure and procedural basis, the Constitution was influenced by that of the IUYCD of 1955, but its aims were much more prosaic: Instead of the “reconciliation of the youth of different countries in the spirit of democratic and European brotherhood” of the IUYCD, the main aims of the ICCS were “to promote contacts between Christian-Democrat and Conservative student organisations of the different countries, to create a better understanding of each others political problems by all possible means of information and to work for greater co-operation.” (Article 2).

In doing so, the ICCS to a certain extent followed the philosophy of the quasi-social democrat ISC – one of the very few occasions besides the quite similar and deliberately chosen acronym. Already in 1962, the vague “work for greater co-operation” was however replaced by the “work for a united Europe”.56

The overall impression of this first Constitution is that it was made for a rather small organisation. There were no separate standing orders or financial regulations. Only in 1965, more specific financial provisions were adopted. This was explained with a need of more efficiency: Several organisations had not paid their membership fees.57 In 1966, procedures for the submission and adoption of motions were introduced.58 Furthermore, an executive board did not yet exist. Every organisation could basically participate in all meetings. The only two organs were the Council and the Executive Committee. The Council was composed of one vote per country and 2 delegates per organisation to be nominated by the member organisations. It also elected the Secretary General (article 3).

The Executive Committee consisted of one delegate of each organisation, and the former Secretary General. Since 1962/63, the ICCS elected up to three Assistant Secretary Generals and two accountants. In 1961, officers needed a 2/3 majority to be elected (article 7). The international conferences would be held once a year (article 8) simultaneously with the Annual Meeting. The host organisation was made primarily responsible for the organisation of it.

57 Minutes, ECM, 30-08/02-09-65, p. 2-3, ACDP IV-007-145/1.
58 Annual Report 1965/66, ACDP IX-003-061.
The day-to-day work was carried out by the Secretary General. This must have been a major challenge, since not everyone owned a telephone and e-mails only existed in science-fiction novels; a kind of work plan had to be drafted and extraordinary administrative meetings had to be planned too. In order to decide the next political and administrative steps and to prepare the next conference(s), Executive Committee Meetings were introduced. The first ICCS Executive Committee Meeting convened in Goslar (Germany), July 28 – August 3, 1961.

In 1966, Secretary General Dieter Ibielski suggested to summon meetings of the secretariat “at least once a year in order to prepare political outlines.” New members were only admitted by unanimous votes of the Council (article 7, 1961). Interesting enough, the members organisations of the new alliance were mentioned in the first Constitution as well. In 1963, these were FÖSt (A), KS (DK), RCDS (D), DKSF (N), SKSF (S), FUCUA (UK), and Etudiants Sociaux-Chrétien (B).

After 1967, echoes of the developments at the European universities, the increasing importance of European politics and the difficulties to make the international approach a reality (i.e. to find new members) gave rise to a debate concerning the name ICCS. The general shift of the students to the left made the use of both the terms “Christian” and “Conservative” more difficult. In the words of Heikki von Hertzen, then Secretary General, “it was the general feeling in Vienna [1969] that the present name is the biggest obstacle in getting contacts.”

The first attempt to change the name was made at the Executive Committee Meeting in Swinton (UK) in 1968, but this led to no results. A second attempt was made at a “spring meeting” in Vienna, 14-16 March, 1969: “It seems to become a tradition to talk about this matter during every conference. The question has again been taken up by several organisations. I hope the delegates have some fresh ideas” (von Hertzen). But the adopted new name “International Progressive Students Alliance” (IPSA, a name undoubtedly inspired by new the ultra-left “Radical Student Alliance” of the UK) caused a harsh reaction by NKSF as the word “progressive” was condemned as being “socialist vocabulary”. The Norwegians suggested “Democratic Students’ Alliance” as alternative. In the end, both proposals went down the drain.

59 ESC is identical to the Flemish organisation CDS, that joined EDS again in 1999. Before 1970, it was common to exclusively quote the French name of Belgian organisations. ESC left ICCS/ECCS in connection with the division of the mother party in CVP and PSC in 1970.
60 Annual Report 1968/69, ACDP IX-003-61.
63 Annual Report 1968/69, ACDP IX-003-61, attached intervention of NKSF, 08-08-69.
Another attempt was made a year later, at the 14th ICCS conference in August 1969, where the name “Students for a New Europe” (SNT) was eventually adopted. But again, this name was not accepted by all member organisations. “Since three negative answers had already reached the Secretariat, ICCS is still ICCS.”

The later adopted name “ECCS” was suggested in 1969 as well by then Assistant Secretary General Ian Taylor (UK), reflecting his own political philosophy: “It is time that we recognise our real identity which is European. This is in terms of membership, in terms of stated objective to fight for European unity. To call ourselves the ‘European Christian Democratic and Conservative Students Union’ helps to give us an identity to outsiders.” This name would also reflect the “desire of members to associate with the cause of European unity more openly.”

So far, it is not clear why the substitution of the C-words was no longer on the agenda. But nobody seemed to have mentioned it anymore. On 8 July 1970, the Annual Meeting adopted the new name in Vienna, in “order to better refer to the European idea in its programmatic work.” A press release of 9 July 1970 announced “European Union of Christian Democratic and Conservative Students” as the new name.

The name change was part of a statutory reform that concluded the constitutional evolution of the first decade. Its second most significant element

Chairman Ian Taylor (1974) 1961

---

64 SG-Bulletin, 01-09-69, ACDP-IX-003-061.
66 RCDS, press release, 08-07-70, KAS-ZA.
was the introduction of the post of Chairman as a replacement of the Secretary General. The first bearer of the new title became Ian Taylor, who had suggested it. Additionally, Vice-chairmen replaced the Assistant Secretary Generals. The first Vice-chairmen were Michel Claris (France) and Njal Moe (Norway).

But there were not only the new name and new titles; the entire Constitution of 1970 was new and longer: It had a new structure with 20 instead of 14 articles. As a new task, the “exchange [of] information on student issues” was introduced. A suggested reference to “participating in a European Student Parliament” was however rejected. The definition of the membership of article 1 was deleted and replaced by more specific regulations for the admission of new members. Additionally, a “joint full membership” for “countries where there is no obvious candidate for full membership” was introduced. This membership type later became the observer membership category, which must not be confused with the status of an observer to meetings of the 1970-statutes (article 5). Beside Christian-Democratic or conservative student organisations, organisations “equivalent” to Conservative or Christian-Democratic organisations were also permitted join after 1970.

These changes however did not affect the major principles entrenched by the “founding fathers”: the system of voting (1 vote per organisation, no extra votes for elected officers), the major responsibilities of the Chairman (formerly known as Secretary General), or the admittance of new members by unanimous vote. The functions of the Council were transferred to the Executive Committee. The Council became an advisory body to the Executive Committee, composed of 3 delegates per member organisation and the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee consisted of one delegate per member organisation and the Officers of ECCS. The powers of the Executive Committee included the elections of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairmen, the “instruction and direction of the Chairman” (article 8.b.2), and the adoption of the budget.

The Council was defined as an advisory body consisting of the Executive Committee and a maximum of three delegates from each member organisation. The main regulations for resolutions and meetings were also retained. With these changes, the organisation transformed itself from a largely multilateral structure with a co-ordinating secretariat to a hierarchical organisation with an autonomous leadership. Whereas the constitutional development marked the steps of the progressing institutionalisation, the new name showed the first signs of “Europeanisation”, a trend that would be salient in the next decade.

---

67 Memorandum on the ICCS-Constitution, 29-06-70, ACDP-IX-003-061.
Membership Development

The founding members of the organisation which were present at the founding congress in 1961 in Vienna were FÖSt (Austria), DK (Denmark), RCDS (Germany), DKSF (Norway), and SKS (Sweden). Other organisations had merely expressed their intention to join. But who was the first member? The first to sign the new constitution was Gerhard Brunner for Freie Österreichische Studentenschaft (FÖSt) from Austria, predecessor of today’s Aktions-Gemeinschaft. Thus, FÖSt was the first member of the organisation. The next signatory was Ulf Hellners for DK (Denmark). Since the Danish Conservative Students were present in the organisation on a more permanent level, they probably even share the title of the first member with AG. The other organisations were RCDS (Germany), DKSF (Norway) and SKS (Sweden).

Only at the Council meeting held in connection with the 4th International Student Conference in October 1961 in Berlin, John Barnes from FUCUA/United Kingdom (October 27) signed the Constitution. But since FUCUA was so involved in the establishment of the new organisation, it was considered to be one of the founding members. The next in line was Juan Roberti from ESC (or ESCB, Belgium) who signed the document in Berlin on 10th December, 1962. Thus, the Constitution of 1963 defined FÖSt, KS, RCDS, KS, SKSF, FUCUA, and Etudiants Sociaux-Chrétiens from Belgium as member organisations.68

Until 1965, no additional (full) member joined. However, membership issues were always on the agenda. In July 1962, the Council Meeting had to discuss for the first time whether two organisations from one country could become member. After a long debate both the Dutch protestant NSSV and the Dutch catholic KSSF became “associated members”. A so called gentlemen’s agreement made a compromise possible. At the same meeting, the Swiss SSV and the Finnish Tuhatkunta (established in 1960) became observers. A certain progress was the application of Tuhatkunta to become full member in the summer of 1965. Other changes concerned the names of the member organisations. The Norwegians replaced DKSF by NKSF in 1966. In 1967/68, FUCUA changed its name to “Federation of Conservative Students” (FCS). In 1968, Danish Conservative Students was established as an autonomous national organisation, and has appeared since as DKS.

Between 1965 and 1970, no increase in membership could be achieved, even though the Executive Committee had adopted a resolution submitted by Ian Clarke, which portrayed regret that there were no Italian or French members.69 In 1961 and again in May 1965, the youth organisation of the French Christian Democrats even refused to join ICCS: “Jean Mastiaz [...] explained the difficulties for his association to join the ICCS. It was stated

---

68 Cf. ACDP IX-003-062, no.4.
69 Minutes, ECM, 30-08/02-09-65, p. 5, ACDP IV-007-145/1.
however that the attending of ICCS-conferences by the French should not be out of question in future.”

The presence of a second Austrian organisation as observer remained an episode (ÖJB, 1963-1965). In 1965, the Swiss SSV decided not to join ICCS. Neither did the Christian-Democrats in Switzerland and Italy decide to join, nor another attempt to get a member organisation in the Spanish region of Catalunya succeeded: The two organisations which had applied for full membership in April 1967 (Union de Estudiantes Democratos and Federacio National d’Estudiants de Catalunya) never showed up – most certainly because both worked in illegality and had no chance to participate in international student activities. The Irish Fine Gael was approached first in 1966/67 (and many times since then) – without success. At least, Vincent Browne from the Fine Gael participated in the 13th International Conference in 1968 in Swinton (UK). In 1970, Akademisk Hoeger (Finland), MGDC (Italy) and JRD (France) were given observer status – a symbolic status that only provided the right to attend meetings.

Most of the full members were permanently active. In 1965, only the activities of ESC (Belgium) and FÖSt (Austria) appeared to be “weak”. In December 1966, Christian Daubie, Chairman of ESCB informed of the withdrawal of ESCB “although ICCS-activities were generally on a high level”. Since “only very few people could take profit of its discussions” this “could not offset the burden of our membership fee”. But he also believed the absence of FÖSt and SSV had destroyed the political balance inside ICCS. After a meeting of Secretary General Reginald Simmerson with ESCB-officials in 1968, the Belgians returned for the time being, but defected again after 1970. Also in 1966, FÖSt had “renounced further attendance of ICCS-meetings as observer”, but returned in 1968. At the same time, the situation with the Dutch NSSV (also referred to as NSSF) looked “somewhat confusing”. Apparently, nobody had ever informed the ICCS-leadership about the merger of the two organisations in May 1968, and their merger with another organisation to become the “Dutch United Nations Student Association” in June 1968 (still in existence). As this example illustrates, the membership was then also divided in “Europeanists” and (early) “Globalists” or “Internationalists”. Another “Dutch” organisation, or at least an organisation represented by Dutch students was “Interdoc-youth”, established in 1968. According to the ICCS-records they often but not always

72 Christian Daubie to Reginald Simmerson, 20-12-66, ACDP IX-003-061.
73 Annual Report 1964/65 and 1965/66, 30-08-65, ACDP IX-003-061. In 1971, Reginald Simmerson rose to some prominence as the “anti-common market tory” and opponent of PM Edward Heath. He was also famous for his lung capacity, delivering his comments with a voice louder “than thunderbolts from Thor” (Alan Sked). In the 90s, he was active in the UKIP. He died on 8th December 1998.
attended meetings until around 1970 without specifying their interest in ICCS. In 2007, this mysterious group was exposed as a joint western European intelligence operation, directed against WFDY and IUS. Apparently, they had tried to recruit students for activities similar to those at the World Youth Festival of 1959, but – as the recorded files clearly show – without success.\textsuperscript{75}

The 1968 conference provides a typical picture of who was active at the time and who was not: the 7 member organisations present were DKS, RCDS, NKSF, SKSF, Tuhatkunta, KSSF and FCS.\textsuperscript{76} The much smaller ICCS “spring meeting” in Vienna on 14-16 March 1969 was attended by six organisations (FÖSt, RCDS, Tuhatkunta, FMSF, DKS and FCS).

Another important event of the sixties was the establishment of the informal old-boys-network of ICCS/ECCS/EDS, the “International Garrick Club”, which is in existence to this day. It was established on 4 May 1968, at the bar of the Garrick Hotel in London (situated between Trafalgar and Leicester square, demolished). Its second meeting took place in Vienna in 1970.\textsuperscript{77} First club president was Dieter Ibielski.\textsuperscript{78} Why “Garrick”? David Garrick (1717-1779) was the famous director of the distinguished Drury Lane Theatre in London in 1747. Many places bear his name, including the Garrick Theatre of London. The Garrick Hotel once stood in its immediate neighbourhood. The use of his name by “retired” EDS-officers was however coincidental (despite David Garrick’s second fiancée being a dancer from Vienna). The existence of another “serious” Garrick Club preserving David Garrick’s important heritage has already led to all kinds of very funny confusions.

\section*{Events and Public Relations}

\textit{Consolidation: International Student Conferences until 1965}

The 4th International Student Conference took place on 22-28 October, 1961, in Berlin (Germany).\textsuperscript{79} The city referred at least to two issues: the pre-ICCS tradition to have centre-right student meetings in Berlin and the division of Europe. After the construction of the Berlin Wall on 13 August, 1961, it was immediately decided to have the meeting in Berlin instead of

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{75} Usually, the topics suggested by Interdoc-representatives were put aside, ignored or refused because they did not reflect the political thinking of the dominating organisations FCS, SKSF and RCDS. Cf. de Graaf et al. (2007), pp. 170-186, and Wenger et al. (2007), p. 45.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{76} Cf. “The future of Europe”, report, ACDP IX-003-62. Due to the merger, their remains a question mark about the motives of the KSSF-representative.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{77} Annual Report 1966/67, ACDP IX-003-061, p. 4.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{78} Letter of Dieter Ibielski to the author, 17-01-01.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{79} Based on: Report, Bonn, October 1961 (RCDS-Brief 4, November 1961, German); Ibielski (1965), pp. 5-6, 15. ACDP IX-003-062; Svensk Linje 4, 1961, p. 45. Venue was the “Ernst-Reuter-Heim”, a student dormitory.}
Copenhagen. The decision was supposed to be a sign that Berlin’s freedom was supported by the organisation. Participants came from Austria, Denmark, Germany, Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. The official topic was “Problems of Europe and the Developing countries”, which was prepared by the delegates with national reports, as had been decided in Vienna. However, the participants mainly discussed the Berlin problem. The conference included a city tour, a reception hosted by the Senate of Berlin, a briefing by the German government on the political situation, a visit to the Berlin Wall, and the presentation of the movie “Die Mauer” (The Wall). Lectures at the German Foundation for Development Aid dealt with the differences between the development aid of communist and western countries.

One of the first resolutions of ICCS dealt with the situation of students in East-Germany: “On hearing of the appeal made by the students studying in the Soviet Zone of Germany for support in their protests against the Ulbricht regime’s oppressive policies and being shocked by the daily reports from this Zone, we the representatives at this ICCS conference ask all students of the free world to protest against, as we do, those policies which attempt to crush students rights and academic freedom within the so-called Deutsche Demokratische Republik.”

The final statement concerned “Europe and the developing countries”, which was at that time an important topic, since it was the year when many former European colonies became independent nations. At that point, ICCS supported an increase of technical development aid suitable to the needs of the new nations. The positive role of international organisations such as the World Bank was emphasised. Another item was the role of education: “There are three possible ways, in which people from the underdeveloped countries can be trained. The first is by bringing them to Western Universities. The second is to create universities within their own countries. The third is to promote exchange [...] within their own geographical region.” Furthermore ICCS stated “the principle of trade not aid should be predominant in relations with the underdeveloped countries.”

The 5th International Conference took place in Lund (Sweden), 6-10 March, 1962. It was opened by Gunnar Heckscher, Chairman of the Moderate Party. The topic of this conference was “University Education”. Besides the 4 member organisations (FÖSt, KS, RCDS, SKS) participants from the Netherlands were present, the “Société Politique de l’Universite libre à Amsterdam”, a Protestant group, and the “Katholieke Staatskundige Studiegroepen Federa-

80 Weberling (1990), p. 83.
83 Final Report, ACDP IX-003-062; information of Dieter Ibielski to the author (2001).
The Establishment of the ICCS

tie”, a Catholic organisation. As a result of the discussion, a “Final Statement on the European University Education” was presented, one of the first statements on higher education. Additionally, the role of the IUS and the ISC was discussed. In a motion, the participants refused any effort to achieve “an agreement on World Student Unity with the Communist infiltrated I.U.S.” The implementation of a “student as pioneer citizen”-philosophy by the I.S.C. was the reason to remain reluctant in matters of co-operation with this organisation as well.

The 6th International Student Conference was held in Baarn, the Netherlands (close to Amsterdam), 16-21 July, 1962. The increase of the number of conferences to two per year signified the high demand. The topic (for the first but not the last time) was the “Welfare State”. Representatives from 9 organisations of 8 countries were present. The final statement pointed out that “a Welfare State is one in which the Government has recognised that not all of its citizens are able to care for themselves and so, from a sense of moral responsibility, has made provisions for such citizens.” But social security “should not be so all-embracing as to destroy the incentive to work.” On the other hand, the state had “a responsibility to maintain full employment”, though the state should prefer to support the unemployed instead of subsidising inefficient industries. In general, interests of employers and employees were considered to be identical.

The resolution also criticised the concept of Social Economic Councils. The final statement also expressed some views on education: “The community must always realise that the education of its children is an essential prerequisite for social and economic progress in the future.” As main principles, free choice for schools and the right to education for everyone according to his merits were emphasised. Other parts of the statement were devoted to health and housing policies (“Free Market cannot provide adequate housing for the lower income sectors of the community”) and pensions. It was expected “that a united Europe provides the best economic and political basis for the solution of the problems of the Welfare State in a Christian-Democrat and Conservative manner”.

The 7th International Student Conference again took place in Vienna, 4-7 May, 1963, and the 8th International Student Conference 23-27 July, 1963, in London and Winchester (UK). The topic of both meetings was “One Europe” – which led to the first (larger) ICCS manifesto in 1963 given the
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84 Cf. chapter 1.6.2.
85 Dieter Ibielski, Motion, 10-03-62, PAI.
87 FÖSt (A), ECSB (B), KS (DK), RCDS (D), KSSF and NSSF (NL), DKSF (N), SKSF (S), FUCUA (UK).
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same name. Kenneth Clarke, who in the nineties became one of the senior MPs of the Conservative Party, chaired the 8th Conference. 40 students from 11 countries took part. It was opened in the House of Commons by Edward Heath, former Chairman of FUCUA, at the time Minister of Labour and Lord Privy Seal. In this function he was speaking for the conservative government of Harold Macmillan on foreign affairs.

The second in Winchester (100 km south east of London) also included meetings of commissions (working groups) on specified topics. The result of the Cultural Commission gave rise to the chapter “Culture and School” of the manifesto. Its main aims were the establishment of a “European Coordination Centre for Education” for the harmonisation of degrees, the establishment of a European Cultural Fund for grants for students from EEC- and developing countries, and an independent European television.

According to a nine page document submitted by RCDS (Germany), policies concerning the creation of private property were discussed as well, an idea which was integrated in the chapter on “Economic Policy”. At this conference, Carl-Henrik Winqwist from Sweden was confirmed as Secretary General, whereas Dieter Ibielski from Germany became his deputy.89

The 9th International Student Conference of ICCS took place 16-22 August 1964, in Reistad near Oslo (Norway). Delegates from Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway and observers from Switzerland and Finland took place. The topic was “Property Owning Democracy”. In the final statement, ICCS promoted policies for achieving the “widest possible spread of property”, since post-war welfare states not only brought “much good”, but also “concentration of power and capital in a few hands” as well as a bureaucracy “far removed from the voters”. For the first time, the high taxation in Norway and Sweden was criticised. In conclusion, ICCS welcomed “the property-owning democracy approach as a useful way in discussing some of our problems. It is not the central platform of our policies but it does express our desire to relate an enlightened form of capitalism with a wider and more democratic society. The ICCS must emphasise the importance of economic freedom and choice to everybody, as an alternative to the inevitable bureaucracy of socialism. If we fail to do this through publicity and education, we will have neither democracy nor property to be owned individually.”90

The 10th International Student Conference took place in Eichholz Manor near Cologne (Germany), 29 August – 5 September, 1965. The 60 participants came from 13 organisations and 12 countries. Per Loening (Norway), Wilhelm
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89 Press release, 01-08-63, PAT; Ibielski (1965), p. 11; Conference report, ACDP IX-003-062.
90 Ibielski (1965), pp. 13-14, ACDP IX-003-062.
Bachem (Germany), Anthony Kershaw MC (UK), and Albrecht Weber from the EURATOM were among the speakers. The highlight of the conference must have been a reception by Konrad Adenauer, former German chancellor.

Konrad Adenauer (left) and Dieter Ibielski (centre), 1965

The topic was the “Joint Initiatives of Christian Democrat and Conservative Parties for Shaping the Europe of the Future”. For the first time, the possible inter-party co-operation of Christian Democrats and Conservatives was the main topic. This also reflected concurrent developments on the party-level. In 1964 and 1965, on the invitation of Chancellor Josef Klaus of Austria the legendary series of Party Leader Conferences started in Klessheim (Austria), which was to finally lead to the creation of the EDU in 1978. Secondly, the NEI adopted its new name UECD in 1965 and started new political initiatives that same year.

The ICCS conference had been prepared by the member organisations by submitting national reports based on a questionnaire of the Secretary General. “The basic idea of this topic aims at the discussion of the fundamental aspects of the policy of the parties concerned. The result should be to state adequate principles of both groups in order to integrate in a changing world their political activities for performing an effective practical work. This initiative to an international co-operation proceeding from a ‘spiritual’ background should not only raise interest of the political parties in the work of the ICCS but also encourage the christian-democratic minded French and Italians to join the ICCS.”

91 Letter of the Secretary General to the member organisations, February 1965, ACDP IX-003-061.
The lectures were followed by the Council and Executive Committee Meeting. At this meeting, ICCS decided to support a motion submitted by RCDS, supporting Germany’s reunification in freedom – for the first time ever: “The reunification of Germany is not only of interest for the German people, but at the same time a problem of the whole free world, because peace in Europe cannot be guaranteed as long as Germany is divided.”

Furthermore, the final statement contained a well balanced concept of public interventions. The aim was to create an economic order beyond laissez-faire capitalism and “total state power”. For the development of a joint European party structure, the “common concern for the individual and human dignity” was considered a programmatic base. ICCS also demanded the reform and enlargement of the European Economic Communities. Conservative and Christian Democratic parties were asked to adopt respective policies and to not to forget Eastern Europe, for the sake of a lasting peace: “Eventually western Europe must form a federal structure – a United States of Europe with a democratically elected central government.”

**ICCS- and ECCS-Conferences until 1970**

The 11th ICCS conference was foreseen for Brussels, but finally took place in Baarn (near Amsterdam, the Netherlands), 15-21 August 1966. For the first time, the conference was termed “ICCS conference” instead of “International Conference of ICCS”. This was just another indication of the ongoing institutionalisation of ICCS. The annual conferences had become internal meetings of an increasingly coherent political organisation. The general topic was “Planning the free economy”. Secretary General Dieter Ibielski proposed six items to be discussed: the definition of “planning”, a review of economic principles adopted in Europe since World War II, possible reasons for planning, its problems, the policies of the mother parties on planning with respect to the European Economic Integration, and recommendations on behalf of any member organisation to be published in the final statement of the conference. Key-note speaker was the president of the Dutch “Centraal Plan Bureau”, Prof. P. de Wolf.

Large parts of the conference were devoted to the draft of the resolution “Planning in a Free Economy”. It is interesting to see to what extent those
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94 Letter of Dieter Ibielski to the member organisations, 16-05-66; Provisional Programme, ACDP IX-003-061.
young non-socialists of the late sixties gave up supply-side economics and
to what extent they resisted to the Keynesian and Malthusian temptations:
“The ultimate aim of indicative planning is the achievement of the economic
responsibilities of a modern democratic government. These include steady
economic growth, full employment, a healthy balance of payment position,
and a comparatively stable level of prices.”

At the same time, the existence of a “modern competitive economy” was
emphasised. Economic growth should be “balanced throughout the commu-
nity” since the opposite, the slower growth of certain areas would be “harmful
both economically and socially”. The main purpose of planning was there-
fore to “complement the free market.” However, any regulation of individual
liberties was “strongly opposed”. European integration, it was pointed out,
should therefore lead to more “specialisation in industry” and the location
of industries “in those areas where the most efficient production could be
achieved with consequent benefit to the general standard of living.”

An argument emerged when RCDS (Germany) submitted a motion asking
the ICCS to support the reunification of Germany and the so called Hallstein
Doctrine. This doctrine argued for the suspension of diplomatic relations with
those governments which maintained or introduced diplomatic relations with
the so called German Democratic Republic (East-Germany). The aim of the
Germans was the recognition of “the right of exclusive agency of the Federal
Republic of Germany” and the “right of the Federal Republic of Germany as the
legal successor of the German Reich to be legal representative of the whole Ger-
many.” Another motion asked for the “final settlement of the eastern German
border” by a “peace treaty with the government of a re-united Germany.”

Whereas RCDS was unanimously supported on the reunification of
Germany, there was less support for the policies of the German government.
As a consequence, RCDS-Chairman Gerd Hammer announced a possible
withdrawal of RCDS. In particular, the “appeasement-policy” of the Finnish
and Norwegian delegates was not acceptable for him. That Hammer was
very serious about that reveals an internal RCDS-memo, after which it was
first of all “necessary to convince all foreign fellows of our viewpoints, par-
ticularly at events in Berlin”. On the other hand, he considered “European
questions” only “another focal point” of the international activities of RCDS.

Hence, a compromise had to be found. Finally a resolution recognised “the
right of the Federal Republic as the legitimate representative of the German
people” as well as the final definition of the German boarders after the reuni-
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fication by a peace treaty. Other resolutions supported the merger of EEC and EFTA, “Britain’s membership of the European Economic Communities”, and the US-policy against the “extension of Communist rule in South-East Asia”, though not “in every detail”.98

The 12th ICCS Conference took place in Copenhagen (Denmark) on 24-28 July, 1967. The topic was “Security Policy in Europe”. Since most of the records of that period seem to be lost, we rely on the summary of the “What is ICCS” to reconstruct its discussions. The booklet supports the assumption, that the participants wanted a stronger NATO. For the revision of the NATO-treaty in 1969, it was however suggested to consider “certain modifications”. The presence of US forces in Europe was strongly supported as well, but “our security must also depend upon the establishment of conventional and nuclear forces that are independent of the United States.” In order to achieve this goal, EEC, EFTA and other states had to co-operate. Reductions of military forces for financial reasons were criticised, since disarmament should always be part of a bilateral military détente. Another part of the debate was France’s “empty chair policy”. ICCS hoped for the return of the French army into NATO structures, but also supported more equality among the NATO partners. Defence policy was seen as one important element of co-operation among the free nations. The other important objective was European political integration including Eastern Europe and the “German reunification as part of an all-European settlement”. The E.E.C.-applications of the UK, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Eire was supported as well. Finally, it was suggested to have Europe as a sort of mediator in international conflicts supporting the UN.99

The 13th ICCS Conference was mainly held in Swinton (UK), 8-12 July, 1968, but also included political talks in London.100 The 35 participants represented eight countries. For the first time, a representative from COCDYC, the Conservative and Christian Democratic Youth Community of Europe (established in 1964), was present. The official topic was “The Future of Europe”. Since the 12th conference, Britain, France, Germany and most other countries of the ICCS-members, had seen dramatic changes in university life. Radical student groups on the left such as the Radical Students’ Alliance (RSA) in the UK or the SDS in Germany had literally overtaken the campuses. Thus it comes as no surprise that the debate on “Trends in Student Unrest” came first and those on visionary security and foreign policy questions second.

The debates of the exiting changes at home must have started immediately after arrival: Already on 9 July, the second conference day, “The Guardian”

brought a 500-words-piece by renowned journalist Martin Adeney, who had met the group in London, on page 3, with the remarkable headline “Student power takes a swing to the Right”. The report was written at a historic tipping point and offers rare insights into the debate of the young conservatives of 1968, the “other” 68ers, and it shall be repeated here in its entirety (cf. box). In a final statement on the topic, ICCS welcomed “the new awareness by students of the problems of their University and social environment. We support those student claims which are aimed at improving society, and not undermining it. Conservative and Christian Democratic students can also take a radical view of society. It would not be negative, but aimed at specific problems facing the world which are being ignored by governments. We wish to attract more students to an active part in politics within the democratic system, and to increase the membership of political groupings offering a viable alternative to the revolutionary cabals of the left. The non-student youth sections of Conservative and Christian Democratic parties should be drawn into the movement to provide a pressure for reform difficult to resist.”
Another interesting contributor to the conference must have been Sir Anthony Meyer of the Conservative Research Department, who spoke on “A wider and a deeper Europe”.\textsuperscript{101} Meyer was no stranger to international student business: as a senior member of the foreign office he closely followed the developments in the IUS and the establishment of the ISC in the early 1950s.\textsuperscript{102}

Later on, reports prepared by DKS, FCS, SKSF once more supported the further integration of Europe and the membership of their countries in the E.E.C. unequivocally. It was also discussed how to eventually enlarge the E.E.C by all European countries except the Soviet Union (NKSF), how to organise European defence (FCS), and how to create “supranational areas of liberty” including economic integration (RCDS). As usual, Tuhatkunta made its reservation on behalf of its country, underlining the role of neutrality and the special relations to the Soviet Union since 1948. But the organisation also clarified that the perception of Finland as a satellite of the Soviets was “completely false and misleading.”

Another paper adopted was a positive evaluation of the European integration. Its author was FCS-Chairman Ian Taylor, a student at the London School of Economics and later Member of Parliament and Minister in Prime Minister John Major’s government. At Swinton, the ICCS also went public with a resolution on the Biafra-conflict. This meanwhile forgotten civil war in eastern Nigeria (1966-1970) resulted in about 1 million dead, destruction and millions of refugees. The British Labour government was involved in the conflict, since it supported the Nigerian federal government. ICCS demanded of the British government to “stop forthwith the supply of arms to Federal Forces [in Nigeria].”\textsuperscript{103}

The 14th ICCS conference took place in Mallasmäki (Finland) on 12-15 August, 1969, and had the topic of the “East-West relations in Europe”. Main topic were however student affairs. Beside DKS, FCS; RCDS, NKSF, Tuhatkunta and FÖSt, an observer from Jeunes Republicains Independents from France took part. Four topics were prepared by the member organisations:
- The role of Germany in the Europe of the 1970s (RCDS, NKSF)
- European Security Conference (Tuhatkunta)\textsuperscript{104}
- Relations between Western and Eastern Europe in the 1970s (FCS, DKS)
- Europe and the US (SKSF, FÖSt)

Again, resolutions supported a federalist Europe and a European Student Parliament. ICCS also decided to become more active in terms of activities,
in terms of recognition by European institutions and mother parties, through
the increased exchange of information and the enlargement of membership.
ICCS also decided to start lobbying national governments for more European
student exchange.

Other resolutions condemned the Greek military coup d’état, criticised
the communist infiltration of the IUS, and supported the Austrian Student’s
Union’s idea to create a forum for the student unions of Western Europe – a
platform which was eventually established on 17 October 1982, and is known
today as European Students’ Union (ESU). ICCS also expressed support for
the idea to have a directly elected European Student Parliament in order to
“co-ordinate efficient student action against the Revolutionary left in our
universities.”

The 14th conference was also the meeting where ICCS adopted a new
policy to systematically introduce official relations to other national and
international institutions and organisations. It was agreed that the organisa-
tion “must become more politically active if it is to be influential in seeking
objectives”. The conference was overshadowed by a conflict on the future
name of ICCS, which was continued at the Chairmen’s Conference in Marburg
(Germany) in October 1969.105

The 15th ICCS conference (or first ECCS-conference) was attended by
42 participants from 10 countries. It took place in Vienna, 3-9 July, 1970.
Two key decisions were taken. First, the name of the organisation was changed
to ECCS (cf. Chapter on Constitutional Development, above). Secondly, Ian
Taylor from the United Kingdom was elected Chairman. Taylor represented
the new self-confidence of the organisation and opened the ideological battle
with socialism, when he suggested attending student conferences with a clear
socialist majority.106

As an eye-witness of the emergence of radical student politics and student
riots at his very own university, the LSE, he was well aware of the political
challenge that lay ahead. He had also realised the increasing political weight
of political student organisations, since the voting age was to be decreased
to 18 years (UK 1969/70, Germany 1970, Sweden 1972, France 1974). The
increasing importance of youth and student politics was the reason for a
growing interest in Taylor’s positions, even though student violence often was
the only topic. In March 1969, “The Guardian” quoted him saying “it was a
myth to believe that all university militancy was part of a plot. ‘Violence has
definitely increased on a new scale,’ he said. The left would deliberately try

ACDP IX-003-061.
106 FÖSt (ed.), press release, 09-07-70, ACDP IX-003-062.
to escalate new crises next term. He blamed some university authorities for backing down too quickly to the left and stopping Conservative meetings too quickly.”

A few weeks later, he was quoted by the same paper as calling “for strong measures to curb student anarchists. Mr Taylor said that those who destroyed property or tried to get power by force had no place in a university”. At the same time, he was one of the initiators of a motion at the LSE students’ union calling to suspend a student strike and condemning the “deliberate disruption of lectures by certain extremist groups” as well as assaults on students and staff: “For the first time in many months [the union] adopted a large part of a Conservative motion.” These sections of the motion were passed “after Mr Ian Taylor [...] told the union that if the school had really been an illiberal organisation many members of the Socialist Society would have been expelled long ago.” Apparently, the motion had “angled to capture the middle ground of student opinion”.

At the 1969-ICCS/ECCS-meeting, Taylor declared the improvement of the relations to the EEC-institutions and of the co-operation of the centre-right parties to be the major aims of his chairmanship, since he was supporting the political unity of Europe. A resolution supported direct elections to the European Parliament and a European Student Parliament.

Ian Taylor influenced the way the organisation developed for many years. Most of his ideas were sooner or later implemented, such as the future participation in all international student conferences in order to “ensure that moderate opinion is represented at all student conferences, including those currently dominated by the left wing”, to improve the mutual exchange of information, to develop new proposals for the Higher Education reform (“with which to confront extremist ideology”), and to prepare a report on the situation of the Higher education in Europe.

Four major Austrian newspapers reported the conference. The confrontative style, supported by the Austrian Peoples Party and its foreign affairs speaker Franz Karasek MP was sensational to the Austrian public, at that time dedicated to preserve Austria’s neutrality and a culture of internal national consensus.

An International Student Conference with more than 300 participants in Bad Godesberg (near Bonn, Germany) in February 1970 was the last event
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of the first decade of the organisation. Participants came from most of the ECCS-member organisations, but also from outside Europe. Topics were youth participation in politics, the East-West and the North-South conflict, and European integration.\(^{112}\)

**Communication and Public Relations**

Communication and public relations were always difficult as long as the interest of the public in European and student affairs was low. The picture only slowly changed by the end of the decade. Despite widespread indifference, all ICCS-Conferences were concluded with a final press statement. Several press releases survived to today in the archives. Some of them were published on behalf of the member organisations. Additionally, a regular newsletter called “Circular”, written by the Secretary General, could be deemed to be the first regular publication. Its first issue was published by Dieter Ibielski at 30 September, 1964. Later on it was called “Bulletin”. The number of issues per year increased every year (1964/65: 6, 1968/69: 8, and 1969/70: 9).\(^{113}\) In 1965, an attempt to produce a “periodical” failed.\(^{114}\)

The first larger publication was issued in 1964 by Carl-Henrik Winqwist, then Secretary General of the organisation. The 30 pages of “One Europe” included opinions of major European statesmen of the work of ICCS (cf. next chapter), historical and political statements of the organisation itself and the Manifesto “One Europe”. The purpose of the publication was to “express more precisely the possible nature and role of the future state which we envisage and the means by which we feel it might evolve.”

The “state” ICCS was talking about in 1964 was no less than the federal and united Europe of the future.\(^{115}\) In this context the French were criticised for their position towards a British EEC-membership.\(^{116}\)

In 1965, the Secretary General published a compilation of major documents of the first five years of ICCS. The last publication of the decade was the booklet “What is ICCS”, published by Heikki von Hertzen, Reginald E. Simmerson and Dieter Ibielski in 1969 which contains conference reports, major resolutions and a short organisational history. The last project of the sixties was a student survey, suggested by FÖSt (Austria) in March 1969 and carried out by Assistant Secretary General Ian Taylor until 1970 – with low
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enthusiasm “when one considers the potential value of such a document.”117 The student survey, an “International Report” by Ian Taylor and “What is ICCS” were published within the “documentation service” of the organisation.

Basic Papers in the Sixties

Visions: One Europe

From 1961-1970, any manifesto or basic paper on the political future of Europe supported a federalist (deeper integrated) European Community and the integration of the EFTA and the EEC. In 1963, the ICCS adopted “One Europe”, its first political platform. Chapters dealt with the co-operation of EFTA and EEC, the European role of the United States, the situation of the neutral states in Europe, the Commonwealth, the developing countries, the welfare concept as a possibility “for the individual to develop his own personality and provide the needs of the family and himself”, and cultural and educational policies. In the centre were European affairs: “For European Christian Democratic and Conservative Students it has been natural to give real support to the ideal of European Unity.” A unified EFTA/EEC was expected to be “a


Cover of the “One Europe”- programme, 1964
stronghold of democracy” and a supporter of the liberalisation of global trade. According to “One Europe”, all European countries should have the chance to join this community.

Concerning the institutions, the powers of the European Parliament should be extended in order to provide “democratic control over Community affairs.” In the chapters on social and economic policies, competition was recognised as the most important mean to achieve prosperity. The ideal economic order of ICCS at that time was however the “property owning democracy” (widest possible distribution of property), an attempt of which they hoped it would make the conflict between planned and market economy “irrelevant”. The harmonisation of economic policies and social standards within the EEC/EFTA, the free flow of capital and labour was seen as a precondition for the “rise in European standard of living”. The future EEC/EFTA-community was suggested to closely co-operate with the US and the Commonwealth. The “rich countries of the world” had been attributed a “moral obligation to support the poor ones” in the chapter on “Developing Countries”. The meaning of this paper for the future policies of the emerging European Union should not be underestimated, since “for the first time efforts succeeded [...] to create a common programme of both Christian Democratic and Conservative student organisations.”

Even though Europe was always on the agenda, only the 13th ICCS Conference “The Future of Europe” in July 1968 was exclusively dedicated to European integration. Again, the member organisations supported unanimously the further integration of Europe and the membership of their respective countries within the E.E.C. Both “A wider and a deeper Europe” – the title of Sir Anthony Meyer’s key note speech – were political objectives. In a

---

resolution on the “Future of Europe”, ICCS pointed out that “There is no sense in uniting Europe just for the sake of it. But our group found some compelling and vital reasons why unification is necessary.” These were the need for collective defence, free trade and a common taxation system. The paper also supported direct elections to a European Parliament and emphasised the need for European political parties: Politicians should not be “technocrats and faceless professors” but “responsible both to the people who elected them and some kind of European Parliament to be elected by direct suffrage.” For this, the centre-right parties of Europe were urged to form a “mighty coalition to fight elections on a European basis.”

Another aim was a much closer European economic co-operation through harmonisation of planning, the integration of production, taxation, company law, and a European currency. It is interesting to see that the ICCS had almost given up their support for the social market economy. A more visionary approach was the predicted membership of liberated Eastern European countries in the future united Europe: At “the end of our days we have a heritage to pass on to our children and grandchildren which is better than our parents and grandparents have passed on to us, we must bury the bitterness and diversity which have plagued Europe for so long and unite to create a great new Europe of which we can be justly proud.”

The resolution was written on Assistant Secretary General Ian Taylor’s initiative. After he had become Chairman in 1969, the organisation became even more federalist: In 1969, at the 14th ICCS-Conference, it was decided to support a “European Federal State; a directly elected European Parliament; a European Party of Christian Democrats and Conservatives”.

**Policies: Higher Education**

Higher education is seen by most as a natural part of any student organisation’s political work. Many see such an involvement even as a matter of credibility. However, higher education policies were mentioned inside ICCS for the first time during its 4th International Conference in 1961, when universities were considered to be helpful for the development of the Third World.

The first congress entirely dedicated to university education was the 5th International Student Conference of ICCS in 1962. A “Final Statement on the European University Education” was adopted: “The existing struggle between the Communist bloc and the Western World has strong materialistic as well as

cultural aspects.” The role of progress for science and technology was pointed out, as well as the importance of the European “cultural background, based on humanistic disciplines.” The paper showed that the idea of European integration was more and more understood as a way to resist the threat posed by Communism. For ICCS, this idea was to be accompanied by suitable educational policies, such as European postgraduate studies in history, philology, law, economics and other social sciences.122

The “One Europe” programme of 1963 considered cultural issues such as the future of higher learning to have “greatest importance”. A chapter was exclusively dedicated to “Cultural Policy” (at the time a term applied for educational affairs, too). European politics was urged to “stimulate the advancement of European education, primarily in universities.” A European Co-operation Centre for Education was suggested that should work for the “universalisation” of degrees. “This harmonisation would ensure the recognition of e.g. degrees from Uppsala by Oxford.” The introduction of a European Examination Book, produced by the EEC was expected to support the aim of mutual recognition of academic diplomas, grades and degrees. The resolution also suggested the introduction of a European Cultural Fund and a European Television.123

Again at its conference in London and Swinton (1968), ICCS discussed university affairs, the student unrest in Western universities in particular. In March 1969, as a consequence of the radicalisation of many students, ICCS announced to better emphasise student affairs instead of just having “friendly meetings of sympathetic people exchanging information about the state of Christian Democracy and Conservatism in their countries”.124

Therefore, the ICCS-Chairmen’s conference of October 1969 discussed primarily student affairs — a reason for FÖSt to become active again. The same year, ICCS urged to create a European student parliament as well as university reforms and to more actively “counter revolutionary left-wing activities in European universities”. It was also discussed how to better co-operate with the emerging educational institutions of the EEC and the Council of Europe. These demands, including the “harmonisation of the higher education standards in Europe” and a “European student exchange”, were repeated at the Annual Meeting of 1970.125

In a way, most of the policy ideas put forward in the field of higher education throughout the decade were later transformed into European legislation.

123 Ibielski (1965), pp. 11-12, ACDP IX-003-062.
124 FÖSt: Some Reflections on International Student Policy, March 1969, ACDP IX-003-61, p. 3.
125 Ian Taylor, Memorandum on the organisation, 1971, ACDP IX-003-061.
The suggestion in 1962 to introduce “international examination books” as a system for the mutual recognition of degrees was reflected very much in the later introduced ECTS and after that by the Bologna process. The same can be said for academic mobility. Since the eighties, the European Commission had introduced mobility schemes quite similar to those demanded by ICCS of 1963.

**External Relations**

*Relations to Political Parties*

The maintaining of external relations was not the primary aim of the organisation’s activities of the sixties, though such relations existed from the beginning. Already the establishment of the organisation was widely noticed and welcomed by noted politicians such as Konrad Adenauer, German Chancellor (“The global conflict with the forces of communist materialism must lead to a closer co-operation of all political groups, acting across boarder, supporting the preservation of the ideals of the free world on the grounds of Christianity and humanism.”), Paul Vanden Boeynants, Chairman of the Belgian Christian Democrats, Alfons Gorbach, Austrian Chancellor, Gunnar Heckscher, Chairman of the Swedish Conservative Party, Sjur Lindebraekke, Chairman of the Norwegian Conservative Party, and Harold Macmillan, Prime minister of the United Kingdom.

These relations with leading politicians were cultivated over the years. In 1965, Secretary General Dieter Ibielski attended the reception on the occasion of the 90th birthday of Chancellor Adenauer: “The Secretary General informed the former chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany briefly about the development of the ICCS.” One year later, Dieter Ibielski met Leo Tindemans, Secretary General of the Belgian Christian Democrats, later Prime Minister of Belgium. Tindemans promised to help ICCS to organise its 11th International Students Conference in Brussels.

Since 1961, relations were also sought – “if necessary and possible” – with the “Nouvelles Equipes Internationales” (NEI), the predecessor of the EPP. However, until 1965, there were no contacts to this organisation. After the conversion of the NEI towards the European Union of Christian Democrats and increasing efforts to better integrate the international work of the European centre-right parties, ICCS gradually increased its own efforts to contribute to this development.

---

127 The meeting took place 20/21-01-66; Circular III/2, 15-02-66, ACDP IX-003-061.
The 10th International Student Conference of ICCS in 1965 discussed “joint initiatives of Christian Democratic and Conservative Parties”. Conferences in 1968 and 1969 had adopted resolutions in support of a better co-ordination of European centre-right politics: “The members of ECCS will urge their senior parties to improve cooperation between the Christian Democratic and Conservative parties of Europe. Such cooperation it is felt will strengthen the influence of moderate students in Europe.”128

At the Annual Meeting of 1970 it was decided to initiate a joint conference of the international secretaries of the mother parties and ECCS, in order to co-ordinate the political work on the European level.129 In a resolution, it was agreed to “encourage in every possible way” a “European Christian Democratic and Conservative Party”. In doing so, ECCS formed an alliance with the new British Prime Minister Edward Heath, who had expressed its sympathies for the European project, when he received continental student delegations in the fifties. Thus, the “Times” of 5 December 1970 reported of “signs of growing contact between the Tories and their leading Continental equivalents” and of informal meetings of French Gaullists, German Christian Democrats and British Conservatives.

But this new policy was not free of controversies among the ICCS/ECCS-activists themselves. A “Paris Press Statement” issued by Chairman Ian Taylor had even caused irritations among members: “The purpose was to give publicity to our view that it is vital for political parties with similar philosophies in the EEC countries to form one European Party, which will attract support on a trans-national basis, make elections for the European Parliament meaningful in a European sense, and ensure that the political balance of power in Europe swings in our way. There was no intention to set up a rival organisation to ECCS, but more a consultative committee to arrange means of gaining further publicity for this objective within the Six plus Britain.” Through this, organisations outside the “normal range” of ECCS were supposed to “become interested in the wider activities of ECCS”. What he apparently had in mind, were Gaullists and some of the Liberals, for example from the Netherlands, which were contacted on this matter.130

Other friendly relations ICCS maintained over the years were those to the Union of International Young Christian Democrats (IUYCD), the youth section of the NEI and later of the EUCD.131 In December 1964, Secretary General

128 FÖSt (ed.), press release, 01-09-70, ACDP IX-003-062.
129 RCDS, press release 80, 08-07-70.
131 Several abbreviations were in use: IUJCD (German), UIJDC (French); The European branch as called EUYCD/ EUJCD/ UEJDC respectively.
Dieter Ibielski attended a meeting of the IUYCD for the first time. That same year, Egon Klepsch, IUYCD-president and later president of the European Parliament, invited the Secretary General of ICCS to be a permanent guest in his organisation.\textsuperscript{132} Klepsch himself had a past as a student activist of a Christian-democrat student resistance group at the University of Rostock, East Germany. Since then, Dieter Ibielski and later Gerd Hammer (RCDS/Germany) regularly attended meetings of the IUYCD. In 1967, the ICCS became an associated member of this organisation. But when the IUYCD increasingly supported socialist ideas, ICCS stopped participating in its meetings. Due to severe internal conflicts the IUYCD was dissolved in April 1970, and re-established the same year – but without ECCS.\textsuperscript{133}

Another partner was the “Conservative and Christian Democrat Youth Community” (COCDYC, established in May 1964, since 1975 DEMYC). In December 1964, the Executive Committee decided to seek co-operation with the newly established association of centre-right youth organisation.\textsuperscript{134} In August 1966, COCDYC-President Dietrich Rollmann MP attended the 10th ICCS Conference in the Netherlands. In July 1968, his successor Ragnvald Dahl attended the 13th International Conference “as a return visit for my own attendance at COCDYC conferences in London and Edinburgh” (Secretary General Reginald Simmerson).\textsuperscript{135} The relations to the COCDYC were however never formalised, but extended to a regular mutual attendance of meetings, particularly after the co-operation with the IUYCD had ended.

Since 1964, there were also official contacts to the Nordic Conservative Students Union. At an Executive Committee Meeting at Gutenfels Castle (Germany) in April 1967 it was decided to re-establish these relations.\textsuperscript{136}

Finally, ICCS found partners in other parts of the world. The first in 1967 were the student wings of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and of the Republican Party of the United States respectively. The Canadians particularly showed an interest to participate, but were often “not able to send a representative to our conference.” The students of the Republican Party were expected to participate in the Annual Meeting of 1969. As a new partner in Lebanon, RCDS activists found the KATAEB, a party of conservative Maronite Christians, but this co-operation ended around 1970.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{132} Circular no.1, Sept. 30, 1964, ACDP IX-003-061.
\textsuperscript{134} Annual Report 1965/66, p. 2, ACDP IX-003-061.
\textsuperscript{135} Cf. “The future of Europe”, report, ACDP IX-003-62.
\textsuperscript{136} Annual Report 1964/65, ACDP IX-003-061; RCDS, list of appointments, 1967, KA-ZA.
**Participation in the European Youth and Student Co-operation**

Although the founding of ICCS took place under the impression of the international youth activities of both the IUS and the WFDY, because of their nature these activities were of little importance for ICCS until 1970. The assumed social-democratic orientation and signs of internal conflict prevented ICCS as well from seeking co-operation with the ISC.

After 1961, the Moscow-supported IUS continued to have mass meetings but avoided to have too far in the West. In 1962, maybe in connection with the youth festival in Helsinki, the co-operation with IUS and ISC was discussed and strongly rejected. An “agreement on World Student Unity with the Communist infiltrated IUS seems completely out of question for the time being. The change of the ‘student-as-such’ principle to the ‘student as pioneer citizen’ in the scope of co-operation with the ISC was looked upon with reluctance. [...] But ICCS does not consider Unity as an end in itself; it will have to be reached only on well-defined principles.”

On the other hand, though it promoted “a free university in a free society” and worked against totalitarianism, the ISC was a dying organisation: The ISC-organised International Student Press Conference in 1963 in Hamburg was only attended by 16 organisations. In 1965/66, an attempt of FÖSt from Austria to approach the ISC failed after the reports of financial aid by the CIA. A similar attempt in 1969 failed, when the ISC was dissolved that same year.

Another development in world politics was having a stronger impact on international youth and student affairs: since around 1969, everybody was talking about “peace and détente” between East and West. It was the Soviet Union, which had first proposed the convening of a European Security conference which would adopt a solemn text confirming the legal borders in Europe and laying down the framework for large-scale East-West economic co-operation.

The idea was welcomed by most European neutral and non-aligned states, but given a cautious reception by NATO. In 1969, the Alliance indicated its readiness to participate in such a conference, provided certain conditions were met. These included the participation of the US and Canada, the discussion of disarmament, and the inclusion of human rights issues. In the early 1970s, these obstacles were overcome, and the time had come for the “Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe” to be held in Helsinki (CSCE). At last, the Final Act of Helsinki was signed by all major European governments on 1 Au-

---


August 1975. In this treaty, the governments agreed to continue the multilateral negotiations initiated by the Conference. This was achieved by “follow-up meetings” in Belgrade (1977/1978) and Madrid (1980/1983).\textsuperscript{140}

Parallel to this, a European youth and student co-operation started as well. Several international youth organisations “considered it our responsibility to contribute, in our own specific way, to the development and strengthening of the process of détente, to the broadening of co-operation, to the preparation and successful holding of the Helsinki Conference. For that purpose we organized many bilateral and multilateral actions of different character with the involvement of different stratas of European youth.”\textsuperscript{141}

So-called “Round Tables” started immediately after the NATO had agreed in principle to have the security conference: The first “World Meeting of Youth and Students” took place 23-27 August, 1969, at almost the same time as the last ISC/COSEC-officer left the former premises of his dissolved organisation. Was it by coincidence? Twenty-five years later, it was summarised, that the “European Youth Security Conferences” were “great cold war jamborees at which the opposing blocs put forward propaganda at the Third World”.\textsuperscript{142}

It is at least perplexing how much this series of international youth meetings resembles those of 1935-1940 and 1945-1950. Obviously, Soviet youth officials tried just another attempt to manipulate youth activists for their own purposes. But a few things were different this time: the youth of Western Europe had become too diverse to monopolise. The centre-right organisations were better organised, more self-confident and knew better how to influence the public opinion. Not only for these reasons, did ECCS decide at its 1970 Annual Meeting to join the East-West youth dialogue and to participate in the (second) “European Youth Security Conference”, which was announced to take place in August 1970 in Helsinki.\textsuperscript{143}

A general interest in extending its external relations as expressed by Chairman Ian Taylor and the desire to provoke the Soviets might have been other reasons to participate. The official aim of the conference, to agree on a paper on youth affairs to become part of the Helsinki Agreement of the governments, did at least not contradict the aims of ECCS. Since ECCS was not invited – the “other side” expected that it neither would remain silent nor support Soviet policies – they managed to be represented by Carl Bildt, “disguised” as COCDYC delegate.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{141} Appeal to the Governments of Europe, 14-10-80, PAT, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{142} The influence of intelligence services on the British left, a talk given by Ronald Ramsay to Labour Party branches in 1996, www.lobster-magazine.co.uk/articles/srrtalk.htm (18-02-01).
\textsuperscript{143} RCDS, press release, 08-07-70, KAS-ZA.
\textsuperscript{144} Annual Report 1970/71, ACDP IX-003-061; RCDS, press release 80, 08-07-70.
After the well-known model of the 1940s, the conference itself was “well attended by communist delegates with just a handful of moderates to add a little spice,” reported Ian Taylor. Carl Bildt “made two speeches which were not overwhelmingly popular (one mentioned Czechoslovakia!); and he issued a press statement at the end of the Conference which stressed that not all the ‘Youth’ of Europe were supporters of Soviet policy. I am very pleased that our points were put across”, the Chairman noted with satisfaction.145 Together with COCDYC/ DEMYC, ECCS/EDS would remain one of the very few defenders of Western values in the emerging European youth structures for the decade to come.

145 Ian Taylor to the member organisations, 11-09-70, ACDP IX-003-061.
Chapter 3

Challenges

The student unrest of 1968 had changed politics dramatically. These changes were a major challenge for a political student organisation such as ECCS, that did not embrace fashionable socialism, when everybody else in academia and elsewhere seemed to have embraced it. The ECCS-activists were confronted with the fact, that European and American universities had become the playground for all kinds of “alternative” lifestyles and extreme political ideas.

After the economic and social recovery in post-war Western Europe, it seemed as if affluence was no longer the global goal of the “modern middle-class”. Or in the words of a sociologist, though the “new Left-Right continuum resembles the old in that it pits forces of change against those of the status quo”, the “optimism of the post-war generation” had been replaced by “the new concept of values of a more sceptic generation”. Suddenly economic security, low inflation or low prices were taken for granted and other values such as freedom of speech or the desire to participate in democratic decision-making became more important. These “decisive political attitudes” were less based on rational convictions than on emotional links. As a result, the “new middle-class” had become dissatisfied, more and more supported “radical social change”, and voted lesser for parties promoting their social or confessional interests.

Students were even more affected by this value revolution than other parts of the youth – intense student political activity was the result.146 In other words: student politics that used to be linked to social backgrounds had become a life-style issue. This was at the same time one of the new challenges for ECCS/EDS.

But even though this perception can explain the increasing appreciation of “change” as a political goal, more explanation is needed to describe the progress of socialist ideas among students. There were for example the unconventional and attractive cliché “liberation” fighters in developing countries. There was also the religious dimension of (neo-) Marxism combined with intellectuality that attracted students. But certainly, there were also the many intelligence activities of communist governments that contributed to the success of socialist dogmas on campus. On the international level, an impressive series of youth and student mega conferences was maintained or even initiated, in order to appeal to opportunism by creating the impression that being young means following the Bolshevik party line.

Other recipes were well known from the 1940s: infiltration, manipulation, and disinformation. As a result, many universities seemed to be completely in the hands of socialist students: “Did the Left succeed in their aims? In their terms – no. They failed to bring down education by a Marcusean-media trick. In our terms – yes. In some places they have successfully destroyed the universities as places of ‘light, liberty and learning.’”\textsuperscript{147}

Eventually, new life styles, changed values and socialist ideas amalgamated to a new youth culture which even reached east of the Iron Curtain, fueling student protest in Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Poland. Since all parts of the academic youth were affected, new conceptions towards the current topics and work style of the new Left had to be developed. In order not to lose any centre-right identity, the survival of ECCS/EDS became a question of finding the right programme, the second major challenge for the organisation.

These developments had several consequences on European and international levels. Senior politicians (re-) discovered youth and student politics. It was the various Councils of Ministers which were the initiators of numerous new youth and student structures. Furthermore, the early negotiations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact aiming for military détente (Helsinki-negotiations) inspired to initiate an East-West-youth dialogue. In no time ECCS/EDS was confronted with a jungle of European youth bureaucracies and a hostile new youth establishment representing the “false ideals of the system”.\textsuperscript{148}

It is curious to see, that the support of western politicians went exclusively to “their” non-communistic leftist organisations, whereas open communistic organisations were backed by the Soviet government itself. In this environment, ECCS/EDS had to develop its role as the only organisation trying to break “obstinate consensus” (Margaret Thatcher) with outspoken enemies of the Open Society. EDS and its member organisations did such by persisting on the achieved freedoms of the West instead of promoting the promises of the East, even if it meant the risk of complete self-isolation.

Another big challenge was the ongoing European integration. Their results were new opportunities. The fourth major challenge was the resulting activities of the centre-right parties on the European level. They tried to benefit from their youth and student organisations by using them for the exploration of new trends and the realignment of defected voters. They had also discovered the crisis of certain political and ethical values, and that the whole disturbing development started on campus. But if they wanted to benefit from the experiences of their own student activists, they had to upgrade their positions.

\textsuperscript{147} Taurus, vol.1, no.1, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{148} Cf. Daniel Brandt, Notes from the late Student Movement, in: Christianity and Crisis, 07-08-72, pp. 190-193.
Significant experiences of student activists could help to write the new agenda of the centre-right, no matter if the party was liberal, Christian-democratic or conservative. It did not make much difference, that Christian-Democrats’ parties – with their traditional “idealism” – were for the time being less affected than Liberal and Conservative parties. If all these challenges were to be met, the seventies promised to be exciting for ECCS/EDS-activists. Or in the words of Tom Spencer, Chairman from 1972 till 1974: “Throughout the year we have been hampered by the upheaval of elections, three-day weeks and general turmoil of our beloved continent. When you also consider the added joy of airline strikes and bomb threats, Europe can be seen as not the easiest place to run an international organisation.”

Annual Meeting 1972 (left to right): Michel Claris, Njal Moe (Vice Chairmen), Margret Thatcher, Sir Alec Douglas Home, Finn Brågård (Chairman 1971/72), Carl Bildt (Chairman 1974/76), Tom Spencer (Chairman 1972/74).

**Internal Affairs**

**Constitutional Development**

Major constitutional reforms took place in 1973, 1976 and 1978, reflecting the development of the organisation. However, the basic ideas of 1962 were preserved, such as the promotion of contacts between the member organisations, the creation of better understanding of

149 Rosenmayr (1976), p. 129, 137.
each others political situation by all possible means of information, the work for a united Europe and the exchange of information on student issues. Other basic principles still were the one-organisation-one vote system, the exclusion of officers from voting and the responsibility of the hosting organisation for the respective conference (with the exception of the Annual Meeting hosted by the ECCS/EDS-board).

A debate that has been continued was the one on the name of the organisation. The new name ECCS was still dissatisfying, for several reasons: It did not reflect the presence of liberal and like-minded centre-right organisations. Further more, the terms “conservative” and “Christian-democratic” had irritating connotations in languages other than English. A more neutral name could also have better endorsed the objective of a joint European Democrat Party. Thus, at the Executive Committee Meeting in Venice in June 1974, Michel Claris (GSL/France) raised the question of “the suitability of the name ECCS. This was debated by the Executive Committee for a considerable time.” During this very debate, Carl Bildt (FMSF, Sweden) “tentatively proposed the name European Democrat Students, EDS.”

The discussions went on at the next Executive Committee Meeting in London: “Doubts about any change of the name were expressed by DKS and RCDS, while FCS and NKSF were more positive and FMSF and SDM outspokenly in favour of a change to European Democrat Students. The position of GSL was well known while it was thought that Tuhatkunta would be in favour of a change.”

On February 2, 1975, at the Executive Committee Meeting in Brussels, the new name “European Democrat Students” was officially proposed by Carl Bildt (FMSF, Chairman), Gerd Langguth (RCDS) and Colin Maltby (FCS) and eventually adopted, as “Main Mail 8” reported: “After the unanimous decision of the Brussels meeting of the Executive Committee, we will henceforth be known as ‘EUROPEAN DEMOCRAT STUDENTS -Union of Christian-Democratic, Conservative and Liberal Students.’”

In April 1975, Carl Bildt informed the European Youth Forum and indicated March 1st as the date, on which the new name had become “effective”. He also delivered an explanation: “the old name has become too narrow to accurately describe our political as well as our geographical base”. The new name was also seen as “acceptable to the political traditions of all countries in which we now have members or observer members, but at the same time

151 Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 29/30-06-74, Venice, ACDP IX-003-18.
152 Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 12-10-74, London, ACDP IX-003-18.
153 Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 22/24-05-75, Bonn, ACDP IX-003-061; since then, there is also a debate whether it has to be “democratic” or “democrat”. Most certainly, it is “democrat”, derived from “democratic”, similar to “socialist” derived from “socialistic”.
a name which still gives a good indication of our position as a broadly based non-socialist organisation of European students and youth.” 154

Another ongoing matter of debate was the admission of new members – a procedure which affected the future direction of the organisation to a high extent. In principle, the membership was open to any European Christian democratic, conservative or “equivalent” student organisation. New members had to be accepted unanimously by the Executive Committee.

According to article 3 there were two kinds of membership: full membership and joint full membership. Joint Full Membership was open to organisations in countries without adequate prospective full member organisation. Since 1976, this membership type was to be applied in case of a second (or more) application for full membership from one country, “providing they indicate a willingness to work together” (art.3 b, 1976). If a second organisation would have been accepted as joint full member, both organisations had to share one vote. This regulation referred to the various Dutch member organisations (KSSF, NSSV, Interdoc-youth), and since 1976 also to the possibility of having Liberals and Christian Democrats from one country as members. 155

The Joint Full Membership was however abolished in 1978. From then on, a member organisation could veto a second membership application from the same country. At the Annual Meeting in 1973, a new article 5 was included regulating the status, the admission and the rights of observers and introducing a new status of “temporary observers” of meetings. The only right of observers was to participate in all meetings of the organisation by a special approval of the Executive Committee. 156 At the Annual Meeting of 1978, this status was converted to an “observer membership”. Additionally, an “associated membership” was introduced, “open to any fraternal organisation” with only the right to send delegates to all meetings. A new article 7.1 also regulated the expulsion of members in case they had failed “to continue to meet requirements of membership”.

In 1970, the only organs of the organisation were the elected Executive Committee (EC) and the Council. The Executive Committee was “the sovereign body of the Union in respect of all matters”. It was composed of the officers (since 1973 the “secretariat”) and one delegate – usually the international secretary – from each member organisation. The number of Executive Committee Meetings was increasing during the decade (1970/71: 2, 1972 until 1978: 4/year). 157

154 Carl Bildt to EYF, 01-04-75, EYFA.
156 Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 27-07/01-08-73, ACDP IX-003-18-IX.
One Executive Committee Meeting each year was called Annual Meeting. At this meeting, the Annual Report was “considered”, the Secretariat was elected and the Honorary Auditors were appointed. The Executive Committee elected (“appointed”) the officers of the organisation (article 8.b.2), was responsible for the “instruction and direction of the secretariat” and adopted the budget. Since the only significant power of the Council was the election of the auditors, it was abolished at the Annual Meeting in 1973. The same year, a secretariat was introduced, which existed until then only as an informal body, consisting of all officers. It met up to seven times in a year (1973/74). In 1973, the number of Vice Chairmen increased from two to four.

The Constitution also intended the coverage of all expenses of the officers – an aim that was never achieved. Article 13 foresaw the election of other officers to carry out specific tasks. In 1973, this article was amended: from now on the Secretariat could appoint a Secretary General. The first holder of this position became John C. Bowis (FCS), who had been informally appointed already in 1972.158 His tasks were however not specified but in practice concerned the running of the EDS office. Additionally, the reform of 1973 specified the duties of the Executive Committee, the auditors and of the “other officers”.159 Innovations of 1976 were the Chairmen of policy and regional committees, to be established “from time to time”, and the Honorary Vice-presidents. Additionally, it was decided to no longer discuss financial matters during Annual Meetings, to streamline the duties of the Chairman, and to specify the voting rights of the members.

At the Executive Committee Meeting (Annual Meeting) in August 1978 in Vienna, more amendments to the constitution were adopted.160 According to Chairman Scott Hamilton, this reform emphasised a stronger reference to higher education, new names for the secretariat and the appointment of the Executive Director. New paragraphs established new rights, obligations and stricter sanctions for non-payment of subscriptions. The Secretary General was renamed “Executive Director” with “clearer responsibilities and method of appointment”. It was also decided to elect two Deputy Chairmen beside the four Vice chairmen (until 1983). Concerning the organs of the Union, it was suggested to replace the Executive Committee by a “Council” and the Secretariat by an “Executive Bureau”.

Other proposals referred to deadlines and periods of notice, and were amended with only minor changes. However, one adopted amendment origi-
nally not included in Scott Hamilton’s proposal mainly referred to membership types and the admission of new members.

Additionally, “Standing Orders for the Conduct of Elections at Annual Meetings” were adopted unanimously. Their most significant innovation was the introduction of a former officer as Chairman for the Annual meeting (“returning officer”) and the order of the elections.\textsuperscript{161} Since 1972 the organisation had also begun to elect Honorary Presidents. British Prime Minister Edward Heath became the first Honorary President in July 1972. On 1 March 1975 German opposition leader Helmut Kohl was elected Honorary President (until 1978).\textsuperscript{162} His “successor” until 1981 was Diogo Freitas do Amaral, Chairman of the Social-Democratic Centre Party of Portugal (1974-1983, 1987-1991, Prime Minister 1980/81).

\paragraph*{Membership Development}

The history of the European centre-right student organisations during the early seventies was moulded by the radical changes on campuses. National politics absorbed resources and dictated agendas. Certain member organisations invested fewer resources in international activities, since they regarded international co-operation no longer “as something to which much time or effort should be devoted.”\textsuperscript{163} In 1971, Ian Taylor reported the “strongest members are from Denmark, Austria, West Germany, Finland, Sweden, Norway and the United Kingdom. An active link with France has recently been secured through the Jeunes Républicains Indépendants. The participation of MGDC in Italy is not as frequent as we would like at present. Problems are being experienced in both Holland and Belgium, as no immediately suitable organisations for membership exist there at the moment, although we make close investigations.”\textsuperscript{164}

Since one of the new challenges was the “internationalism” of the left, it was only a question of time until the member organisations increased their international work again. The total number of member organisations developed from seven in 1970 to 19 in 1980, almost identical with the average number of organisations actively participating between the Annual Meetings (1979: 15-18). The participation in Annual Meetings itself first stagnated (1970: 7 members, 2 observers; 1974: 9 organisations), but then increased

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Cf. Minutes, Annual Meeting 1978, 18/22-08-78, PAT; Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 10-06-78, ACDP IX-003-18.
\item Carl Bildt to EYF, 04-04-75, EYF-A.
\item Annual Report 1970/71, ACDP IX-003-061.
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in the second half of the decade (1975: 12, 1975: 8 members, 1976: 11 of 12 full members, 4 observer members, 1977: 16). This moderate enlargement did however not receive a euphoric welcome by all the members. In 1976, Finnish Tuhatkunta criticised, too many members would make unanimous decisions more difficult. For the first time an argument on the heterogeneity of membership aroused.

Apart from an active core group of about seven organisations – the level of involvement of some of the member organisations was often changing. A representative of the Austrian FÖSt returned in 1971 for a short period; it was Wolfgang Stickler, who became one of two Vice Chairmen. In 1973, for ECCS it became “clear that FÖSt no longer existed as a political organisation.”

Another organisation, “Österreichische Studenten Union” (ÖSU), established in 1967 by the Austrian People’s Party and catholic university and middle school student fraternities had replaced it in the National Students’ Union of Austria. ÖSU claimed to be the legal successor of FÖSt. In 1971, the organisation received 54 percent of the votes. It “dealt almost exclusively with student issues and so felt shy of conservative groupings.” Communications with ÖSU started as early as 1970. But the Austrians preferred stonewalling, or in the words of ECCS-minutes, they only “wanted to keep in touch with ECCS, but did not wish to apply for full membership until after its January elections.” A membership application in July 1970 by ÖSU apparently had no consequences. Not long after, another centre-right organisation, “Studenten Forum Österreich” (SFÖ), was established. Both organisations were present at the 18th ECCS-conference in 1973.

In 1975 ÖSU was approached again, but turned down membership and offered Austria’s neutrality contrasting the pro-NATO and pro-EEC positions of EDS once more as an excuse. Finally, ÖSU joined EDS during the Annual General Meeting on July 19, 1977 and became full member at the Annual Meeting of 1979. Not long after this meeting, the SFÖ asked to replace ÖSU. They and others claimed that ÖSU had lost track of their previous moderate objectives. A German academic newspaper reported in 1979 of ÖSU officials

165 Minutes, Annual Meeting, 1974, Copenhagen, ACDP IX-003-18; Report to the EYF, August 1976, participant’s list, EYF-A; Annual Report 1976/7, p. 1, ACDP IX-003-40; Minutes, Council Meeting, 06-04-79, Eichholz Manor, ACDP IX-003/29.
166 Tuhatkunta to EDS, 22-02-1976, ACDP IX-003-10.
167 Participants list of the ECCS-Conference, London, 09/14-07-72, ACDP IX-003-061.
168 Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 14-10-73, Bolton (UK), ACDP IX-003/18; Member organisations index (1977?), ACDP IX-003-18.
169 Franz Bittermann to EDS, 01-07-70; Ian Taylor to the ECCS-member organisations, 11-09-70, ACDP IX-003-061.
170 (18th) ECCS-Conference, 28-07/02-08, 1973, participants list, ACDP IX-003-061.
171 ÖSU to EDS, 01-08-75, ACDP IX-003-061.
accepting donations from “the socialist side”, openly declaring to no longer promote anti-socialist policies and supporting the abolition of the Austrian army and the legalisation of abortion. Thus in 1980, EDS accepted SFÖ as observer member.\(^{173}\)

In the case of Belgium, EDS had to try harder to find a substitute for the departed ESC/CDS. Several attempts of Tom Spencer in 1972 to discuss the matter with the Belgian Christian-Democrats proved to be unsuccessful.\(^{174}\) The Catholic Flemish University Student’s Union (KVHV), full member from 1972, was expelled in 1975, due to its lack of participation.\(^{175}\) At the same time and with more success, EDS negotiated with the Belgian Liberals. In 1972, FNJLP (Fédération Nationale des Jeune Liberté et Progrès/ Liberal Youth) became an observer. The new student organisation Fédération des Etudiants Libéraux (FEL) was accepted as observer in December 1975 and as full member at the Annual Meeting of 1977.

That did not mean a red light for Christian Democrats: The Verenigde Democratische Studenten (VDS), the student organisation of the Flemish Christian-democrat Youth, became observer at the Annual Meeting of 1975 and remained such until 1978.\(^{176}\) However, the presence of Belgian and Dutch Liberals was apparently a strong reason for VDS not to become more active.\(^{177}\)

The first French EDS member was JRI i.e. the Jeunes Républicaines Indépendantes (Young Independent Republicans, observer since 1970). JRI then changed its name to Generation Sociale et Libérale (GSL). In May 1977, GSL was replaced by “Autrement – Jeunes Giscardiens” after a merger with another group. At the Annual Meeting of 1979, it was agreed that “Collectif des Etudiants Libéraux de France” (CELF) would succeed Autrement as member.\(^{178}\) All organisations were linked to the liberal Republican Party of France and supported the different candidacies of Valery Giscard d’Estaing, who for some time had put his distant cousin Nicolas in charge of student affairs.\(^{179}\)

During this time, ECCS also started to establish relations to liberal organisations in the Netherlands. In 1971, the “Jongerenorganisatie Vrijheid en Democratie” (JOVD, Freedom and Democracy Youth), the youth wing of

---


\(^{175}\) Ian Taylor, Memorandum on the Organisation, 1971, ACDP IX-003-061; participants list of the ECCS-Conference, London, 09/14-07-72, ACDP IX-003-061; Executive Committee Meeting, 10/14-07-72, and Executive Committee Meeting, 13-12-75, Minutes, ACDP IX-003-18.


\(^{177}\) Cf. Policy towards UEJDC and COCDYC (memo), 1975/76, ACDP IX-003-10.

\(^{178}\) Annual Report 1979/80, p. 7, PAT.

\(^{179}\) Nicolas Giscard d’Estaing, at present a banker at Rothschild’s, is the eldest son of the former French president’s cousin Jacques, and neither his son nor his nephew as it is sometimes claimed.
the VVD (Freedom and Democracy Union) decided to regularly participate in ECCS-meetings. In 1972, JOVD joined ECCS as an observer. Following that, they seem to have been not very active, since they “decided to take up [reclaim] their old position as observer” again at the Annual Meeting of 1975. Since then (until 1978) Liberale Studentenvereniging Nederland (LSVN) was observer member as well. In February 1978, the liberal FLJ was recommended by the Bureau to become observer member. At the Annual Meeting of 1979 it became a full member.

Various efforts to win over Christian-Democrat organisations from the Netherlands such as the youth group of the Dutch Catholic Peoples Party (KVPJG) in 1973, were failing. Apparently, the ECCS-board did not know that both former member organisations NSSV and KSSF had ceased to exist.

A rather extensive project was about finding members in the European South. Most promising was Malta. Since 1973, the youth organisation of the Christian-Democrat Nationalist Party ZPN of Malta was present at ECCS-meetings. The same year, the student organisation Studenti Demokristiani Maltin (SDM) was formed: “A separate student group had been set up which had subsequently won the student elections and is expected to apply soon for full membership.” In 1974, eventually SDM became EDS full member.

In 1974/75, right after the introduction of democracy in Greece in 1974, EDS Vice Chairman Gerd Langguth got in contact with the Greek student organisation ONNeD of the party Nea Dimokratia. The organisation became full member on July 2, 1975. A strange incident occurred, when ONNeD declared its withdrawal one year later, at the first day of the annual conference in Athens (!) in July 1976, even though it was “their” event. The surprising move was not entirely theirs, but a result of ND Chairman Konstantinos Karamanlis’ sudden choice to join to the Liberal camp.

PEON from Cyprus became observer member in December 1975 and full member in August 1978 at the Annual Meeting in Vienna. In April 1979, the Cypriot PEOF (Pancyprian Unified Students Organisation) also became observer member, the “first non-socialist student organisation for Cypriot students studying in Cyprus and abroad” (established on 30 August 1978).

---
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Cypriot organisations had all the reasons to join: between 1976 and 1980, EDS had adopted six resolutions strongly supporting the position of the Cypriot government.

At the Annual Meeting of 1975, Juventude Centrista from Portugal became observer member and in 1976 full member. In December 1975, the first representatives from Spain took part. PUI, Partido Universitaria Independiente, became full member at the Annual Meeting of 1976.\(^\text{188}\) In 1977, the “Federacion Juventude Liberales” and in 1978, the “Juventude Union Centro Democratico” (successor of PUI), both from Spain, were treated as full members.\(^\text{189}\) Between 1976 and 1979, during a difficult period of Spanish democracy, EDS supported the centre right in Portugal and Spain in many ways, e.g. by a number of resolutions.

Another new member came from Iceland. At the Executive Committee Meeting in Brussels on 9 December 1972, the organisation Vaka (literally “vigil”, “watch”, “awareness”) was accepted as member. The organisation was represented by David Oddson, later Prime Minister of Iceland. The minutes even state the delegates were “delighted to welcome the two Icelandic representatives.”\(^\text{190}\)

Negotiations with both Irish parties Fine Gael and Fianna Fail were less successful (1972/73).\(^\text{191}\) Though membership was not achieved, representatives from both youth structures attended several meetings. In the first half of the seventies, Brendan Phelan attended meetings for Fine Gael (e.g. in 1972).\(^\text{192}\) From 1974 (Annual Meeting) until 1978, several meetings were attended by Daragh Owens, Conal O’Flynn and Mary Harney from Fianna Fail.\(^\text{193}\)

\(^{188}\) Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, 28-07-75, ACDP IX-003-18.
\(^{189}\) Report on the EDS training course at the EYC, 02/12-01-77, p. 2, ACDP-003-40; Minutes, Bureau Meeting, 22-10-78, p. 5, EYF-A; Address List of 1978.
\(^{190}\) Cf. Minutes, ACDP IX-003-18.
\(^{191}\) Carl Bildt, Report on activities within ECCS 1972/73, annex, ACDP IX-003-061.
\(^{192}\) Participants list of the ECCS-Conference, London, 09/ 14-07-72, ACDP IX-003-061.
\(^{193}\) Minutes, Annual Meeting, 1974, Copenhagen, ACDP IX-003/50.
Likewise, the Italian Christian-democrats were difficult to approach. In 1970, it was stated, the “Movimento Giovanile della Democrazia Cristiana” (MGDC, Christian Democrat Youth, Italy) “are as elusive as ever”. The organisation was observer since 1970 until at least 1975, but attended only few meetings. Again in 1978 and 1979, no agreement with MGDC could be reached. In 1980, the “absence of an Italian organisation” was even considered to be “a major obstacle” to closer co-operation with the EPP.

EDS had also for a long time been looking for a member in Switzerland. Swiss observer in 1972 was JCVP (Youth of the Christian Democratic People’s Party). But the interest of this organisation in EDS was weak. Finally, in 1979, EDS got in contact with Swiss Liberal Students, which announced its application for full membership at the Annual Meeting of 1979.

At the end of the decade four categories of member organisations can be identified. The first were the founders and their successors: FMSF (for SKSF), DKS (for DK), NKSF (for DKSF), RCDS, FCS (for FUCUA), Tuhatkunta and, finally, ÖSU and SFÖ for FÖSt. A second group resulted from the first wave of enlargement in the early the seventies: CELF (as successor of GSL, JRI and Autrement), Icelandic Vaka and Maltese SDM.

The third wave of enlargement in the mid-seventies brought in centre-right student groups of the Mediterranean. These were PUI and JJCC from Spain, JC from Portugal, PEON and PEOF from Cyprus and ONNeD from Greece. Finally, the fourth group consisted of Liberal organisations such as JOVD (NL), FNJLP (B, later FEL) and Swiss SLS.

An attempt to integrate high-school students failed: The Danish organisation Konservative Gymnasiaster’s Landsorganisation (Conservative Highschool Students’ National Organisation) only shortly appeared in 1972/73.

At last, the International Garrick Club continued to exist. Dieter Ibielski from Germany remained its President until 1972. Subsequently, the Garrick Club elected various successors (Finn Brågård 1972/73, Carl Cederschiöld 1973/74, Tom Spencer 1974/76, Carl Bildt 1976/78, Scott Hamilton 1978/81), a Secretary General (Nigel Ashford 1978/81) and also Vice Chairmen.

---
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Events and Public Relations

Summer and Winter Universities

As in the previous years, large parts of the resources were devoted to all kinds of events. In 1977, the idea to have a “European Summer University” was born. “If a success, we might try making it part of our annual programme in the future,” wrote Chairman Scott Hamilton in 1977. The new event created a chance for more students than ever before to get in touch with EDS. The first Summer Universities were not yet held in connection with Annual Meetings, as was the case later on. The conception followed the example of French parties. The support of the French President was not surprising, since his relative Nicolas Giscard d’Estaing was International Secretary of the official organiser GSL, the youth organisation of the Parti Républicain.

At the first EDS-Summer University in 1977 in Nice (5-13 July, France), 178 students gathered from 18 organisations of 17 countries. In 1978, the Summer University had about 220 participants and in 1979, 190 students attended the Summer University. The Summer Universities of 1978, 1979 and 1980 saw participants not only from Western Europe, but also from the US, Turkey and Chile.

The first Summer Universities were supposed to be “an opportunity to show that Europe is not only living in a parliament or some bureaucracies, but Europe is, that young European people come together, think together and discuss together about politics.” There was a real university atmosphere: the first Summer Universities took place on university campuses or training centres. Since there was no general topic, a huge variety of different topics was discussed. In 1977, the event was “divided into five study groups, of about forty people. Each study group will have sixteen sessions of one and a half hours, on the following themes:

i) Lecture on European Institutions (1 session)
ii) Lecture on European Political Parties (1 session)
iii) Lecture on Direct European Elections (1 session)
iv) Discussion on Student Affairs (2 sessions)
v) Discussion on European Education Policy (2 session)
vi) Discussion on a European Manifesto (4 sessions)
vii) Presentation of National Situations (5 sessions).

200 Scott Hamilton, Report to the Executive Committee on EDS and the “youth institutions” and the options for EDS in the future, September 1977, p. 5, ACDP IX-003-36.
201 ÖSU, FEL, FCS, PEON, DKS, Tuhatkunta, GSL, NDK, Vaka, SDM, LSVA, NKSJ, JC, FJL (Spain), FMSF, RCDS, College Republicans, College Democrats (USA); cf. ACDP IX-003/40.
202 Figures according to participants list (1979); for 1978 according to Main Mail 8, August 1978. for 1980 according to Rudolf Henke, in Taurus Jubilee Edition, p. 16; according to R. Henke, there were 300 participants in 1979.
203 Taurus extra issue (1979), p. 2, PAT.
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The second Summer University near Valencia (Spain) foresaw language education, nine panel discussions (e.g. “A European Higher Education Policy”, “Tactics in Student Politics”, “The Future of the European Communities”), debates on resolutions, and 13 thematic lectures (e.g. on Eurocommunism, the Cyprus-question, “How the European Community works”, on European elections and parties, the third world, “new philosophers”, East-West dialogue), as well as sports. One highlight was a lecture of Antonio Fontán, hero of Spanish democratisation, co-author of the Spanish constitution, editor, minister, and member of the senate.

The 3rd Summer University of Bernried (Germany) with more than 200 participants from 18 countries in July 1979 included similar topics, such as “European Elections – and now?” (Pierre Moinet), “Free trade – the only chance for third world countries” (Elisabeth Langby), “The situation in the south of Africa” or “The principle basis of education policy”. A member of the Chilean student opposition gave a speech on the situation in his homeland. In a very well written newspaper article, Vice Chairman Rudolf Henke also mentions a very passionate speech by former Chairman of EDS and newly elected member of the European Parliament Tom Spencer, who told the audience to critically follow up the actions of the parliamentarians, called the decision making of the European Council (heads of governments) “highly anachronistic and undemocratic” and demanded more competences for the European Parliament.

Other parts of the programme included presentations of member organisations, separate meetings of law, economics and medical students, as well as lessons in “basic German”. The result of these meetings was the creation
of the European Medical Students’ Association (EMSA) and the European Law Students Association (ELSA) which exist to this day. The current ELSA-leadership however claims 4 May 1981 as the official date of foundation. EMSA disappeared in the late eighties, to be re-established in 1990/91.

Responsible for EMSA was EDS-Vice chairman Rudolf Henke, a medical student himself. First coordinators of ELSA were Ernst Wurz (SFÖ, Austria) and Reinhard Stuth (RCDS, Germany). In 1979, EMSA and ELSA were considered as permanent working groups of EDS, to meet alongside EDS-meetings, to focus on all topics related to medicine and law respectively, and to add new topics to the agenda in order to involve more students in EDS. Such working groups had already met in the years before. According to “Deutsche Universitätsszeitung”, the first ELSA project has been a comparative analysis of the various degree programmes in Europe with a “special emphasis on the reference of theory to praxis”. Another ELSA-project agreed on at the EDS-Summer University was a pan-European internship programme for law students.206

Other highlights of this legendary Summer University were a Bavarian (beer) festival, barbecues, sightseeing tours, sports events and the cabaret. Or in the words of a participant: “Those, who cannot party together, cannot cooperate politically. After all, we are no political robots. For Europe, personal friendships are as important as policy debates. Only where both complement one another, long-term successes can be achieved.”207

206 Neue Vereinigung europäischer Jurastudenten, in: DUZ/HD 19/79, S. 629. This paragraph is also based on interviews with Reinhard Stuth and another former EDS-activist who wishes to remain anonymous.

In 1980, the Summer University included 44 different panels, seminars, lectures, working groups, debates and social events. It took place in Lisbon, August 2-9, and was attended by 180 participants from 18 countries, including Chile, the US, Israel and Argentina. Most prominent speakers were Alice Saunier-Seite, French higher education minister, Diogo Freitas do Amaral, deputy prime minister of Portugal, and Amaro da Costa, the Portuguese defence minister.

Lucas Pires, Vice-president of the CDS-party spoke on “Revolution and Constitution”, Julen Guimon, President of the Basque UCD on “Nationalism and Terrorism”, Harald Evensen from Norway on the “French Political Situation”, the former Secretary General Nigel Ashford on Neo-Conservatism in the US, and Ulrich Bunjes (Germany) on European Youth Organisations. Steinar Brenden (Norway) spoke on the New Economic World Order and Stefan Eisel (Germany) about “Federal Elections in Germany”. There were also presentations of member organisations themselves: FMSF informed of the “Swedish Referendum on Nuclear Power”; RCDS explained “German Neutrality”; Tuhakunta shared its views on disarmament; FEL explained the Belgian constitutional reforms; and finally SLS had a lecture on Swiss Neutrality.208

Apparently, the event also included another meeting of the European Law Students Association (ELSA). Due to the increasing ideological tensions inside EDS, it must have become obvious to the people behind this project to develop a “multinational, non-partisan, non-profit law student organization”. This also enabled them to attract students without party affiliation, from all walks of life and even from beyond the Iron Curtain, and to focus on academic and professional aspects of student life, an approach typical for EDS-activists from Austria. However, from the basic idea of the association to terminologies such as “International Council Meeting” for regular board meetings, to this day ELSA resembles its “mother” EDS as much as its “father”, the Austrian National Students’ Union (ÖH). However, from an EDS perspective it looks like an unfriendly takeover.209

In 1979, there was also a presentation by the young human rights activist Georg Miller-Kurakin (1955-2009) on his new network “East European Soli-

---
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209 In 2006, ELSA itself admitted that ELSA-founder Ernst Wurz and his friends participated in “a conference of Christ Democratic [sic!] law students in Portugal in the summer of 1979”, by this confirming that EDS’s history started before 1981. However, if it was Portugal, the only meeting in question is the EDS Summer University of 1980. Cf. 25 Years of ELSA, in: Synergy, Magazine of the European Law Students’ Association, 40/II 2006, pp. 44-45. In 2011, Laura Jelinek, ELSA Germany Chairman 2006/7 stated that previous claims of ELSA-officials, the organisation has been established after a chance encounter of 5 law students in a train to Vienna in spring 1981, were a "myth". In referring to Ernst Wurz’ anniversary presentation of 2011, she also mentioned “various meetings” before 1981, “during which the foundation was engineered”. Cf. ELSA Alumni Deutschland e. V. - Bericht vom LIX. International Council Meeting, Poznan, Polen, www.elsa-germany.org [accessed 02-11-2012].
For him “the demise of Soviet Communism was an absolute certainty, provided that the West remained strong. [...] The European Democrat Students, a federation of Conservative student movements, heard him describe how human rights could be used as a lever to destabilise Communist dictatorships. His effect on the audience was electric. As radicals for change in their own countries, they were captivated by Miller’s vision of a democratic Russia. Charismatic, pragmatic and persuasive, he signed them up to his cause. [...] Couriers carried uncensored mail and anti-Communist literature into Soviet Bloc countries and brought information out – a lifeline for hard-pressed dissidents. Periodically, the youngsters were caught and expelled, making good use of the resultant publicity.”

In February 1978, the first European Winter University took place in Lienz (Austria). At this conference, the discussion of a “Charter on Higher Education” was commenced (cf. chapter on higher education). The Winter University was organised by ÖSU (Austria) and was attended by 50 to 60 participants. In 1979, the participants of the Winter University in Lienz formed a working group on “workers participation”, which presented a report on the topic. The working group was the result of a Council decision, after a compromise could not be reached. The result was an extensive “Report on Worker’s Participation”, emphasising that “the power to make decisions must be decentralised and brought as near to the individuals as possible” – even in private enterprises. The main concern was to increase individual possibilities to influence decisions affecting the individual citizen.

The paper apparently reflected the views of the leftward-drifting Austrian hosts, and was neither accepted nor adopted by a statutory body of EDS. A seminar with 34 participants called “visit to the European institutions in Brussels and Luxembourg” was held only a few days before that event. The two meetings combined resembled the Winter Universities of the nineties – new activists of old student organisations are destined to recycle old ideas. Soon afterwards, Scott

211 Report of the EDS Working Group on Workers Participation, 28-01/04-02-79, ACDP IX-003-29; Main Mail, February 1979, p. 1, PAT.
Hamilton suggested to drop the name “university” and just to “take a winter holiday together”.212

Seminars

On June 26, 1971, the ECCS celebrated its 10th anniversary at its annual meeting in Stockholm. Finn Brågård, a 26 years old “stud. mag.” from Denmark was elected to be the second Chairman of the organisation.213 In general, the seminar activities of the organisation expanded significantly during the seventies, particularly after the establishment of the “European Youth Foundation”, when up to three seminars per year were financially supported by this institution. 483,000 French Francs were received between 1974 and 1980.214

From 1976, the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg was used every year for events such as “Training Courses” e.g. on “electoral techniques”. Other seminars were organised in co-operation with NATO.215 The number of seminar participants was dependent of the funding: the Annual Meeting in London of July 1972 was attended by approximately 50 students,216 the Oslo-seminar in 1973 by 25 participants from 10 member organisations, the (18th) Conference in Berlin in July and August 1973 by 57 participants,217 the Annual Meeting of 1976 by 59 participants.218 In 1976/77, five seminars were attended by almost 200 students from approximately 15 countries (not including the Summer University).219 More and more, the term “International Student Conference of ECCS” was replaced by the terms “Annual Meeting” or “seminar”. New traditions emerged too: the first “fact finding mission” was organised by Tom Spencer to Belfast in 1972.220

One of the first meetings in the seventies seemed a disappointment: “The Conference in Brussels organised by the European Communities Press and Information Office was disappointing, but it did establish the principle of sponsorship, and made us known,” wrote outgoing Chairman Ian Taylor 1971 in his Annual Report. Yet in 1972 another information visit to Brussels

212 Chairman’s report on activities, Malta, April 1978, ACDP IX-003-18.
213 Finn Brågård grew up in and around Ringkøbing (Jytland, Western Denmark) as the son of the owner of what is now Sommerland Vest Holiday Park. Before his time in EDS he served as Chairman of the Danish Young Conservatives in the Ringkøbing district and studied at Copenhagen University. Cf. Ringkøbing Aarbog 1970-1971, Ringkjøbing 1971, p. 53. So far, neither his whereabouts nor the ECCS papers of his term could be detected.
214 In 2001 this would have been about 73600 Euro. EYF-data sheet, 1974-2001.
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(“Youth and the Community of Nine”) was organised. Lectures were held on the enlargement of the EEC, external relations and “Regional Policy after the Summit”. A round table debated “education, youth and the EEC”.221

Other topics for seminars included “Northern Flank Problems” (Oslo, 1973), Federalism (Amsterdam, 1974), “Politics and Pollution” (Venice, 1974), “Capitalism and the Economics of Europe” (Copenhagen, 1974), “Sweden in Europe” (Stockholm, 1974) with a host of different themes, “Direct Elections and Student Affairs” (London, 1976), European Institutions (Athens, 1976), “Human Rights” (Brussels, 1977), or “Student Affairs” (Stockholm, 1977). In 1977, EDS came to Berlin to discuss issues such as “Euro-Communism”. A central topic of human rights debates remained the situation of a divided Cyprus. In May 1977, EDS organised a study trip to Cyprus with five participants, a result of the debate on Cyprus during the Human-Rights-Conference in Brussels.222 By the end of the decade, the human rights situation in Eastern Europe attracted the attention.

Only a few of the seminar reports have survived in the archives, and their objectivity is in question. An example are the discussions of the environmental conference in Venice (28-30 June, 1974), inspired by the pessimistic doom-and-gloom scenarios of the notorious “Club of Rome”. The author of the report, Chairman Tom Spencer, considered the special situation of the city a “warning and symbol”. Political decisions destroying the environment he interpreted as being the result of the “current short-sighted unbalanced view of the future”. Such views would be caused by “a hurried and incomplete education, compounding lack of time and absence of thought.” There were serious doubts, whether “we have produced the men capable of taking advantage of the technology put at their disposal.” Venice was also considered to be an example for “inner-city deprivation.”

The participants also discussed the implications of what they thought was Karl Popper’s philosophy: the European civilisation was facing “extinction as a society caught between materialism and totalitarianism, between extremes of both freedom and equality. [...] In this sense, Europe has a key position in the search for a rational response to problems of the environment.” As an ideal, Spencer envisioned a “Europe of the middle way”, not only for environmental questions.223

Another example was a training seminar at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg (1976), which aimed at the promotion “of better knowledge of democratic organisational affairs, political youth and student organisational

221 Commission of the European Communities, Programme for the Information Visit of the ECCS, Brussels, 07/09-12-72, ACDP IX-003-038.
222 EDS (ed.), Cyprus Divided, report, May 1977, PAT.
223 Tom Spencer: Venice - warning and symbol for Europe, 1974 (quotations from last chapter), EYF-A.
activities and internal political education” in particular in Greece, Portugal and Spain. Trainers came from “better established member organisations”. An external speaker was Jean Knopf, regional secretary of the FNRI-party (France). Additionally, Carl Bildt spoke on “Communism in Western Europe” and Reinhard Stuth (RCDS) on possible high school activities of student organisations.224

Another training seminar at the same location in 1977 promoted the “education of executive members and future executive members in the member organisations in the fields of political education and political information.” Its unofficial objective was the exchange of information among the member organisations. The seminar itself consisted of lectures and working group sessions. A leadership team had prepared “group tasks” for the various parts of the seminar. Lecturers mainly came from the member organisations and presented training methods of their organisations. A lecture by Nicolas Giscard d’Estaing, EDS-Vice Chairman, on the European elections was the starting point of a discussion of European affairs. Finally, the Council of Europe and the Court of Human Rights were visited.225

At a seminar in Bergen (Norway) in 1977, 25 participants from 10 countries discussed energy-policies. Speakers elaborated on the interdependence of security issues and energy supply, and topics such as different pricing systems for energy, nuclear power and the “Critique of High Energy Society”. Additionally, a paper on energy policy was submitted by FMSF and discussed: “I am sure we came away from the meeting convinced that full scale production of nuclear energy is both necessary and desirable.” The meeting also discussed the section of the EDS European Programme which dealt with energy policy. “After much discussion a format was agreed upon, reflecting the Scandinavian interpretation of the English language.” The paper aimed at the introduction of a common European energy policy “to ensure solidarity in times of supply difficulties”, more research on the opportunities of nuclear energy, to “provide energy at the lowest possible cost”, and more competition in the energy industry.226 Another study session in Strasbourg in 1978 dealt with “theoretical and technical aspects” of student, national and European elections. Aims were the “flow of advice and ideas from the stronger and more established organisations to the newer ones”, to “provoke greater interest” in student politics and the preparation of the European elections.227

224 Council of Europe (ed.), Study Session held in co-operation with the European Democrat Students, 5-13/07/76, EYC-report CEJ/S (76) 13.
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227 Council of Europe (ed.), Study session held in co-operation with the European Democrat Students, 17-26/09/78, report CEJ / S (78) 21.
A seminar in Reistad (Norway) in 1980 dealt with the “organisation of society in general and aspects of industrial and economic policy in particular”. Lecturers came from the University of Oslo, the Federation of Norwegian Industries, the media, the Employers Confederation of Norway and the Conservative Party. Topics included “Is modern Society over-governed?” (“Society is not governed because it is over-governed: more governing means less control.”), and suggested more liberal economic solutions for the society and new ways in development aid. Other lectures dealt with “Industrial Democracy – Economic Democracy”, “Totalitarian aspects of cultural policy in Norway”, “Combined Wage Agreements in Norwegian Politics”, and recent political developments in Latin America. Interestingly enough, the participants discussed Popper’s “Open Society”, again, because it was believed it indicated in “which way we want society to develop.”

With its increasing seminar activities, the reputation of the organisation improved significantly. More and more, ECCS/EDS-events included influential politicians and exceptional places: The Annual Meeting in July 1972 included a reception at 10 Downing Street by Prime Minister Edward Heath who had brought the United Kingdom into the European Communities the same year and expressed his appreciation for the support of both Ian Taylor and Tom Spencer for his policy. Among the attendees were Margaret Thatcher, then Secretary of State for Education, and Sir Alec Douglas-Home, then Foreign Secretary.

On 14 March 1975, a meeting in Paris was opened by Prime Minister Jacques Chirac. Most prominent speaker at the Summer University in Nice was the French President Valery Giscard d’Estaing. In October 1978, the EDS-

---
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230 Programme, ACDP IX-003-061.
Bureau was received by French Prime Minister Raymond Barré.\textsuperscript{231} The Annual Meeting of 1975 took place on the ship “Svea Regina” en route from Helsinki to Stockholm.

A contrasting setting was provided for the Annual Meeting of 1973 which took place in West Berlin while the communist “World Youth Festival” was held in East Berlin. ECCS-activists used the opportunity to disturb the East German organisers. After they had released some negative press releases for Western media they “took the opportunity to watch the ‘happenings’ arranged for 120,000 ‘peace and freedom loving’ young people in East Berlin.” Since they had started political discussions with the participants of the communist festival, the “authorities became positively obsessive about ECCS imagining our number at more than their modest sixty. In crossing Checkpoint Charlie we scored a total of twenty stopped and questioned, seven held for more than an hour; and three stripped, held and questioned. Freer movement of peoples has a long way to go.”\textsuperscript{232}

**Campaigns: Portugal, Malta and Human Rights**

In the seventies, various campaigns made EDS widely known. The need for efficient campaigning had been realised in the middle of the decade: In June 1975, a seminar on campaigning was organised in Edinburgh (UK). At the same time, the campaign “Support Portugal’s Democrats!” was initiated. Another campaign in support of the democracy in Malta started only a year later.

What had happened? In both Portugal and Malta the democratic forces had come under pressure. In Portugal, 25 April 1974, the military had carried out a coup d’état. The goal was the introduction of democracy. Exactly a year


\textsuperscript{232} Taurus, vol.1, no.1, p. 7.
later, elections were held with the results in favour of the Socialists and the centre-right Popular Democrats, both of which promised a peaceful transition to democracy. But the results of elections were ignored by several radical leftist groups trying to establish their own government. This included communist attempts to overthrow the prime minister and the president. A “Council of the Revolution” which was composed of communist military officers decreed the nationalisation of the industries and collectivism in agriculture. Private entrepreneurs were arrested. Independent labour unions were infiltrated. However, the democratic parties which had won the elections resisted these attempts. Throughout the summer of 1975, Portugal was wrought with constant public and sometimes violent protest. Eventually in November 1975, General Ramalho Eanes put an end to the communist coup in Lisbon and by this avoided a civil war.\(^\text{233}\)

EDS-officers had been direct witnesses: On the occasion of the national congress of the CDS party in Oporto in January 1975, Carl Bildt, Gerd Langguth and Tom Spencer were confronted with violent attacks against the congress “by an alliance of Communist Party directed mobs and Communist Party directed sections of the Armed Forces. Together with the rest of the foreign guests, we issued a statement voicing our concern for the future of freedom in Portugal which was widely reported across Europe.”\(^\text{234}\) This incident made front page news. A report of the “Guardian” confirmed that “Foreign diplomats and parliamentarians were released early today after spending the night besieged in an Oporto sports pavilion while left-wing demonstrators protested outside against the holding of a party convention they were there to attend. [...] Delegates had kept up their spirits during the night by singing Land of Hope and Glory to Portuguese words. (...) One British delegate, Mr Tom


\(^{234}\) Report, 1975, ACDP IX-003-061.
Spencer, an accountant representing the European Union of Christian Democrat and Conservative Students, spent the night outside the hall after being barred from entering. Today he said that troops from the local infantry force sent to restore order had in fact sided with the crowd.” When he arrived at the conference hall, he found “the hall barred by the crowd of about of about 1,000 left-wingers – organised, we believe, by Communists.”

Tom Spencer also told the reporter, how the commander of these troops was replaced in a mutiny: “We were told in the crowd that the soldiers were sons of the people and that they swapped jokes and cigarettes with the demonstrators while becoming progressively drunk as the evening wore on. At one point five cars were overturned and set on fire but the troops and armed police made no attempt to intervene. During the evening a gun battle developed between the local troops and armed police, in which five policemen and 12 civilians were injured, two seriously.” During this time, Spencer was trapped in a dead end street. He did however not believe “there was any intention of storming the conference hall”.235

During this period, a close co-operation was established with the Youth of the Centre-Democrats, Juventude Centrista. Representatives of this organisation were invited to the Conference with the possibility to establish a European Democrat Party in Edinburgh and to a visit to Germany.236 At the same time, EDS officially launched its campaign “Support Portugal’s Democrats!” The co-operation developed well, and from 28 August to 1 September 1975, EDS held a seminar in Lisbon, which was attended by 40 representatives from 12 European countries, the United States and the World Assembly of Youth (WAY). Speakers did not only come from the host organisation Juventude Centrista, but also from the Christian-Democrat party PPD, the Social Democrat PS, the Greek Parliament (Miltiades Evert) and the European Parliament.

At this event EDS decided to intensify the “European Youth Campaign for Democracy in Portugal”. The main aim was to influence “national governments to give positive support to those parties in Portugal that are working for and respect a pluralist democracy.”237 In the final resolution, EDS asked for more political support for the freely elected Constitutional Assembly of Portugal, for the respect of basic constitutional rights and for more economic support. “Portugal and her people are ready for democracy and freedom. [...] The manoeuvres of antidemocratic forces in Portugal have created a climate of insecurity and fear among democrats.”238

235 Christopher Reed, Oporto siege traps MPs, The Guardian, Jan. 27, 1975, p. 1.
237 Europe and Democracy in Portugal and Spain, report, 1975, EYF-A. Communiqué, 1975, ACDP IX-003-
hostile reactions from leftist newspapers. EDS was accused of supporting right-wing extremism. EDS even appeared in the leading newspaper of communist East Germany “Neues Deutschland” as supporter of “right wing forces in Portugal”. The German bulletin “Berliner Extra-Dienst” of October 1975 labelled EDS as “right wing conservative or fascist”, since it supported Portuguese Socialists and Centrists. In 2001, after the opening of the East German intelligence archives it became evident, that the entire counter-campaign had been well prepared in advance by Eastern intelligence agencies in support of the communist forces in Portugal.239

From 1976 onwards a second large campaign had been supporting the Maltese democracy, when an EDS-resolution in support of the Maltese Christian Democrat Party expressed its hope for fair elections. In July 1977, another resolution condemned several actions of the Socialist Maltese government, such as government interference in the work of the labour unions, an “abuse perpetrated by the government controlled media to alienate Maltese public, and influence their opinion against the workers who followed legitimate trade union directives.”

In March/April 1978, a “Mediterranean Conference” in support of the Maltese democrats was organised on the island. 40 participants of 18 organisations took part. The conference was opened by a speech of Edward Fenech Adami, then leader of the Maltese opposition. He outlined that the Socialist conception of Malta’s neutrality “differs radically from the traditional juridical concept of neutrality” but that he “looked forward to the day when Malta would find its rightful place in a united Europe.”

The final communiqué of the meeting criticised the “lack of any mention of the need to maintain law and order and the acts of violence during the [election] campaign.” Hence, the national elections were not considered to be free. The support of students’ and teachers’ efforts to maintain freedom of education was pointed out, whereas proposals of the government to change educational laws were considered to be “in direct contrast to the recommendations of the European Council for Higher Education under the auspices of the UNESCO.”

This caused a tremendous echo: The final communiqué of the conference was the reason for the Maltese Socialists to convene a press conference, where they were “warning European political parties which sent representatives for the European Democrat Students conference that the delegates [...] are being detrimental to both Malta and the democracy of the same parties they represent.”

239 Neues Deutschland, 22-07-75; Berliner Extra-Dienst, 21-10-75; both in: BStU 000043, 000045.
241 Times of Malta, 28-03-78, p. 1.
The newspaper “Malta News” reported of a “Christian Democrat Conspiracy Against Malta” aimed at “downgrading Malta by suggesting that it is a totalitarian state.” According to the newspaper, the British Labour MEP John Prescott “said that further evidence of this Christian Democrat conspiracy against Malta may be witnessed from what was published in a section of the local Press about the European Democratic Students, who talked about ‘tendencies towards totalitarianism’”. Prescott also “praised Prime Minister Dom Mintoff for being a man who is committed to advance the cause of the people of Malta” and said “to hear these [centre-right] parties which have relationships with some fascist organisations in Spain and Greece talking about democracy in this way is terrible.” These statements again motivated the Tory-MEP Geoffrey Rippon to join the EDS-campaign on behalf of the Conservative Group in the European Parliament. He published Prescott’s statements and wrote an open letter to Prescott “I can hardly believe that the report reflects the views of you and your colleagues.”

The discussion of the situation on Malta was set forth at the Annual Meeting in France in 1979. It was agreed to continue the campaign as “Campaign on Democrat Solidarity”. The objective was to “support democrats in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes to a far larger extent [...] a political and moral support of people working for freedom.” Secondary aims were to gain senior parties’ support to “get students more concerned about democrat solidarity” and to “demonstrate to people that we are committed to support democrats who fight dictatorships of all kinds.” Apart from Malta, the situa-

---

tion of Chile was supposed to be brought up again. In a position paper “EDS-Actions for Democrats in Malta”, Vice Chairman Elisabeth Langby specified several policies in order to promote the Maltese case throughout European universities. Among others, Malta’s early entry in the EEC was suggested. The campaign was to be continued until early 1981, when the Maltese parliamentary elections were expected. In 1980, open letters to the government of Malta were sent, and the poster “Democrat support Democrats” was produced.

A third campaign was the Human Rights Campaign, launched in February 1977 in Brussels: “its objective has been to draw attention to the violation of Human Rights in two quite distinct social orders.” The campaign target was the ignorance of particular nations at CSCE-conferences towards “the issues dealt with in basket 3 in the final act, on violation of Human Rights.” All achievements of the process should be “subject to sincere and open discussions.” They also referred to the UN- and the European declaration of Human Rights and the Final Act of Helsinki. The campaign focused on the release of the Chilean student Juan Bosco Canales and the Russian historian Boris Ewokedimov, two political prisoners.

EDS produced 2000 posters, stickers, postcards and a special edition of the Taurus magazine for the campaign. The co-operation with various human rights groups was initiated. Letters were prepared to the embassies of Chile and the Soviet Union as well. The campaign itself took place at several European universities. Altogether 30,000 signatures were collected for a petition. Additionally, a number of letters from organisations both within and outside Europe were received expressing solidarity with the campaign. The presence of EDS-campaigners at the Frankfurt University in Germany in June 1977 received much publicity from the German media and led to another commentary in the RCDS-files of the East German intelligence service. In 1979/80, the campaign for democracy in Chile was integrated in the “Campaign on Democrat Solidarity”.

But various EDS-activists did not stop at passing resolutions and printing materials. After Peter Young and Nigel Linacre of the FCS had met human rights activist George Miller-Kurakin, and after they had brought “together émigré eastern Europeans with Conservative and Liberal activists”, they could recruit “dozens of youngsters to travel clandestinely to Eastern Europe to support dissident groups”, by this “shocking western diplomacy”. Miller-Kurakin

---
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was convinced that the human rights campaign “could be used as a lever to destabilise Communist dictatorships.” During the travels to Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia leaflets and books (Orwell, Hayek, Rand, Nozick, Rothbard and others) were taken in and dissidents’ manuscripts were taken out. In January 1980, Peter Young was arrested in Warsaw for attending an “unofficial conference in Poland”. After being stripped, searched and held in police custody for seven hours, he told the media that dissent journals and photographs had been confiscated.

Peter Young, though Vice Chairman of FCS, was travelling as representative of EDS. He and his friends had attended the now legendary first meeting of representatives of the Polish democratic youth and student underground with EDS at Rynias glade in the Polish Mountains. While the Polish representatives were mainly coming from the Club of Catholic Intelligentsia (KIK), SKS and/or NZS, EDS was represented by Chairman Lars Eskeland, Ståle Gundhus and Trine Than (NKSF), Jörgen Johansson and Klaus Weidstam (FMSF), RCDS-Vice chairman Stefan Dingerkus, Richard Thoburn (FCS) and another student from France. Many others were involved in the secret planning of this event. The conference participants did not only discuss the current state of affairs, but also what role Conservatives and Christian Democrats could play to end the communist regimes. The participants from the West learned that they were “many oppositional democratic movements in Poland” and an overwhelming anti-communist sentiment among students, which was never reported in the news of the free West. It should be emphasised that this meeting took place months before the strikes at the Gdansk ship yard and the establishment of the Solidarnosc labour union in summer 1980.

As far as we know, of the Western participants only Peter Young got caught. However, he kept his courage. Later in the same year, he already travelled to Moscow in order to meet dissident author Georgi Vladimov and to bring out a microfilm of his latest book for publishing in the West. Another participant, the 25 years old Ståle Gundhus from Norway, was shot in Afghanistan in 1982, when he tried to report the real events of the Soviet occupation for a Norwegian newspaper. In 2011, the Polish Government hosted a reunion on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Rynias conference, by this emphasising its high importance for the struggle of the Polish underground.
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Public Relations

In the seventies, the organisation was able to increase the number of its publications significantly. The most relevant publications were the different newsletters, the Taurus-magazine and political reports. The regular newsletter was continued under the name “ECCS-Bulletin” and issued three times in 1970/71. The outgoing Chairman Ian Taylor regretted the low number of issues.254 In autumn 1972, the new bulletin “One Europe” was issued. It mainly contained reports from the Youth Security Conference in Helsinki. Altogether 300 copies were distributed.

Since the summer of 1974 the bulletin had been called “Main Mail” (1974/75: 10 issues, 1975/76: 11 issues, 1976/77: 9 issues, 1977/78: 8 issues, 1979/80: 8 issues). The tenth issue from the 4th of April 1975 was the first publication with the new name “European Democrat Students” in the masthead. At this occasion, Carl Bildt wrote, “it is my hope that we will all in

---

due course become as accustomed to European Democrat Students as a name, as we were to ECCS."

“Main Mail” was downsized to merely a newsletter, when the ECCS decided to publish “Taurus” as a quarterly political magazine. The project to influence public opinion by a political magazine dates back to 1974: “Communication the prime problem in Europe. We have to defeat language, distance, poverty and nationalism to work well. [...] Taurus wants to let some fresh air in on ECCS and on the closed ‘magic circle’ of international youth politics. The key to under-involvement is knowledge of what is being done in your name. Then, and only then, will ideas and effort and people become fully involved.” First Taurus-editor became Tony Baldrey. The A4-sized Taurus was one of the first pan-European political magazines ever made by students. It made EDS widely known.

The publication’s name had been chosen in reference to ancient myths: “‘Taurus’, as you will know, is Latin for a bull. Europa, as some of you will remember, was the only daughter of Agenor and Argiope and lived in Crete. She was so beautiful that Zeus felt in love with her. He disguised himself as a snow-white bull. ‘Europe was struck by his beauty and found him gentle as a lamb.’ She, foolish maiden, put flowers in his mouth and climbed on his back. Zeus-Taurus suddenly swam away with her, turned himself into an eagle and ‘ravished’ her. [...] She bore him three sons, one of whom, Minos, founded the great Minoan civilisation on Crete. ECCS is also attracted by the beauty of Europe. We intend to gain a great deal of pleasure out of our association, but also to produce something worthwhile. Thus ‘Taurus’ is our name.”255

In autumn 1976, Taurus was issued once, and in 1977/78 twice (editor: Friedbert Pflüger).256 In 1978, it was discussed whether to develop a magazine and additionally an internal newsletter besides “Main Mail”.257 In 1979, the decision was made to change Taurus into a quarterly magazine in A-5-size.258 From now on, it would be “directed towards the public opinion and must reflect our ideas on certain important political issues.” FMSF had taken “the risk to issue the magazine”.259

With its new face, a first number was published in 1979 and two in 1980 (editor: Elisabeth Langby). A special Taurus was produced by Heinz Neubauer (RCDS) for the 1979 Summer University in Munich and Bernried. With the agreement of the member organisations to buy its copies, the financing of the magazine could be secured. Articles covering different aspects of European

---
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politics augmented the number of subscribers. Stephan Eisel (RCDS) became editor at the Annual Meeting of 1980. His personal aim was to intensify the “intellectual debate within the non-socialist circles in Europe.”

A third area of publication was the reports. In the beginning, there were “ECCS-Blue Books”, an “occasional series of research pamphlets on issues of importance to European students”. In 1973/74, the first of this series was about the findings of a study on the (communist) International Union of Students. The second ECCS-Blue Book contained the conclusions of an environmental conference in Venice in 1974, written by Tom Spencer: “Venice - warning and symbol for Europe”. Other reports of the time were a comparative analysis of the party programmes of several non-socialist parties, the financing of higher education in different European countries, the role of student unions (1976), a study trip to Romania (1978, Pierre Moinet) and the 11th “World Festival of Youth and Students” in Havana (Cuba).

In July 1979, Elisabeth Langby presented a report on “Pinochet’s Chile” and a “Background Paper on the Third World”. In 1980, reports on visits to Canada and the US (Stephan Eisel), to Italy (Stephan Dingerkus), on Youth Forum Committees, the Framework for All-European Youth and Student Cooperation, the World Forum of Youth and Students on Peace, Détente and Disarmament (Lars Eskeland) were available. In 1980, a report about the conference on “The Open Society” in Reistad (Norway) was issued. In 1977, EDS also started upgrading the design of its Annual Reports (Scott Hamilton). These reports were published for the first time as a booklet in 1980.

---
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The first information leaflet presenting ECCS was printed in 1972/73 with Margaret Thatcher (as Secretary of State for Education), Sir Alec Douglas-Home (Foreign Secretary) and the ECCS-Board on the front-page. New leaflets were printed in autumn 1976, 1978 (“This is European Democrat Students”, 5000 copies) and 1979. Other publications were posters, for example on the Cyprus problem (1978) and the Programme for European Elections (1978).

Ever since July 1976 the creation of an EDS-logo was being discussed. A first suggestion by Reinhardt Stuth (RCDS) was however rejected. Since September 1976, in connection with an attempt to establish a “European Democrat Youth”, a logo showing three overlapping circles was in use, symbolising the three political families the organisation represented. The final EDS-logo was developed in connection with the campaign for the European elections in 1978/79, when a poster “Europe for the Individual” was to be printed. Three different drafts were supposed to symbolise the three political families. Finally, three simplified flowers surrounded by the 12 European stars were printed on the posters. The use of the logo during the 3rd Summer University in 1979 would make it so popular that its shape was never to be changed since.

---
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Basic Papers in the Seventies

Policy: The Manifesto of 1976

By 1975, EDS had lost its traditional ideological homogeneity. Difficulties to integrate organisations such as ÖSU (Austria) or Tuhatkunta (Finland) are strong indications for a growing need for philosophical clarity. The presence liberal member organisations since 1972, the change of the organisation’s name in 1975 and the ongoing ideological debate inside the mother parties – as well as among the students – created further incentives to start a programmatic debate.

Thus in March 1975, at an Executive Meeting, "GSL was asked to present a proposal for a revised text concerning European foreign policy and joint defence, while RCDS [was asked] for a 'mini-manifesto' concerning student issues relevant on the European level. It was also felt that there was a need for a more extensive treatment of the subject of democracy and freedom."267 This draft Manifesto on political principles and basic aims was discussed at all meetings until the Annual Meeting of 1975, when “a large number of interventions were made by the delegates” and a final version was eventually “approved” – with “applauds from the delegates”268

However, at the Executive Committee Meeting in April 1976 in Munich (Germany), the manifesto “was discussed again. Each paragraph was penetrated.” This discussion lasted for more than 12 hours. In the end, the delegates could agree to adopt the Manifesto in two steps. The first part was immediately adopted in Munich, on 11 April. The second part was adopted after another extensive debate in Copenhagen, on 11 June, when the Manifesto was eventually signed by DKS, FCS, FMSF, GSL, JC, NKSF, ONNeD, ÖSU, SDM, Tuhatkunta and Vaka.269

But again, the debate was not yet over. In 1977, the Manifesto was discussed at the first Summer University in Nice. In 1978, Chairman Pierre Moinet announced a conference to discuss a new Manifesto.270 In 1980, at the Annual Meeting in Oxford, the manifesto was substantially amended.271 These
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debates seem to have been quite chaotic, because few proposals and not all amendments have been recorded. Why the original version of 1975 appears once again in 1980 to be the base for further discussions, is not clear.

However, with the Manifesto EDS agreed for the first time on basic principles. It contained nine chapters:

1. Rights of Man
2. An Open Society
3. A Just Society
4. A Social Market Economy
5. The New Social Question
6. The Human Environment
7. Education and Opportunity
8. European Unity
9. European Democrat Party

The Manifesto was based on the belief “that all men and women are equal in dignity, irrespective of difference in colour, race, nationality or religion. Accordingly, we believe in the brotherhood of men. Therefore, we attach supreme importance to personal freedoms and civil liberties.”

Furthermore, the Manifesto supported the European Convention on Human Rights. An “Open Society” was characterised by “a constant competition and interaction between ideas and parties, by plurality of interests and diffusion of power.” In order to create a “just society”, EDS supported a moderate welfare state. The principles of “social market economy” were supported as well, which was qualified as a combination personal freedom, decentralised decision-making and the absence of monopolies. This would lead to an “economically democracy in its fullest sense, balancing the interests of consumers, workers and the community as a whole.” The importance of a balance of labour and capital, and between organised and unorganised social interests was pointed out.

International “antipollution measures” were demanded as well, in order to protect the environment. The value of education “must be increasingly acknowledged”. Furthermore, European Unity was seen as “essential progress of mankind”. “We require closer European military and political co-operation. [...] We support economic and monetary union within the European Communities”. On the other hand, there were limits: “Regional characteristics and national identities must not be lost in a super state.” It was also believed that the principles expressed in the Manifesto could unite all centre-right parties, whether Conservative, Christian Democrat, Liberal or Centrist.272

Certain amendments and “reservations” in regard to the Manifesto depict the diverging political agendas of the EDS member organisations. ÖSU (Austria) submitted its reservations already at the Annual Meeting of 1975: the chapter on “European Unity” was opposed since it contradicted the idea of the Austrian neutrality (i.e. too “right-wing”!). Therefore full membership of Austria in the European Communities was not supported. Similar objections came from Tuhatkunta. Later the Finnish organisation objected to the whole Manifesto, since it disagreed with a possible membership of Finland in the EEC - also because “EDS has too close contacts with NATO.” Other reservations by GSL (France), ONNeD (Greece) and again ÖSU and Tuhatkunta referred to paragraph 11, which recognised “the importance of the Christian responsibility in our view of a just society”. ONNeD and Tuhatkunta also disliked paragraph 33, concerning the creation of a common European defence system.273

While the proposed amendments of 1977 would have changed the Manifesto in a more conservative direction, those of 1980 referred to developments in European politics and in higher education. These amendments were submitted by SFÖ (higher education) and NKSF (environment, European integration). In 1980, it was also agreed to reject the far-reaching Tuhatkunta-draft for an entirely new Manifesto and to use the old Manifesto for the debate.274

The Manifesto of 1975/80 constituted the central point of reference of all basic papers until the nineties. Through “the adoption of common programmes”, such as the Manifesto, EDS could demonstrate “that there is a fundamental basis of agreement among the non-socialist forces.”275 Hence its importance for the further development of the organisation cannot be underestimated.

**Politics: The Charter on Higher Education**

Higher education policies are essential for any student organisation’s identity. Particularly the Austrian and the Finnish member organisations started various initiatives in this field. At least one entire meeting was dedicated to higher education every year. A conference in July 1972 on “The Role of University Education in Western Europe” was prepared by extensive reports from member organisations.

In 1973, the Annual Meeting adopted a motion in favour of increased student mobility, a better information policy on behalf of the European
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Commission, a European Educational Council and the mutual recognition of degrees from EEC-countries.  

The Annual Meeting of 1975 re-adopted these goals, decided to “put more emphasis on the work with education” and formed a “Student Affairs Working Group”. This group had its constituting meeting immediately after the Annual Meeting. Its chairman until 1976 was Einar Frydén (Sweden). In August 1975, Frydén sent out a questionnaire containing 10 questions to each member organisation concerning “the state of the student unions”. The goal was to create a “common platform for EDS actions in this field.” Apparently, this referred as well to the increasing need for more homogeneity and improved external relations.

The result of this study was presented as a 27-page report at the student affairs conference of EDS in Munich in April 1976. Topics were the structure of different national university systems and the role of the student unions, the range of college autonomy from government control and access to higher education. At this conference, Carl Bildt held a lecture on the “Decline of the New Left since 1968” and made an attempt to link student affairs with ideological positions. He pointed out that the student unions in Austria and Sweden “enabled the centre-right to organise and win control”. According to Bildt, student politics had its “added value” for its provision of “excellent leadership training” and for the “great spill-over effect” of academia into society. He also stated that the New Left had collapsed because of internal contradictions and was for the time being replaced by the orthodox left. However the situation on campus was still considered dangerous: Student dissatisfaction had increased, the old left was intact and the “centre-right had not adequately met the challenge”.

In 1976, a new “ad hoc working group” to draft “some policy on specific student issues” was established. Chairman of this “EDS Student Affairs Group” (ESAG) became Tony Fekete (UK). It was supposed to consist of 5 members. In the Bureau, Friedbert Pflüger (RCDS) was responsible for the group. He submitted various proposals for an EDS-conference on “Direct Elections and Student Affairs” in London in autumn 1976, which mainly dealt with the question of how to strengthen the role of the EDS-member organisations at their universities. He also suggested exchanging views on “how to overcome opponent groups”. A second group of questions examined how the centre-right could contribute to the improvement of the individual stu-
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dent’s situation. The Pflüger-proposals led to “questionnaire no. 2” of 30 questions. The first evaluation of the results took place at the ESAG-meeting in Brussels in February 1977. A “student finance project” and the upcoming student affairs conference in Stockholm were also discussed.

Shortly after, a third survey was launched: a questionnaire of four questions was sent to all member organisations. It asked how students finance their studies in the various countries, on expected changes in this field, the attitude of the national student unions on the question of student finance and the position of the respective organisation. The aim was to collect as much data as possible on student financing. The first result was that a “large proportion of the conference [in Stockholm] was taken up with a discussion on student grants and loans.” It was concluded that every Western European country except Malta knew “some form of financial aid to attend colleges and universities, but the types differ widely”.

What the various systems had in common was obviously “great complexity, intricacy and above all, unpopularity amongst the student population. In most countries, loans started as a topping-up operation to the student grant. Since then the wedge has thickened and the proportion of loan has increased at the expense of the grant. The delegates at the conference did not feel that equality of opportunity had commensurably increased.”

The “Student Affairs Conference” in Stockholm in April 1977 shows how the organisation then thought about higher education. In the area of student finance, alternative ways such as student loans or negative income tax in relation to student finance were discussed. Another important issue was the internationalisation of higher education. In order to achieve this goal, EDS not only wanted to increase the international content of existing courses, but also make the mutual recognition of degrees and a higher mobility of scholars and students easier. A scheme for financing students abroad was suggested. Other topics were the European co-operation of student unions, adult education in Sweden and the work of FMSF in the Swedish student union.

A resolution on “Internationalisation of Education” was adopted at the Annual Meeting in Lisbon in July 1977. Student mobility was emphasised again, but the harmonisation of national higher education systems by the EEC was now opposed. But the need for more international content, for the harmonisation of diplomas and degrees and the autonomy of higher education institutions was repeated: “Teaching and research must be organised in such a
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way, that they can contribute to the critical examination and evaluation of the society they are part of, with no ties to party or economic interests.” The state “should only create a basic framework for research and education.” The “rigid application of market principles” was rejected – and reservations up until now have come from FMSF.

At the same meeting, the results of the ESAG were evaluated and its future was discussed. It was criticised that the ESAG had met infrequently and produced nothing of “startling originality.” A resolution on the future work of the group was adopted stating that the “group should prepare a Charter” for “Free and European Higher Education”. The Charter should be presented to the Annual Meeting of 1978 “to be adopted”. The new Bureau also had appointed Peter Adler (ÖSU, Austria) to be the Chairman of the Working Group. The resolution concerning the prospective Charter was sent to all members immediately after the conference. The members were also asked to appoint a head over the group.

The group itself had two informal meetings in autumn 1977 in Bemelen (Netherlands) and Bergen (Norway), where it was agreed to set Peter Adler in charge of a first draft. Already in December 1977, Adler suggested the following three chapters as the structure of the new Charter:

- free and open universities (role of state – autonomy of universities, finance of universities, role of science, meaning and definition of higher education, universities and vocational training, manpower planning);
- the situation of students (student finance, student participation, compulsory membership, student union structure, student services);
- Internationalisation (transfers between countries, co-operation between universities, acknowledgement of diplomas and degrees).

At the first EDS-Winter University in Lienz (Austria) in February 1978, Adler submitted a first version of the “Charter on Higher Education”. After a 36-hour-discussion in Amsterdam in June 1978, a new version of the Charter, including 20 amendments, was submitted to the Annual Meeting in Vienna in August 1978, where it was eventually adopted, again “after a large number of amendments and considerable discussion”.

In accordance with the decision of the Annual Meeting, the Charter cov-
ered all relevant areas of higher education, including basic ethical questions: “Higher Education should help to develop the individual itself, should give the necessary preconditions to solve problems concerning the pursuit of knowledge and society and should serve realization of the potential and the enrichment of the quality of life of the individual and the society” (article 1.2).

The “Role of the Pursuit of Knowledge” was characterised as “search of truth” and as “essentially subjective”. The point of reference was however not individualism, but the authoritarian regimes on the other side of the Iron Curtain: “There can be no positiveness that a theory presented is consistent with absolute truth. And thus we stress, that a pluralism of philosophies, attitudes and opinions, together with their free criticism, is a prerequisite for the full development of all branches of knowledge (and society)” (article 2.1). The Charter went even further and stated a general responsibility of “those who pursue knowledge”, i.e. scholars and students, for “securing progress and a higher quality of life”. Scientists were also made morally responsible “concerning the transformation of his scientific work into practice” (articles 2.2, 2.3).

The articles three to nine dealt with questions of university structures, planning and financing. The Charter supported freedom of academia, but stressed an overall responsibility of the state for overall planning and financing and even the balance of domestic and foreign students (article 3.10). Private sources for research were welcomed, but may not “limit the independence of research” (article 3.5). On the other hand “Private institutions of higher education, where they exist, must be taken into account as a beneficial part of the system of higher education. The state may be financially involved to varying degrees. These institutions may fill in gaps in the system, or offer subjects not covered by state institutions” (article 4.8).

Other articles stressed the importance of student unions, which should be guaranteed by law (article 3.13). Individual student tuition fees “should be avoided” (article 4.7). A common European system of higher education was rejected (article 6.1). Student participation in academic decision-making was supported as “essential for democracy in our institutions” (article 7.1).

Chapter eight defined the role of student unions as democratic, service oriented and democratically elected advocate of students’ interests, though under certain provisions: “automatic membership is necessary” (article 8.6). In Chapter nine, the Charter listed many of the older ICCS/ECCS/EDS-requests concerning internationalisation, such as the mutual recognition of grades and entrance requirements. A European credit transfer system very similar to the later introduced ECTS was part of this concept. Additional costs of students for studies abroad ought to be covered by national student finance-systems.

However the adoption of the Charter could only be achieved for a price,
i.e. for the acceptance of a number of reservations. The highest number of objections came from the Federation of Conservative Students (FCS) which opposed free access to higher education (article 1.3), a too large of an autonomy of higher education institutions (article 3.7) and the involvement of others than professors in academic decision-making (article 7.2). The Austrian ÖSU and the Belgian FEL objected to the access of students to certain institutions being decided by the institution itself (article 3.9). DKS, Vaka, FMSF and FEL were against compulsory membership in student unions – the most objected paragraph.

With the adoption of the Charter the organisation could however present its higher education policies much better than before. It was another example of the possibilities of a broadly based centre-right co-operation. But the Charter’s existence did not stunt a regular adoption of higher education resolutions within the organisation. A special resolution on studies abroad was passed at the Council Meeting in St. Pol de Leon in September 1979, “promoting contacts between young people on an international level as does also the Treaty of Rome [...]. The participants deplore the lack of information available to students concerning studies abroad, the mutual recognition of course-exams and qualifications.”

This time, the “mutual recognition and equivalence of academic qualifications” was demanded of European governments. Other demands concerned the social, financial and bureaucratic obstacles for students abroad – again.

Another debate on higher education took place in the beginning of 1980 in Paris, in connection with the discussions of the European Youth Forum. In May 1980, the ideas developed were presented to Hywel Jones, head of the education division of the European Commission, on the occasion of his meeting with Lars Eskeland and Mark Leverton.288

**Visions: The Case of Europe**

Even in its earlier years ECCS/EDS had constantly been adopting resolutions in support of European integration. In 1971, Chairman Ian Taylor stressed that it was one of the main priorities of ECCS “to participate as much as possible in discussions on the future of Europe in order to press for European unity.” Main objectives were “European economic and political integration, a directly elected European Parliament, a European Christian Democratic and Conservative Party, a European Student Parliament, European student exchange, harmonisation of higher education standards in Europe.”289

These aims were even boosted in 1972, when ECCS demanded “a European Federal State, a directly elected European Parliament, a European Party of Christian Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals, a strong student grouping to voice a moderate view in the universities of Europe.”\textsuperscript{290} In its “Charter of the European Democrat Party” of 1972, EDS declared its “support for the building of a united Europe, which can ease tensions on our continent and solve social economic and other problems that the present nations are too small to master within themselves. We consider that this can be achieved through the political and economic development of the European Community: but we realise that the ultimate unity of Europe will be incomplete without all the countries of Europe.”

Unlike his own party, Vice Chairman Tom Spencer also called for direct elections to the European Parliament in the British press, when he warned of too much reluctance and a possible “alliance of the distant, the worried, and the mischievous” against this proposal.\textsuperscript{291}

As Chairman after 1973, he also promoted more efficient European policies for the young. After the EEC-governments had agreed to establish a “Youth Advisory Council” (YAC), ECCS criticised its insufficient composition of mainly appointed members. The project was considered as “youth alibi the cost of which is exorbitant”. Upon Spencer’s initiative, ECCS together with COCDYC and EUYCD submitted a detailed alternative proposal to the political groups of the European Parliament. Instead of the bureaucratic YAC they suggested a biannual conference, “drawn from members of international non-governmental youth organisations [...] it should meet in three sections. A political committee composed of political groups recognised by the Groups of the European Parliament. Secondly, a social committee, bringing together trade union representatives and others whose work is primarily of social nature. Thirdly, a cultural committee, grouping together the other internationals.” This conference was supposed to closely co-operate with the cultural and educational commissions of the European Parliament. Additionally, a youth centre providing technical assistance to international non-governmental youth organisations was demanded.\textsuperscript{292}

But soon it became evident that this anticipated “Youth Forum” was endangered of becoming an ideological battleground rather than becoming an institution which involves the youth in European affairs (cf. the chapter “Participation in the European Youth and Student Co-operation”).

\textsuperscript{290} ECCS, Memorandum on the organisation (leaflet), London 1972.
\textsuperscript{292} Joint Proposal for the Involvement of Youth in the Building of Europe, submitted to the European Parliament, 1973/74, ACDP IX-003-17.
The debate on the future Europe gathered momentum after direct elections to the European Parliament were announced for 1979. In September 1977, at the meeting in Bemelen (Netherlands) on “A Programme for Europe”, the programmatic paper “Approaching the European Elections” was discussed for the first time. In 14 chapters it strongly supported a “federal” Europe: “We fully understand that many – on hearing the word ‘federalism’ – react against it strongly; but we wonder how many people really understand its significance. Essentially, it means that decisions should be taken at their most effective level; be it in the European Parliament, national parliaments, regional assemblies or by the individual himself. [...] power should never be concentrated in either Brussels or national Parliaments.” The paper was gradually transformed into a “Programme for European Parliamentary Elections”, which was eventually adopted in Berlin, 10 December 1977, by 12 member organisations.

The programme was of course not intended to serve EDS-candidates, but to “actively strengthen and support those ideals common to our members.” The future members of the European Parliament were recommended to contribute more passionately to the “building and consolidating” of a “free and open European society”, instead of committing themselves to a bureaucratic day-to-day approach. Interestingly enough, a speech by Sir Geoffrey Rippon on “Our European Future” held at the Bemelen-meeting served the European Conservative Group as publication for the European election campaign.

The election programme also reveals priorities: about 20 percent of the text is dedicated to the “Individual and Europe”, 40 percent to economic issues, and about 15 percent to the external relations. The institutional problems covered only less than 8 percent of the content; basic principles were even less represented. It even seems as if EDS considered the EEC primarily as a common market: In order to achieve “economic stability and European Unity”, it was demanded to place “more control over national economic strategies [...] in the hands of European institutions.

295 Main Mail 8, August 1978, p. 3, EYFA.
Without this, Economic and Monetary Union – an acknowledged goal of the treaty of Rome – will be impossible to achieve; and the polarisation of rich and poor countries within the Community can only increase” (article 39).

At that time, EDS also supported the idea of a European Monetary Union under the condition of an independent European Central Bank. For the industry, EDS suggested a European “set of rules for employee participation” and a policy serving the interests of small and medium-sized companies. The Charter also argued against the protectionism concerning agricultural products and was in favour of consumer protection.

Concerning the reform of European institutions, EDS endorsed more power for the European Parliament in order to secure that “all policies are a result of decisions taken by a parliamentary majority.” It should be elected by a “uniform proportional electoral system.” In the Council of Ministers “majority voting should speedily be reintroduced” and it should become a European Senate in the long run.

In its programme, EDS also strongly supported the enlargement to the South. The only organisation criticising this was the Finnish Tuhatkunta. Those paragraphs which dealt with basic principles followed the line of the Manifesto, whereas the paragraphs on defence stated, that the Atlantic “common ideals of freedom and democracy which we share are more important than those matters which might divide us. [...] The United States will remain an essential partner for the security of a free Western Europe.”

At the Annual Meeting of 1978 the organisation’s role in the European elections was again discussed. A respective report had been prepared by the new Chairman Pierre Moinet and an ad-hoc working group formed. It was agreed to draft a “specific action plan to the EC” and to produce campaign material for a special go-vote-campaign by EDS. Among others, the poster “Europe for the Individual” was created.296 The same year, Chairman Pierre Moinet achieved a major lobbying success, when the Executive Bureau could meet and discuss with Raymond Barré, Prime Minister of France, and with Pierre Christian Taittinger, member of the French senate, on 21 October, 1978. Key-issues were the youth unemployment in Europe and the situation of the European youth structures. As a possible solution, the EDS-delegation urged for support of a better information policy concerning job assessment, European language learning, the reduction of travel costs for young people and a European Educational Fund. This fund was supposed to finance exchange and youth employment programmes. Through these meetings the organisation

---

296 Minutes, Annual Meeting 1978, 18/22-08-78, p. 2-3, PAT.
could finally gain political support of major politicians as well as introduce itself into the “French political circles”.  

Finally, in 1978/79, the campaign for the first direct elections to the European Parliament (and by this, the European integration as such) was supported in an almost unprecedented way: “During the campaign for European elections an EDS minibus travelled through Germany, Denmark, Austria, Italy, France and Great Britain, distributing leaflets and posters [...]. The minibus received a lot of publicity in the countries we visited and was met by leading politicians such as Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl.”

Vice Chairman Rudolf Henke (RCDS) also reported of meetings with French Prime Minister Raimond Barré and first President of the European Parliament Simone Veil. In about 40 university towns, EDS had initiated voter awareness campaigns and promoted close cooperation of all the centre-right parties after the elections. According to Henke, the “Europe for the Individual” campaign had been primarily about vigorously supporting everyone’s inalienable rights: “Common denominator of all the EDS member organizations, representing about 100,000 members, is [...] the supremacy of individual freedom of choice over both collectivist ideologies and patronising bureaucracies. From an integrated Europe, EDS does not expect a new super state or a new super bureaucracy, but a political community for the people by the people.”

In the news with the minibus tour of 1979: EDS with Margaret Thatcher in London

297 Report of the meeting (1978); Note à l’attention de M. le Premier Ministre (1978), Le Monde, 23-10-78, EYF-A.
External Relations

Party Relations: The Struggle for an All-European Centre-Right Party

In the early seventies, the so-called New Left was countering the Western democracies: youthful movements of the late sixties developed to radical terrorist sects, trying to overcome Western democracies with all means. A general trend to vote for left parties inspired the media to define the decade as a “social-democratic era” – a major challenge for the centre right parties all over Europe.

The former Austrian Chancellor Josef Klaus, initiator of the historic “Klessheim-meetings” of centre right party leaders since 1964/65, considered the situation of the international centre right co-operation as “in crisis”. Due to the student unrest, there was “simply no time for informal international meetings. In some Christian-democratic parties signs of decay and disintegration became visible. Together with its generation of founders and fathers, their personified individual strength and authority, their ‘lonesome’ decisions, their forward looking politics were buried as well.” Klaus also asked why it should no longer be possible for Christian Democrats, to be on the right side of politics.301

Secondly, the European integration (“European Political Co-operation”, 1970) was intensified in the early seventies. The centre right parties responded to the trend with an intensified international party-co-operation.302 In this very moment, ECCS decided to support any effort to unify all democratic non-socialist parties on the European level in order to defend traditional centre-right ideas and as well as civil liberties. The conjunction of “democracy” and “freedom” described the central items of this policy. The aim was to create a “European Democrat Party” on the European level.

From the beginning one of the first intents of this policy was the inclusion of the European (“classical”) Liberals. The mission was soon accomplished: in 1972, both JOVD from the Netherlands and FNJLP from Belgium joined EDS, two outspokenly liberal organisations, even though the Christian-Democrats in these countries stonewalled these efforts and refused cooperation.303

A second result of the new approach was the “Charter for a European Democrat Party”, signed by 13 youth and student-organisations at the ECCS-Annual Meeting of 1972 in London, which was well covered by the British

303 ECCS, Memorandum on the organisation (leaflet), London 1972; Policy towards UEJDC and COCDYC (memo), 1975/76, ACDP IX-003-10.
With this Charter, the signatories expressed their belief “in the concept of a European Democrat Party as an important step forward in the unification of a democratic Europe. The text of this Charter is a statement of our beliefs and a call for action to the parties of the Centre-Right.”\textsuperscript{305} The Charter tried to approach a “broad church” of organisations since it included economic ideas positioned somewhere between social and free market, contained environmental issues, classical liberalism and social rights. Authoritarian ideologies were denounced “both fascist and communist which alike are built on reactionary and undemocratic structures”. It was believed that the principles of the new Charter could “unite the differing traditions of Christian Democrat, Liberal and Conservative political thought in Europe.”

Based on this programme the party leaders were asked to institutionalise party leader conferences, to establish a permanent liaison office, to work for a “single political party operating within the European Parliament and the Council of Europe” and to adopt the name “European Democrats”. A first occasion to discuss the further integration of the centre right was a conference organised by the “Young European Federalists” on 13-15 April 1973 in Cambridge (UK). Chairman Tom Spencer reported that this conference was “staged at our initiative and was largely successful in working out further issues where we share policies as the Centre-Right.” The topic was the central question of the day: “European Political Parties – is the time ripe?”\textsuperscript{306}

At the Annual Meeting of 1973, first reactions to the new Charter were reported: The Conservative Party of Norway, traumatised by a lost EEC referendum, did not support the campaign, whereas the Danish Conservative

\textsuperscript{304} DKS, FCS, JRI, FMSE, NKSF, RCDs, Jeunesse du Parti Liberte et Progres (B), KKH (B), MZTPN (Malta); Carl Bildt, Report on activities within ECCS 1972/73, ACDP IX-003-061, p. 1.
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Party “largely” accepted it. In Sweden a “letter of endorsement from the party leader was being sought”. Progress was reported from Germany, France and the UK, where an organisation called “Young European Democrats had been formed”. Additionally, the campaign had been co-ordinated with COCDYC.307

In 1974, the new Chairman Carl Bildt announced “to activate the EDP campaign again”. This re-launch took place at a meeting of Christian-Democrat and Conservative parties in 1974, where ECCS raised “considerable interest” of the mother parties during their working group on party co-operation. It included a letter to all centre right party leaders in Europe asking to support Portugal's centre-right forces. In 1974, a research project was published examining the principles and policies of six national parties, “which demonstrated the close agreement between them, allowing for the different national circumstances.” The result was the report “Foundations of Alignment” concluding that there were “no major obstacles to cooperation”. It was presented at the EDS-Conference on the Campaign for a European Democrat Party in Edinburgh in 1975, where the history and the objectives of the EDP campaign were presented to a new generation of EDS-activists.308

In 1975, Chairman Carl Bildt also asked how EDS could contribute to a merger of the Christian-Democrat UEJDC and the centre-right COCDYC: “There is no sense in having a youth organisation for Southern Europe and one for Northern Europe, as it is the case today.” His vision was a united “European Democrat Youth” (EDY) as a subgroup of the European Democrat Party in the first directly elected European Parliament. The EDY would set up national and European campaign committees in support of young candidates for the European Parliament, a joint action programme, a joint campaign for the European elections. For early spring 1978, he envisioned an EDY-Congress. Besides this, he also announced “to reduce the Scandinavian influence in EDS”.309 The result of these efforts also was the close co-operation of EUYCD, DEMYC and EDS in the European Youth Forum and the East-West Dialogue. Hence, since November 1977 many “officers talks” of these organisations took place.

Between 1976 and 1979 EDS had demonstrated the possibility for common policies of Christian-Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals three times: with the adoption of the “Manifesto” (Munich/Copenhagen, 1976), with the adoption of the “Programme for European Parliamentary Elections” (Berlin, 1977) and with the adoption of the “Charter on Higher Education” (Vienna, 1978). With this, the organisation had taken over the role of a model for the party co-operation to come. It was now evident “that it was possible for Chris-

tian Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals to agree on both basic principles and specific policies.”

Simultaneously this was appreciated by party leaders. In 1972, ECCS was for the first time officially invited to attend a meeting of high-ranking officers of the German CDU and the British Conservatives. In 1975 (June 28-July 2), EDS was invited to the Interparty Conference in Munich. At this meeting, EDS and COCDYC presented a “Joint Proposal” for a “Charter of the European Democrat party”, based on the earlier EDS-paper.

During this time, the EDS leadership closely co-operated with leading senior politicians, such as Margaret Thatcher. In 1977, she wrote to EDS, “It is more than ever urgent for the Parties of the Centre and Right in Europe to find practical ways of working together, based on the common ground which our parties share. The Student and Youth Movements have already given the lead, and I hope that during the Conference at Lisbon you will make further progress. There is so much at stake that we simply cannot afford to remain divided.” German opposition leader Helmut Kohl emphasised the importance of the organisation in strengthening the political centre in view of growing socialist influence.

The EDS-Bureau itself considered two politicians of the early seventies decisive for the success of the EDU: Edward Heath of the Conservative Party and Rainer Barzel of the German CDU, “the first important politicians that took up the EDU idea.” Other close allies were Chris Patton of the Conservative Party and Franz Josef Strauss, Chairman of the Bavarian CSU, two of the leading architects of the EDU, while Swedish party leader Gösta Bohmann refused to cooperate after his Socialist opponent Oluf Palme had dubbed the new party “the Black International” and had linked catholic politicians to fascism.

In 1978 the EDP-campaign was continued. EDS-Chairman Scott Hamilton was invited to participate in the “the drawing up of the Statutes and Charter of the proposed European Democrat Union. Regular consultation in the Secretariat has helped to clear up certain misunderstandings between our senior parties. The EDU is to be established in the very near future – and EDS will probably be accepted as Observer member on the Union’s Political Committee.”
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The establishment of the EDU was commented by Hamilton as “a welcoming beginning to a larger Union of the forces of non-collectivism in Europe. But only a beginning. Only in this way can an effective counterbalance to the Left be created.” At the founding congress of the EDU on 24 April 1978 in Klessheim (Austria), leaders of 18 political parties signed the “Declaration of Principles”, the so-called “Klessheim Declaration”. Among these leaders were former and current honorary officers of EDS, such as Margaret Thatcher, Helmut Kohl or Diogo Freitas do Amaral. EDS was represented by its Vice chairman Gustavo Gill Dominguez (Spain). Austrian party leader Josef Taus became the first EDU-chairman, a decision that had been supported by EDS. At this conference, EDS also applied for an observer status for DEMYC, UEJDC and itself. The “Permanent Observer” status was granted to DEMYC and EDS at the 2nd Party Leaders Conference in London on 20 July 1979.

After that, representatives of EDS attended all EDU Party Leaders Conferences until the end of the decade and most of the three (number varying up to five) EDU working committees introduced to “implement the decisions made by the Party Leaders Conferences” and to prepare “recommendations for the joint action of the EDU parties on the national level within the European and international structures of the OSCE, the Council of Europe, NATO, WEU and the European Union.” In 1980/81 alone, EDS was present at eight EDU-committee meetings – a remarkable presence considering the limited finances of students.

Each of these meetings was used to promote EDS policies such as in 1979, when Heinz Neubauer (RCDS) presented a resolution on security and co-operation in Europe. In 1980, EDS contributed to an EDU-questionnaire on “European Structures and European Policy”.

Soon after the establishment of the EDU the question became evident how to co-operate with the other centre-right party nucleus on the European level, the European People’s Party (EPP). The EPP had come into existence, more or less, as an off-spring of the EUCD. In 1972, the EUCD had established a Political Committee to “co-ordinate” the political work of the Christian Democrat Parties of the European Communities which was the starting point for a second, more centrist and a little less liberal European centre-right party. In 1976, the EUCD decided to convert the Political Committee to be the European People’s Party.

As a result, there were those EDU-member parties in the European Parliament which joined the European Democrat Group, while others joined
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the EPP. Soon it was realised that this situation contradicted the aims of all the major political forces involved – but nobody wanted to “loose face”. In 1977, EDS carried a motion stating that “the EDU is not a Conservative foundation in competition with the European People’s Party. But it is an attempt to bring together centrist parties, not only in perspective of the European direct election in 1978 (reservation: Tuhatkunta) but for further European co-operation. The claim to be an organisation of all centrist parties is only believable if there is not a total Conservative dominance. Everything should be tried to get more Christian-Democrat and Liberal organisations to join the EDU.”322

Thus, EDS did not only remain member of the EDU, but also held informal relations with the EPP, mainly through CDU-members which were active in both structures.323 In May 1980, EDS hosted a reception in the European Parliament and invited representatives of the Liberals, Conservatives and Christian Democrats, in order to support future political co-operation. Speakers were Christine Scrivenier (ELDR), James Scott-Hopkins (EDG) and Hans-Gert Pöttering (EPP).324 In 1980, the complete first issue of the Taurus-magazine was dedicated to the integration of EDU, EPP and the liberal FLYPEC. However, at the beginning of the eighties, the European centre-right was better integrated than prior yet still divided.

**Participation in the European Youth and Student Co-operation**

“The world of international youth institutions is a strange fairy tale place haunted by initials in search of a role.”325 – Already in the late sixties, paral-
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Parallel to the increasing talks on security and disarmament between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, an East-West dialogue between youth organisations had been established. Since 1970, this initiative coincided with various attempts of ECCS-Chairman Ian Taylor to improve the organisation’s external relations.

As a result, ECCS/EDS did not only join the so-called East-West youth dialogue but also applied for membership in the newly established ECB (1971, European Coordination Bureau), the Youth Forum and the CENC (Congress of European National Youth Councils). But it only seemed as if international relations had improved, ECCS/EDS had great difficulty from the beginning to cooperate with these structures. First of all, its resources were limited; it was neither funded by governments nor big business. But also for its principles, ECCS/EDS could not agree to an unlimited expansion of youth bureaucracies and conference marathons. Ian Taylor and his successors neither were ready to accept the social model offered by the Soviet Union, nor did they accept the utopian “third way” of the Western European Left. But the talks were also not to become an end in itself.

It is also obvious that ECCS/EDS was not at all welcome at these meetings. That ECCS/EDS outspokenly supported Western liberal values led to attempts to exclude ECCS/EDS from decision-making, to discriminate its participants and to label the organisation as right-wing extreme and non-democratic. Hence this “area of youth co-operation was particularly difficult” for ECCS/EDS, when the meetings were used exclusively to serve the foreign politics of the Soviet Union. According to Rudolf Henke, EDS-Vice Chairman and participant, the majority of the delegates were “exclusively communist or pro-Communist representatives, doing nothing else than strongly following the party line, very often professional youth in the age of young grandparents, which were very witty and well trained for the international conference business. They were easily able to isolate ‘unacceptable’ positions.” Most of the lengthy discussions created “some sort of compromise paper, which could then be disseminated as a result, that obviously supported the idea, the European youth is in line with the positions of the youth representatives of communist countries.”\(^\text{326}\) As it so was in the 1930s and 1940s, the objective of the Soviets was to create a monopoly in youth and student politics.

Another problem was the behaviour of certain Western delegations, which often refused to emphasise the importance of human rights and the dependence of military and political questions. The explanation for this was a system of interdependence among the various youth and propaganda policies of governments which had resulted in strong government ties to “like-

Civil servants behave like civil servants, it’s in the nature of their contract: Most of the well-recognised and well-funded youth structures were established by governments (East-West youth dialogue), intergovernmental European institutions (ECB, YF) or even intelligence agencies (CENYC), in order to promote moderate left but anticommunist/anti-Russian policies of Western governments. Their budgets were adopted by various Councils of Ministers (ECB, YF) or increased by donations of national governments or the CIA respectively (CENYC).

This highly corrupted system had many advantages: European “youth” structures helped governments implement their own social agenda disguised as “progressive” ideas of the European youth. As to the East-West youth dialogue, it was priority of western youth officials to show “good will” towards the East, as it was the official line of many Western governments towards the Warsaw Pact. On the other hand, this system provided resources, conference tourism and careers to a growing number of professional and semi-professional youth politicians and their staff, mainly young academics which would have otherwise slept under bridges.

Consequently, certain Western governments and political parties, the leadership of certain youth organisations, and the Communist organisations from the East formed a strange alliance against organisations such as ECCS/EDS or COCDYC/DEMYC, which appeared not to represent their “ideas”.

In order to work in this atmosphere of manipulation and disinformation, ECCS/EDS was forced to permanently modify its strategy. Sometimes, it was necessary to agree to compromises in order to avoid political isolation. Sometimes, it was also necessary to preserve its political identity and to get noisy. The main goal (or illusion!) was to be part of the structures in order to gradually change them or to at least make conservative, Christian democrat and liberal ideas better known to other youth activists. This in turn meant allocating a lot of time to internal debates and policy papers. An important part of this strategy was to provoke.

The dominant figures of the various youth structures tried to reduce the impact of this policy with centralised decision-making, “surprise papers”, non-transparency and confusing agendas. However, since 1970 ECCS/EDS was “determined to add to the co-ordinating function of ECCS a commitment to represent our members and their views at every important forum of political student debate in Europe where in the past their voice had been lacking.”

327 Concerning the whole topic of students and youth in the psychological warfare during the Cold War, cf. Kotek (1996).
The same year, Carl Bildt attended the first “European Youth Security Conference” in Helsinki. In 1971, Chairman Ian Taylor described the search for “closer informal and informal links” to the “various European student movements” as one of the main activities of the organisation.\textsuperscript{329} In 1972, Chairman Tom Spencer and Carl Bildt participated in the second “European Youth Security Conference”, again in Helsinki, “disguised as COCDYC-delegates”.

The distribution of an information leaflet with conservative content and several speeches at the conference hit many participants very hard, as Tom Spencer reported: “it is possible that our appearance at the Youth Security Conference gave us rather too strong an image as a politically aggressive movement who were not prepared to be silenced. While this certainly made us known, it may also have made us slightly feared and certainly made entry into International Organisations more difficult.”\textsuperscript{330} Or as Carl Bildt described it: “We made a considerable impact at the conference, and in spite of the fact that ECCS was not formally attending the conference it is probably fair to say that our existence was noted by the majority of the organisations present.”

At the same time, Carl Bildt and Tom Spencer tried to find out, how far the tolerance of the Soviets would go and proposed the establishment of official relations to Soviet youth officials, “but the response from the Soviet side to our various hints were cool.” This might not have been surprising: “It is however evident, that the Soviet attitude towards contacts with West European ‘reactionaries’ today is much harder than it was two years ago. They today demand a specific political price in the form of non-discussion of certain issues, i.e. Czechoslovakia and freedom of movement.” Bildt and Spencer made clear that “ECCS is not and will not be ready to pay that price.”\textsuperscript{331}

In 1973, Tom Spencer and Carl Bildt also unofficially visited the communist World Youth Festival in Berlin, again to the “delight” of the organisers. Parallel to this meeting, EDS had convened its Annual Meeting in the free

\textsuperscript{329} Ian Taylor, Memorandum on the Organisation, 3/1971, p. 1, ACDP IX-003-061.
\textsuperscript{331} Carl Bildt, Report on activities within ECCS 1972/73, p. 2, ACDP IX-003-061.

part of Berlin. In January 1974, ECCS-delegates attended another international student conference in Bucharest “On Security and Co-operation”. The conference would not have been of importance, if it had not been the first defeat of the Soviets at a youth conference: “The Soviets, who during the European youth conferences in 1970 and 1972 had been able to get their will through, this time faced opposition not only of the West European democrats, but also of those East Europeans wishing to preserve their national independence and autonomy.”

With the help of the Romanians and Yugoslavs, the delegates from the West had succeeded in adopting in the conference abridgement the free flow of information, people and ideas across borders as conditional for disarmament. For the first time, internal conflicts of the Soviet world had appeared at the surface. “The number one Soviet man responsible for international student affairs, Vladimir Ponomarev, had to return home after a humiliating conference.” Therefore, the Taurus-magazine considered the conference as “the most fruitful of the European youth and student meetings of recent years.”

After the Helsinki Act had been signed in 1975, the Soviets and their allies gradually decreased their willingness to tolerate such unforeseen developments at youth meetings. The times once again became more confrontative. In June 1976, when the communist Polish youth organisation had invited 1,500 participants to a so called “European Youth and Student Meeting” in
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Warsaw, only two of the requested 50 delegates had been allocated to EDS. Since EDS insisted on 50 delegates (against the 140 delegates of the International Union of Socialist Youth alone) and additionally in free access of the press to the meeting, the decision was made to boycott the meeting, together with the Young European Federalists, DEMYC and UEJDC. “At least for EDS it is clear that this decision is a protest against the East’s manipulating and total lack of respect for our organisation’s dignity. East-West co-operation cannot work on such conditions and may not be allowed to work on such conditions in the future either.” To disguise their intentions, the communist groups spread rumours, EDS and the other “reactionary forces” never had intended participation. Only in the very last moment, the organisers increased their offer to 35 delegates, though never officially, so that it was impossible for EDS and its allies to organise the trip.

“We are not anti-detente in any way,” EDS-Vice Chairman Scott Hamilton told The Guardian and we should be willing to participate in any future East-West meeting, if the question of representation can be cleared up right from the start. We had hoped to make a strong Conservative, Christian Democrat and Liberal presence felt in Warsaw.

Peter Mandelson, later minister in Tony Blair’s Labour government, decided to attend the meeting as Chairman of the British Youth Council, which is more that just another historic footnote: “By Mandelson’s time in the mid-1970s – under a Labour government – the British Youth Council was said to be financed by the Foreign Office, though that may have been a euphemism for SIS.” This kind of support illustrates once more, why EDS could never possibly play a more constructive role in this dialogue: the key-players were others than the key-speakers; EDS had to compete with well-funded government agencies dressed up as “youth”. The outcome of each conference fixed in advance to please various government interests – even in the West. Hence, it comes to no surprise that the British Youth Council belonged to the strongest critics of the boycott. After talking to the Chairman of the BYC, the Guardian titled “Tories blow cold on the brave new world of detente” and commented that the “promise of detente and East-West cooperation at Helsinki has just fallen victim to a political row which would have done credit to the chilliest
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days of cold war. (...) It is at this stage that the brave hopes of Helsinki degenerate into a head and vote counting propaganda exercise.”

However, with their withdrawal, EDS and the other moderate organisations had brought the logical fallacies of the Helsinki youth process to the attention of a wider public. EDS even succeeded in irritating the East German Security Service which was compiling newspaper articles referring to the boycott. For them, the joint boycott of EDS, DEMYC and UEJDC was a serious threat to the legitimacy of the entire Helsinki-peace process. Last but not least, EDS and friends also saved their reputation as advocates of liberty.

In November 1977, Vice Chairman Friedbert Pflüger attended the “Second Thematical Preparatory Seminar for the European Youth and Students Conference on Disarmament” in Bonn (Germany). Moderate Western delegates walked out of the room, when communist organisations announced at 2.30 a.m. that “some persons” drafted a report as a mandatory basis for discussion. Meanwhile, Pflüger understood that “they were always doing it like this”. The meeting was closed without agreements on most of the issues – not even on the date of the upcoming conference. A “more open approach” of the communist World Federation of Democratic Youth was however the reason for Chairman Scott Hamilton to attend the “Students Conference on Disarmament” in Budapest (20-22 January, 1978). “If we favour real detente, it must be pursued at all levels; but, above all, we must seek ways of furthering our ideas and beliefs, founded upon the concepts of democracy, pluralism and the free and open society.” It was impossible to “stop multilateral meetings so we had best to try to at least make them more relevant.”

In order to get better results, Hamilton modified his strategy towards the youth dialogue and developed a kind of “right wing with a smile”-approach. At
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the Budapest-conference, he declared the “fact that this conference is taking place is in itself an important and considerable and positive achievement [...] no reasonable person could fail to lend support to the objective of the total disarmament”. The main reason for the increase of national defence budgets and the slow speed of the negotiations was “in very simple terms, [...] that we do not trust one another; and we do not trust one another because we do not understand one another; and what is not understood is often feared.” However, the new strategy also included the “linkage between military détente and political détente”.

But he also stated, if EDS was not successful, it should “consider whether there is any value in our committing time and resources to a venture over we have no influence and whose outcome cannot, therefore, be in our interest.” Furthermore, EDS emphasised a “free and open” discussion which serves as a “basis for better understanding among people”. For some time, the Eastern delegates tolerated this policy to justify their own efforts for “political détente”, though the suggested link with “military détente” caused them a true headache. The general atmosphere among the delegates in Budapest was described as “cordial and good”. EDS could even agree on the Final Document, despite “subject to certain reservations” concerning a more realistic approach towards the political influence of youth and student organisations in world politics.

The rather positive outcome of the Budapest-conference motivated the new EDS-Bureau to follow Hamilton’s philosophy to link military and human rights issues and to continue with the East-West youth dialogue. Thus, members of the EDS-Bureau participated in consultative follow-up meetings of the student co-operation in June and July 1978. But at one of these meetings in Sundvolden (Norway), Vice Chairman Lars Eskeland witnessed a complete failure of negotiations. The communist WFDY had submitted a long surprise list of amendments to a draft document which made it impossible to find a common position on disarmament: “The reaction upon this proposal was strong. [...] The status of the document [is] nothing, and the plans for the future rather unclear.”

In order to find a solution to this deadlock, the EDS-Annual Meeting of 1978 discussed further involvement again. A “Working Paper” stated “EDS should increase its contacts with other international youth organisations
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in order to promote its own views” including the “all-European Youth Co-
operation” (AEYSC). It was however necessary to include “the widest possible
number of organisations”, to focus on a “non-bureaucratic organisation” and
exchange “involving the widest possible circles of youth”. The AEYSC should
also work in the “framework of UN bodies (a.i. UNESCO or EEC)” and provide
free access of the press to all meetings. A special student dimension of co-
operation was to be developed as well. Together with DEMYC, EDS supported
the idea to hold an “all European youth and student conference” parallel to
the “CSCE Review Conference” in Madrid in 1980. But for the time being it
was decided to focus on bilateral contacts to “eastern countries”. Therefore a
study trip to Romania took place in November 1978.\footnote{Minutes, Council Meeting, 6/7-01-79, p. 3, PAT.}

In 1980, when human rights violations in Afghanistan and Poland were
omitted, and when organisations from the United States and other countries
were excluded from the meetings, EDS changed its policy again. The first re-
sponse was to be “a vocal critic of these meetings for being manipulated by
the Soviet Union”, particularly concerning the follow-up meetings in Helsinki
(January, June 1980) and Madrid (December 1980).\footnote{Nigel Ashford, Taurus Jubilee Edition 1992, p. 8; Cf. Lars Eskeland, Report to the Executive Commit-
tee, 04-07-77, ACDP IX-003-15.} Chairman Lars Eskeland
criticised that “EDS was almost alone in pointing out that an escalation was taking place in the Eastern bloc by the development and building of the SS-20. The conference as such was unable to see this [...] It has forced NATO to modernise its weapon systems”. The meeting should therefore emphasise the “real situation” rather than “promises of good will”.346 This time the EDS-response to the developments at the Madrid-meeting was even stronger: Since a “free and open exchange of ideas between youth and student organisations of differing national and political standpoints” did no longer take place and the participating organisations in their majority were chosen for their Soviet friendly views, EDS vehemently refused to participate in the upcoming “World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Détente and Disarmament”, in Helsinki in January 1981.347

Again EDS did not give in, and declared, the Finnish host organisation SNT “always gives in to the communist front organisations and the socialists”. For EDS, “the question of transparent decision making, fair participation and the possibility of achieving a result is most important. Others might put more emphasis on the dialogue as a process and hope for progress at the next crossroads.”348 Helga Krumbeck, Executive Director of EDS, found it unacceptable that the conference organisers refused to invite national delegations from China, Egypt, Israel, New Zealand and Japan as well as the National Youth Council of the United States. EDS-Chairman Lars Eskeland pointed out, that to him this conference “would never become the open and representative forum of youth organisations which we had supported in principle”. This view was shared by Bernard Friedman from the US-College Democrats, who also did not like the Soviet approach to regard an informal and hand-picked committee as representatives of the entire US-youth.

At the same time, an attempt was made to institutionalise and to “Europeanise” the East-West student conferences. Interestingly enough, the “Europeanisation” of the international and so far bipolar affairs could be observed at the CSCE-follow up process as well.349 In order to promote this, the “All-European Youth and Student Co-operation” which took place within an “All-European Youth and Student Framework” (really!) was established at a conference in Budapest in October 1980. Before long EDS belonged to the 28 signatories of the “Constituent Document of the Framework for All-European Youth and Student Co-operation” and the “Appeal to the Governments of Europe”.
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The Constituent Document urged governments to support this framework in order to “work more successfully for the realization of our common task: the safeguarding and strengthening of peace and security and promoting cooperation in Europe.” The Budapest-agreement even supported the “promotion of fundamental rights” apart from social rights. Additionally, it was agreed on a large number of “basic fields” for “discussion as well as joint actions”, such as sports, culture or peace education but also “peace, security and cooperation in Europe”. More than half of the agreement concerned structural matters. With the AEYSC another youth bureaucracy was born.

The reasons for the presence of EDS in this “framework” were similar to those for its presence in East-West conferences: the promotion of own policies and values and finally for curiosity’s sake. EDS was well aware that “ordinary” young people from Central and Eastern Europe without special relations to the communist establishment would be excluded from any activity: “we expressed that we felt the framework was unbalanced since there were no independent or free representation from the eastern block and that this should be corrected in the future.”

Though with its signature under the Budapest-declaration, it had reached a maximum of integration in international youth structures as so never was the case before in history, EDS intended to sooner or later confront the communist organisations from the East with representatives of the Polish (anticommunist) opposition that they knew from their own underground activities in connection with the East European Solidarity Youth. Since September 1979 EDS had urged for the re-enrolment of five suspended students of the Wroclaw-university who were active in the underground student union SKS (“Student’s Solidarity Committee”). This opposition group was founded in spring 1977, and organised illegal academic lectures (“flying universities”).

Another effort for institutionalised youth co-operation – influenced by the new climate of political détente – was made on the initiative of the EEC-Commission. In March 1971 the “European Co-ordination Bureau for International Non-Governmental Youth Organisations” (ECBIYO, later ECB) was established, succeeding the “Liaison Committee for European Youth Organisations” (since 1969), an organisation “functioning on an experimental base”. In connection with the EEC-Commission, this committee had organised several youth conferences such as “Which Europe do we want?” (1970). Their aims were to “reorientate the process of European integration in a direction of a more human, more democratic and more just development.” In 1970 this meant however “a fundamental transformation of the society” and less the
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promotion of co-operation and information between the international youth NGOs or the representation of the international non-governmental youth organisations before European (EEC) institutions. Neither did it mean to assist in seeking financial and technical means for European activities, as it was later on expressed and desired by EDS.\textsuperscript{351}

Already in 1970, ECCS was discussing how to co-operate with the committee: “I doubt our ability to participate effectively at present, although we should at least keep in touch with its activities”, commented outgoing Chairman Ian Taylor in 1971.\textsuperscript{352} Yet soon after the establishment of the ECB an application for membership was submitted. Since the applications of the liberal ELFRY and the EUYCD “had been delayed” as well, it was understood, that the ECB-Bureau was “trying to delay centre-right participation” at least for a certain time.

In 1973, the ECB eventually refused to accept the ECCS-application, “as a result of errors of simultaneous translation. [...] It was particularly important to counter the inaccurate rumours that circulated to the effect that ECCS had been rejected for being too Right-wing.” The Taurus-magazine even argued in 1974, the ECB had “developed a tendency to act as a political club for its founders. It has tried to limit its membership to those who share its party-political goals. At the least it aims to preserve the dominance of a ‘mafia’ of socialist-orientated groups. Such a position is unacceptable now that the Bureau is financed by the Community.” As a result, the ECCS-Chairman suggested talks with UEJCD and COCDYC for joint action.\textsuperscript{353}

Again in 1974/75, Carl Bildt considered the relations to the ECB a “high priority” since “it is our belief that ECCS must become a member of this organisation sooner or later if we shall be able to play a full part in the emerging youth policies of Europe.” Therefore the application was “re-submitted” in 1974. But due to internal irregularities – a former Secretary General of this organisation had taken off with approximately 500,000 Belgian Francs (2001: 12,500 Euros) without justification\textsuperscript{354} – at the Executive Committee Meeting in London (October 12, 1974) it was agreed “that ECCS should not apply for membership in the ECB again until the internal situation in the organisation had been stabilized.”\textsuperscript{355} Thus, at the General Assembly of the ECB in January 1975 EDS was not present.
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A third application from EDS was submitted in 1976, after internal reforms in the ECB. For the latter it again caused a very intense debate.\textsuperscript{356} Surprisingly, in December 1976, the application was accepted. EDS tried to get involved at once: In 1976/77 a representative of EDS (Per Ledin from Sweden) was member of the ECB-Advisory Committee, a body which influenced, for example, the distribution of finances. At the same time he also was member of the ECB Executive Committee, preparing the General Assembly of this “representative organ of young people in Europe.”\textsuperscript{357}

However, before long the representatives of EDS became dissatisfied: “The seminar was a bore. It is clear that ECB does not manage to arrange seminars like this and should refrain from it in the future” – an advice, the ECB did not follow. “Other organisations are even more frustrated [...] and see the contradiction between the present socialist oriented preamble and the openness of the organisation which has let the centre right in.”\textsuperscript{358} Thus, EDS requested to base any ECB-activity on the smallest common denominator. Since the ECB never adjusted its activities, EDS decided to modify its policy. The relations were maintained on a low level since the ECB played a certain role in the co-operative system of European institutions. Though the ECB-seminars were still considered questionable, “EDS has found it useful to participate”. Finally in 1980, EDS was “not convinced that the ECB provides the service it should [...]. The organisation has failed to show that its influence is worthy of us being seriously involved. One thing is for certain, EDS cannot give a long term definite commitment to continuous membership of the ECB unless it improves its image, efficiency and service to member organisations.”\textsuperscript{359}

Other institutions of the EEC – partly in co-operation with the ECCS/EDS – tried as well to institutionalise European youth activities and to promote the spirit of détente and human rights. In 1973, ECCS together with COCDYC and the EUYCD had strongly criticised the suggested plans of the EEC to set up a “Youth Advisory Council” (YAC) without considering the participation of youth organisations. As an alternative a biannual youth conference was suggested after the three organisations had met in Vienna in October 1973. Though it was agreed that there was no need for another “voice of youth”, it was felt “that some consultation with the Parliament and Institution is necessary and that there are many things which the community could usefully do to encourage youth politics.”\textsuperscript{360}
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Only under certain conditions would the three organisations have agreed to further institutionalisation: First, “individual and independent youth action” was to be encouraged. Secondly, different instead of a “compromise viewpoint” had to be reflected. Third, “clarity of representation” had to be achieved and “heavily institutionalised additional bureaucracy” avoided. A “Charlemagne Centre” for European Youth Organisations which would provide technical assistance for international non-governmental youth organisations, and a “Community Conference on Youth Affairs”, composed of three councils (political, social, cultural affairs), which was to meet twice a year, were proposed. This “conference” was supposed to be a consultative body of the European Commission and the European Parliament for organisations coming from EEC-member countries.

This project was also supported by the mother parties: In June 1974, the Executive Committee Meeting in Venice was informed of a joint initiative of the Conservatives, the Christian Democrats and the Liberals in the European Parliament to set up a youth forum, “following the line of ECCS”. This political support at the beginning of the Youth Forum (“Youth Forum of the European Communities”) also shows the consideration of official ECCS/EDS-positions in the decision making. The official “EDS attitude towards the establishing of a European Youth Forum” repeated some of its previous concerns: the forum should be broadly based, not monopolising the co-operation with European institutions, include a system of sub-committees and have INGYO’s as members. YF-functionaries should not represent the member organisations. Democratic and transparent procedures were conditional, and the “representation of national interest must be adjusted to the present state of European integration”. Thus, INGYO’s should have more influence than youth councils.

In 1975, the European Commission published its recommendations concerning the set-up of a Committee for Youth Questions and the Creation of a European Youth Forum. These recommendations included the ECCS-suggestion of the three sub-sections. However, since this provision had been “heavily attacked” by socialists (the exclusion of non-political left organisations from the political section would make socialist majorities more difficult), this structure was no longer conditional for the Commission. In 1976, EDS was finally invited to send a representative to the newly established “Temporary Secretariat” which was to become the “European Youth Forum”.

Since the rules of procedure were considered essential, EDS invested many resources in the negotiations of these rules: “Per Ledin has also rep-
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resented EDS in the slow and laborious negotiations to set up a European Youth Forum, and has presented proposals on its future structure. The Secretariat has supported the creation of such a Forum as a means of strengthening our contribution to the building of a united Europe, but remains cautious on the kind of body that might be established.”

Eventually, the EDS-Bureau succeeded with at least six ideas for the draft statutes of the Youth Forum.

In 1977 the establishment of the Youth Forum was announced. It finally became active in November 1978. Chairman Scott Hamilton concluded that the “EDS approach to establishing a Forum” was a “frequent item on the agenda of our Executive Committee meetings for at least six years. We have consistently supported the idea. We have never supported creating a new youth bureaucracy, with all that entails. A General Assembly meeting once a year, with ‘ad hoc’ commissions meeting from time to time would have been much more in line with our thinking.”

Since March 1977 EDS had been formally applying for membership in the Youth Forum. In May and June 1977, Secretary General Nigel Ashford made the first presentations at YF-meetings. The application was successful. Immediately after succession, Peter Adler (ÖSU) and Nigel Ashford (FCS, Secretary General) “argued successfully for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Education and Culture.” Since the Youth Forum later on operated “mainly through three Permanent Commissions on general politics, social affairs, and education and culture” (Nigel Ashford), EDS representatives attended all of their meetings, which meant to attend nine additional meetings in six places until 1980 and six meetings in 1981. In May 1980, Rudolf Henke (Germany) and Rick Parker (UK), members of the EDS “Higher Education Group” and co-authors of the “Charter on Higher Education”, successfully included the higher education dimension in the “terms of reference” of the Commission, and promoted the internationalisation of education as a topic for the discussions.

Besides the strong interest in educational committee work, several other EDS policies can be identified as well, such as the permanent opposition of the anticipated growth of the European youth bureaucracy. Another target was to create clearly defined and transparent procedures for decision-making. Thus, EDS advised the General Assembly of the YF to adopt a parliamentary

365 Scott Hamilton, Report to the Executive Committee on EDS and the “youth institutions” and the options for EDS in the future, September 1977, p. 4, ACDP IX-003-36.
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work style instead of consensus seeking as procedure. “This would provide us with better opportunities to present our views and we would not legitimate the work of our opponents.” Therefore, all General Assemblies of the forum were also attended. Finally, EDS demanded a “more dominant role” of the INGYOs and the reduction of the influence of the National Youth Councils in the meetings.371 The interest in the Youth Forum didn’t decrease until after 1980, when the EDS-Bureau still intended to continue to be involved in the Youth Forum, but our exact priorities will very much depend on our work in other fields and our view of the general development of the European Community.”372

A fourth organisation, beside the “framework”, the ECB and the Youth Forum, was the Congress of European National Youth Councils (CENYC, established 23 March 1963). Officially, its aims were similar to those of EDS: to act “on behalf of its members to European institutions, governmental and non-governmental, and to appropriate international bodies; promote democratic participation by young people [...], assist them to develop a European consciousness based on mutual respect”, awareness of a common European culture.373

But in practice, CENYC was one of those left-leaning international networks that had received funding by the CIA (and probably other government agencies) for their anti-Moscow positions.374 In the seventies, CENYC was criticised by EDS for being to moderate (“Social-democratic”) in the East-West youth dialogue. The emergence of the ECB encouraged CENYC to admit international youth organisations as members. Since ECCS wanted to be present in one of the official European youth structures, especially considering the reluctant attitude of the ECB, they decided to apply for membership in CENYC as well. The application was submitted in late 1972. Similar to the ECB, CENYC made the accession dependant of a study’s result. “It might be assumed that the reasons for the decision [...] were not entirely of an organisational nature,” wrote Carl Bildt.375 The application was therefore pending until 1973. After 1976, with the emergence of the Youth Forum, EDS changed its position on the application, when the former Secretary General Per Ledin (Sweden) concluded, that CENYC “belongs to the past era in the European integration.”376 It was eventually decided to withdraw the application.

In 1977, Chairman Scott Hamilton summarised the politics of EDS towards the East-West dialogue, the ECB, the Youth Forum and the CENYC:

371 Per Ledin, Memo on the growing European youth political bureaucracy, 11-10-76, p. 3, ACDP IX-003-017. The EDS-attitude towards the establishing of a European Youth Forum, p. 2, ACDP IX-003-017.
372 Annual Report 1979/80, p. 25-29, PAT.
“Until recently, EDS has either avoided institutional involvement altogether or - like the ECB - it avoided us. But with our membership of the ECB being accepted at last, and the resurrection of the idea of the Forum, we have been slowly sucked into the whirlpool over the past year. This is an appropriate moment to pause and consider what we are doing. If we become involved in the institutions, then we must do so wholeheartedly otherwise our time will be wasted. But time is the key word; [...] Remember that in youth politics, everything hangs together; if we want to develop relations outside Europe, then we must keep in touch with what the ‘youth thinking’ in Europe is; if we want to influence the East-West dialogues, then we should be influencing our national youth councils – to influence CENYC; and so it goes on.”377

From a historical perspective, all these organisations were instruments of national governments – whether East or West – to domesticate the idealism of youth activists and to implement social agendas. Since EDS was not considered to be very helpful for social engineering or the implementation of dubious “peace processes”, it could never become a major player in them.

Co-operation with European Institutions

In 1971, Chairman Ian Taylor mentioned the search for “formal and informal links with European bodies such as the EEC, the Council of Europe” for the first time as one of the main activities of the organisation.378 Among these “bodies” was the before-mentioned “Liaison Committee for European Youth Organisations”, which was later transformed to be the European Co-ordination Bureau (ECB).

But the by far largest European organisation whence ECCS/EDS expected support was the Council of Europe. Since 1970, ECCS was investigating how to get their recognition. The same year, ECCS “received a nice letter thanking us and assuring us of speedy attention. A year later, after constant work, we had another letter telling us a new procedure for granting consultative status was being introduced which would speed up the process. Unfortunately the letter explained, introducing this new procedure could take two years during which no application could be considered. We waited our three years and now we have it.”379

Therefore the co-operation with the Council of Europe started in autumn 1973, when ECCS was granted a consultative status with the Council: “The

377 Scott Hamilton, Report to the Executive Committee on EDS and the “youth institutions” and the options for EDS in the future, September 1977, ACDP IX-003-36, pp. 1, 3, 8.
379 Taurus, vol.1, no.1, p. 2.
Council said some very nice things when they let us in so perhaps the long wait was worth it.”380 The new status “allowed one conference a year, in addition to participation in the various youth activities.” The first invitation was to attend a conference on international voluntary service in November 1973.  

The Council of Europe was also maintaining the European Youth Foundation. The relations to the foundation were established in 1972 and extended to the level of “good working relations” (Carl Bildt) in 1974. Some problems arose only “out of a slightly hostile attitude towards ECCS from some other organisations.” Since this time, regular applications for administrative, seminar or other grants addressed to the European Youth Foundation belong to the task of every Secretary General/ Executive Director of the organisation.

The first grant for a seminar was received in autumn 1974. Until 1981, 11 of 27 applications for seminars were accepted. Additionally, the European Youth Foundation accepted two applications in publications support and the annual application for administrative grants. While the support for projects was dependant of political goodwill and the quality of the applications, the administrative grants were permanently increased. The overall support between 1974 and 1980 was 751.118 French Francs.382 On top of that ECCS/EDS was frequently granted the use of the premises of the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe for its meetings.

Additionally, ECCS/EDS tried to establish direct links to European top officials. In 1974/75, an exchange of letters between the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Georg Kahn-Ackermann, and Chairman Carl Bildt took place. The result was the permanent invitation to the language courses of the European Youth Foundation. In 1973, the UNESCO was approached to get support for the environmental conference in Venice.383

In 1978, Chairman Pierre Moinet met with Fontana Brava of the European Commission to discuss financial matters and the future of the European youth structures.384

**Linking the World**

Throughout the decade, parallel to activities in European structures as well as to the East-West dialogue, ECCS/EDS-officers were increasingly interested in the establishment of their own international networks. “Looking

---
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in the resources the communist organisations and their fellow travellers in the west are able to put into this work and what they actually are able to achieve”, and since the “interests of EDS are not confined to Europe”, worldwide activities were increasingly considered to be a necessity. Overall aim was the establishment of self-initiated and self-defined international projects, independent of the international youth establishment or governmental structures. The political importance of “Third World”-topics was growing, too: “ECCS passionately believes that Europe should be outward-looking and is acting to increase its contacts with the Third World”. As an independent organisation, it was however always difficult for EDS to receive the necessary financial support for such activities.

Since 1971/72, the idea was to first establish bilateral contacts which could then later on be converted into an international organisation. For this reason, the most important bilateral co-operation was initiated with like-minded students of democratic western countries outside Europe, such as the US, Canada and Australia. Furthermore, the Association of Christian Democrats of Latin America in Europe (ADCLE) should be mentioned.

First, the College Democrats (Larry Childers) and the Young Americans for Freedom (Ron Dockside) attended an Annual Meeting in 1972. Informal meetings with these organisations and the College Young Republicans, the American Council of Young Political Leaders, the United States Youth Council and others were continued in 1972/73.

During the Chairmanship of Tom Spencer, American conservatives became close allies of ECCS/EDS: “Great interest has been shown in developing more enduring bonds across the Atlantic Ocean, and it is hoped that the question will be further pursued.” Representatives of the College Republicans and the College Democrats had attended the Annual Meetings since 1974 as well as the Summer Universities since 1977. In October 1974, Carl Bildt and the legendary Karl Rove agreed on an exchange programme with the College Democrats and the College Republicans.

This exchange was continued in 1975: “In spite of the great distance, relations with the College Republicans and the US-Youth Council have developed satisfactory. [...] Correspondence has however been slightly problematic, since the CR’s never put enough stamps on their letters, causing them to arrive six weeks later.” In 1976/77 the relations “with the College Demo-
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crats and College Republicans of America were excellent” but were however consisting of only “regular mailings.”  


In 1972/73, Chairman Tom Spencer approached the Canadian Progressive Conservative Youth, which sent delegates to the Annual Meeting of 1978. Other participants of the meeting represented the Liberal Party of Australia, the Japanese Liberal Democrats and opposition parties from India.

In August 1975, Carl Bildt suggested an associated membership of the National Student’s Union of Israel in EDS. The late seventies also saw efforts to get in contact with Turkish organisations. After the participation of Celik Kulvay of the Justice Party Youth (Adalet Partisi Genel Baskanligi) in an Executive Committee Meeting in Malta and the Summer University in 1978, EDS organised a study trip to Turkey on 23-28 March, 1979 on the invitation of this organisation.

393 Carl Bildt, Report on activities within ECCS 1972/73, annex, ACDP IX-003-061.
Bilateral relations were also established with organisations which were not exactly potential members of a global centre-right association. The aim was to maintain an East-West or North-South dialogue independent of the established conference system. This policy included a joint meeting of representatives from Egypt and Israel on the occasion of the Executive Committee Meeting in Malta in 1978. Another project comprised of contacts to the democratic opposition in Afghanistan. In 1978, a delegation travelled to Romania and met representatives of the communist state youth organisation (CUCSA). This co-operation seemed promising at the time, since the Romanians were about to defect from the official Soviet youth policy. This assumption was wrong: besides some friendly talks no substantial results could be achieved.

On the other hand, EDS refused to co-operate with pro-apartheid groups of South Africa: “EDS condemns the racist apartheid system in the Republic of South Africa. It is necessary to start negotiations between all racial and social groups and political tendencies in South Africa in order to find a peaceful solution to the problem. EDS demands the South African government to abandon laws maintaining inequality, to free all political prisoners and to allow the work of all political groups and parties.” Other “partnerships” with organisations from China and Chile were mentioned by EDS in 1980, but were merely symbolic.

The project of a global centre-right student co-operation itself started very early in the decade, maybe as a logic consequence of various discussions how to continue the I in ICCS after the name change. In 1971, a possible membership in the World Alliance of Youth (WAY) was on the agenda. WAY had been set up in 1948 in London by 29 national youth councils dissatisfied with the communist WFDY. One of its priorities was the Third World. In 1965, even Nobel peace price winner Martin Luther King spoke at a WAY-conference. It was the sister organisation of the International Student Conference (ISC) until its dissolution in 1969. Its membership was also open to international non-governmental youth organisations.

Presidents of WAY were mainly Socialists and Social Democrats, such as the Indian Shri Ravindra Varma 1958-1962 (Indian Minister 1977-1979), the Austrian MP Peter Schieder 1969-1971 (2002-2005 President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe), and the Danish minister (1994-98) Ole Loeving Simonsen 1976-1993.
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Main reason for EDS to approach WAY was however the absence of ideologi-

cal splits such as in the “framework”, YF, ECB or CENYC. EDS-officers only

knew of a polarisation between European and North American WAY-members

on the one side and African and Asian members on the other. The presence of

organisations of developing countries was a second reason to approach WAY,

especially since the co-operation with such organisations had been an EDS-

long term goal.398

But already in the sixties, WAY itself was criticised for being supported

by US-sources (1969: about 200.000 USD of an annual budget of about 450.000

USD).399 WAY was also mentioned in connection with revelations of CIA-funds

for the ISC in 1966/67. Other sources even claimed that WAY “was set up and

financed by MI6 and then taken over by the CIA in the 1950ies.”400 For the ISC

these revelations were lethal. However, WAY somehow “lingered on”.401 Its

officials succeeded by admitting only the most necessary.

Additionally, a new generation of activists used WAY as a platform to

heavily criticise US-policies in Vietnam (i.e. anti-US protests financed by the

US taxpayer). It was also claimed that the relations to the CIA had cooled

down. With this WAY regained its credibility in no time. Hence, in 1971/72,

when ECCS started to communicate with WAY, the allegations seemed to be

past. For the first time in 1972, ECCS participated in a WAY-conference in

Manchester, where the information leaflet with Margaret Thatcher on the

front cover was distributed.402 In October 1974, a new application of ECCS to

WAY was reported.403 At the meeting of the Executive Committee of WAY,

November 27-30, 1974, associate membership was granted to ECCS, though

ECCS was not present at this meeting – they were not even informed about

it.404

This behaviour was highly disappointing for EDS. However, at the Annual

Meeting in Bonn in May 1975, the co-operation with WAY was discussed

again. But the year saw for a second scandal. This time, WAY came into an

existential crisis, when the former CIA-executive Philip Agee published the

book “Inside the Company: CIA Diary”. The publication caused a tremendous

echo, since it was one of the first insider accounts of the CIA. Agee alleged

the CIA of maintaining WAY to rival the WFDY and the IUS as long as these
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organisations promoted policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under the guise of unified campaigns (anti-colonialism, antinuclear weapons, pro peace groups etc.).

This time, WAY was in the centre of the allegations: “The two international bodies constructed to rival those sponsored by the Soviet Union were the Coordinating Secretariat of National Unions of Students (COSEC) with headquarters in Leyden, and the World Assembly of Youth (WAY) situated in Brussels. [...] both also work as propaganda agencies for the CIA – particularly in underdeveloped countries.”

After this and allegations of corruption, WAY was paralysed. In 1977, Chairman Scott Hamilton reported that EDS had tried “to revive the organisation last year on a more secure footing, that failed and there is now no hope of saving the organisation.” This referred to a vote when only the Young Conservatives, FCS, EDS, and the Young European Federalists had supported the continuation of WAY, but even then could not take over the organisation.
The Danish Socialist Ole Loeving Simonsen remained in charge until 1993. In 2001, WAY still “lingered on” with an office in Copenhagen (Denmark), was mentioned in connection with several UN-conferences, gender equality and “national grass-roots level community development”. At the same time and until 2005, there was an office in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) claiming to represent WAY. However, EDS was never again involved in that organisation after 1977.

The stories told in “Inside the Company” might not even be entirely true. Agee seems to rely on sources from before 1967. A former KGB-agent even claimed that the KGB helped him to write his book. “Additionally, in 1992 a high-ranking Cuban intelligence officer who defected to the United States claimed that the Cuban government paid Agee up to $1 million in the years after his defection.” Finally, Agee spent the last years of his life in Castro’s Cuba.

However, many people knew for a long time that the US-government was interested in international youth co-operation at least since the 1950s. The movie producer Stanley Kubrick (1928-1999, “Lolita”, “Full Metal Jacket”, “Eyes Wide Shut”) had produced a documentary about WAY in 1952, which
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was entirely funded by the US-State Department. Admirers of the late artist have discovered that the movie is no longer available, not even in specialised cinematographic libraries.\textsuperscript{411} After the partial opening of the archives in the nineties and the research since then, it became even more obvious to what high extent international youth and student politics was part of the psychological warfare between East and West.

Although it “appears paradoxical that the American intelligence agencies should have financed organizations that often stood well on the left of the political spectrum”, there were reasons for the Western governments to financially support international youth structures of the left. They “appreciated that anti-communism is not saleable in most countries unless it is wrapped in a progressive package” as famous feminist Gloria Steinem, youth activist of the 50s and 60s confirmed.\textsuperscript{412}

The main interest was to counter the “infiltrationist tactics” of the Soviet government, not party politics: “The Bolsheviks had been first to conceive of youth as a politico-economical weapon”. It was them “who have done most to develop this particular twentieth century form of political corruption: the calculated exploitation of idealism.”\textsuperscript{413} Since the necessity of supporting ISC and WAY – in order to break the monopoly of both the IUS and WFDY – appeared during the middle of the so-called McCarthyism in 1951, a direct support of non-totalitarian left organisations was “condemned to penury – or to receiving funds clandestinely.” That was not as “paradoxical as it seems: we must remember that the chief objective of the intervention was not to control or interfere in the internal affairs of these organizations, but to break the communist monopoly.”\textsuperscript{414} The result was a “bipolar system of equilibrium” in international youth and student affairs (Joel Kotek) in which there was no role for EDS.

Another paradox of Agee’s allegations was that did not only destroy the reputation of WAY, but as well that of non-socialist organisations: Agee had also accused catholic and Christian-democrat organisations of being financed by the CIA. This of course affected EDS as well. But at least in one aspect, Agee was wrong: members of EDS had never been involved in the ISC. EDS had been loosely affiliated with WAY for only three years and had not even been invited to its own accession. It is also worth noting that the acronyms ICCS, ECCS or EDS were nowhere mentioned by Agee. He only alluded to “specific operations through Catholic, Christian Democrat and non-communist socialist

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
student organisations” without specification.\textsuperscript{415} Even though ECCS/EDS with its pro-US policies would have accepted any support by official US-government sources, no evidence for these allegations can be found. Quite on the contrary: Exchange programmes with US-student groups had created fees rather than to increase the EDS-income.

Repeatedly, EDS-officials even complained that the US-government was “virtually ignoring its conferences and programmes which emphasize vital Western security interests. […] Without U.S. participation, America’s friends cannot adequately safeguard America’s interests.”\textsuperscript{416} If it was the intention to finance non-totalitarian leftist groups and politically undecided activists of developing countries, ECCS/EDS were simply not one of the target groups of the “agency”.

After the WAY-scandal, the EDS-Bureau started to investigate the possibility to have a new independent international student organisation. In 1977, EDS adopted a motion asking the next Secretariat (board) to “establish contacts with Democratic Parties all over the world […] with the hope of establishing an international co-ordinating mechanism between EDS and comparable regional organisations throughout the world when possible, with national organisations if not.”\textsuperscript{417}

At the same time, an “International Strategy Paper” was discussed with the “North American Student Accord” (NASA) which was foreseen as the first partner in the United States. The US-College Democrats (member of NASA) had suggested establishing “international contact/action between non-socialist and socialist democratic, pro human rights student organisations”. But since this would have meant the revival of the original ISC/WAY-idea, EDS was reluctant to agree to it.

Various meetings of EDS with US-delegations from 1978 and onwards turned into being perfect opportunities to discuss this highly delicate project. During these consultations EDS was however informed that neither the new leadership of the College Democrats nor the British Labour students were any longer interested in such a co-operation. The attitude of the different organisations was probably influenced by the decline in co-operation of socialist and non-socialist organisations during the East-West youth conferences of 1980. Whereas left and centre-left organisations participated in the 1981-conference in Helsinki, non-socialist organisations had either not been invited or had withdrawn participation (e.g. EDS).

\textsuperscript{415} ICCS/ECCS/EDS (unlike IUSY and IUJYCD) does neither appear in the Rampart-magazine (1967), nor in Agee (1975) or Kotek (1992/96).
\textsuperscript{417} Resolution, July 1977, ACDP IX-003-18.
After no substantial results had been achieved by 1980, it was agreed to limit the project to Christian Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives. In 1980, an informal “steering committee” was set up - without social-democratic groups. Chairman became Lars Eskeland, EDS-Chairman. Vice Chairman became Steve Gimble representing NASA. For the first time “Democrat Students International” (DSI) appears as a preliminary name. Under this name, the project was finally presented to the EDS-Council in 1981.\(^{418}\)

Third World issues were however on the agenda. In 1979, EDS organised a Third World conference in Bonn: “EDS finds it intolerable that in the modern world too many people live in absolute poverty. [...] one of the man’s basic rights is the right to live decently and have the chance to realize his potential [...] to eliminate poverty must therefore be one of the chief objects of the North-South co-operation.”\(^{419}\) The main proposal of the working group on “free trade and Third World” was what the title suggested: free trade as a solution for economic disturbances in developing countries.

After a detailed analysis, it was concluded, that “economic aid has to be significantly raised” but should be “unlinked to production from giving country”. Development aid should furthermore be linked to democratic developments and the gradual introduction of free access of the developing countries to the markets.\(^{420}\)

It was also decided to continue the discussion at the Annual Meeting in St. Pol de Leon (France) in 1979. A “Background Paper on the Third World” by Vice Chairman Elisabeth Langby was supposed to deliver some content to the debate. At least in parts, the paper followed the pessimistic proposals of the “Club of Rome”.\(^{421}\) Yet other parts of the paper showed another phenomenon: the advent of libertarian ideas. While the idea of more workers’ participation in private enterprises was supported in early 1979, now the earlier avoided term of “Free Market”-economy played a key-role in Langby’s paper.\(^{422}\)

---
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Chapter 4

Challenges

The first thing to remember about the eighties is that it was a decade of transformation: Western Europe transformed itself into the European Community, the Christian-Democratic and Conservative parties in the US, Great Britain, Germany and elsewhere were winning elections again. Margaret Thatcher (since 1979), Ronald Reagan (since 1980), Helmut Kohl (since 1982) and others had taken over. The IT-revolution began, and, at the end of the decade, the Eastern communist regimes broke down. In 1986, the member states of the European Community signed the Joint European Act. This treaty was the start of higher education and research initiatives on the European level. At the same time, the new Pope John Paul II (since 1978) encouraged the emerging liberation movements in Central and Eastern Europe spiritually and morally.

The first thing to remember about EDS in the eighties is that it was also undergoing a process of transformation. It is true, the organisation continued to organise student conferences on various topics. Publications were printed, campaigns were organised and the manifestos of the seventies were amended. But on the other hand, the members of EDS looked for new “fields of action”, and how to respond to the new challenges. Conflicts emerged on how to continue.

At the same time, the global youth dialogue on peace and disarmament – the big issue of the seventies – had reached a deadlock. The European youth debate followed soon after. Hence the Executive Bureau of 1980/81 emphasised that it had to “allocate enough time and resources to the discussions and preparations of [the] development of EDS activities and policies into new fields […] to an even greater extent than last year” instead of “general discussions and on information about the work of EDS”.423

Additionally, most of the mother parties moved towards a more liberal Hayekian direction. In EDS itself, this philosophical shift contributed to the increasing internal conflicts as well, and a danger of self-isolation in external affairs occurred. Both trends overshadowed the first half of the decade. The stagnation of the global youth dialogue could be overcome only after the election of Gorbachev to the post of Secretary General of the CPSU in 1986. As a result, the relations between the Kremlin and the White House improved and parallel to it the climate in European youth and student politics.

Personal priorities also had a great influence on the further development of EDS, as any new generation reinvents international student politics.

The stagnation in its external affairs came with an internal discussion about the meaning of the whole project. Everyone had to find out for themselves what EDS meant to them: Without external “prompters” they had to learn the meaning of a “social network for contacts”, to discover that “exchange through discussions with representatives from other countries sharpens own arguments as well as it – equally important – enlarges personal perspectives” as FMSF-member Susanne Enger declared in 1987 after having attended an EDS-seminar.424

The complexity of a weird political world did not make it easier for the members to understand and tolerate one other. During the eighties, EDS therefore had great difficulties to find its place in an environment composed of two antagonist political blocks, the European Communities, the new and the old Left in the West, Libertarians posing as the new Conservatives and finally a Soviet dictator with improving relations with Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, Helmut Kohl and even the Pope. And even worse, a big internal communication problem led to the most serious crisis in the history of the organisation when a number of the member organisations suspended their membership.

After 1986, EDS had to be restored.425 Defected member organisations had to be convinced to return. The search for new members, ideas and projects went on again. One of the new priorities was the search for partners in Eastern Europe. In 1989/90, when almost everybody showed great surprise about the communist regimes disintegrating, most EDS-activists were less surprised, since they knew the situation better. Since 1979, EDS had been actively supporting opposition groups in the Communist East of Europe, with the Young Poland Movement as associate member in 1980, a revolutionary step.

Thus, in 1981, at the Summer University in Sada near La Coruña in Spain, Maciej Grzywaczewski of RMP, then a student of the history of philosophy, today a prominent producer of films and publisher in Poland, was the first delegate ever at a Summer University representing a non-communist organisation to the east of the Iron Curtain. In November 1988, one year before the Velvet Revolution, Chairman Bettina Machaczek and Executive Director Knut Albert Solem visited Vaclav Havel and Cardinal Tomasek in Prague, where they discussed the role of the opposition and the church. Their impression was that “people do not give up. New organisations are being formed to fight for human rights. When one person is arrested, another is ready to fill his position. People take to the streets to protest, despite the brutality of the police.”426

425 Report, EDS study session on academic unemployment, 26/31-03-87, p. 1, PAT.
Another incident marks the advent of two major developments of the decade to come: the first e-mail received by Chairman Bettina Machaczek on 15 June 1989, talking of the anticommunist student uprising in China, announcing the democratic revolutions in the communist part and the IT-revolution all over the world. These two would reshape the face of the earth to an extent most could not even have dreamed of at the beginning of the decade.

**Internal Affairs**

**Constitutional Development**

In 1981, the Constitution to be applied was that of 1978 with its two organs, the Council and the Executive Bureau. The supreme body was the Council (Council meetings: three in 1982/83, 1983/84, 1988/89 and two in 1989/90). The Council was defined as the “sovereign body of the Union in respect of all matters and has overall direction of the Executive Bureau.”

The Executive Bureau was the board of the organisation, consisting of the Chairman, two Deputy Chairmen and four Vice Chairmen (since 1982 six Vice Chairmen, Art.8). The frequency of Bureau meetings differed from year to year (1980/81: 4, 1982/83: approximately 6, 1983/84: approximately 7, 1988/89: 6, 1989/90: 4). The Executive Bureau was responsible for the preparation of meetings, the execution of Council decisions and the finances.

---
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Among the responsibilities of the Chairman were the guidance of the work of the Bureau, external relations, the delegation of responsibilities, and the preparation of work reports. The first Executive Director of the eighties was Helga Krumbeck from Germany (1979-1982). From time to time, Deputy Executive Directors were appointed (Christopher Hamilton, 1981/82; Thierry Poskin, 1983/84). The statutes of 1981 also contained rules for resolutions. With a 2/3 majority of the votes cast, a resolution could be declared to be a basic document of the organisation. Additionally, the Statutes suggested a final statement to be adopted after any conference (article 16.4). The finances were regulated in short – expenses of Bureau members could be reimbursed if possible though the realities of the time did not provide many possibilities.

First amendments to the statutes were adopted at a meeting in Cadenabbia (Italy) in June 1981. From then on, they included the name of the organisation in English, French and German. The French version replaced the word “conservative” with “centrist”, as a response to the bad connotation connected with the word “conservative” in the French language.

Article 2 (Aims) emphasised the co-operation between Christian Democrat, Conservative and Liberal students, a better understanding of each others political situation, a “united Europe” and – slightly modified – the exchange “of information on education and social policy, particularly concerning students and higher education”. Other amendments by Stefan L. Frendo (SDM) of May 1981 were discussed together with other Bureau proposals from 1980 at the 3rd Council Meeting in Strasbourg in July 1982.

However, only the suggestions of the Bureau were accepted. Since then, membership was open to the three political streams and additionally to “like-minded” student or youth organisations, which meant a further opening of the organisation. Secondly, the Bureau-proposals included the conversion of the positions of the Deputy Chairmen to two additional Vice Chairmen and third, the abolition of the “Joint Full Membership”, since organisations were considered “not to belong to a certain country, but to represent an organisation. If the case would arise that two organisations from one country are like
minded and apply for full membership, they should have the same rights”, although the older organisation should have the right to veto new applicants from the same country.

Fourth, associated membership was introduced and “observers” became “observer members”. Associated membership was open to any “fraternal organisation” whereas observer membership was open to “any interested organisation”. The difference between associated and observer members was the exclusive right to submit resolutions for observers. All three types of membership needed a 4/5 majority for approval. Membership rights were conditioned to the payment of the annual membership fee. The new article 7.a regulated the reasons for expulsion. Other amendments referred to the qualified majorities in voting.429

The conduct of meetings and elections was supposed to be regulated by Standing Orders “as approved from time to time”. The “Standing Orders for the Conduct of Elections at the Annual Meeting” of 1978 were apparently in use until the Annual Meeting of 1981.430 In August 1982, the Annual Meeting in Iceland adopted a “working motion on standing orders” asking the Bureau to “create a committee to prepare Standing Orders for the conduct of meetings and present them for adoption at the next Council Meeting”, an immediate response to criticism that had emerged during the meeting. Thus, newly drafted Standing Orders were presented by Vice Chairman Stephen Morrison (UK) to the Council in Edinburgh in January 1983.431 They were supposed to “maintain order in the general business of meetings of the Council to ensure that fair and reasoned proceedings take place” (Article 101).

These Standing Orders were amended again until 1984, since the matters such as “points of order”, votes and breaks in meetings had to be specified. By this, the powers of the Bureau were considerably extended. The Standing Orders defined a quorum (plus 50 percent), deadlines for motions, the matter of urgency of motions, “points of order”, and how the minutes shall be discussed: “There shall be no discussion of the minutes except on matters of accuracy.”

The rights of the “Chair” to conduct meetings were by this extended: He was not only able to decide “who shall speak” but even to adjourn meetings in case of disorder. He could also ask “a person to leave the meeting” after at least three calls of order. Debates were mainly foreseen in connection with

429 Stefan Frendo to Helga Krumbeck, 22-05-81; Bureau Meeting, Minutes, Minutes 16-05-82, p. 1; mailing of 21-05-82, PAC.
430 Cf. Minutes, Annual Meeting 1978, 18/22-08-78, p. 8, PAT; a copy of these Standing Orders was found in the papers of Helga Krumbeck from the 5th Summer University of 1981, ACDP IX-003-3. Since an intense inquiry on the matter did not produce other results, these Standing Orders with seven paragraphs are the only in question for the period of 1978-1981.
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motions. The new Standing Orders also regulated in detail, in which order a submitted motion was to be debated. Article 108 underlined the importance of a vote, during which nobody was allowed to leave or enter the room or start a debate on other issues. A reopening of the vote was forbidden except in case of inaccuracy or foul play. In general, it was foreseen, that at all times “members of the Council shall conduct themselves with dignity and if entering or leaving the Council meeting shall do so quietly.”

In 1986, Chairman Mattias Bengtsson submitted a proposal on new rules for membership fees, which was adopted. In September 1988 the Council adopted the last statutory amendments for the decade in Athens. Honorary Vice-presidents were abolished and the term of office for the Honorary President was limited for one year. A new honorary membership was introduced, perhaps a first step towards a prospective individual membership.

Until these changes, EDS regularly had elected its honorary officers. Honorary Presidents were Diogo Freitas do Amaral (1980/81, Portugal), Sir James Scott Hopkins MEP (1981/82, UK), Margaret Thatcher (1982/86), and Carl Bildt (1987/88). Margaret Thatcher accepted her nomination since she attached “considerable importance to the development and strengthening of ties between democratic parties of the Centre Right”. She also felt “honoured to have received your invitation.” However, the Annual Meeting of 1988 did not elect an Honorary Chairman, but Menachim Begin from Israel to be the Honorary Officer. At the same meeting in 1988, Financial Regulations were adopted for the first time.

Finally, at Annual Meetings, elections to the International Garrick Club – the EDS-old boys’ network – usually took place. In 1982, Per Heister became Club-Chairman; Stephan Eisel became Deputy Chairman and Nigel Ashford Secretary General. Ymke Botsmaa was elected Vice Chairman, while Helga Krumbeck became the Executive Director.

---
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Membership Development

The number of about 15 actively participating organisations remained stable during the decade, except around 1985. A seminar on “Peace and Defence” in Brussels and Liege (Belgium) in January 1982 was attended by participants from 13 member organisations: NKSF (Norway), FMSF (Sweden), DKS (Denmark), Vaka (Iceland), FCS (UK), CELF (France), RCDS (Germany), FEL Belgium, FLJ (Dutch organisation, expelled at the Annual Meeting 1988), SLS (Switzerland), PCS (Canada), SDM (Malta) and representatives from Cyprus.436 In 1984, there were 16 full members, two observer and five associated members.437 The member organisations participating in a study session in Strasbourg in March 1987 were AG (Austria), FEL, Prottoporia, VO-FH (Finland), CELF, RCDS, DAP-NDFK (successor of ONNeD), Vaka, FILS (Israel), NKSF, JC (Portugal), NG and CU (Spain), FMSF, and FCS – 15 organisations from 14 countries.438 Similar figures apply for the 1987- and the 1988-Annual Meeting. As a result, approximately 75 percent of the members remained active throughout the decade, with the exception of 1985/86, when less than half the traditional member organisations participated actively.

A majority of member organisations had already joined in the sixties: DKS, FCS, FMSF, NKSF, RCDS and Tuhatkunta. The Austrian members ÖSU and SFÖ can be considered as the logic continuation of the founding member FÖSt. A second group of members had joined EDS in the seventies: VAKA, SDM, CELF (as successor of other French liberal organisations), FEL, Prottoporia, and ONNeD. The first new full member of the decade were the Swiss Liberal Students in 1980. An important associated member came from the US: both College Republicans and College Democrats were a joint member under the name of “North American Students Accord” (NASA, 1980-1986). In 1988/89, the Young America’s Foundation (YAF) and the College Republicans became associated members. Additionally, both the Progressive-Conservative Youth Federation from Canada and the Australian Liberal Student Federation became associated members at the Annual Meeting of 1982.439 Efforts to regain closer contact with Italian youth movements (MGDC, Cattolici Popolari, Liberals) were repeatedly made, but were unsuccessful.440

For several reasons the membership development of the eighties was different to other decades. On the one hand, there were relatively uncontro-
versial entries of new members. These were for example the cases of the Greek organisation ONNeD and the Cypriot organisation Protoporia respectively. ONNeD became full member at the Annual Meeting of 1982.\textsuperscript{441} Later on, ONNeD created a student branch called DAP-MDVJ (1988) and PEON was replaced by Protoporia (established 1981). Since December 1986 until at least 1988/89 another Greek organisation, ADIK (“Youth of Renewalistic Democratic Movement” was observer member, a group of ONNeD-dissidents.\textsuperscript{442} Even this seems to have been uncontroversial. At the Annual Meeting of 1983, the Ulster Unionist Students (Queen’s University Unionist Association, QUUA) joined EDS as an observer member, after they had proved to be independent from the British Conservatives – which was perhaps not entirely true, since the Federation of Conservative Students was also operating in Northern Ireland, despite of the existence of the Ulster Unionist Party.\textsuperscript{443}

Other positive developments were the creation of new relations with Israeli students. New contacts to them were reported in 1983.\textsuperscript{444} In March 1983, Young Likud became associated member.\textsuperscript{445} In June 1988, the Israeli Liberal Students also applied for membership but the decision was postponed to the Annual Meeting of 1988, since a merger between the Liberals and FILS was expected.\textsuperscript{446} In March 1983, Studentenforum Österreich (SFÖ) was accepted as a full member, since the other Austrian organisation ÖSU had “not paid nor shown interest in EDS in the last years.”\textsuperscript{447} In 1984, before ÖSU could have been expelled for good as suggested by the Chairman both organisations merged to AktionsGemeinschaft (AG).

After the first anti-communist student groups had been established in Central-Eastern Europe, EDS started to look for partners from East of the Iron Curtain. Due to the covert actions of George Miller-Kurakin and his Polish emigre friend Kazimierz Stepan, and thanks to the Rynias meeting in the Polish mountains in the beginning of the year, EDS was first successful in Poland: At a conference in Cadenabbia (Italy) on 24-28 June 1980, Ruch Młodej Polski (RMP, Young Poland Movement, established in 1979) was accepted as associated member.

In the words of a NKSF-delegation visiting Poland in May 1981, RMP had an ideology which was “conservative, European and nationalist, with heavy emphasis on Polish traditions and Christian values. It totally rejects the socia-
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The Establishment of the ICCS

list system and ideology, and aims for Polish independence from the Soviet Union.” RMP had close relations to KPN (Konfederacja Polski Niepodleglej, Confederation for an Independent Poland, established in 1979), the then illegal nationalist and conservative party. Chairman was Aleksander Hall. In its own words, RMP was a “youth movement which is centred around, and has evolved from student groups who participate in the publishing of ‘Bratniak’ (an uncensored student magazine).” They were “convinced that a fundamental condition of authentic social and political life in our country must be self education and an honest presentation to society of political groups.” Despite their cultural conservatism, representatives of RMP also stated they were “still searching for a fundamental ideology. [...] all people of good will in our country should link together with the target of fighting for respect of human and civil rights and giving the nation the freedom to decide its fate.”

Its reasons for existence were the experience of a young generation, which did no longer accept the lies of the communist leaders (“we do not wish to betray”). Hence, one of the priorities was to create a moral alternative to the ruling Communists in order to better serve the nation, with “person” and “nation” as the two ideological points of reference. However, RMP rather was a movement with an improvised organisation, due to the nature of its illegal activities under communism. Hence it only obtained the “associated” membership status.

The participants of the second EDS-study trip to Poland (January 1983) confirmed that “we have contact with a group which is both organisational and ideologically strong and has a lot of support.” Branches existed in Gdansk, Poznan, Lodz, Warszawa, Lublin, Stettin and Krakow. At the time of the visit, RMP was “focusing all its force to the underground Solidarity since they consider this as best possibility to gather the Polish nation against the state.”

The report of 1983 also informed of the Polish appreciation for President Reagan, “which was considered the Western leader which had done the most for Solidarity and the Polish nation.” But the visitors were also informed of persecutions by the Polish authorities. Thus, RMP did no longer want their associated EDS membership publicised. Even official visits of EDS-representatives were refused as they were thought as being too dangerous.

In 1983, the situation in Poland was so desperate that EDS suggested supporting RMP and the Polish students not only with typewriters but also with food. Only in 1986, the name of the organisation reappeared in an EDS-
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For the time being, the membership of RMP was maintained by members in exile and could only be refreshed in March 1989, when RCDS organised another study trip to Poland. Soon after, when Aleksander Hall founded his own political party Forum Prawicy Demokratycznej and prepared for the first free parliamentary elections, RMP was dissolved.

However, at the Council Meeting in Paris in May 1989, RMP-representatives presented the Katolicki Zwiacek Akademicki “Verbum” (Catholic Academic Association “Verbum”). This organisation had evolved from being the student wing of the RMP in 1988 (after all, a youth organisation) to one of the founders of the Katolicki Nurt Stowarzyszeń Akademickich (KNAS, Association of Catholic Academics/ Students), officially registered in autumn 1988. It also had close ties to Solidarnosc, and in 1991 it became the student wing of the Republican Coalition. Jacek Bendykowski (later Vice Chairman and auditor of EDS) immediately applied for observer membership. He presented “Verbum” as being independent and catholic, unifying Conservatives, Christian-Democrats and Liberals, but right-wing and in opposition to Marxism and the rightful successor of RMP. EDS was divided on the issue: for some, “Verbum” was a more party-political group, for others it had too much of an apolitical student club.

Another Polish student organisation in contact with EDS was Niezależne Zrzeszenie Studentów (NZS, a.k.a. “student solidarity”). Representatives of

---
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NZS, the “broadly based democratic student movement” were met during the study trip of 1983. Sometimes, NZS was criticised for its support of round tables with the communists. But “how can you compromise with communists which took everything from the people and do not want to substantially loose power?” However, NZS was rightfully seen as an organisation “fighting for freedom and democracy” since its foundation in 1980. In 1988/89 it apparently had the most of the student support.

The integration of non-communist Polish organisations into EDS was unanimously supported by all members but one: Tuhatkunta, even though this view contradicted the EDS-constitution, objected to “formalise links to democratic organisations in the eastern block”. Thus, the Finnish organisation was temporarily expelled in 1981 for one year. In the respective motion, they were assured to “be welcomed by the Council if it at a later stage is willing to work with the union.”

Within one year Tuhatkunta was given the chance to “take internal decisions and make a proposal for the forthcoming relations”. After that, they were supposed to announce an application for one of the three memberships or to declare the end of its relations with EDS. This incident was the starting point of a serious argument between Tuhatkunta and several EDS-boards. Soon after, the Tuhatkunta board declared to return and reapplied for observer membership.

Meanwhile, another obstacle for their membership had occurred: the application of a second Finnish organisation called “Vapaa Oikeisto – Fri Höger” for observer membership. Of course, Tuhatkunta wanted to remain the sole Finnish representative, since this “has been the tradition which has been for a long time been respected by all EDS member organizations”. VO-FH had been founded in 1978 as the student wing of the Constitutional Party. Although this party and its students never played a significant role in Finnish politics, its clear stand against Finnish neutrality and its western orientation made them a very attracting partner to the other Scandinavian organisations, which at the same time ignored that this party often supported Socialist candidates in order to weaken Tuhatkunta’s mother party, the Coalition Party (Kokoomus).

Hence the application of Fri Höger was recommended by some of the Bureau members, thereby obviously underestimating the difficulties of the Finnish parties, heavily under pressure from Moscow. It was for example

---
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criticised that Tuhatkunta had joined the “Finnish Peace Council”, which was part of the global communist peace movement. But as it is even now, many years later, difficult for many to understand the meaning of the various European “Peace Movements” for Soviet policies, it was even more difficult in 1982 to acknowledge such a membership to be a matter of Finnish self-defence. Although Tuhatkunta had repeatedly explained its peculiar situation and why they wanted to be the sole representative of Finland in EDS\textsuperscript{460}, the Annual meeting of 1982 accepted both applications. Under these conditions, Tuhatkunta could not accept to be part of EDS, and renounced its membership only ten days after this decision.\textsuperscript{461} On the other hand, an extensive report of Tuhatkunta showed their ongoing interest in EDS, though on special terms. It also showed disappointment at the lack of understanding among EDS-activists. However, in March 1983 Fri Höger became full member.\textsuperscript{462}

In 1984 and 1985, Antti Peltomäki, Tuhatkunta Secretary General, repeated his willingness to return to EDS, since “we here in Tuhatkunta are still regarding ourselves as ‘like-minded’ student organisation to the tradition of European conservatives, christ-democrats and liberals.” But until the arrival of a more moderate political approach in EDS he would continue his “wait-and-see” policy.\textsuperscript{463}

Fri Höger remained the main obstacle for Tuhatkunta for that time being. After 1984, EDS was even less prepared to arrange special conditions for Tuhatkunta: In a resolution, the EDS-Council demanded of Tuhatkunta to accept VO-FH’s membership, to support EDS-initiatives to support Eastern European opposition groups and to support policies on peace, freedom and human rights.\textsuperscript{464} Furthermore, VO-FH maintained its voting rights at EDS-meetings even though it had dissolved after 1987, when its mother party had lost its only parliamentary seat. Thus, Tuhatkunta campaigned for its case through bilateral seminars and regularly invited delegations of EDS-member organisations to Finland.

But Tuhatkunta was not the only defecting member. At the Annual Meeting of 1981 in Malta, the RCDS-delegates left the meeting earlier and in protest. Three incidents had provoked their untimely departure: an allegedly “unfair ending” of the Malta-solidarity campaign, the perceived exclusion of
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RCDS from decision making, and the “lack of willingness for serious political action” of the EDS-board. However, RCDS repeated its willingness to maintain its membership and to even host the EDS-office. Soon after, reconciliation could be achieved. Deputy Chairman Stephan Eisel and Secretary General Helga Krumbeck, both from RCDS, resumed attending meetings. The election of Johann Friedrich Colsman as Vice chairman in 1982 was also supposed to signal the RCDS-leadership that they were welcome in EDS. The reasons for the conflict were however still there. Thus it erupted again in autumn 1983, when RCDS one more time discontinued its attendance. This time, the perceived exclusion of a study trip to the US was taken as an example for the existence of an inner circle in EDS which excluded RCDS.

However, the EDS-Chairman had reasons to complain too: in March 1983, EDS had to leave its office in the CDU-headquarters in Bonn, and RCDS pretended to not to have the resources to accommodate the organisation either. This attitude was widely understood as unwillingness to co-operate. Only in February 1984, after a reconciling meeting in the Swiss Alps (“Zurich Agreement”), EDS-Chairman Knut Olav Nesse announced the resolution of these conflicts and the return of Colsman to the Executive Bureau.

But again, this reconciliation was only temporary. Furthermore, the negative feelings towards EDS had spread among RCDS-members. Several RCDS-branches had carried motions against EDS. As a consequence, RCDS informed EDS in July 1984, that it would suspend its membership immediately. Apparently, a majority of Chairmen of state branches and the new federal Vice Chairman Uwe Uibel were considering the expectations of the agreement of Zurich as not fulfilled. Formally, RCDS withdrew from EDS at the Annual Meeting in August 1984.

But the internal debate went on, since RCDS had caused an embarrassment for the leaderships of both the Christian-Democrat Union and the Christian-Social Union which closely cooperated with the British Conservatives in the establishment of the European Democrat Union (see below). There were even rumours of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl personally dressing down the responsible RCDS officers. Very soon, the newly elected RCDS board returned to EDS. On 22 June 1985, RCDS became observer member. In March 1986, the RCDS Federal Annual Meeting carried a motion in support for full membership. “But with this, the tiresome problems with EDS are not yet out of the world”, a nervous RCDS-leadership commented in an internal report.
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What were the real reasons for the split? First of all, there were different personal approaches how to “do” politics, causing personal animosities. Whereas the mainstream of EDS was becoming increasingly influenced by the way think-tanks were working, RCDS (and others) preferred the traditional pragmatic “student as such” approach. At the same time, they criticized the withdrawal of some of the major conservative organisations from active participation in student parliaments.

This had some influence on the expectations how the organisation was to develop. Whereas RCDS preferred a grass-root approach, with individual members gathering to promote higher education and general politics, other organisations preferred meeting political leaders, and did for example not have partnership agreements among local branches of the various EDS organisations among their priorities. Both sides blamed each other to not taking EDS seriously enough. This led to much frustration on all sides.

A second important reason for conflict were the differing perceptions of the European integration. Whereas continental European centre-right parties were focusing on the development of a European federation and a European party structure, a British-Scandinavian group preferred multilateral co-operation with close ties to the US and other countries with liberal governments. Although these policies do not necessarily contradict each other, they did in practice. Whereas RCDS-activists never really understood the unconditional admiration of US-conservatism, and sometimes even assumed a vast right-wing conspiracy, some of the northern Conservatives never understood the unconditional admiration for the European Communities, which they in turn sometimes seemed to have suspected of being a Catholic conspiracy. Other factors, such as secularisation and the advent of English as the second language of Norway, Sweden, Iceland and Denmark, while German, French and other students had to subsist on the results of a school system in decline, might have added to the conflict.

A third reason was a lack of pragmatism on both sides in almost every area of politics, whether it was tuition fees, the admission of new members, Christianity or economics, due to the increasing influence of Libertarian thought in the UK and Scandinavia, ideas that had so far never been discussed in student circles outside the English speaking world. Finally RCDS wanted influence on the decision making in accordance to its considerable financial input – the most delicate item. Other issues, such as the heavily criticised information policy, the lack of organisational skills or the policy to invite guests could be explained by the lack of professionalism which is the normality in student organisations.
Such criticism did not only originate from the German contingent: First rumours of SDM leaving EDS appeared already in 1983.\textsuperscript{469} Eventually, the organisation left in June 1985, reason being that EDS was “too right-wing”. DKS (Denmark), the Belgian Liberals, both Spanish organisations and AG (Austria) reduced their activities in EDS for that time being. The Dutch FLJ was even expelled for its lack of interest at the Annual Meeting in 1989. Though each organisation might have had its own reasons, it thus seems as if RCDS expressed a general dissatisfaction other organisations felt as well.

As a result, the working year of 1985/86 became disastrous: political work no longer took place, the European Youth Foundation cancelled any further financial support, and the Executive Director resigned in the middle of his term. Additionally, the competing organisation “United Student for Europe – Federation of Christian Democrat Students” was set up in September 1987 by five former EDS-organisations which were at the same time observer members of the UEJCD (informal name: EUYCD).

Due to its lack of membership, resources and status, USE had however never the potential to become a second EDS, or to better promote centre-right student politics on the European level, how ever high the ambitions were. Whereas EDS remained observer member of the EDU, USE only became observer to the UEJCD, which was itself observer of the EUCD: In 1988, the UEJCD agreed on a “convention” with USE, which put “an end to the observer status in EUYCD of the student organizations”, i. e. replaced the various individual memberships of the USE-members by a single observer-membership of USE.\textsuperscript{470}

It was certainly not a coincidence that the crisis of EDS culminated with the crisis of FCS in 1985/86, leading to its dissolution. Thus, the events preceding this crisis are more than just a footnote to the EDS-history: The revitalisation of FCS dates back to the mid-seventies. Since then, FCS-activists had increasingly refused a role of being passive local agents of their mother party, had inspired EDS with many interesting and innovative ideas, and introduced the economics of von Hayek, von Mises, and other “Austrians” to it. During the era of “stagflation” it was certainly necessary, to become “critical of post-war government policy and [...] the spirit of consensual pragmatism. It was at this time that the FCS began to campaign for a range of policies that were designed to undermine the post-war settlement and challenge established orthodoxy.” In 1976, FCS “would strive to create a more responsible and representative” national student union, “were to pursue a strongly pro-European strategy”.
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and “would vigorously promote a radical free-market agenda”. With this and the strong support for Eastern European opposition groups, and not only on paper, FCS had done a lot to make the EDS of the late seventies and early eighties a great success.

But soon, the FCS would give up libertarianism for anarcho-capitalism, demanding such things as legalisation for drugs, euthanasia or abortion, which were unacceptable for the continental centre-right. The support for democratic opposition groups was extended to authoritarian anti-communist or even, in the case of Afghanistan, to islamist groups. The radical conversion of FCS became apparent, when three of its former Chairmen and other leading figures of the late seventies joined the newly established Social-Democratic Party (SDP) in 1981. It is also interesting to see that former Prime Minister Edward Heath, who was seen as a right-winger in 1970, was now no longer welcome as patron of the FCS for being too left-wing.

While it was in a way acceptable to apply a whole new set of aggressive ideas and tactics to challenge the political opponent and such parasitic, guild-like entities as national student unions, it was certainly a grave political mistake to elevate certain ideas to dogmas and to apply destructive tactics to fraternal organisations from other countries and to EDS itself. It is impossible to fight and to make friends with the same people at the same time.

While it might be true in theory and in accordance with Friedrich August von Hayek that certain “statist” policies always make politicians the natural allies of Communists (and Fascists), this was certainly not true in practice for the Christian democratic students from Portugal, Malta, or Germany, which were on a daily base the worst enemies of the radical, violent and Moscow-oriented Left. To apply the interchangeable terms “communist” or “scum” for so-called “wet”, i.e. moderate centre-right students was neither fair, nor justified, but an intolerable invective.

In the end, most of the EDS-activists, the media and large parts of the leadership of the UK Conservative party regarded FCS as an extremist fringe group. The increasingly eccentric behaviour of their leaders, including admiration for right-wing militias in the third world, and at the same time for “Leninist discipline” and Communist mass-murderer Trotsky (though disguised in irony) had caused great damage to the cause of freedom. Though it is fair to say that not only its own extremism, often only that of a small faction, but also slander and outright lies of the political Left, as well as agents provocateurs
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Internal Affairs

(given the importance of universities for the socialist project) had discredited FCS’ legitimate criticism of domestic statism and any “passivist” approach to the Soviet threat.

This eventually provoked harsh reactions by the Conservative Central Office. Though a first attempt by Tory party Chairman John Gummer to suspend FCS had failed in June 1985, a second attempt by his successor Norman Tebitt succeeded in 1986. But again, the official reason for this radical step proves the FCS was not entirely wrong with its sarcasm and criticism, because this reason was an interview in FCS’ own magazine New Agenda. It contained an attack on Lord Stockton, the former Harold Macmillan, now the conservative leader in the House of Lords.

Based on the fact-filled book “The Victims of Yalta” (1977) by Count Nikolai Tolstoy, the magazine had dared to reveal that Macmillan as resident minister at allied headquarters during the Second World War, and from 1959 until 1964 Prime Minister, was responsible for sending about 40,000 Cossacks and their families from the British occupation zone in Austria to most certain death in the Soviet Union following the war. The same happened to refugees from Yugoslavia, which were sent back to Tito’s death camps.

Even though it had always supported Margaret Thatcher’s politics like nobody else, this politically incorrect article (since it assumed war crimes on behalf of the British government) was the final blow for the FCS. For Tebbit, the “attack was a disgraceful assault on a former prime minister”, for which “he apologised to the Macmillan family.”475 He ordered all copies of the August 1986-issue of the FCS quarterly to be returned to the party headquarters and destroyed.

In September 1986, the FCS was obliged to withdraw its invitation to Count Tolstoy to address its national conference, but refused to obey and to retract its allegations.476 In October 1986, Tebbit announced to replace the FCS by a new organisation called Conservative Collegiate Forum with appointed, unelected officers “and the FCS was no more.”477

It is not really clear, how and to what extent the EDS leadership and the member organisations were informed about the wider implications of the suspension. Chairman Mattias Bengtsson concluded that since the old FCS-leadership was partly integrated in the new CCF-board, for EDS “the situation was basically the same as the day before.” However, the Bureau decided to

not to invite the CCF to Council meetings, but to all other meetings for the time being. At the Annual Meeting in 1987 it was decided not to regard the CCF as the continuation of the FCS. But finally in April 1988, the Council accepted the CCF as observer member and at the Annual Meeting of 1988 as a full member.

Another evident membership problem concerned the member organisations from Spain. In 1982, the Spanish centre-right party UCD had lost the national elections dramatically. The future of the party was uncertain as well as the future of the youth organisation and EDS-member JJCC. The Spanish Bureau member Enrique Pena Gonzalez announced to leave his own organisation. At the Council meeting in Edinburgh in February 1983, it was decided to invite representatives of other conservative, Christian-democrat and liberal groups in order to initiate a new Spanish presence. Shortly afterwards, a new partner appeared: Nuevas Generaciones (NNGG), which was invited to the Annual Meeting and to the Summer University of 1983. At that meeting, Nuevas Generationes became observer member. By December 1983 NNGG had applied for full membership.

But shortly before that, another Spanish organisation, JDP (Juventude Democrata Popular – Centro Universitario) had done the same. This organisation had emerged out of the old JJCC, which led to some discussions as to whether there should be a vote at all. Both organisations were accepted as full members at the Council meeting in Lund in March 1984. Interestingly enough, JDP-CU became observer member after a “straw vote” and two more votes, and became full member after a fourth vote a few minutes later, all cast during the same meeting. In 1987, as “Centro Universitario ‘Gimenez Fernandez’”, the organisation belonged to the founders of USE. In 1989, the mother parties of both Spanish member organisations merged, and the membership of JDP-CU was annulled. However, until around 1989, both organisations were not very active in EDS.

Finally in June 1989, EDS representatives met delegates of the Hungarian youth movement FIDESZ at the occasion of an EDU “Committee Meeting on European Structures”. This organisation was transformed into a party later
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Events and Public Relations

Summer Universities

Since 1977, the annual Summer Universities had become the most important event of every working year. The 5th Summer University of 1981 took place in Gandario (near La Coruña, north eastern Spain). The participants were accommodated in eight-bed rooms in a youth hostel. The programme consisted of language classes, working groups and plenary sessions. Because of the heat, the sessions took place either in the morning or after 5 p.m. Speakers mainly came from the government of Galicia, the Portuguese Centre Party (CDS) and the German Christian Democratic Union (CDU) as well as the hosting UCD from Spain. Most prominent speaker was the President of the Spanish Parliament, Landelino Lavilla. 39 working groups covering almost all areas of politics and political thought were prepared by the member organisations. Some member organisations presented documentary films. The Summer University included a party on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the organisation.488

488 Extra Taurus to the 5th Summer University, ACDP IX-003-3.
The Summer University of 1982 in Elst (The Netherlands), 7-14 August, was attended by about 180 participants, this time even including a delegation from Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{489} The topic was “European Integration” since “it is worth to bring it again under attention, since the strive after a united Europe seems to be under pressure.” Lectures and presentations covered all kinds of EU policies, from the agriculture to the bureaucracy, from the “attempts to formulate a common European foreign policy” to “a lot of other things, which many don’t even realize.”\textsuperscript{490}

A large number of working groups dealt with topics such as “USSR and the third world”, terrorism, administrative reforms, the Green Party in Germany or the “Training of Law Students in Europe”. Among the speakers were Hanna Renate Laurien, Education minister of the State of Berlin (Germany), diplomats, Tom Spencer MEP (Conservatives) and Hendrik Jan Louwes MEP (Liberals and Democrats). The social part of the programme included live music by the “Dutch Liberal Swing Formation”, barbecues, the traditional EDS-cabaret and a trip to the famous “Delta Works” (a system of dikes that protects the Netherlands of floods).

\textbf{Summer University 1983, alpine sunrise}

The Summer University of 1983 took place in Fiesch (Valais/Wallis, Switzerland), 6-13 August. About 200 participants from approximately 20 countries participated. The programme included speeches of Georges-André Chevallez, Federal Minister for Defence (Bundesrat), Bernard Comby, Prime Minister of the Wallis canton, Alexandre Hay, President of the Inter-
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national Red Cross, and Edouard Brunner, Swiss Ambassador to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Madrid. As usual, every member organisation had to prepare a working group. Experts on energy, youth and third world affairs were invited to contribute to these meetings. A highlight of the Summer University was the trip to the Mount Eggishorn, starting at 4:30 a.m. in order to see an Alpine sunrise.  

Other leisure activities included a “fondue party followed by a short but convincing folklore performance, cocktails in a romantic palace built from 1658-1678, dinner in a small provincial hotel, a crazy disco evening in the canton’s largest disco; [...] a tour over 4 of our most impressive mountain passes”.  

The Summer University of 1984 took place in the very south of Europe, in the Greek fishing village of Porto Heli, 185 kilometres south-west of Athens. Among the invited speakers were Evangelos Averoff MP, party leader of the New Democracy party, the head of the Greek Tourist Authority, a speaker from the US-embassy, a representative of the Greek ship owner’s federation, a representative of the National Bank of Greece and a speaker from the Federation of Industry. The mornings were dedicated to working group meetings, the afternoons to lectures, but the organisers also wrote, “don’t worry, there will also be time for the sun.”

The main topic of the Summer University of 1985 in Ojén (near Marbella, Spain) was the Spanish EC-accession. It was attended by more than 100 students of 13 countries. Lectures were held on the situation of the German universities, the relations of culture and politics, and the impact of the European integration on Spanish politics. Speak-
ers came from the Hanns Seidel Foundation and both the Liberal party and Allianza Popular. Among the more prominent speakers was exiled Soviet human rights activist Edward Lozansky. Parts of the debates were dedicated to the distinctions between free and social market economy. Excursions were organised to Marbella, Granada and Malaga, and included an audio-visual presentation of the region of Andalucia and a genuine Spanish open-air fiesta.494

The Summer University of 1986 was held for the first time in Cyprus. The topic was “For a united Europe, Cyprus without a separation line”. The Cyprus-conflict was at the centre of all lectures and debates. A highlight was the meeting with the Chairman of the Renewalistic Rally, Glafcos Clerides, who spoke about his ideas towards a solution of the Cyprus conflict. For the first time, the Annual Meeting took place simultaneously with the Summer University.495

The Summer University of 1987 took place in Israel: “The agenda included the visit of historical and biblical sites as well as the military, social and political situation.” Excursions went to Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, Masada, Lake Genezareth, and border check points. About 120 delegates attended. The main topic was the Middle-East conflict and a possible international peace conference. Prominent speakers were Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, President of the Parliament Shlomo Hillel, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, Minister Moshe Arens, Minister Sharir, and UN-Ambassador Benjamin Netanyahu (later Prime Minister).

494 Más de ciento cincuenta jóvenes participan en la Universidad de los Estudiantes Demócratas, ABC, Aug. 1, 1985, p. 29.
Netanyahu pointed at the support for international terrorism by countries such as Libya, Syria and Saudi-Arabia, and considered the fight against terrorism as “defence of democratic achievements by military means”. Foreign Affairs Minister Shimon Peres took the time to discuss with the student participants. Another important topic was the immigration of Jews from the USSR. Visits were paid to the Yad Vashem Memorial, Jerusalem’s old town, Tel Aviv, Bethlehem, and the Theodor Herzl Memorial.\textsuperscript{496}

The Summer University of 1988 took place in Bonn and Berlin (Germany). Among the speakers were various cabinet ministers and MPs. The event included a visit to the Chancellor’s office and a boat trip on the river Rhine. A trip to Berlin, including the Eastern part of Berlin, was certainly one of the most inspiring parts of the programme.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{summer_university_1989.jpg}
\caption{Summer University of 1989, Konstantinos Mitsotakis, Bettina Machaczek, Stavros Papastavrou}
\end{figure}

The Summer University of 1989 was held in Athens and again in Porto Heli (Peloponnes, Greece). The highlight was a meeting with party leader Konstantinos Mitsotakis. Among the speakers was a Chinese student reporting the massacre at the Tiananmen-Square in Peking of May 1989. The meeting also included excursions to historic sights and boat trips.\textsuperscript{497}

The Summer University of 1990 (Vienna, Prague) was attended by 109 students from 18 organisations.\textsuperscript{498} For the first time, participants from
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Romania, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Estonia were present. The official topic was “Austria and the EC”, but the real topic was of course the start of a transformation of the former Communist countries. Among the speakers in Prague was former dissident Jan Urban, who spoke about the “velvet revolution”. Hence, for the motto and the overwhelming feeling of the participants the German word “grenzenlos” (without limits and borders) was applied, describing a wave of enthusiasm never seen before and after in Europe.

Seminars

The organisation of seminars always remained the main part of the activities in the eighties and covered a lot of the time and the energy of the Executive Bureau members. Until 1985, even the Annual Meeting every August was organised together with a seminar and not with the annual Summer University. A good example was the Annual Meeting of 1982 in Iceland which
was connected with a seminar on media politics. EDS also continued to hold annual training seminars at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg (1981-1984, 1987), e.g. a colloquy on “Interparty relations” (July 1982, see: chapter on party relations). Until at least 1987, EDS could apply for meetings with a great variety of topics. Since then, the EYC started to accept EDS-applications only under certain conditions and according to the political priorities of the Council of Europe.

Topics of seminars in 1980/81 were “Political Patterns for the eighties”, “European Foreign Policy”, “Higher Education” and the “European North-South Dialogue.” The seminar “The Individual and the Society” took place 25-30 January 1981 in Porvoo (Finland). Speakers came from the Coalition Party and Tuhatkunta. Lectures covered the Finnish constitution, Finnish foreign policy, student finances, the Humboldtian idea of the university, the results of the East-West youth dialogue, and different philosophical views on individualism.

All speakers referred to the issue of individualism in modern mass democracies. The “university ideology” of the German politician Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), which assumed the unity of teaching, learning and culture, was presented as well. “A Humboldtian man does not belong to the ‘leisure class’, but he is a man of culture, who can see beyond the limits of everyday knowledge, and thus adapt himself to new situations better than a highly specialised technocrat can do.” This statement of Eero Waronen points at the objective of the conference, to find a concept of individualism beyond any “Marxist” or “technocrat” vision.

A seminar on “Totalitarianism” in Strasbourg in March 1983 included “lectures and discussions on totalitarianism as a political idea and in the reality. There will be studies of existing totalitarian states as well as a thorough discussion on totalitarianism versus the open society” as Cecilia Stegö, Executive Director announced in the official invitation. Speakers came from the resistance movements of Poland (Slawomir Czarlewski, since 2007 amba-

---

500 Report of the EDS Seminar about Individual and Society in Porvoo, Finland, January 1981, PAT.
ssador to Belgium), Afghanistan (Parwin Ali) and Cambodia (Dr. Han Chen), from the Council of Europe, the UN, and several NGOs. 22 participants from 12 countries participated. Additionally, European institutions and the university were paid a visit. 501

Topics of 1983/84 were “East West Relations”, “Youth and Academic Unemployment” and Higher Education. The seminar on “Youth and Academic Unemployment” took place in Lund (Sweden) in March 1984. The programme included speakers such as Carl Bildt MP, Prof. Ingmar Stahl, and Georg Ehrnrooth MP. A trip to Copenhagen was foreseen as well. The approximately 35 participants came from 14 countries. 502

Many seminars were sponsored by the European Youth Foundation. Between 1981 and 1990, EDS received more than 1 million French Francs for seminars. 503 Only in 1986, EDS-applications were not accepted, since the Executive Bureau had shown to be unable to properly administrate the grants.

A few examples show the evolution of meetings in the decade. The 1987-Strasbourg meeting on academic unemployment was attended by 34 participants from 16 organisations. “The problems discussed do not have any easy, ready-made solutions, but nevertheless important for EDS to discuss topics like these with their obvious significance for students all over Europe.” 504

Speakers were Gunnar Lindahl (Norway) and Stephan Eisel (Germany). Whereas Lindahl presented libertarian views, Eisel informed of latest developments in German politics. The seminar indicated as well that EDS had overcome its internal crisis, since all factions were equally represented.

Another seminar in autumn 1987 was interesting for another reason: Its venue was the town of Hitzacker (Germany), with the East German border towers in sight and with “Open Borders” as a topic. The participants drafted “Statement on Open Borders” which was to be adopted in April 1988 in Estoril (Portugal), strongly supporting European integration: “European Democrat Students believes that the development of a world of free and democratic societies is linked to the gradual and eventual disappearance of borders.” 505 The seminar included excursions to prehistoric places as well as a lecture by Nigel Ashford, political scientist and former Secretary General of EDS. Some member organisations such as FMSF had prepared extensive papers for the debates.


501 Conference materials, PAC.
502 FMSF (ed.), Information to the Seminar, PAC; Minutes, Council, 24-03-84, participants’ list.
503 EYF-balance sheet, EYF-A.
504 Report, EDS study session on academic unemployment, 26-31-03-87 , p. 1, PAT; Annual Reports 1988/89, 89/90.
found it valuable to discuss our own three political tendencies [...] in order to strengthen our political force by knowing each other better. In one way or another, every EDS generation should go through our own basic ideas.” The event was part of the efforts to reconcile the different wings. Chairman Bettina Machaczek was of the opinion, that “it was proven again that our common roots and convictions serve as a solid basis for our multi-tendency organisation.”

The key term of the event was Freedom, which “is the starting point of every thought about how a society should function. Freedom is the highest value; from freedom only as far as one does not harm the legitimate freedom of somebody else. This means that – as man is not born infallible – freedom needs protection by law which is executed by the state.”

Parts of the debate were dedicated “to the socialist understanding of freedom, which we oppose.” True Liberals on the other hand “tend to ask whether there should be any morality when it comes to the definition of the state. Libertarians leave this question to the individual only. On the other hand Christian Democrats and Conservatives from Scandinavia put high ethical demands on the way a state should function. There is a clear understanding among all tendencies that – however you call it – the community has the task to care for the real needy people of a society.” Market economy was considered to be the “sole mean” to achieve the best common good.

Equality was defined as equality of chances not of results: “the discussion revealed that the participants are a subject to their own countries political and cultural heritage a well as to the present political situation. Being governed by a quite excessive state as in Sweden can lead you to another judgement of the state than somebody who comes from [...] Germany, e.g. where the state is strong in some areas, but still it gives you a broad space of freedom and individual responsibility.” 506

Besides the seminars, the organisation continued to have study trips. Between 1980 and 1986, smaller delegations frequently travelled to the US, on the invitation of the US Youth Council. The tradition to organise Winter Universities ended after 1983, for financial reasons and due to a lack of interest (1988). 507

EDS also continued to organise events in co-operation with NATO. In January 1982 such a seminar on “Defence and Freedom” critically dealt with topics such as pacifism (“it was asked how dangerous pacifism is for the defence of Western Europe”), women in military forces, NATO-related

506 Bettina Machaczek, EDS Ideology Seminar, in: the EDS Letter III/III, pp. 7-9, PAM.
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research, or disinformation in Western media.\textsuperscript{508} A similar seminar in 1988 obviously did not fulfil the expectations – which was most certainly not the fault of the NATO. But again, a NATO-seminar was held in September 1990 (22 participants, 13 organisations).

After EDS had recovered, it once again welcomed high ranking speakers such as Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir (Summer University 1987), Danish Prime Minister Poul Schlüter (February 1988), and the Portuguese Minister and Leader of the Centre-Democrats, Diogo Freitas do Amaral (April 1988). A seminar in Paris in May 1989 included a reception in the French Senate.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{bureau1988.jpg}
\caption{The Bureau of 1988/89 with Chairman Bettina Machaczek}
\end{figure}

**Public Relations**

Also in the eighties, the organisation could gain some media-attention through its campaigns and publications. Its withdrawal from the “World Forum of Youth and Students for Peace, Detente and Disarmament” in early 1981 inspired the British newspaper “The Times” to define EDS as “One of Europe’s most influential student organisations.”\textsuperscript{509} The largest campaign, the Malta campaign, continued after 1980, since the Marxist government of Dom Mintoff was still considered dangerous for Malta’s democratic constitution.

\textsuperscript{508} Fredrik Carlsen, Rapport fra EDS-Seminar om Fred of Forsvar av Frihet (in Norwegian), 1982, PAT.
This government even developed sympathy with Libya’s Gadhafi and with
the USSR. Thus the Annual Report of 1980/81 was suggesting once more a
“Democrat Solidarity Campaign” with an emphasis on Malta, also supposed
to help the Maltese Christian Democrats in the elections.

It included a report, a poster “Democrats support Democrats”, a motion
to be sent to the Maltese government by the member organisations\textsuperscript{510} and
a seminar on Malta. This conference ("North-South Dialogue in Europe", 10-14 August, 1981), turned out to be a protest gathering against the politics
of the Labour Party of Malta. However the campaign ended immediately
after August 1981, when major conflicts at the Annual Meeting in Malta had
emerged and some member organisations including Maltese SDM froze or
even suspended their memberships.\textsuperscript{511}

A second topic for campaigns, often suggested by the Austrian member
organisation, was Higher Education. Since the Austrians usually hosted the
Winter Universities, at least one debate there was dedicated to this matter. In
the beginning, the enthusiasm did not seem to be high: “With the exception
of the conference in Bad Gastein [Austria] in February [1981] it has still been
difficult to involve the members in the concretisation of the work. It is obvi-
ous that further progress will require substantial research to an extent which
means that both EDS and member organisations must allocate resources for
this in particular.” But eventually, EDS managed to have a permanent debate
throughout the years.\textsuperscript{512}

\textsuperscript{510} Annual Report 1980/81, p. 7, ACDP IX-003-3.
\textsuperscript{511} RCDS (submitter), declaration, 13-08-81, ACDP IX-003-3.
\textsuperscript{512} Annual Report 1980/81, pp. 10-11, ACDP IX-003-3.
A third campaign concerned European issues. From 9 May to 7 July, 1982, EDS organised a minibus tour through Western Europe. The topic was “Peace and Defence of Freedom”. About 100 universities in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium and France were visited. “The aim of the tour was to spread the idea that peace, freedom, and human rights cannot exist in isolation but dependent upon each other.”

A second minibus tour was organised in 1984 (1 May – 16 June). This campaign was a Go-Vote-campaign for the European Elections of 1984. 6000 leaflets in English, German and French were printed and distributed. A new campaign for the election to the European Parliament was suggested by Johannes Laitenberger from RCDS at the Annual Meeting of 1988. The campaign was to include a “European Parliament Election Statement”, a poster for distribution all over Europe, and autonomous events to be organised by the member organisations. The content of the campaign should be based on the EDS-Manifesto, the EDS-Charter and the Open-Borders-Statement. Since there was a strong emphasis on the member states of the European Community, it turned out that not everyone in EDS could get involved in this campaign. Only six of the 13 organisations present came from EC-member states.

Another large campaign was dedicated to the liberation of a Soviet dissident: “The name Ida Nudel was a household word about 15 years ago when she won a long, hard battle to emigrate after years of imprisonment and exile as a human-rights activist in the former Soviet Union.” As a resistance activist she had been deported to Siberia and had later on applied for immigration to Israel. 28 January, 1987 was agreed to be the campaign day for all member organisations. Several protests were organised by the Belgian, Cypriot, German, Swedish, and Greek member organisations. RCDS held
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various protests in front of the premises of the Soviet airline company Aeroflot. FMSF protested in front of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm. EDS-Vice Chairman Gil Samsonov personally got in personal contact with Ida Nudel and her family. Newspaper articles could be placed in various European newspapers. In May 1987, the campaign had reached the European Parliament, where the film “Mosca addio” (“Farewell Moscow”), loosely based on Ida Nudel’s life, was presented by the Swedish actress Liv Ullman. The film was made as part of a concerted effort to help obtain Nudel’s release.

In 1989, after Václav Havel was sentenced to nine month imprisonment for “disturbing public order”, Chairman Bettina Machaczek wrote an open letter to the Prague-based Chairman of the communist IUS, Josef Skala: “Me and my organisation is wondering how this fits into the line with the new openness IUS and WFDY launch when we meet on the occasion of the All European Youth and Student Co-operation. [...] Josef, I do not only urge you to help with your position to get Vaclav Havel rehabilitated, but also I would be thankful to hear your comments on my letter soon, please.”

Since that was already the time of perestrojka, Skala felt committed to reply to this letter. According to him, Havel and his supporters were not arrested for their political views but (among other) since he had called radio-listeners “to commit acts, disregard and not respect decisions made by the state body”. With this, he “committed a criminal offence”. This response was widely published by EDS and presented the true quality of communist logic.

The second pillar of the PR-work was the publications. In 1980/81, the Bureau decided on a new effort to increase their number, since at the time only older reports on Committee meetings of the European Youth Forum (by Carmel Caccopardo, Malta), conference reports of the Framework for All-European Youth and Student co-operation, on the World Forum of Youth and Students on Peace, Détente and Disarmament in Budapest (Lars Eskeland, Norway) and reports of several visits were available.

In 1981, reports on “Malta – democracy in danger” and “Cyprus – a divided island” were published. As a result of a seminar, a booklet on “Peace and the Defence of Freedom” was published in 1983. A report of 1987 was dedicated to academic unemployment, a result of a seminar at the European Youth Centre. In 1988/89, two other seminar reports were produced (Strasbourg, Athens).

The most advanced publication of the eighties was the Taurus-magazine. In 1980, the new Chief Editor Stephan Eisel and his editorial board (since issue 2/1980) defined new objectives for the magazine: “Taurus should be aimed at increasing the intellectual debate within the non-socialist circles in Europe.”

In 1981, two issues and an extra-issue for the 5th Summer University were published. In 1982 and 1983, EDS managed to publish the magazine four times. Topics of 1981 were “Spotlight on democracy”, “Spotlight on the West”, and Higher Education. In 1982, “spotlights” were “Europe and the Middle-East”, North-South Dialogue, and Inter-Party relations. The same year, the Annual Meeting decided a new editorial structure of the magazine and
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agreed on a higher degree of independence of the editorial board. In 1983, “spotlights” were thrown on Latin America, mass media, African democracy and transatlantic relations. In 1982 and 1983, each issue was printed in 2500 copies, of which about 2000 were sold (EDS: 500, member organisations: ca. 1500, other organisations: ca. 40-150, individuals: 46 (1983)). The number of individual subscribers was permanently increasing.

Due to the restless efforts of Chief Editor Stephan Eisel, authors came from all continents, although mainly from Europe (ca. 80 percent), particularly from Germany (24 percent) and the UK (20 percent). In order to better balance the origin of articles, the EDS-Bureau asked all organisations to nominate correspondents.\footnote{Stephan Eisel, Memorandum to the EDS-Council, 15-06-83, PAC.}

In March 1984, after only one issue was published, it was decided to modify the conception of the magazine, since “many organisations have reduced or even stopped subscribing to Taurus”. The reason was that “they do not like it the way it is.” Most certainly, the Taurus had become too intellectual. Soon after, Stephan Eisel resigned as Chief Editor since the “concept a majority voted for is not a concept I can agree upon.”\footnote{Bureau, Minutes, 02-06-84, p. 2, PAC; Knut Olav Nesse to Stephan Eisel, 08-03-84; Stephan Eisel to EDS, 30-05-84, ACDP IX-003-063.} After that, EDS did not publish the magazine any more. Several attempts to revive the magazine failed, the last time in 1988.\footnote{Cf. Annual Report 1988/89.}

Since Taurus was the god Zeus in the shape of a bull, the news section of the magazine was called Bulls-eye (since issue 3/1982), which later became the quarterly magazine of EDS.

For internal purposes, the organisation continued to print its newsletter “Main Mail”. The editor of this publication usually was the Executive Director. Until 1984, approximately 10 issues were published annually, each consisting
of two to three pages. At the end of the eighties, “Main Mail” was replaced by “The EDS letter” (five issues 1986/87, five issues in 1987/88, four issues in 1988/89), written by Executive Secretary Knut Albert Solem.

A special category of publications were the posters and the leaflets, dedicated to support EDS-campaigns. For the same purpose, T-shirts were produced. On the occasion of the 25th anniversary, a new leaflet to present the organisation was prepared. The leaflet itself mentioned reports on topics and conferences as primary publications of the organisation. In 1988/89, a new general leaflet on EDS and another one about the upcoming European elections were printed.

Basic Papers in the Eighties

Visions: The Case of Europe

In 1981, the visions of EDS for Europe’s future were resting on two programmatic pillars: the Manifesto (1976), and the Programme for the European Parliamentary Elections (1978). The first to “subsequently revised in 1981” was the Manifesto.\(^{525}\) The election programme debate opened in
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February 1983, when Christoph Eberl (RCDS) and Johann Friedrich Colsman (EDS-Vice chairman) submitted an extensive proposal to the Council meeting in Edinburgh. The central point of reference of the motion was the ongoing debate between monetarists and social market supporters, “reduced to the following six principles:

1. [...] freedom of the individual;
2. the principle of social balance (material wealth for all);
3. anti-cyclical policy;
4. policy of growth;
5. structural policy;
6. the principle of market conformity for all measures of economic policy;”

According to this paper, market economy had its roots in “neo-liberalism” and “christian social theory”. Whereas the Keynesian idea of anti-cyclical action was supported, at least the “establishing of certain economic or stability limits (as in the Federal Stability Act of 1967) contradicts the principles of a social market economy, as well as any form of overall state control.” The mutual dependence (“balance”) of individual freedom and social balance was underlined. The aim was an alternative to both “laisse-faire-liberalism” and “state planned economy”.

The “basic co-ordination principle” of this type of economic order was however “competition, understanding that competition can appear in various patterns and knowing that social responsibilities are better met in a free enterprise system”. But “Competition rather requires a clear-cut framework to remain in working order as an organisational tie of the industrial society.” State intervention was acceptable if it was “coherent” instead of “incidental and incoherent”.

The social dimension of social market economy was defined as “not just a supplement to soothe the conscience towards the underprivileged” but a “strategic idea of solution finding within a collision of goals.” Social market economy therefore “wants to solve the conflicts that occur in each society, in a peaceful and productive way.” The social dimension “is based on the Christian ethic, which calls for society to support somebody who is not able to earn his own living without his own fault [...] and thus enable him to participate in the growing wealth.” A “state income policy” was preferrable to simple redistribution because such measures would “ensure the social purpose without interfering in the market mechanics.”

Since the European Community was understood as a project of economic co-operation, this motion had some influence on the “Programme for the

526 Motion to the EDS-Council on its meeting in Edinburgh (1983), PAT.

European Elections 1984” of EDS, drafted by both Chairman Knut Nesse and Stephan Eisel, to be discussed at the same meeting in Edinburgh in February 1983, and supposed to be adopted in August 1983.527 Whereas the RCDS-motion merely thought of the society as a whole, the new paper emphasised the role of the individual.528 “We recognise the great benefits derived from the inevitable conflicts of ideas and interests between different groups and individuals in society; and we regard it as the task of the institutions of the society to take advantage of its diversity and to regulate these conflicts in a peaceful and non-violent way.”

Other principles of the programme were parliamentary democracy and “social oriented market economy characterised by a high degree of personal freedom and opportunity although we accept that government intervention may be necessary on certain occasions.”

In the chapter on “community structure” EDS supported a stronger European Parliament, and the right for the Commission to “claim its right of political initiative”. The EC-institutions should develop to a system similar to that on the national level. For the Council of Ministers the paper asked for the introduction of majority voting. This institution should develop in the direction of a European Senate, but selected by the national parliaments.

The European Community as such was supposed to enlarge to the Mediterranean without delay. Many of these positions were more or less those of the programme of 1978. A longer and more innovative part dealt with the role of the individual: “We strongly support the European Convention on Human Rights but we believe that something further is required in the context of the European Community. We thus recommend to adoption of a Charter of Individual Rights by the European Parliament, by which the citizen would have a right of access to the European Court of Justice.”

The influence of the RCDS-paper on the European Programme is evident in those parts (4 of 12 pages) devoted to economic policies: “The main objec-

527 Report to the EDS Council, 12-01-83, p. 2, PAT.
528 EDS (ed.), Programme for the European Elections 1984, PAT; Stephan Eisel, Rundbrief Nr. 12, 17-02-83, p. 2, PAM.
tive of our economy today is to ensure steady and balanced growth, with due accent on the quality of life and not merely on quantitative figures. This can be done by extending and safeguarding the free market for the benefit of the individual. Economic growth is necessary in order to meet widespread and justified demands for a better standard of living and social security [...] We are strongly committed to improving the standard of living of the poorest people in the world.”

The support for the “social market economy” was explained with its ability to solve “great economic problems of an international character such as inflation, stagnation and unemployment”. Another idea was the concept of a balance between the “dynamism of private initiative and responsible management of the economy”. To some extent, the “social market economy” of this programme even resembled the free markets of Austrian economics. In doing so, the EDS could achieve the homogeneity so vital for its work.

Other paragraphs referred to a possible monetary union among European countries. However, such a union was considered to be “doomed to failure” in case national monetary policies would remain. Therefore, EDS supported the Werner Report, “which states that monetary union needs to be accompanied by the Community right to create money; the money supply should be controlled as well as the size and composition of the Debt by the European Central Bank.” Other economic aims were the abolition of all trade barriers, subventions and high taxes, the creation of antitrust legislation, the support for small and medium sized enterprises and the need for a free market approach for the Common Agricultural Politics.

Furthermore, common defence structures of the European Communities were demanded, the so called second European pillar of the NATO. A second but not a secondary aim was the stabilisation of the relations to the communist East on the basis of the CSCE-act, including closer economic relations. The paper also supported development aid for the Third World, but “along Western liberal democratic lines.”

For the European elections in 1989, no programme was adopted. The key European policy paper of the preceding years was the “EDS-Statement on Open Borders”. It had been prepared between the Annual Meeting of 1987 and a seminar in Hitzacker (Germany) in November 1987, a few kilometres away from the inner-German border, and was adopted in Estoril (Portugal) in April 1988. Its preparations included an extensive “report on liberty” by FMSF. Both the seminar and the paper were supposed to be part of an “Open Border Campaign”. The overall objective was the removal of any political border as

529 EDS (ed.), Programme for the European Elections 1984, pp. 6, 12, PAT.
limitations to individual freedom. The “development of a world of free and
democratic societies is linked to the gradual and eventual disappearance of
borders. National boundaries and prejudice prevents the free flow of goods,
capital, ideas and people.”

The advent of the European Economic Area was reflected in this paper
as well, when it emphasised the support of EDS for any progress of free trade
instead of protectionism. The resolution wanted to go even further than GATT:
“There should be no restriction on the exchange of capital or financial servic-
es between countries.” The European Union was considered to be a “valuable
vehicle for the achievement of permanent open borders in Europe. However
the EC should not become an extra level of government. The Community must
remove barriers completely, not replace them or establish new ones.”

The removal of political borders was linked to the decrease of the limits
for student mobility. In its conclusion, the programme “provides practical
expression to the desire to see a Europe without frontiers as a first step, a
catalyst, towards a world without frontiers. The key is to allow natural and
spontaneous desire to exchange goods, services and information to build un-
derstanding between nations and respect of the fundamental rights of life,
liberty and property towards peace and prosperity, no war and fewer taxes.”

Again, at the Annual Meeting of 1988 in Berlin, European affairs were
at the centre of the debate. A resolution considered the division of Cyprus
as a major obstacle for the European unity. A similar motion was adopted
in January 1990. Another motion referred to a statement of Prime Minister
Margaret Thatcher to the situation in the divided Germany: “We don’t need
walls to keep our people in!” In this resolution, EDS stated that Yalta “has to
be overcome” and that the “division of Germany and the division of Europe
will not last forever.”

A third motion demanded “Open borders for European students”, in
which the mutual recognition of diplomas by European states in 1988 was
considered to be “a first step for a new European Education Policy”. The next
steps were to be the extension of the Mobility Programmes and the support for
the better co-operation of universities. In a last motion, the organisation pro-
tested against the conversion of 8000 Romanian villages into “agroindustrial
centres”.

The case of Europe was never exclusively a Christian Democratic case.
In an open letter to all EDS-members in 1988, the Swedish FMSF asked their
“fellow student politicians in EDS to pursue their politicians at home, to

encourage Swedish politicians to take steps towards Europe.” The aim was “to tell other students, student politicians and authorities that Swedish students wish to participate in the building of the new Europe” since “a new, open and liberal society [is] growing in the European Community”, based on common values and tradition. Programmes of the European Communities for student mobility were also supported: “Unfortunately, Swedish students are unable to participate.” Swedish politics was criticised for being too reluctant towards the European integration, since for them a “united Europe” was “a threat to their power over Swedish citizens”.

In 1990, the historic events at the end of the third EDS-decade resulted in a resolution on the “Baltic situation”, violent attacks of the Soviets against the independence movements of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia: “The attacks on peaceful civilians in Vilnius and Riga have clearly been ordered by Soviet Officials in Moscow and responsible for them is the winner of the Nobel Price for Peace, Michail Gorbachev.” The Council clearly stated that the Baltic states are to be regarded as free and independent nations, that violence has to be condemned, and that the Soviet Union has to be encouraged to start negotiations with the objective of independence for these countries.

Politics: Higher Education

The Charter on Higher Education of 1978 remained the basic programme for higher education for that time being. Only in April 1984, few amendments were adopted in Strasbourg. But EDS had all reasons to continuously discuss higher education topics: Since 1970, the industrialised countries of the

---

534 Even though there are still some uncertainties, the text of Taurus Jubilee Edition 1992, p. 40, presented as the Charter of 1984, is identical to the Charter of 1978, which was published in Taurus 3/1982, pp. 16-20.
West were confronted with dramatic challenges arising from the sharply increasing numbers of students and the fast development of sciences. Additionally, the European integration started to influence higher education. Almost unnoticed by EDS, twelve European governments signed the Joint European Act in 1986, and on this ground, the European Commission started the ERASMUS-programme. For the first time in the history of the European integration, an EC-institution implemented policies for the development of higher education co-operation, student mobility, and the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) for the mutual recognition of grades and degrees. Soon, the programmes were extended to participants from the EFTA-countries.

Thus, EDS dedicated at least one meeting every year to higher education. It can be said, that the higher education seminars of the decade were the events where EDS built a lot of its expertise in higher education matters through exchange of information. On these occasions, the organisation had to achieve a common platform acceptable for all members, and the challenges of a changing higher education landscape in Europe and of the ongoing European integration.

A first occasion in the eighties to discuss these matters was a seminar (“Individual and Society”) in Finland in January 1981, where Eero Waronen held a detailed lecture on the “Humboldtian Idea of University and University Reforms” with a special reference to the Finnish situation. A Working Group on “Quality of Higher Education” discussed the differences between education and vocational training. According to this, education “includes progress of democracy, science and society, training of social behaviour and self realization”. Both education and skills would constitute the academic career of the individual. “It should be clear that the free system” – not the planned system of Higher Education – “is the only system that will give a qualitative better higher education”.

Another Working Group on the Internationalisation of Higher Education analysed the reasons for more student mobility (freedom of study and science, professional specialisation, internationalisation, European integration), and then identified the difficulties for studies abroad (recognition of degrees, social aspects, lack of information). A third Working Group dealt with ideological questions. The freedom of choice and the freedom of the universities from political influence were particularly emphasised. In the debate, controversies about the extent of student participation in student councils emerged.535

The EDS “Programme for the European Elections” of 1984 also discussed university policies, repeating many objectives of previous papers: “We believe

535 Conference reports, copy by ACDP in the EDS-archive.
that education policy has been badly neglected as the European Community has grown; this must be swiftly put right if both a European identity and a graduate pool to match the rest of the world is ever to be created.” Basically, access to education should be independent of “sex, means, local environment or social background”. European educational policy should only support and stimulate regional policies.

The idea of a Europe-wide educational broadcasting was now defined as an “Open University with courses based upon broadcasted lectures and lecture notes by correspondence”. In order to finance student mobility, a “Community agreement to help fund individual students” was to be set up. The mutual “recognition of equivalent national education standards and qualifications” was regarded an “urgent necessity”, which could be “achieved by adopting a Community system for registration and classification of examination and assessments.”

Furthermore, the extension of future mobility schemes for non-EEC members was demanded: “The removal of educational barriers within the Community will also facilitate the participation of non-Community countries in this co-operation.”

In April 1984, the organisation held a higher education seminar at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg. After an introduction to the higher education policy of the Council of Europe, each participant had to present state of higher education in his own country. Working groups covered topics such as internationalisation of finance schemes, internationalisation of academic degrees, and promotion of student exchange. Lectures were held on issues such as “Financing Higher Education in a Free Society” and “Educated for Employment?”

Special attention was given to the theories of the philosopher Sir Karl Popper on “The open society and its enemies - a free university in a free society”. Small discussion groups continued the topics of the lectures and working groups (finances, universities and labour market). Finally, workshops to amend the Charter on Higher Education took place. The topics of these workshops were “Internationalisation of Higher Education”, “Finance Schemes for Students” and “Academic Freedom”.

Again in March 1987, a seminar on “Academic Unemployment” in Strasbourg was devoted to higher education. Lectures were held on the role of the individual, the university and the state. In a conference report it was stated, it was “a matter of great importance that the universities provide their students with a sound base for future learning and self development.”
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ganisational autonomy of the universities ought to be increased. Working Groups discussed the various national university systems, and the roles of governments and the private sector in reducing academic unemployment.  

After 1984, the Charter on Higher Education was not amended anymore, which was regretted by outgoing Chairman Bettina Machaczek in 1989.

In January 1990, a motion submitted by FMSF was adopted, stating that “compulsory membership of student unions is a flagrant infringement on basic human rights, and should be abolished”. The motion was a response to left-wing extremism in student unions, and justified with the lack of support by a majority of students, the improved economic situation in comparison with the time of the establishment of student unions, the Communist dominance these unions, and the high costs. According to the paper, such a compulsory membership also violated the freedom of choice.

External Relations

Party Relations: Weaving the Net

Although the EDU had come into existence, “inter-party relations” remained a major topic in the eighties. In 1981, EDS welcomed EDU-President Alois Mock as guest speaker at the Winter University. In July 1982, a seminar on Inter-Party relations was held in Strasbourg with 56 participants from 19 countries. Speakers were among others Kai-Uwe von Hassel, former EUCD-President (who had supported international centre right student co-operation already in 1956), former Chairmen Tom Spencer MEP and Scott Hamilton, Hans-Gert Pöttering MEP (later President of the European
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Parliament), the liberal Dutch MEP Hans Nord, the leader of the European Democrat group James Scott-Hopkins MEP (UK), Marlene Lenz MEP (Germany), former Secretary General and political scientist Nigel Ashford, Florus Wijsenbeek, ELD-Secretary General, Ottavio Lavaggi, President of IFLRY, Reinhard Stuth, EUJCD, and Alexander Demblin, DEMYC.

In his introductory statement, Nigel Ashford, pointed at the division of the centre-right parties, which “mainly falls into one of the three categories: ‘Christian-democratic’, ‘Liberal’ or ‘Conservative’. It is very important to recognise, how very much these three lines of political thinking have in common, and that the differences are mainly, due to historical reasons based on different national traditions. There is a base of common values and common beliefs which are far more important than the differences, but this is not recognised by the senior politicians.” After a brief report on the historic development of EDS and the EDU he continued that the “inspiration of the EDU owed much to the inspiration and work of the EDS including its name. The co-operation among the centre-right had its first remarkable result, when a French Liberal, Simone Veil, was elected President of the European Parliament.” Ashford also mentioned the ways in which the EDS had influenced the centre-right co-operation in Europe:

“(1)EDS provided the concept, the very idea of centre-right co-operation in order to balance the well organised left,
(2) EDS offered a name – European Democrat – which has now spread, and which eventually was taken by the EDU,
(3) EDS set an example in showing the possibility of gathering together in one organisation Conservatives, Liberals and Christian Democrats from all over Europe in meaningful co-operation."\textsuperscript{541}

This presentation was followed by a lecture by German history professor Rudolf Hrbek on the development of the three political streams. Secretary General Florus Wijsenbeek of the ELD-group in the European Parliament informed the participants about the history and the structure of the Liberal movement on the European and international levels. The Christian-democratic movement was introduced by Marlene Lenz MEP. The EDU was presented by Scott Hamilton, now head of the international department of the British Conservative Party. As most important he described “counteracting the work of the Socialist International supporting Marxism.” The co-operation of national parties in the EDU would work towards increasing a common understanding and support the formation of inter-party coalitions in the European Parliament.\textsuperscript{542}

A panel discussion brought the three streams together.\textsuperscript{543} The starting point of the discussion was the election of a Socialist President of the European Parliament with the help of Liberals and Conservatives (20 out of 60). Hans-Gert Pöttering also mentioned the election of Simone Veil in 1979 to the President of the European Parliament. For him, the failure of the same coalition in 1982 was the “greatest disappointment in my work in the European Parliament.” In conclusion, Pöttering supported the idea of a closer co-operation between all three streams, “at least as far as the Christian Democrats and the Conservatives are concerned”.

More sceptical towards closer co-operation was the Liberal Dutch MEP Hans Nord. He outlined the importance of co-operation with all democratic forces, since “it is part of our philosophy”, and that “historically Liberalism belongs to the left.” He even called his group an “a la carte” alliance, “meaning that you can pick what you choose” and referred to the good success of Social-Liberal coalitions in the Netherlands and Germany. “I think it will remain like that: anything like a permanent or official alliance between our three groups is not very likely.”\textsuperscript{544}

Tom Spencer MEP responded by explaining the British position: A certain number of votes of the European Democratic Group formed an alliance with “the Socialists (except the French) and with the Italian Communists”.

\textsuperscript{541} Council of Europe/ Leif Villars-Dahl (ed.): Colloquy held in co-operation with European Democrat Students, Theme: Interparty relations, 07-04-83, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{542} Council of Europe (1983), cf. fn. 109, pp. 5-8.
\textsuperscript{543} Taurus 4/1982, pp. 12-16.
\textsuperscript{544} Council of Europe (1983), cf. fn. 109, p. 9.
since they were closer to the interest of the British government to pay less to the EEC, than the continental centre-right parties. The Socialist who became president of the European Parliament was “extremely able”, had a good reputation and “was interested in budget reforms.” Another reason not to join the EPP-group was that the British Conservative group with sixty MEP’s is “far too large” and “far too British”: “We do not have in our political bloodstream the ability to work in a multinational Parliament.” Spencer also criticised the procedures: the EPP-candidate had been chosen without any consultation of the other groups. “We would have been prepared to vote for a Christian Democrat candidate but we would have liked to have a say in the choice of a candidate. [...] If the Christian Democrats were not prepared to take us into consideration, at the end of the day we always have the option to vote, if we have to, for a Socialist.”

All three speakers agreed that coalitions in the European Parliament are much more dependent of national interests than of philosophical differences.

Knut O. Nesse, EDS-Chairman, elaborated on the expectations of EDS after the establishment of the EDU: In order to achieve a “further deepening of co-operation between Christian democrats, Conservatives and Liberals, it is necessary to investigate the factors that make them distinct from each other. First, and probably more important than one would think, are the labels: names that the different national groups give themselves to characterise their ideas. In some countries, especially the Benelux-countries, Italy and France, the term ‘conservative’ has a very bad connotation. It means plainly reactionary and anything that can be associated with the worst of tradition and old way of thinking. Liberal on the contrary, stresses freedom and development of free individuals and institutions in an open and secular state. This is very similar to modern conservatives. The only difference is the liberal idea of a secular state. Here Conservatives would stress the Christian values and defend a more value-oriented state. Christian-democrats would stress the Christian values even stronger and in a way that cannot generally be accepted by the Liberals.”

Chairman Knut Olav Nesse

Nesse also stated that EDS had proven its ability to cope with these differences. “First of all we have paid much attention to discussion, and much development of common ideas has come from that. Secondly there has been a great degree of tolerance. We have had fruitful co-operation within EDS even among organisations representing tendencies that would be competitors on the national level.” The “most important advantage” was seen in the “strong common base” where “we have put down most of our work”, primarily a united Europe, democrat solidarity, and human rights. He concluded that “there is often a fundamental lack of will for further inter-party co-operation. [...] Usually the other tendencies were accused of causing the blockage. There is obviously a lack of idealism within our mother parties. The traditional partners tend to stick together even when political realities demand a co-operation across traditional boundaries. EDS is moving the political frontier and we will continue to encourage the rest of the centre-right movement in Europe to follow.”

Finally, Nigel Ashford resumed that “Senior politicians have picked up some of our ideas, but they are always under the pressure of short term considerations. Some people must be concerned with the long term aim of a European Democrat Party. Who better than the non-socialist students of Europe?”

During the eighties, the EDU remained the most preferred partner of EDS, since it came closest to its ideal of a united centre-right. From 1981 to 1990, all Party Leader Conferences were attended by Bureau members. At the EDU Party Leaders Conference in Rhodos in 1988, Chairman Mattias Bengtsson and Vice Chairman Bettina Machaczek were given the opportunity to speak to the conference. In her statement, Bettina Machaczek referred to the work of the Working Group on Educational Politics in Europe, and reminded the party leaders to consider education to be the key for a prospering Europe based on principles. She strongly emphasised the importance of competition, objected attempts to harmonise national educational systems, and demanded a better mutual recognition of studies in order to make student mobility possible. Finally she supported to better implement the educational policies of the Council of Europe and the European Communities.

The presentation also showed the newly won appreciation for EDS by the party leaders, a success of Chairman Mattias Bengtsson’s efforts to overcome the setbacks caused by the internal crisis of the mid-eighties. When the internal conflicts of EDS made many EDU-officials stay away from EDS, he had met with several of them in order to help steer the ship into calmer waters.
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Additionally, EDS participated in EDU-expert groups and sub-committee meetings during the whole decade. Due to a tight budget EDS could however never cover all of them, but secured its participation in about half of the meetings. The most preferred committee meetings to attend were those on European Policy (Daniel Bischof) and Transboundary Environmental Problems (Johann Friedrich Colsman).

Good relations were maintained with DEMYC as well, meanwhile the EDU-youth organisation. In 1988, Secretary General Alexis Wintoniak addressed the Annual Meeting. Chairman Bettina Machaczek attended several meetings of the DEMYC-executive. Other “sporadic” contacts were maintained with the EPP, European Liberals (ELD) and the European Democratic Group in the European Parliament.\(^\text{549}\) The level of interaction with the EPP remained however low during the decade. This became particularly evident, when the EPP informed the public of its initiative “Students for Europe”, which was supposed to be a separate organisation campaigning for the EPP before the European elections of 1984.

---

**All-European Youth and Student Framework (AEYSF)**

The withdrawal from the global youth détente-conference in Helsinki (January 1981) did not mean the immediate withdrawal from the European youth “framework” (AEYSF). Since the AEYSF-founding meeting in Budapest in October 1980, EDS-delegates had attended a working group follow-up to the CSCE-treaty, a working group on the New Economic World Order (Amsterdam) and a follow-up group meeting in Minsk in April 1981. At the same time, there were complaints about the little outcome of these meetings: “resources might be better used in bilateral contacts where the items concerning us could be put on the agenda.”\(^\text{550}\) Simultaneously, the bigger picture showed the temporary end of the Helsinki-process. After the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan and the introduction of Martial Law in Poland, the entire “peace process” seemed to be pointless.

EDS did at least try to include these developments in the agenda of the “framework”. But even though discussions of human rights violations in Poland and Afghanistan had then taken place, they were never even mentioned in the minutes of the meetings. Thus, at the Annual Meeting in Iceland in 1982, a motion was carried asking the Bureau to withdraw from AEYSF, “unless the framework is able to promote a discussion of real problems of East West

\(^{549}\) Annual Report 1980/81, p. 10, ACDP IX-003-3.

\(^{550}\) Ibid., p. 11.
co-operation and to reflect an exchange of views in the communiqués of the meetings.”

However, the Bureau did not withdraw. Though the new Chairman Knut Olav Nesse informed all AEYSF-members of the Reykjavik-decision, already in September he participated in a working group meeting in September in Frankfurt (Germany). As a result of this meeting, he informed one of his Vice Chairmen that the participation in the “Dialogue on Disarmament” in Amersfoort (Netherlands) in October 1982 had been “most important business”. A major concern was the agreement with the (communist) WFDY to admit US-participants to all parts of the meeting. Eventually, EDS succeeded in convincing both the College Democrats and the College Republicans to participate in this meeting and another AEYSF-Annual Meeting in Cyprus in November/December 1982 on the EDS-ticket.

Since the WFDY had a US-citizen among their delegates as well, they “convinced” the CENYC (European Youth Councils) to demand a written declaration about the official status of the US/EDS-delegate. Only by announcing the departure of the EDS-delegation it was possible to get permission for this delegate. Based on this experience, Nesse pointed out that for him “EDS has a clear, influential role of representing center-right east/west policy. None will take over our work if we leave.”

At the conference in Amersfoort itself, EDS participated in the committees on “European Security” and “Peace Movement”. In the first committee, the EDS-contributions were “very strong, but well substantiated and we managed to put the conditions for the debate.” In the second committee, the WFDY first refused to discuss compulsory military service, but soon gave in order to maintain “good relations to the representatives of the Dutch peace movements, they wanted to give an impression of common aims and methods.” The event was therefore considered as “most constructive”, since there was no success for the “manipulatory wishes” of the communist groups. At the next meeting, the “Consultative Follow-up Group” in Sofia (5-6 November), EDS maintained its criticism towards the AEYSF concerning their ignorance towards the situation in Afghanistan and Poland. Two more projects supported by EDS were a peace camp close to the German-German-Czech border and a CSCE-conference.

The 3rd Consultative Meeting of the AEYSF in Nicosia (Cyprus), 23 November – 3 December 1982, however “broke down on the question of
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admission of the European Union of Jewish Students. No program of action for 1983 was agreed upon except a new Consultative Meeting in June in Germany (West).”556 Almost all western organisations had supported this application. Only the socialist “IUSY was all along against the Jews”, together with the state-controlled youth committees of the East. EDS announced that it would “leave if the Jews are kept out”. Eventually, the issue was postponed.

The breakdown was “a political problem of much importance for the communists, and at the same time a principal question of openness [...] Not accepting the Jews means this is a closed shop, and this is unacceptable. At the same time there is a strong desire to continue both from East and West (esp. CENYC). Our evaluation is that the Framework could not continue on this track where all important East/West topics are ignored (Poland/Afghanistan). At this point a break seems to be the right thing.”557

Altogether, the 1982-involvement in the AEYSF – five meetings in four months –resulted in only disappointing minor successes, such as the admission of the US-delegates. The conclusion for EDS was to leave the framework until the admission of the Jewish organisation was accepted. Hence, EDS no longer attended the informal follow-up meetings until 1986.558

After March 1985, with the election of Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow, world politics was changing again. Developments such as the Soviet defeat in Afghanistan and the decline of the Eastern European economies motivated the Soviet leadership to redraft its foreign policy, including its role in the “Negotiations on Confidence-building Measures” in Stockholm (1984-1986). From then on, the climate between the two super-powers were dramatically improving. In 1987, Michael Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan ratified the INF-treaty in Washington DC. These events resonated in youth politics as well.

1985 and 1986 saw several ad-hoc-meetings to revitalise the youth framework. “Peaceful co-operation” became the overall goal, and “more centre-right self confidence” became the objective of UEJCD, DEMYC and EDS. In July 1986, UEJCD and DEMYC attended the “Extraordinary Consultative Meeting” of the framework. Soon after, though Bettina Machaczek called it “nice words, to be converted to reality right now”, EDS “agreed to participate in the Framework for the time being, but without any illusions that we can change the
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minds of the communists.” Again, the exchange of views, the role of the framework itself and a special youth contribution to disarmament were in the centre of the debates.

The minutes of several EDS-meetings of 1986/87 reported of regular attendance of “Framework meetings” in 1986/87 and some of the results: “The disagreements between the participating organisations about the formal working of the Framework were solved.” Soon, everybody realised Gorbachev’s new policies of Glasnost (openness) and Perestrojka (reconstruction).

In January 1987, Chairman Mattias Bengtsson and Vice Chairman Bettina Machaczek attended a “Youth and Student Conference on Economic Co-operation in Europe” in Amsterdam, at the same time the “5th Meeting of the Consultative Follow-up Group”. Topics were the organisation of thematic events and the UN-year of peace. For the communist organisations, the most important item was now the removal of “artificial barriers”, i.e. the external trade barriers of the European Union. Economy had replaced ideology.

Only four weeks later, the next meeting took place, this time the “4th Consultative Meeting of the Framework for All-European Youth and Student Co-operation” in Prague. “The participants in the 4th Consultative Meeting evaluated recent developments in the political situation in the world in general and on the European continent in particular, as well as exchanged opinions on different aspects of the Framework’s functioning.”

Glasnost & Perestrojka 1987: Matthias Bengtsson with communist youth leader Josef Skala at the framework-meeting in Prague – in one picture!
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Topics were almost all areas of politics. In the end, it was agreed to continue the discussions at follow-up events. The revitalisation of the framework seemed to have succeeded. Two more preparatory meetings followed the same year. The first meeting was co-hosted by East and West-Germans in Hanover and Magdeburg. The topic of the Oslo meeting in September 1987 was “Youth Tourism and Exchange in the Service of Peace, Mutual Understanding and Trust.” In March 1988, the new political climate made it possible to accept the Jewish organisation at the 5th Consultative meeting of the AEYSC in Vienna. EDS participated in this meeting with five delegates including Chairman Mattias Bengtsson.

Since the output of these meetings was low and the costs were high, it is interesting to have a look at the motivation: For EDS, not the topics were interesting, but “to get to know the development in Eastern Europe – to find the limits of ‘glasnost’ and ‘perestroika’. Generally we can observe that the Warsaw Pact Countries are in a process of allowing more diversity. There are growing differences between the more ‘liberal’ IUS and the more ‘conservative’ WFDY – but the national differences within these organisations are also exposed. To a large degree, the time of streamlined answers – based on the works of Marx – is over.” Besides these signs of disintegration, the EDS delegates also realised an increasing “fear of loosing face by ‘Just copying the capitalist way’” on the side of IUS/WFDY, and a widening gap between Poles and Hungarians on one side and Czechs and East-Germans on the other. Apparently, the Iron Curtain had begun to corrode. Again, EDS-activists were among the first in seeing the signs on the wall, even though the IUS still could not accept the invitation of a member of the Charta 77 to one of the panels, and thus a panel discussion had to be cancelled.

But already on the occasion of another “framework”-seminar in Prague in October 1988, EDS-representatives could informally meet two heroes of resistance: Cardinal Tomasek and Vaclav Havel, later President of the Czech Republic. Hearing the Cardinal speak of his sufferings under Communism was certainly moving: Before he was recognised by the state as a bishop, he spent two years in a labour camp. Only 3 of 13 dioceses had bishops. Recognition by the state was conditional but not given. The other dioceses had been unoccupied for 20-30 years, “but the state does not allow more bishops.”

The Cardinal was rather sceptic about the future: “We have not seen much of the praised Perestrojka in Czechoslovakia.” Religious teaching was still forbidden in 1988. In the end he quoted a slogan that expressed his ambiguous feelings: “Working for God is self-evident, praying for God is much, suffering
for God is everything. The last happens here! In spite of all that I look optimistically in the future, and appeal to the public opinion abroad. As I said, this is a chance for us.”

The situation of Vaclav Havel at that time was even worse: His plays were performed all over the world, but had been banned in his own country since 1968. Since he was one of the founders of the Charta 77 (a resistance group) in 1977, he was imprisoned several times. During the conversation in October 1988 he explained, that the “people are becoming more brave, particularly because of the insecurity of the government. Ten thousand protested on the anniversary of the invasion of 1968. We are also planning new activities for mid-October [1988]. A new organisation is being founded, the so-called Movement for Democracy, that will focus on the right to speak, to organise and to demonstrate.”

He also said “I am a cautious optimist”, people applauded, whenever and wherever they acknowledged him. But shortly after this conversation, before the anticipated protests around the old national holiday on the 28th October, he was arrested again, but the protests took place anyway.564

In early 1989, the EDS-Bureau evaluated the participation in the “framework” again. Since “EDS gets more and more involved in the East-West issue, it was agreed to have a broad general discussion as well as reports from the Bureau Members who have been actively involved in this issue.” As a result, EDS tried to contribute to the release of Vaclav Havel by publishing his case all over Europe, writing open letters, and by bringing it on the table of the Framework-discussions. Even personal contacts to IUS-Chairman Josef Skala were used.

In 1989/90, EDS continued to participate in the proceedings of the AEYSF. David Hoey and Jacek Bendykowski represented EDS at the AEYSC-Conference in autumn 1989 in Warsaw. In May 1990, a conference on environmental issues in Bergen (Norway) was attended. But times were changing: “this meeting provided few ideas, little notion of the realities and no perspectives on the issue of the European Common Home.”565 The delegates of the communist organisations WFDY and IUS were reported to have “remained passive”.

At the same time, the idea of a European Common Home was no longer perceived as Gorbachev’s idea. The nations of Central Eastern Europe were no longer patiently waiting, but liberating themselves and looking for integration in the family of free nations. The so called spirit of Helsinki was exposed as a rather ugly fellow, compared to the uniting spirits of the revolution and of the European integration. But the framework had not yet given up, and contin-

565  Report to EDS, unknown author, PAM, p. 1; Bettina Machaczek, Report, 5/7-05-90, p. 2, PAM.
ued to send out memos. Even though key-players from the East had defected in order to work for the UNESCO or for “business”, there was an attempt to convert the framework to one of many institutions offering weekend-seminars for young people, by this slowly becoming redundant, not only for EDS, and “for three reasons:

1. As Eastern Europe slowly moves towards pluralist society the representatives from the east no longer represent anyone of significance.
1. Fewer in the west are really interested in maintaining the process and those who do merely wish to perpetuate their own existence for which FRAMEWORK gives and added justification i.e. CENYC.
1. The framework process is controlled by a small group who make it difficult for others to participate effectively in the process.”

Meanwhile, EDS and other centre-right organisations had noticed that the “framework” had no future at all. The proposal to change the structure in a global NGO-network as suggested by CENYC, the Canadian Youth Foundation and the WFDY/IUS appeared to be another “cabal” to travel to Brazil on the expenses of others. Although EDS was not yet officially leaving the Framework, it was clear that resources would from now on be devoted to the direct support of centre-right groups in Eastern Europe instead. With this, the involvement of EDS in the “framework” ended. Attempts to restore this organisation in 1990/91 without the “trouble members” EDS and DEMYC failed.

**Co-operation with European Institutions**

Unlike in the seventies or nineties, co-operation with organisations such as the Council of Europe, the UNESCO or the European Communities was not a priority of EDS in the eighties. Only from time to time, thematic conferences of the Council of Europe were attended. International youth structures were more important.

In 1980, Deputy Chairman Mark Leverton came to the conclusion that “EDS has no clear strategy or purpose within these structures”. A working group in 1980/81, which was supposed to evaluate the work in European youth institutions, had come to no conclusions either. Hence he suggested developing specific policies for the work in each of these structures.

For the Council of Europe, he emphasised the positive role of the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Centre for the work of EDS. For the Youth Forum of the European Communities, he underlined the importance of the three Permanent Committees (PC). Particularly PC 3 “Youth organisations
and the educational and cultural situation in the European Communities” he thought was of major interest to EDS. Leverton stated that the Youth Forum “is still aiming for the more and ambitious role as a formal consultative body of young people to the European Communities. This right is less likely to be achieved while the Forum continues [to have] such a bad reputation within the Community.”

For all these structures as well as the European Co-ordination Bureau (ECB), Mark Leverton suggested to first ask “why we are involved with these institutions at all”, and suggested two reasons: “The institutions provide a platform for EDS to promote its ideas to a wide range of targets including parliamentarians”, and they also were a “major source of finance”.

On the other hand, he stated these two reasons might not be considered adequate. The promotion of political aims and the lobbying of European politicians were also possible without these structures. Furthermore, it could be claimed these organisations were often not representative. As a “critical approach towards the establishment” for EDS, Leverton suggested to “resist all attempts to obtain a non-existent consensus. The results of this policy are only too apparent in the Youth Forum, where virtually every document which is discussed finishes nothing more than vague and meaningless.”

Another critical issue was the decision-making of the European Youth Centre. Since other youth organisations applying for EYC-grants were represented in the supervising Advisory Committee of the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Centre, EDS “has been on the receiving end of the worst effects of this practise. Only recently we have reports of other international organisations speaking against us for political reasons.” And even worse, the ECB was assumed to have an informal agreement with the Council of Europe that granted them an exclusive right to decide upon the composition of this Advisory Committee. This committee was in turn delegating the eight INGYO members of the decision-making Governing Board of the European Youth Centre. Hence the overall conclusion was, that “we must establish our priorities and decide upon a strategy.”

Based on these assumptions, the newly elected Chairman Knut O. Nesse wrote another Memorandum “on an EDS-policy in external organisations”. Though he considered these relations to be a “second priority”, he identified a link between the image of EDS in some of the structures and financial support from other structures. However, both the Youth Forum and the ECB were the “two headaches” of EDS. For the ECB, Nesse believed that the assumed
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common aim “can be questioned”. But the ECB could also have some meaning 
as a forum for exchange of views and better understanding” – a role that “EDS 
can accept but never give top priority.” Therefore, Nesse suggested lobbying 
instead of policy-making, to use the meetings for obtaining valuable informa-
tion, and to co-operate with DEMYC on all other matters.

For the Youth Forum, Nesse was more critical. He saw himself unable 
to suggest a policy, since the aim of common lobbying was considered to be 
impossible. The only exception he made was the Permanent Committee 3, 
dealing with higher education. However, influencing its policy was difficult, 
since EDS represented minority positions. The aim could therefore only be to 
emphasise that “the Forum is not a Voice of Youth”, to use the meetings as an 
educational experience and to advocate the idea that “less government regula-
tion on youth and youth activities is better than more.”

As a result, EDS maintained a low but permanent level of involvement 
in both the ECB and the YF, though it was very time consuming. 568 Though 
EDS was not participating in the discussions of the first two ECB-initiated 
“White Papers” on the “European Work of International Youth Organisations” 
(1984, 1988), the minutes of several EDS-meetings of the decade report of a 
considerable level of participation in ECB-activities. In 1982, Vice Chairman 
Atli Eyjolfsson became responsible for the ECB. In 1983, a seminar and the 
General Assembly of the ECB were attended. In 1986/87 and in 1988/89, EDS 
was even present at all statutory meetings of the ECB and “expressed repeat-
edly that we believe that this system does not function as just as it should. 
[...] Whether this had any effect will be evaluated in the period until the ECB 
General Assembly in December 1989. EDS is currently considering whether 
our membership in ECB is worthwhile, and we have to look at the possibilities 
for influencing the European structures by other means.” 569 But this meeting 
was considered to be “even more negative than previous ones”. 570 Thus, EDS 
joined the signatories of an open letter expressing the dissatisfaction with the 
undemocratic and corrupt behaviour of the ECB-leadership during the Gene-
ral Assembly in February 1989. At the same time, EDS was discussing whether 
it made sense to pay the membership fee. “We are not particularly impressed 
by the way the organisation is run, and we are not convinced that ECB does 
much to promote our interests in relation to different European bodies.” 571

The same was true for the Youth Forum. In 1980/81, EDS delegates 
attended the General Assembly and three sessions of permanent commit-

---

569 Annual Report 1988/89. 
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571 Knut A. Solem to Bettina Machaczek, 09-09-88, PAM.
In 1983, Nikos Vassiliou (Vice Chairman, Cyprus) was responsible for the Permanent Committee No. 1 (Youth Organisations and the political evolution of the European Communities). Egil Sjursen (NKSF) together with Mario Micallef (SDM) attended a meeting of Permanent Committee No. 2 (Social situation of young workers in the European Communities). Vice Chairman Johnny Colsman (RCDS) was the representative to the Permanent Committee No. 3. However, the work in these PCs did not lead to substantial results, since the delegates were “aware that the General Assembly the next day would decide to take away the PC’s”, a decision eliminating another reason to participate in the YF.

EDS also continued to attend the General Assemblies of the Youth Forum (1983). Since the statutory changes of 1983, EDS could also send a representative to the meetings of their Executive Committee. One of the first delegates was Claude Henry Ney (1984, CELF). In 1988/89, EDS attended all major YF-events, even though their output was below measurable limit. Michael Raphael from Cyprus was elected as a member to the YF-Committee on “North-South”.

At that time, the YF tried to establish a European Students Forum as well, which was “of particular interest” for EDS. A conference in Granada in April 1989 had already agreed on how to distribute the votes. Objective of this new structure would have been the evaluation of programmes such as ERASMUS of the EU, mutual recognition of diplomas and all other issues related to student matters. It should have also been entitled to present proposals to YF-committees. EDS agreed that this was not supposed to be another institution, but only a platform for discussion. The projected ESF was supposed to be established in 1990, but the decision was obviously postponed again so as not to repeat the mistakes of the AEYSF.

Linking the World

The discussions in connection with the “framework” had led to an ever closer co-operation with student organisations from the US. The search for partner organisations around the world was one of the priorities in the first half of the decade.

More international partners were mainly found in other English-speaking countries. Both the student wings of the Republicans and the Democrats were

---

a joint member under the name of NASA, North American Students Accord (1980-1986). Between 1982 and 1985, a considerable number of mutual visits was organised. In connection with these visits, relations with the “Young Americans for Freedom” were (re-)established. The Progressive-Conservative Youth Federation of Canada and the Australian Liberal Student Federation joint as associated members at the Annual Meeting of 1982.576

This increasing co-operation over the Atlantic and beyond was accompanied by increasing activities to establish an international youth structure. As a result, the International Young Democrat Union (IYDU) was established in Washington D.C. on 18 July, 1981. The driving force behind its founding was DEMYC together with the Young Republicans and the Young Democrats in the US. Elmar Brok (Germany) became the first IYDU Chairman.577 Similar efforts were made on the party level: On 24 June 1983, the International Democrat Union (IDU) was established during the EDU Party Leader’s Conference in London. First IDU-Chairman became Alois Mock, Vice-chancellor of Austria. He was a very old friend of EDS, and had supported EDS-activities in Austria many times. At the same meeting, EDS formally joined the IDU as associated member. Scott Hamilton, its former Chairman, became the first IDU-Secretary General. From now on, EDS-officers frequently attended IDU-conferences.578

At the same time, an internal debate started as to how to institutionalise the international centre-right student co-operation. These discussions were fuelled by the energies created by the aggressive behaviour of Moscow-oriented groups at the global youth dialogue on disarmament which EDS had left at the same time. Furthermore, EDS wanted to maintain links with organisations from outside Europe without being dependent of the goodwill of the communist fellow travellers.

This was the situation in 1981, when at the Annual Meeting in La Coruña (Spain) the idea to establish the “Democrat Students International” was presented.579 Confidential talks with US-organisations had been taken place already since 1978. “The first year when DSI was formally launched as a concept [1980/81] was to a great deal a year of investigation into possibilities and discussions with people who showed interest [...]. The emphasis was put on the need to balance the international youth scene and reference was frequently made to the role of EDS in East-west co-operation as an example. The lack of ability to maintain the American interest in this after the so-called World Forum in Helsinki has made our work more difficult.” In practice, the

---
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first year consisted of a visit of Per Heister and Lars Eskeland to the US and some correspondence. Additional contacts were established during the IDU informal group meeting (1981) and the Mont Pelerin Society General Meeting in Berlin in September 1982. At this meeting, Tony Dimmit, Chairman of the Australian Liberal Student’s Federation, joined the DSI-project. Soon after, Stephan Eisel (RCDS) and P. Daniel Bischof were asked to participate in the preparations for the DSI.\textsuperscript{580}

A second attempt was made in September 1982, when the EDS-Council was informed, that P. Daniel Bischof was nominated to be the EDS-representative to the DSI. Other Steering Committee members were Susan Elliot (Canada), Tony Dimmit (Australia), Peter Karly (New Zealand) and Stephen Morrison (UK).\textsuperscript{581} At the same time, both EDS and DSI were trying to get in contact with Latin American Christian Democrats. Apparently, talks to the ADCLE, the organisation of Latin-American Christian Democrats in Europe, did not lead to any result.\textsuperscript{582}

At a meeting in Wildhaus (Switzerland) in October 1982 a new Steering Committee was set up. Members were among others Grover Norquist for NASA (US) and Knut Olav Nesse (for EDS). P. Daniel Bischof (SLS, Switzerland) became Chairman of the Steering Committee. Organisations that had declared their will to join, came from Europe, the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Papua, and Jamaica. The organisation was established even though the already existing IYDU had invited EDS for co-operation. It was agreed to only admit regional unions, such as EDS for Europe, NASA for North America, and the Pacific Student Union (Japan, Australia). Additionally, refugee organisations (parties in exile) were allowed to join. The ideological background was similar to that of EDS. As the only organ the Executive Board was foreseen. The second Steering Committee meeting was planned for November 1982 in Wellington (NZ), the third was supposed to take place in Edinburgh in January 1983.\textsuperscript{583} August 1983 was announced as date for the DSI-founding congress.\textsuperscript{584}

In May 1983, the EDS-Bureau discussed the possibility to have the DSI-founding conference parallel to a seminar in Berlin in November 1983. Daniel Bischof was asked to draft a declaration of principles for this meeting.\textsuperscript{585} Again, at the EDS Annual meeting of 1983, the foundation of the DSI “was given high priority.”

\textsuperscript{580} DSI-Steering Committee, Report on the DSI-Activities 1981-1982, 16-09-82, PAC.
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At a meeting in Washington D.C. in October 1983, further discussions with US organisations took place. After that, point 3.a the agenda of the Council Meeting in Berlin on 24 November 1983 included the topic “Democrat Student International”. For this, the Chair of the meeting was taken over by P. Daniel Bischof, Chairman of the DSI-Steering Committee. First he presented the Political Programme of the new organisation. After an intense debate, the programme was accepted. After that, a working programme and the DSI-Constitution were put to a vote and adopted.

However, delegates of RCDS immediately started to object the whole procedure. The arguments were based on the presence of less than 15 organisations at the meeting, and only seven to eight organisations during the DSI-debate. Secondly, RCDS feared that Europe could become a secondary matter in the work of EDS. But a compromise suggested by ONNeD to verify EDS’ commitment to the DSI, to repeat the votes and to start with the elections could be adopted.

After that, P. Daniel Bischof and Cecilia Stegö were elected to the Executive Board of the DSI.586 The other members of the Executive Board were Knut Olav Nesse (for EDS), Jack Abramoff, Grover Norquist, Dan Cohen (College Republicans, USA), Tony Dimmit (ALSF, Australia) and Chai Sirivudh (Thailand). This was the launch of the Democrat Students International, as a press release proudly announced. As the only two full members, EDS and NASA were mentioned, “however there is participation from those areas where there are Democratic forces but they are not formed into regional unions as DSI requires.”587

---

586 Council, Minutes, 23-11-83, pp. 2-3, PAC.
The DSI working programme mentioned various existing international projects, such as the International Youth Year, the Youth Festival in Cuba, and the International Student Movement of the United Nations (ISMUN). Secondly, campaigns for democracy in Latin America, involvement in the North-South dialogue, the promotion the free market economy, and to struggle against the global “peace” movement were announced as future projects. Concerning higher education, the major aim was the free flow of students and the international recognition of academic titles. Though DSI declared to co-operate with IDU and IYDU in these matters, offers by the IDU to merge with the IYDU were rejected by the EDS-Bureau. The DSI-secretariat was hosted by the USA-Foundation in the Heritage Building, Washington D.C., which also financed the first DSI-newsletter.

In March 1984, Daniel Bischof presented a new political platform, a classical liberal programme with a focus on defending democracy, human rights, peace and security, a free enterprise system and free access to higher education. Education was also understood as “vital for social mobility”, which would result in even more “personal freedom and social security of the individual.” It was adopted unanimously. Afterwards, two Standing Committees were approved (on United Nations, on Latin America). Additionally, first steps to participate in the International Year of Youth were made, though it was not clear whether they were made by the DSI or rather by EDS. However, in June 1984, Daniel Bischof started to criticise the lack of US-participation. For 1985, a larger conference with participants from all continents was discussed. After the end of Daniel Bischof’s term as EDS-Chairman in 1985, limited resources seemed to have ended the DSI as well.

After 1989, EDS eventually accepted invitations to attend meetings of the IYDU, which it joined later on as “regional member”. Since separate attempts to establish a global structure were from now on no longer considered to be efficient, DEMYC and EDS agreed in a close co-operation on this matter.

In addition to the creation of the DSI, EDS continued its talks to organisations from all over the world that were not seen as prospective members. In this category belong meetings between 1982 and 1985 with the “Organization for Strengthening the Unity and Struggle for the Liberation of Afghanistan” (OSULA) that had been established by the exiled former Prime Minister Dr. Mohammed Yussuf in Germany in 1981.
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In 1982/83, Stephan Eisel tried to get in touch with democratic opposition groups in Nicaragua, when they were persecuted by the Sandinist government. But not even to define a position on Nicaragua was easy at that time: the US-administration supported the anti-Communist guerrilla, the moderate public opinion (even parts of the political Catholicism) felt sympathies for the pro-Communist Sandinist government, and thus the moderate opposition was very weak.

Eventually, EDS succeeded to get in contact with moderate conservative forces preferring a more reconciling approach. In April 1983, Stephan Eisel met with opposition leader Jose Davila in Bonn (Germany), an exiled Christian Democrat and a former member of the State Council of Nicaragua.\footnote{Stephan Eisel, Report to the EDS-Bureau […], 07-04-83, PAM.}

In 1983, EDS was also approached by an obscure “National Student Federation” of the Republic of South Africa. After it turned out that this organisation (it was actually a government front) supported the policy of apartheid, the EDS Chairman immediately refused to continue the negotiations.\footnote{Knut Olav Nesse, to the EDS-Bureau, 12-02-84, PAM; Knut Olav Nesse to RCDS, 08-01-83, p. 4, PAC.}

EDS Bureau 1985/86, together with Greek party leader Konstantinos Mitsotakis, with David Hoey, Eros Antoniades, David Hoile, Konstantinos Mitsotakis, George Anagnostakos, Claude Henry Ney, José Masetro López, Mattias Bengtsson and Olafur Arnarson (from right)
Chapter 5

Approaching the Next Millennium: 1991-2001
The years between the fall of the Iron Curtain and the beginning of the new millennium could be portrayed as having represented four challenges: the economic, social and political reconstruction of Central and Eastern Europe and beyond, the ongoing integration of the EU-member states, the accession of new member states to the EU, and the breakthrough of new information technologies. The first three included the restructuring of the centre-right party landscape.

EDS had to find new answers, and it was confronted with even one more challenge: its own reform. “We must ensure that we view Europe in its broadest possible context. [...] EDS may operate in a utopian situation where the only parameters we need to work within are those which we set ourselves. [...] We must learn new styles, new approaches, and new cultures. But we must also teach what we have learned. [...] We must be united not just as representatives of individual National states but as Conservatives, Liberals and Christian Democrats. We need to strengthen our constitution from crippling EDS, but we must always be fair and open if we are to gain credibility. [...] Developing EDS into a flourishing student body, which is established with European politics as well as with all branches of our national organisations, may take another decade. But now is the time to set the agenda.”

With this in mind, EDS had to renew its manifestos and its statutes. It also had to renew its relations to other international organisations and party associations. Of utmost importance were its relations with the European People’s Party, in order to “bridge the gap between politics and academia and to give students a say in the process of European integration.”

It also had to seek re-integrating those organisations from the West, which had once suspended their membership, and integrating new centre-right student movements from the East. For the first time in its history, there was a realistic chance to cover all parts of Europe, and to become a true pan-European network.

Only with its presence in a majority of European countries and institutions, could the organisation claim to be truly European: “European Democrat Students, in so many respects, works like a mini European Community. The more familiar one becomes with EDS the more apparent that truth actually is; the need to expand, the questions of internal reform, political campaigning and all of this built on the timeless need for Co-operation in Europe.”
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In this regard, 1997 was the year of decisions: That year, EDS lobbied the EPP, UNESCO and the Council of Europe at the same time. “The present board believes in the necessity to intensify the promotion of our politics. Therefore we try to be present wherever it seems useful.”\textsuperscript{599} Furthermore, EDS continued to co-operate with the European Democrat Union, IYDU and DEMYC.

Several other policies were emphasised in the opening statement of Chairman Michalis Peglis at the 4th Council Meeting in Gdansk on 20 March 1999, e.g. the importance of training, lobbying and campaigning. Higher Education was understood as being the “raison d’être d’EDS”.

In his election platform for 1999/2000, Ukko Metsola also referred to these challenges: “our expansion is by no means over. But the new situation does create certain challenges: how to preserve the cohesiveness and the famous spirit of our organisation? How do we maintain the high level of pro-European activity and enterprise while still being comprehensible to the member organisations? How do we serve our individual members better? How to structure the EDS work in the most efficient possible way?”

Internal Affairs

Constitutional Development

An unsatisfactory statutory situation gave rise to much criticism. In 1991, Alex Aiken from CCF (United Kingdom) first raised the question of a constitutional reform at the Annual Meeting in Protaras (Cyprus). A first draft for a new Constitution was submitted by Klaus von Lepel (RCDS)

\textsuperscript{599} Holger Thuss, 1997 - the Year of Recognition, in: Bullseye 6/1998, p. 3.
at a Council meeting in Lisbon on 23 November 1991. But the decision was postponed after a longer debate – to the great disappointment of some member organisations. This disappointment had had very serious consequences, since some members had already started to establish a new organisation named the “European Student’s Initiative” (EStA).

Hence, the Council Meeting in Madrid (January 1992) decided to set up a Constitutional Commission, which was to consist of Chairman Laura de Esteban and three more members, including one from the Garrick Club and one from the organisations that had suspended their membership for that time being.\(^\text{600}\)

The debate was continued at the next Council in London in March 1992. The majority of the proposals delineated more flexible political regulations and stricter financial regulations. As a result of these efforts, completely rewritten “Standing Orders for Meetings of the Council” and “Standing Orders for Finances” were adopted at the Annual Meeting in Palma de Mallorca in August 1992.

In autumn 1992, a second step was taken. Vice Chairman Tim Arnold, a member of one of the “critical” organisations (RCDS), was given the mandate to present a draft proposal of an entirely new Constitution for the beginning of 1993.

But after a meeting with former Secretary General Nigel Ashford in January 1993, Arnold very wisely decided not to “present a complete document that does not bear any resemblance of the existing ones. Since it took long time to hammer out the existing versions it seems prudent to restrict ourselves to the bits that seem essential.”\(^\text{601}\) Soon after, at the Bureau Meeting in London in February 1993, a first “Arnold-draft” was on the table. The Bureau decided to recommend most of the proposals to the Council. The big issues were the future role of a treasurer, the admission of new members (whether observer membership should be conditional to become full member), honorary officers (art.14), and the financial regulations.\(^\text{602}\)

The revised draft was supposed to be adopted at the Annual Meeting in Oslo in August 1993, but this was postponed. Thus, the discussion could continue at a Bureau Meeting in Gdansk in September 1993, which once again led to significant changes. These changes referred to requests of many member organisations to strengthen their own role in meetings. Hence it was decided to allow discussions of membership applications at any Council meeting, and
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not only at Annual Meetings. At the same meeting, the Standing Orders of 1992 (see below) were slightly amended and integrated as the second part of the Statutes. As a result, it was possible to conclude the reform with the adoption of the revised Constitution at a Council meeting in Frankfurt (Germany) in December 1993.

The new Statutes of 1993 were comprised of three parts: the Constitution with general provisions, the Standing Orders for more detailed regulations, and the Financial Regulations. The centre-piece of the new statutes became the Constitution. Article 1 defined the name of the organisation, which was debated from time to time, since it was deemed to be “torturing the English language with this ‘Democrat’ word” (Ross Curds, 1992). Hence in 1992, Executive Director Pia Farstad sought to explore the reason why the organisation was not called European Democratic Students. The study resulted that there was another organisation bearing the same name.603 The provision continued stating that EDS could have its seat “at the seat of any European government”.

For the first time, English became the “working language”. Article 2 defined “aims”: Besides the traditional objectives laid down by the founding fathers (to promote contacts and co-operation between Christian Democratic, Conservative and Liberal students of different countries, to create by all possible means a better understanding of each other’s cultural and political situation, to work for increasing international co-operation, to work for a free and united Europe, to exchange information on education policy and other political matters), a new aim was introduced, “to seek common action where possible, especially towards the European Institutions” in order to better reflect the necessities of European politics.

Significant changes of the 1993-reform referred to the admission of new members. Article 3 defined three kinds of membership (full membership, observer membership and associate membership) and integrated the main content of the old Articles 3, 4 and 5. “Full and observer membership of EDS shall be open to
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Christian Democratic, Conservative and Liberal student and Youth organisations from European countries.”

From now on, the admission for new members required 2/3 instead of 4/5 of the votes cast at the respective meeting and only observer members could apply for full membership. With this, observer membership was clearly defined to be the conditional first step to become full member. It was also innovative to exclusively admit organisations “which are involved in student politics and active on Campus” – a rule which was however always applied with some flexibility – and a new approach towards international co-operation, since the associated membership was opened to “any fraternal non-European organisation and to European International Youth Organisations.” At the Annual Meeting of 1995, it was however specified to submit the voting right to new members only at the meeting following that of the accession.

The organs of EDS continued to be the Council and the Executive Bureau, that consisted of the Chairman and six (since 1999 eight) Vice Chairmen. A suggestion to enlarge the Bureau by including the treasurer, a Political Director, and a Publications officer, was not adopted. But it was now possible for the Chairman to “appoint up to two officers with temporary duties.” Whereas the regulations for the Council remained unchanged, the duties of the Executive Bureau were specified. “Each member of the Executive Bureau must once have enrolled at the university or some other sort of higher education institution.”

As in the past, the Bureau had to present “agendas, reports and other documents to the Council”, to execute Council decisions and to take care for all financial matters of EDS. The Chairman was supposed to be “the main responsible and the chief executive of EDS who shall guide the work of the Executive Bureau.” From now on, the Bureau had to “present a budget to the first Council Meeting after the Annual Meeting to be approved by the Council, to present to the first Council Meeting after the Annual Meeting a Working Programme to be approved by the Council, and to propose membership fees to be agreed by the Council as specified in the Financial Regulations.”

There were also new regulations concerning the duties of Vice Chairmen. An amendment, which would have specified fields of action for each of the Vice Chairmen, was not adopted. The responsibilities of Executive Director (called the Secretary General since 1997) were supposed to be “the EDS Office, the day-to-day business of EDS and such other duties as the Chairman may from time to time confer upon him.” In 1993, the Executive Director herself described the co-operation with the Chairman to be a “very special relationship.”

Since 2000, the Secretary General had to have a work contract with

---
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EDS according to the respective legal standards of the country where the Secretariat was situated. Finally, the election of an Honorary President now required a 2/3 majority, and the Honorary Membership was limited to up to two persons per year, that had not held any post for five years. It was now also possible to have patrons – “individuals of outstanding reputation in politics and academia”.


In 1992, revised Standing Orders were adopted. Amendments concerned the powers of the Chairman, debates, and the right to speak in debates (art. 6.c.i, 1992). The general competence of the Chairman to decide upon matters not regulated was laid down in Art. 9.c. Amendments to the Standing Orders introduced in 1993 concerned the new structure of the six chapters A, B, C, D, E, and F and the submission of motions. Part A was the slightly more detailed regulation of the admission procedure for new members. Part B remained mostly unchanged. It concerned invitations to meetings, quorums, deadlines for motions, rights to speak in debates, voting, and the content of the agenda for Council Meetings. The aim was again to strengthen the role of the Chairman in meetings.

Part C regulated the conduct of the Annual Meeting, the election of the new Bureau and the role of the returning officer. The newly drafted part D regulated the conduct of Bureau meetings. It defined the frequency of these meetings (at least four times a year), the quorum (three, later five members or more), the simple majority voting and the deadline for minutes (21 days). Part E was defining the tasks of the Working Groups. Part F concerned the change of the Standing Orders. These Standing Orders were amended again at the Council in Antwerp in February 2001, in “order to better reflect the reality of our organisation”. Among other things, the tasks of the Working Group Chairmen were redefined.

The third part of the statutes, the Financial Regulations, included provisions for the elaboration and changes of the budget, lack of budget, sources of income, salaries and expenses, and travel reimbursements. Since 1993, they also contained the responsibilities of the Executive Director (since 1997

---

Secretary General), the duties of the treasurer (abolished in 1999), provisions for fund-raising, external sources of income, and a detailed description of the membership fee system.

A planned upgrade of the treasurer to be the main accountant was strongly objected by Vice Chairman Lars Jørgensen. Unlike foreseen in the draft of Tim Arnold, he suggested the treasurer only to be the main fundraiser of the organisation. Eventually, the Bureau followed Jørgensen’s proposal: by this, the strong position of the Executive Director as the administrative and financial head was maintained. But this was the only discussion at the Frankfurt-Bureau Meeting of December 1993. Thus, the amended Statutes could finally be adopted.  

Another objective of the reform achieved was to conclude the long going debate on travel reimbursement. In the past, travel reimbursement was provided in principle, but usually the financial resources did not allow applying this rule. It was obvious that this situation would never change in a foreseeable future. Hence in 1993, it was decided to suspend this regulation. Now it was agreed to not to reimburse travel expenses anymore, unless a special budget for this was provided. Less successful was an attempt to change the philosophy of the membership fees, though Tim Arnold had developed five (!) alternative models for the discussion.

The next minor amendment to the Standing Orders was adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1995 (submitted by Günther Fehlinger, AG) and concerned minimum requirements of the agenda (art.b.7). The second amendment of the
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new Statutes was proposed by Henrik Sørensen (DKS/Denmark) and adopted at the Council Meeting in May 1996 in Athens. The new article 6 specified the payment of the annual membership fee and provided incentives to pay earlier. Early payments were allowed a 5 percent discount of the membership fee. Late payments were punished with penalty fees of up to 20 percent of the membership fee. “The right to vote and put up candidates is conditional on payment of both the membership fee and the additional penalty. If the full member has not paid their membership fee by the first day of July it loses its right to vote and put up candidates.”

A third amendment concerned the responsibilities of the Executive Director, as suggested by Michalis Peglis in 1997 and adopted at the Council Meeting in Constanta (Romania) in May 1998. The first two changes concerned adjustments to the practice of other organisations. It was decided to rename the Executive Director to General Secretary (later, the more correct version Secretary General became common), and to rename the EDS-Office in Secretariat.

A more significant step was the increase of the number of Vice Chairmen to eight. The explanation was that the rapid growth of the organisation made it necessary “for more national member organisations to be integrated in the work of the Executive Bureau.” Treasurer and Secretary General were also formally included in the Bureau, but without voting rights. A fifth amendment concerned the activity reports of applicants, which now also had to report their campus activities.
But even after that, the organisation continued with its statutory evaluation. At a Council Meeting in Trier/Germany (May 1999), 16 minor amendments were adopted. EDS then became statutorily an “organisation” instead of a “union”. The most significant change was the abolition of the position of the treasurer, since this position was considered to be “somehow outdated”. For specific tasks, one additional employee could be appointed by the Executive Bureau.

Other amendments were adopted at a Council Meeting in Bratislava in April 2000. For membership-applications “by an organisation from a country
that already has an EDS member organisation, the vote on such an application requires a majority of three quarters of all votes cast in the Council meeting."

Other revisions concerned the work contracts with EDS and the introduction of the Euro. At the Council meeting in Antwerp in 2001, the role of the Working Groups was redefined. The last change of the decade was adopted in May 2001 at a Council in Coimbra (Portugal), which aimed at synchronising the terms of office of the auditors and the Secretary General to the fiscal year (without intending to change the election procedures), in order to create a transition period. However, this was abolished at the following Annual Meeting.

Membership Development

The number of EDS member organisations grew significantly until 2001. Around 1990/91, only a little over 10 national student or youth organisations used to attend meetings (1992: 24 member organisations; Annual Meeting 1991: 13 full members present, 9 with voting right; Council Meeting in Oslo 1991: 10 organisations present).

The active organisations were the founding members FMSF, NKSF (since 2001 HSF), DKS, CCF, RCDS, and AktionsGemeinschaft (for FÖSt), secondly CELF, NNGG, DAP-NDFK and SLS which had joined EDS in the seventies, and NPP from Romania, at that time the most active member from one of the new democracies. These figures were changing dramatically throughout
the decade: In 1996, the Paris-Council (October) was attended by 17 member organisations and six guest organisations.

The Annual Meeting of 2001 was attended by 30 full members (of 39 members in total): AG (Austria, no vote), CDS (Belgium), FISS (Bulgaria), HAZ (Croatia), Protoporia (Cyprus), MK (Czech Republic), DKS (Denmark), Graali (Georgia), RP (Estonia), Tuhatkunta (Finland), UNi (France), RCDS (Germany), DAP-NDFK (Hellas), Fidelitas (Hungary), VAKA (Iceland), FIG (Italy), LKJA (Latvia), JKL (Lithuania, no vote), SDM (Malta), HSF (Norway), MK-AWS (Poland), NZS (Poland, no vote), JSD (Portugal), NPPCDS (Romania), ODM (Slovakia), NNGG (Spain), FMSF (Sweden), SLS (Switzerland), USA (Ukraine), and DY (Yugoslavia). Observer members present were YPF (Belarus) and FILS (Israel). Representatives of the organisations UGEL (Algeria), Ogra Fianna Fail (Ireland), and Conservative Future (UK) attended the Annual Meeting as guests.

This growth was influenced by external and internal factors. An important external factor was the integration of most of the centre-right parties into the EPP. This also led to the integration of the EUCD and the EDU into the EPP. In 1995, the European Democrat Group joined the EPP-group (1998-2009 EPP-ED-group). Even when some restless members of EDS started a new student organisation “European Student Association” (EStA) parallel to EDS, they were doomed to failure, since the effort did not fit into the overall political situation towards integrating the entire centre-right in one movement.

Since its foundation, EStA negotiated with EDS on the conditions of a merger. By 1991/92, EStA and EDS agreed to not to accept any new members until a final mutual agreement (“moratorium”) was reached. After 1992 and the dissolution of EStA, it was eventually possible for a new and united EDS to respond to the political challenges of the decade by enlarging its membership.

However, for the time being the number of active members decreased to eight – the lowest number ever. The project to enlarge EDS to the East was on hold until 1993. And matters were even more complicated: In 1995, under the chairmanship of Andrew Reid (Conservative Students), the new EDS-board rediscovered the existence of the Christian-democrat student organisation “United Students for Europe”, some of whose members had suspended their membership in EDS during the eighties (SDM Malta) or even earlier (CDS Belgium). After some talks, an official “warm invitation” to these organisations to “apply for EDS membership in order to further strengthen the centre-right political student movement in Europe” was signed by the members of the Bureau and the Council on 23 March 1997. After even more talks, the student organisations from Luxembourg, Malta, and Belgium decided to join EDS. Other USE-member organisations had dissolved, or merged with EDS- or YEPP-member organisations.
A second and probably the most important trend influencing European party politics in the nineties were the new parties in Central Eastern Europe. Hence, it was increasingly important to travel to the East and talk to prospective member organisations. In 1992, Chairman Laura de Esteban suggested to speed up the enlargement of the organisation, and to focus on Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, but to “wait with Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Albania, Latvia and Lithuania”. She also suggested three criteria for the evaluation of prospective members: EDU-membership of mother parties, the overall situation of their countries, and whether the organisations attended EDS-events and showed interest in the political work of the organisation.607

Already before that, at the Council Meeting in Bonn on 26-27 January 1991, the applications of FISS (Bulgaria) and NPP-CD (Romania) were discussed for the first time. They both were accepted at the Council Meeting in Athens on 13-14 April 1991.608 At the Annual Meeting 1991 in Protaras (Cyprus), the application of Tuhatkunta (Finland) for observer membership was accepted. The application of UNI (France) was discussed for the first time at a Council Meeting in January 1992.609 At the following Council in London in March 1992, this application was however rejected. But NPP-CD from Rumania was accepted as full member. Applications for observer membership of the Polish Republican Coalition (later MK-AWS, successor of “Verbum”), SCDP (Bulgaria), ENIP (Estonia) and the Democratic Youth (Serbia) were accepted as well.

Members of ENIP (Estonian National Independence Party, established in 1988, ERSP in Estonian) were met for the first time on the occasion of a study trip to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in January 1992. At that time, it was the leading party in the process to regain Estonian independence. Its Vice Chairman Jüri Adams drafted the constitution. Another Estonian organisation that was met was “Res Publica” which joined EDS in 1993 and became a full member in 1994. This organisation was established in 1989/1992, and was at that time supporting the centre-right party coalition “Isamaa”. In Latvia, EDS met Janis Lusis from the Latvian Popular Front, Karlis Leiskalns from the Conservative Party and representatives of their youth organisation “Young Democratic Union”, representatives of the small Christian Democrat Party, and Romualdas Razukas from the People’s Front. It was decided to wait until after the Latvian elections to then look for a possible member. In Vilnius
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(Lithuania), EDS met student representatives of the university and representatives of the Independence Party, a conservative splinter group.610

In October 1992, the Council eventually accepted French UNi’s application for observer membership, but postponed the second application of the Bulgarian FISS (Bulgaria) for observer membership (full member in November 1997).611 At the Council Meeting in Frankfurt Main (Germany), in December 1993, the Ukrainian Students League became observer member. At the same time CCF announced that it had changed its name to “British Conservative Students” (CS).612

At the Annual Meeting of 1993, Forum Młodych Konserwatystow (FMK, Poland), Tuhatkunta (Finland) were accepted as full members and Res Publica (Estonia) as observer member.613 At the Annual Meeting of 1994, Res Publica became full member. At the Council Meeting in May 1995 in Poland, MK (Czech Republic) became observer member. At the Annual Meeting 1995, UNI (France) and MK (Czech Republic) became full member, and HAZ (Croatia) observer member.

Due to the slow increase in membership until then, often caused by the mistrust between the various factions inside EDS, from 1995 it was discussed to revise the membership policy. As a result, during the chairmanships of Andrew Reid (CS, UK), Günther Fehlinger (AG, Austria), and Michalis Peglis (DAP-NDFK, Greece) the members of the Council Meeting supported a far less restrictive open doors policy for applicant organisations. This decision was supported by the expulsion of 10 organisations that no longer participated in EDS-activities on 16 November 1996, making way for fresher forces to join.614

From then on, not only details of political manifestos, but also historical facts, such as the involvement in anti-Communist student uprisings or links to major centre-right government parties became decisive for a positive vote on membership applications: “The theme of expansion has been central to our thoughts and our activity throughout the year. European Democrat Students has long supported the enlargement of the EC and this has been reflected in our own inclusion of members from the liberated democracies of the former Soviet-bloc.”615
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Even a double-membership from Poland became possible: In May 1997, the application of NZS (Poland, “They seem like jolly nice chaps” – Ross Curds, 1992) for observer membership was accepted (Sinaia, Rumania, first submitted in 1992). Both FMK (ex-Verbum, later MK-AWS, since 2001 MK) and NZS enjoyed full voting rights. In May 1998, NZS became full member.

The Democratic Youth of Yugoslavia became observer member for the second time at the Annual Meeting of 1996. Ukrainska Studentska Spylka, student organisation of the “Rukh” movement of Ukraine (Ukrainian Students’ Association), became observer member in October 1996 in Paris.

In March 1997, in Stockholm, ODM (Slovakia) became observer member. At the Council meeting in Lund (November 1997, Sweden), the Youth of the Democratic Choice of Russia became observer member. At the Annual Meeting of 1997, EDS accepted the applications from CSJ (Luxembourg) and Fidelitas (Hungary) for observer membership and from HAZ (Croatia, application in 1994) and Democratic Youth (Yugoslavia) for full membership.

At the Annual Meeting of 1998 EDS welcomed SDM from Malta, FILS from Israel, and YPF from Belarus as observer members. Fidelitas from Hungary and CSJ/SaS from Luxembourg, ODM from Slovakia and USA from Ukraine became full members.616 At the 1st Council Meeting of the 1998/99 term in Paris, Nuoa Generatie, the youth organisation of the Christian Democrat Popular Front of Moldova, became observer member.

At the second Council Meeting of the 1998/99-term on 20 December 1998 in Athens, Forza Italia Giovani from Italy was unanimously accepted as a new member. At the third Council Meeting in Brussels on 6 February 1999, EDS welcomed Latvias Konservatīvas Jaunatās Apvienība (LKJA, Latvian Conservative Youth Union), and HAZ-BiH from Bosnia-Hercegovina as new members. At the 5th Council Meeting in Trier (Germany) in May 1999, SAS from Slovenia, Graali from Georgia, and JKL from Lithuania became observer member. The student association “Graali” was the student organisation of the National Democratic Party of Georgia (Christian Democrats, established 1917/1981), which was paid a visit in Tbilissi in October 1998. The organisation JKL was the youth organisation of the party of Vytautas Landsbergis, the key architect of the Lithuanian independence.

At Annual Meeting in Bugibba (Malta) on 26-28 July 1999, 22 Full Member Organisations and 7 Observer Member Organisations were present. In his closing remarks, outgoing Chairman Michalis Peglis also pointed at the development from 11 to 22 member organisations present and voting since the Annual Meeting of 1995 as one of the major successes of his 5-year presence in EDS. At this meeting, the Council also celebrated the return of “Christen Democratische Studenten” (CDS) from Belgium after almost 30 years and accepted them as observer member.

But the enlargement went on: At the Council meeting in Strasbourg, February 13, 2000, EDS unanimously accepted Juventude Social Democrata from Portugal as a new observer member. As full member, EDS unanimously accepted Studenti Demokristjani Maltin from Malta, LKJA from Latvia, and Forza Italia Giovani from Italy. At the Council meeting in April 1999 in
Bratislava, EDS accepted the Albanian Democratic Student Forum as a new observer member. The accession was meant to be a positive signal to the reform movement in Albania’s Democratic Party. At the Council Meeting in February 2, 2001, in the city hall of Antwerp, the organisations Graali (Georgia), JKL (Lithuania) and CDS (Belgium) were accepted as full members. With this, EDS reached the number of 39 member organisations (Conservative Future, UK, suspended membership in May 1999). The youth of the VMRO-DPMNE-party from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia joined EDS in May 2001.

Events and Public Relations

Summer Universities

The growing number of member organisations also influenced the annual Summer Universities. More national delegations than ever before attended these conferences. At the same time, a kind of competition who attended the most Summer Universities preserved some homogeneity among the participants. Famous became for example Bernhard im Oberdorf (SLS, Switzerland) who attended almost all the Summer Universities (!), first as a student, later as a journalist, or Lars Andreas Lunde from NKSF (HSF, Norway), who attended almost all Summer Universities between 1988 and 2001. Every Summer University was completed by the traditional EDS-Football Tournament (sometimes beach volleyball tournament) and grandly
closed with the highly appreciated EDS-cabaret, where any delegation had to perform those parts of the previous programme they hated most.

The 1991-Summer University took place in Nicosia and Protaras (Cyprus) with about 100 participants from 15 organisations. The 1992-Summer University in Palma de Mallorca (Spain) was smaller, with 80 participants from 23 organisations. Both events were overshadowed by serious internal conflicts, which had emerged in Cyprus, but could be solved in Palma. Topics in Palma were Higher Education, the Future of the European Communities, Politics in Latin America, and the future of the labour market in Europe. The conference was opened by the President of the University of the Baleares, and included round table discussions as well as receptions by Joan Fayada, Mayor of Palma, Joan Verger, President of the Council of Mallorca, and by Cristobal Soler, President of the Balearian Parliament.617

The 1993-Summer University took place in Vestre Gausdal near Oslo (Norway) with about 120 participants. There was no specific topic, but in the tradition of previous Summer Universities, the hosting country and many areas of politics were presented. “The profile of the last SU was more academic than earlier. More working groups and more plenary discussions were welcomed by the participants.”618 Among the speakers were Kaci Kullmann Five, Party Leader of Hoyre, Francis Sejersted, Chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, Aneurin Rhys Hughes, head of the EC-delegation to Norway, Bo Lundgren, Minister for Fiscal and Financial Affairs (Sweden), and representatives of the Oslo-university, since higher education was part of the programme as well. A day was spent in the winter Olympic city of Lillehammer. Last but not least, a new songbook was presented.

The 1994-Summer University took place in Greifswald (Germany), on the coast of the Baltic Sea, under the auspices of Bundeskanzler Helmut Kohl and Prime Minister Carl Bildt. 150 students took part. Lectures and speeches covered areas such as “Security in Europe”, “Europe: Diversity and Identity”, “Policies for Future Generations”, “The state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Europe”, “Economic Reform in Eastern Europe”, “University Reforms in Germany”, “Do we need a Reform of Economics in Europe?”, and “Quality of Education in Europe.” Among the speakers were Prime Minister of the State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Bernd Seite, State Minister Steffi Schnoor, CDU-Secretary General Peter Hintze, EPP-Secretary General Thomas Jansen, and Timothy Boswell, Parliamentary Under-secretary of State, Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, UK. For the first time after many years, Hans-Uwe Erichsen, first Secretary General of the ICCS in 1961, now President of the
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German Rector’s Association (HRK), appeared at an EDS meeting to speak on “Perspectives of a European University Landscape”.

The 1995-Summer University on “The Creation of the European Conscience” took place in the remote Greek region of Thrace, in the city of Komotini: “Thrace was selected to host the conference because the region is forgotten and needs to be promoted with deeds and not words” reported the Greek news agency MPA and continued “the fact that Greece was able to host it defeating the candidatures of France and the Czech Republic is regarded as very important success. In this year’s Conference which began yesterday participnte 119 student members of Liberal, Christian-democratic and Conservative parties from 20 European countries. The conference will be concluded this weekend and is expected that resolutions on issues concerning the Intergovernmental Conference of 1996, higher education, human rights, the crisis in politics, new technologies and the problems faced by the new generation in Europe will be adopted. The programme of the Conference includes speeches by politicians, university professors and academicians and also a number of cultural events and visits in archaeological sites of Thrace.”

It was however exaggerated, when the same news release claimed the “promotion of the Greek national positions and the marking of the peculiarities of the region of Thrace are the two main targets” of this conference. The dissemination of such news releases would however explain some hostile reactions of some of the Muslim inhabitants of surrounding villages to some of the foreign visitors and the absence of a delegation from neighbouring Bul-
garia. As a matter of fact, most of the students were totally unaware of these objectives, and EDS never actively promoted such positions.619

The Summer University of 1996 was held in Prague and Podiebrady, Czech Republic. The topic was “Central Europe: an integral part of Europe”. Among the speakers were Jiří Stejskal (Czech Christian Academy), Marek Benda (Vice Chairman of the ODS parliamentary group), Pavel Kysilka (Vice president of the National Bank), Kamil Janáček (Komercni banka), Pavel Stepanek (Ministry of Finances), Madsen Pirie (Adam Smith Institute), Tomáš Ježek (former minister for privatisation), Tom Spencer MEP, Sir Michael Burton (British Ambassador), Stephan Eisel (Adenauer Foundation), and Karel Maly (Chancellor, Charles University). Visits included the City Hall of Prague, the city of Kutna Hora, and the Institut Francaise in Prague. Working Groups dealt with the future role of Russia, security and NATO, conservatism, the role of Germany, and the crisis of the welfare state.620

In 1997, the Summer University “Pasion por Europa: Building a Bridge for the World” took place in La Mollina close to Malaga in the South of Spain. For the complex topic “decision-making-processes of the EU concerning the enlargement of the Union”, the EDS-board had decided to have a role play instead of a speaker. For this, about 40 participants joint three different groups, that were supposed to play the role of parliamentarians, commissioners and

the EU-council. These three groups were supposed to adopt EU-law according to the legal procedures of the EU. The 200 participants also discussed topics such as EU-subsidies, the common agricultural politics, immigration and problems of social-democratic governments. One of the highlights was the presentation of the President of the Bask People's Party, Carlos Iturgaiz, who reported of the atrocities committed by ETA-terrorists and his plans for the future of the Bask country.

Other prominent speakers were Inocencio Arias, Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ángel Acebes, General Co-ordinator of Partido Popolar, Manuel Atencia, President of Partido Popular in Malaga as well as
representatives of a agricultural co-operative producing olive-oil. The marvellous swimming pool is also well-remembered by the author.

The Summer University of 1998, which commenced on a very hot 25 July in Vienna, was designated “Against Extremism”. A first panel covered the topic “Extremism in Europe” to which to a certain extent referred all other lectures and panels of the Summer University. Participants were Max Koch, former chairman of the Institute for Integration of the City of Vienna, Hannelore Beil, Federal Ministry for Domestic Affairs, and Prof. Michalis Papandreou, University of Athens. The state of the political culture also played a role in the panel on EU enlargement at the Law Faculty in Vienna. Participants were Hans Mühldorfer (Chamber of agriculture), Martin Sadik (Federal Ministry for foreign affairs), Ilse Rein (Association of Industrialists), Prof. Gerhard Fink (University for Economy, Vienna).

Other panels covered Higher Education, the EMU and Federalism and their references to civil society. The conference also included cultural highlights such as the reception in Vienna’s city hall, hosted by the Mayor of Vienna. In Bad Ischl in the Alps, the second part of the EDS-Summer University took place, which included higher education discussions, working group meetings as well as sports events.

A totally different picture was delivered in the Summer University of 1999, which was held on 24-31 July 1999, on Malta. The topic was “Europe and the Euro-Mediterranean Co-operation”. About 200 participants from 30 countries took part, including most of the European countries, Israel, Azerbaijan, Morocco and Algeria. The conference was opened by a speech of Louis Galea, Minister for Education of Malta, who outlined the policy of his government and the tasks of the Christian Democrats for the next century. Prof. Henry J. Frendo introduced the Maltese Republic to the participants. Anthony Livanious (Karamanlis Institute, Athens) held a keynote speech on “Mediterranean Co-operation”.

The Permanent Working Groups on Policy, on Higher Education and on Campaigning held their final sessions for the work year 1998/99, and pre-
pared their final documents. Dominic Fenech, Roderick Pace, Stephen Calleya and Ambassador Alfred Zarb reported on several dimensions and the history of the EuroMed-Process since the Barcelona-Conference in 1995. A festive dinner was hosted by Jesmond Mugliett, Parliamentary Secretary for Youth and Culture of the Government of Malta and addressed by Alejandro Agag Longo MEP, Secretary General of the EPP. Maren Günther, former EP-rapporteur for Malta, spoke about her concept to bring Malta closer to the EU. Mounia Ghoulam from the Istiqlal youth of Morocco, spoke of her view on the EuroMed dialogue. Prof. Gerd Langguth (Germany) presented some general remarks on the German view on the Mediterranean world. Peter Diacono (Brandstätter Group) and Leonard Mizzi spoke about the interests of private companies in the north-south-integration process.

Günther Fehlinger (UNICE) presented the views of the European business community on the European social model. Other lectures dealt with the role of the EU (Ives de Barro), the interaction of cultural and economic aspects (Prof. Ian Refalo), the importance of developing the telecommunication systems (Michael Frendo). Finally, the newly elected Executive Bureau had the opportunity to meet the President of Malta, Guido de Marco.

The Summer University of 2000 took place in Warsaw and Gdansk (Poland), 23-30 July 2000. About 250 EDS-activists from 40 European countries gathered in Warsaw and Gdansk for a week of discussions, debates and briefings on the topic “Centre-Right Politics in Europe”. A total of 19 speakers addressed the participants including Marian Krzaklewski, Chairman of AWS, Radoslaw Sikorski, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Paribas-banker Christo-
pher Bandyk, Maria Smereczynska, Family Minister, and Roland Freudenstein of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation. Radoslaw Sikorski presented his view on Poland’s process toward EU-membership. Maria Smereczynska defended traditional family values, emphasising that families rather than individuals are the fundamental cell of every society.

Roland Freudenstein emphasised the importance of political parties and NGO’s from democratic countries, supporting the opposition in undemocratic countries or countries where democracy is not fully developed. Czeslaw Bielecki, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Parliament, outlined the urgency of the EU-enlargement for Poland, assuming that Russia’s power would increase again and could then be a threat to the Polish EU-membership. Katarzyna Skórzyńska, Deputy Minister of European Integration, said that the lack of enthusiasm among Polish citizens towards EU-membership caused by the fear of losing the newly gained independence.

On the third day, the participants gathered in front of the Belarusian Embassy in Warsaw, in order to protest against the Lukashenka-regime. The second part of the meeting took place in Gdansk. Lectures there were held by the former EDS-Chairman and current head of public relations of the EPP-group Per Heister, by the former EDS Chairman Michalis Peglis, who spoke about being a private entrepreneur, and Bill Cash MP from the Conservative Party of the United Kingdom, who provoked strong criticism with his Europe-sceptic ideas.
The 2001-Summer University took place in Nicosia and Limassol (Cyprus). The topic of the conference was “Globalisation: Challenges and Opportunities”. About 190 students from 34 countries participated. The programme of the Conference included speeches by politicians, university professors and academics and a number of cultural events, visits and even a barbecue. Andreas Adrianopoulos, former Greek Minister of Trade and Industry, outlined the importance of market economy for producing wealth worldwide. Poverty in the third world was created by planned economy. Demetrios Syllouris MP, head of the Democratic Rally group, emphasised the present and future role of Cyprus as a bridge between East and West, North and South. Andreas Theofanous, Professor of Political Economy, compared in his lecture the economic and political situation of the EU and the US, analysing a “political deficit” in the EU.

Theresa Villiers, British Member of the European Parliament, elaborated on the positive effects of globalisation. According to her, globalisation means more choice, more freedom and more availability of information. A highlight of the conference was a dinner hosted by Nicos Anastasiades, President of the Democratic Rally. Other speakers were Ouranios Ioannides, Minister of Education and Culture of Cyprus, Prodomos Prodomou MP, Economic Affairs Spokesman of the Democratic Rally, Alexos Michaelides, Institute for Euro-Democracy, Lellos Demitriades, Mayor of Nicosia, Andreas Droushiotis, Managing Director of Hanseatic, Günther Fehlinger, SME-Union (Brussels), Eva Gustavsson, Moderate Party (Stockholm), Demetris Kontides, Mayor of Limassol, and Oliver Röseler, Advisor to the Chairman of the CDU (Berlin).
Debates took place on issues concerning moral values in politics, economics, higher education, human rights, and new technologies. The event concluded another decade of EDS’ history – this time with a happy ending. Everybody was celebrating together. Everybody else in the hotel could hear the evidence... EDS was united. Optimism on European affairs was the mood of the day. Finally, at the end of the traditional cabaret everybody who was not fast enough was thrown in the hotel pool by the German delegation – clothed of course.

**Winter Universities**

In the middle of the decade, the Bureau realised the importance of debating European topics more thoroughly, and re-invented the Winter Universities. The intension was to gradually develop the Winter Universities into the second largest and at the same time the most political EDS event of the year: “A student- and youth organisation such as EDS has all young people as a target group. For us it should be even more essential to enlarge our activities, because we always look to the future. [...] When in 1996 the socialist youth had a Summer Camp with 5000 participants they could demonstrate their presence among the youth in all of the media.[...] Secondly, it seems quite necessary to look eastward, on the development of a civil society and its institutions. The European Peoples Party and EDS as its student organisation have a special responsibility to support the convictions which make the democratic constitutions of the CEE-countries a living reality. [...] We are in an
age of mass-democracy and media-democracy which force us to mobilise our supporters and to unify them with our activists. There is no reason to believe that this couldn’t happen. That was the lesson of the Winter University.”

The first Winter University after 1983 took place in Helsinki and Talinn in February 1996, with about 50 students from 23 countries. The aim of the conference was to take a closer look at the role of Russia in Europe both politically and culturally, and what have been the effects to the rest of Europe. Referring to this topic, Risto E. J. Penttilä MP, and Olli Rehn MEP, talked about the EU- and NATO-enlargement. A very interesting debate went on about the question whether the borders of Europe should include Russia or not.

The second Winter University styled “Taking Care of Europe’s Future” took place in Brussels in February 1997. It included a visit to the European Council, hosted by the General Director Brunmayr, a visit to the European Commission, and a round table discussion with Sir Leon Brittan, Vice President of the European Commission, a visit to the NATO-headquarters, a meeting with EPP-Secretary General Klaus Welle, and a visit to the European Parliament. During the conference, the participants were addressed by Charlotte Cederschiöld MEP (Sweden), Efthimiou Christodolou MEP (Greece), Karl von Habsburg MEP (Austria), Ursula Stenzel MEP (Austria), and Roy Perry MEP (UK).

These events were still rather small. That changed in 1998, when about 110 attended the Winter University in Brussels. The topic was “Knocking on Europe’s Door – Central Europe on the Way to European Integration.”

---
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The conference started with a reception hosted by the famous Greek singer Nana Mouskouri, at that time an EPP-member of the Committee on culture, youth, education and media of the European Parliament, who passionately pronounced the role of cultural exchange in the development of an all-European peace.

The next day started as “NATO-Day”. Members of the German delegation to the NATO-Headquarters explained the role of the defence alliance in a changing world. After that, Sir Leon Brittan, Vice-president of the European Commission, outlined the future development of Europe’s economy. According to him, only the liberalisation of markets was making the enlargement of the western zone of prosperity to the east possible. Other speakers were Tom Spencer MEP (UK), Astrid Lulling MEP (Luxembourg) and Dieter Koch MEP (Germany). The next day, the “Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe” (SHAPE) were visited. There, Lt. Col. Forsteneichner informed of this institution’s role in the allied defence concept. Later on, the conference was addressed by Efthimios Christodolou MEP (Hellas), Roy Perry MEP (UK), Klaus Welle, Secretary General of the EPP, and Per Unckel from the Moderate Party of Sweden.

The 1999-Winter University was even larger. The topic dealt with the European elections: “1999-2004: What must be done?” About 160 students from almost 35 countries and about 40 organisations participated. The programme was similar to that of 1998, but the second part was held in parallel to the Congress of the EPP. Thus meetings with Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria

Winter University 1998, opening reception with Nana Mouskouri MEP, and EPP Secretary General Klaus Welle
Aznar, Slovak Prime Minister Mikuláš Dzurinda, Konstantinos Karamanlis (party leader, Greece), Marcelo Rebelo de Souza (party leader, Portugal), Wolfgang Schäuble (party leader, Germany), Jacques Santer (President of the EU-Commission), and many other prominent politicians could be arranged. Finally, the Chairmen of the Working groups Michael Unger (Austria), Iva Kralj (Croatia) and Frank Engel (Luxembourg) reported the results of their work.

A different approach was used for the Winter University of 2000, with the topic “European Institutions and Civil Society”, which took place in the “Palais d’Europe” in Strasbourg. About 100 student leaders from 40 countries participated in the conference. Speakers were Jacob Söderman, the European Ombudsman, Antonio Tajani MEP, and Ilkka Suominen MEP, Vice-president of the EPP-group, who spoke about “The enlargement of the EU – are we ready?” Keynote speaker Hans-Gerd Pöttering MEP, President of the EPP Group, lectured on “Europe 1999-2004: It’s borders, limits and fringes”. The conference was also addressed by Nicole Fontaine MEP, President of the European Parliament, and commissioner Viviane Reding, who presented the latest projects for the development of the European youth and education policy. A highlight was a dinner hosted by Jacques Santer MEP, former President of the Commission. Other speakers were Walter Schwimmer, Secretary General of the Council of
Europe, and Ingo Friedrich MEP, Vice-president of the European Parliament, Gunilla Carlsson MEP from Sweden, Ursula Stentzel MEP Paul Rübig MEP from Austria, and Hans de Jonge of the Council of Europe.

The topic of the 2001-Winter University was “Regionalism in Europe”. Altogether 103 participants from 30 countries from Europe and beyond participated. The first part took place in Brussels, in order familiarise the participants with the European institutions. The second part took place in Antwerp to get to know internal Belgian politics better. Several prominent speakers were asked to update the participants on European (“Post-Nice-“) issues, among them President Hans-Gert Pöttering MEP, Roy Perry MEP (UK), Miet Smet MEP, Paul Rübig MEP (Austria), Nigel Ashford (Professor, UK), Alexis Wintoniak (EDU, Austria), Alexander Stubbe (Professor at Brugge University, Finland), Scott Hamilton (Consultant, UK), and Mattias Bengtsson (Timbro Institute, Sweden). Every presentation was followed by questions-and-answers-sessions.

The Belgian Constitutional Model was specified in speeches and lectures by Luc Van Den Brande, Jean-Luc Dehaene (former Prime Minister of Belgium), Wilfried Martens (President of the EPP), Marianne Thyssen MEP, and academics, such as Prof. Vos (Ghent-University) and Prof. Storme (Leuven University). Martin Borowsky PhD, representing the German State of Thüringen as legal councillor, presented the view of a German state concerning the European Charter. At a festive dinner, EDS also celebrated its 40th Anniversary together with former officers. Guest speaker was Carl Bildt MP, former Prime Minister of Sweden. In his speech he emphasised the contribution of EDS to the integration of Europe, but also remembered anecdotes typical for this organisation.
Seminars

During the nineties, EDS also saw an increasing number of seminar activities. The number of seminars went up from two in 1994/95 to seven in 1998/99 (including Winter Universities, but excluding Summer Universities, Fact Finding Missions and Working Group meetings; average number of seminars/working year: 4.8). Due to the increasing number of member organisations, the total number of participants in all events increased significantly from 229 in 1992/93 or 264 in 1993/94 to 504 in 1996/97 to 792 in 2000/2001. But more and more member organisations did not only wish to attend but also to host EDS meetings.

In order to “continuously improve the quality of the training [...] and thus to make the participants gain new skills for their work”, even a “Better Training Paper” with detailed guidelines for hosting seminars was adopted in May 1999. This paper was submitted by the Chairman Michalis Peglis himself, who had initiated the rapid growth of the seminar activities in the second half of the decade.

Though all seminars had to be financed by member organisations in principle, the EDS-secretariat helped raising funds. As a result, a high number of events created a reputation of EDS as one of Europe’s key players in organising political and educational student events. Thus, year by year the annual budget for events could be increased. External support came from, among
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others, the Council of Europe (European Youth Foundation), the European People’s Party, the European Commission, political foundations, national governments, and individuals, such as members of the European Parliament. Gradually, even though it is difficult to measure, prestige and quality of the seminars improved. One indication for this was the increase of events with a clearly defined topic. Another one was the growing number of high-ranking speakers, such as cabinet ministers, members of the EU-Commission, or representatives of the business, academic or media community.

In 1990/91, EDS organised six seminars on various topics, such as “European security policies” in connection with NATO and SHAPE, “Research Policies” with a focus on private research, “East-West Relations” with a large number of participants from Eastern Europe, and on European and Student affairs.\(^\text{624}\) A conference in December 1992 in Germany provided the opportunity to get more familiar with the EU-institutions by participating in a one-day-role play. Speakers such as Thomas Jansen, EPP-Secretary General and Peter Kittelmann MP informed the participants of their involvement in European politics. A seminar in July 1993 in Gdansk analysed the different national ways of political transformation in the years since 1989. Three models of transformation were analysed: the compromise model (Hungary, Poland, Slovenia), the capitulation model (Czech Republic/Slovakia, East Germany), and the control model (Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro). In the first case “the democratic opposition played a visible role for the rest of the society – the communist party had to deal with this fact [...], communist ‘liberals’ took the power in their parties” and decided to go the way of a peaceful compromise with the opposition. In the second case the opposition was weak, but it could initiate huge protests that made the communist rulers surrender. In the third case, the Communist parties made the rules for transition: “in consequence it won the elections, in some countries [this caused] bloody riots [...] [There is an] impossibility of any political compromise between the post-communist elite and the new elite.” According to these scenarios, the party systems developed differently, thus bearing an influence on the work of EDS.\(^\text{625}\)

In 1993/94, EDS organised five seminars with altogether 150 participants (without Summer University). Two seminars concerned higher education (Cyprus, UK). A seminar in Denmark discussed matters of the EU-enlargement. A seminar in Prague in March 1994 dealt with ethnic minorities: “Small is Beautiful”. All member organisations contributed to this seminar with reports on their national situation, which were compiled to an extensive report. At the

\(^{624}\) Annual Report 1990/91, pp. 5-6.
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seminar itself, representatives of the Czech government explained the new approach of the post-communist era towards ethnic minorities, but carefully avoiding mentioning the expelled German minority. The largest seminar was however the one on the European Monetary Union in Frankfurt in December 1993 with 60 participants. The participants visited the Stock Exchange, the Deutsche Bank and the Deutsche Bundesbank.\footnote{Annual Report 1993/94, p. 10.}

In 1995/96, the organisation held five seminars.\footnote{Andreas von Gehlen, EDS at Work, Taurus 1996, p. 14.} One of the larger seminars was on Education in Krakow, Poland (“Education – Social Value or a Market Commodity?” October 1995). Topics were the role of education in the post-totalitarian countries, and whether “educational systems [are] simply underlying the impact of political, economic and social reforms, or on the contrary, are education and training important vectors of these reforms?”

The objective of a training seminar on campaigning in London in November 1995 was to equip student politicians from developing democracies with the campaign techniques used by Western European political student organisations. The training was based on two main topics: how to secure basic student rights, and how to win student elections. The first part of the programme was organised by Conservative Students and focused on basic stu-
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\caption{Romania 1997: the three gentlemen in the foreground are Radu Vasile (Secretary General of the PNTCD-Party), Gabriel Tepelea (First Vice-president of the party, former political prisoner), and Victor Ciorbea, Prime Minister of Romania (left to right). Right of Mr. Ciorbea: G. Fehlinger, Chairman. Left of Mr. Vasile: M. Peglis, Victoria Cristobal, Razvan Cotovelea (right to left).}
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dent rights, vis-à-vis the university and the university student union. Emphasis was given to students’ freedom of speech on campus and freedom to form political groups.

The second part, organised by DAP-NDFK, focused on how to organise a successful student election campaign. Serious consideration was given to how to mount an effective political campaign in university, how to get a particular message to fellow students, and to different campaigning techniques and lobbying. At a round-table discussion, participants had the opportunity to talk about their experiences in their own countries. A similar training seminar took place in Athens, Greece, in May 1995, with a focus on effectively organising student organisation and public speaking. The speakers provided an analysis of the organisational model of DAP-NDFK in the Greek universities, internal elections, relations with governing bodies, decision making, policy making and over all the national student campaign which is held every year before the national student elections. The second part of the programme was organised by Conservative Students (UK) and focused on public speaking and the use of media.

In 1996/97, seminars took place in Stockholm, Copenhagen, Sofia, and Bucharest. A remarkable seminar was that in Stockholm on “Free Market Environmentalism”. Lecturers revealed the myths of the environmental movement and suggested free market solutions to environmental problems. The Copenhagen seminar discussed university policies, whereas the seminars in Sofia and Bucharest dealt with the European perspectives of Bulgaria and Romania.

A seminar in 1997/98 dealt with “Britain and Europe” including speakers such as Lord Howe, Tom Spencer MEP and John Stevens MEP. A seminar in Lund (Sweden, 1997) discussed free market solutions for immigration. Seminars in Romania and Bulgaria once again dealt with the political perspectives of these countries. In both events, cabinet ministers addressed the participants. In Sofia, EDS was received by Petar Stoyanov, President of the Republic, and Stefan Sofianski, Mayor of Sofia. A seminar in Athens in December 1998 dealt with youth unemployment and another one in Gdansk (Poland) in March 1999 with the European Monetary Union. At a seminar in Trier (Germany) and Luxembourg, the organisation discussed the policies which were to take priority in the period following the elections to the European Parliament (May 1999). The last seminar presided by Chairman Michalis Peglis took place in June 1999 in Dubrovnik (Croatia), and included a study trip to Mostar (Bosnia-Herzegovina). The topic was “Higher Education in Transition”. During the seminar, the participants were confronted with the destruction caused by the Balkan war until 1997.
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The first event of 1999/2000 was the seminar “Georgia and Europe”, taking place in Tbilissi (Georgia) in October 1999. The 25 participants were informed of the challenges of a country deeply involved in economic and political transition on the one hand and local military tensions on the other. EDS also tried to support the election campaign of the National Democratic Party of Georgia. Lectures were given by Irakli Kadagishvili, former Minister for Finances, Edward Surmanidze, Vice-president of the Parliament, Zurab Gaiparasvili, the Chairman of the Committee Youth Affairs, Tedo Isakadze, Deputy to the President of the Republic, Tengiz Kapanadze of McDonalds Georgia, and Mark Mullen, Director of the National Democratic Institute of the Democratic Party (US). The Archbishop of Mtsketa-Tbilissi, who is the Patriarch of the Georgian Church, the Supreme Court of Georgia, and Irina Sarishvili-Chanturia, President of the National Democratic Party of Georgia were paid a visit. Beside the beauty of the country, the participants also celebrated the victory of political conservatism at Stalin’s birthplace in Gori, 150 kilometres north of Tbilissi.

The second seminar of Chairman Ukko Metsola took place under the headline of “Encounters on Business and Politics” in Helsinki (Finland) in December, 1999. The topic itself – the relations between politics and private business – was covered by managers of the energy firm Fortum.com and of NOKIA, which held lectures on issues such as the future of the European information society and strategies for safeguarding reliable energy resources for the European industry.

EDS was also addressed by the former Prime minister Holkeri. In the second part of the seminar, the participants joined an EPP-seminar with
participants such as Riitta Uosukainen, Speaker of the Finnish Parliament, Ivan Kostov, Bulgarian Prime Minister, Andrius Kubilius, Lithuanian Prime Minister, Mikuláš Dzurinda, Slovakian Prime Minister, Edward Fenech Adami, Maltese Prime Minister, Mart Laar, Estonian Prime Minister, Mario Monti and Franz Fischler, EU-Commissioners, Kimmo Sasi, Finnish Minister for Foreign Trade and European Affairs, Alexandru Herlea, Romanian Minister for European Integration, Hans-Gert Pöttering, President of the EU-group of the European Parliament, and Elmar Brok, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Parliament.

Whereas Commissioner Monti outlined the importance of the small and medium sized enterprises and functioning markets for the future of the European prosperity, Commissioner Fischler stated in a third way approach between a “pure liberalisation approach” and a continuous financial support towards agriculture as a matter of fairness. Both agreed that the enlargement of the EU was to be better described as European reunification.

A seminar in Bratislava (Slovakia) in April 2000 had the topic “Youth Unemployment in Europe and its Possible Solutions”. The main purpose of the 60 student participants was to elaborate new, free market oriented solutions to solve the problem of youth unemployment, and to compare this with the reality of the Slovak Republic. Speakers included diplomats, such as Hans Löffler from the German embassy and Magda Vasaryova from Slovakia, who spoke about “European Integration and its Impact on the Labour Market”, but also the business sector, that was represented by Earl Godby from
Boeing, Gabriel Eichler from the steel firm VSZ, Hanna Ovesny-Straka from the Austrian Bank Austria-Creditanstalt and Peter Kollarik from Siemens.

Last but not least, academia was represented by Juraj Stern, former Rector of the Economic University in Bratislava, who spoke about “Education in the 21st Century and its consequence on the employment policy”. The highlight of the seminar was however a meeting with Mikuláš Dzurinda, prime Minister of the Slovak Republic, who vigorously defended his way to reform of his country, a process which was severely blocked by the former nationalist government.

The last seminar under the Chairmanship of Ukko Metsola was called “Left Alone? The Impact of the Balkan crisis on Bulgaria” and took place in Sofia in June 2000. The meeting was hosted by the Federation of Independent Student Societies (FISS). The main aim was to inform on how the disturbances in the economic and political sphere, as a result of the Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99) crisis, were being tackled. Another aim was to show Bulgaria’s prospects for the European Union.

Among the speakers were Jordan Sokolov, Chairman of the National Assembly, Nadezhda Mihaylova, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Boiko Noev,
Minister of Defence, Ekaterina Mihailova, UDF-group leader, and Dimitar Abadjiev, Deputy Chairman of UDF. Guglielmo M. Caporale, Professor of Economics and Finances of the South Bank Business School at South Bank University of London provided a critical assessment of the reforms undertaken in Bulgaria since the collapse of the communist regime. “Provided the necessary measures are adopted, the transition to a market economy will be successful, despite the disruption to trade caused by the Balkan crisis.” George Tabakov, President of the Bulgarian Foreign Investment Agency, informed the participants of the promotion of his agency for foreign investments in Bulgaria. Other speakers were Stefan Sofiyanski, Mayor of Sofia, Velislav Velichkov MP and Antoan Nikolov, Chairman of City Council of Sofia. Two days were spent in Borovec, a holiday resort in the Rila-mountains.

During the 2000/2001-session, seminars took place Budapest, Tallinn, Venice, Stockholm and Coimbra. With almost 800 participants, the organisation achieved the highest number of participants ever. The first seminar of the working year in Budapest was devoted to the “The future of centre-right in Europe.” During the Seminar special attention was given to the fact, that Fidesz (Hungarian Civic Party), the mother party of Fidelitas, was considering applying for membership in the European People’s Party. The seminar was also used to exchange views on EU-enlargement and Hungary’s accession negotiations with László Kövér, Chairman of Fidesz, József Szájer, Fidesz group leader, László Surján, chairman of the Hungarian Christian Democratic Alliance, Zsolt Németh, Political State Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Miklós Maróth, former dean of the Peter Pazmany Catholic University, and Alejandro Agag, Secretary General of the European People’s Party. The
The second seminar of 2000/2001 held in October 2000 in Tallinn dealt with “Environmental issues in the Baltic region”. Among the speakers was Tunne Kelam MP, Vice Chairman of the Parliament. The seminar also included an excursion to the Eastern part of Estonia, where the participants saw the Kohtla oil shale mine and the Narva Electrical power plant.

Estonia, October 1999, Excursion to the Narva Oil Shale Mine

The third seminar of the term, “Per Un Europa di Tolleranza e di Liberta”, took place in December 2000, in Venice (Italy). Among the speakers were the Vice President of the Regional Government Fabio Gava, Renato Brunetta MEP, Antonio Tajani MEP, Claudio Azzolini, European Secretary of Forza Italia. One of the more interesting issues discussed was the impact of the transformed Italian centre-right on Europe and inside the European People’s Party. Finally, Prof. Ferdinando Adornato, President of the Liberal Foundation, held a lecture on the cultural integration in the enlarged EU of the future.

Venice 2000: For Tolerance and Liberty
The fifth seminar dealt with “Consequences in Politics” and took place in March 2001 in Stockholm and Gimo (Sweden). Mattias Bengtsson, Executive Director of Timbro, former chairman of EDS, presented “The Timbro Think Tank and The Consequences of Ideas”. Bo Lundgren MP, Chairman of the Moderate.

Stockholm 2001: Bo Lundgren MP, Chairman of the Moderate Party

Party spoke on the co-operation within the European Centre right organisations and the EU. Gunilla Carlsson (MEP), Vice Chairman of the Moderate Party, explained “Why Freedom Is Difficult to Accomplish within the Present EU”. Gunnar Hökmark (MP), speaker on economic issues for the Moderate party, revealed his “The Vision of an Open and Prosperous Europe”. Nigel Ashford spoke on “The Consequence of Consequence”, and showed the effects of political philosophies on politics. The sixth seminar took place in Coimbra (Portugal) in June 2001 under the topic of “Portugal and the New Economy”. Lectures outlined the importance of Higher Education for the emerging new technologies as well as for the integration of Portugal in the EU, the solution of environmental and economic problems. The second day was partly devoted to explore the traditions of the Coimbra University, one of the oldest European universities. A dinner in a traditional wine cellar concluded the meeting.

Additionally, a “Freedom Tour 2001” dealing with the “role of freedom in higher education” integrated elements of working group meetings, campaigns, study trips and conferences. Thus, a group of EDS-activists travelled through Vilnius (Lithuania), Hrodno, Miensk, Mohiliev (Belarus), and Riga (Latvia) in June and July 2001, discussing the role of free universities in the three countries. In Belarus, the organisation showed its support to the stu-
dents in the democratic opposition against the Lukashenka-regime, which were organised in the Popular Front under the leadership of Vincuk Viacorka. The last part of the seminar in Riga was devoted to developing a common platform for the upcoming EU-Student elections (“EU-StudentVote). Besides the social and cultural aspects of travelling, this last project of the decade also showed the political implications of international student activities: support for democracy – albeit symbolic – training for democracy, and the development of common political platforms on the European level.

Permanent Working Group Meetings

Since the early nineties, Permanent Working Groups increasingly became a constituent part of the organisation’s activities. Since 1993, they were even mentioned in the Standing Orders. However, discussions of principled questions went on: “Obviously the idea of having a working group is so that a small, efficient and dedicated group of people can get together regularly and determine policy proposals for EDS where a council meeting would otherwise grind to a halt.” It was also recommended that the existing political viewpoints of EDS should be equally represented in these groups. However, the institution of Permanent Working Groups, each of them created for one year, developed and replaced the ad-hoc working groups of earlier days.

In 1992/93 and 1993/94, two permanent working groups existed: Higher Education (Chairman 1992/93: Christian Hepp, RCDS; Chairman 1993/94: Victoria Boswell, CS), and Eastern Europe (Chairman 1992/93: 

---
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Jacek Bendykowski, FMK; Chairman 1993/94: Taavi Lepmets, Res Publica). The higher education working group was intended to develop the Charter on Higher Education, campaign materials and was supposed to finalise an “EDS answer to the EC Memorandum on Higher Education”. This working group had separate meetings in Strasbourg, 15-16 December 1992, where the participants met with Doris Pack MEP, speaker of the EPP-group for Education and Youth, and additionally in March and May 1993. The Working Group on Eastern Europe was supposed to discuss the constitutional problems of Central and Eastern Europe. Later, it was suggested to discuss matters such as inclusion of the new democracies in international structures, European identity and ethnic minorities. This Working Group had its meeting in July 1993 in Gdansk.

The “Central Eastern European Working Group” (CEEWG) met in April 1994, where it became obvious, that the participants “had once again major problems with defining the aims of the CEEWG. While several of us were quite optimistic about our opportunities to compete with academics (and rightly so) we should still in the beginning focus on forces to create a thorough paper for the Summer University regarding Russia.”

Though this idea to receive political support for their respective country’s new independence merely reflected the expectations of participants from Central Eastern Europe, this line was more or less followed. After two more meetings (Gdansk, June 1994, and Jena, September 1994), an extensive report of the Working Group was published in 1995. After this, it was suggested to close this working group, “since its work has been finished” which was rejected by the Bureau that wanted to make use of it in its search for new members.

The higher education working group met again in London in June 1994, when it prepared the final version of the new “Charter on Higher Education”, and in 1996 in Cologne (Germany) to compare and discuss the situation of the national higher education systems and strategies to win student elections. As a result, papers on liberty, quality, the situation in Eastern Europe, and on “Responsibility of Students in the Society” were to be presented at the following Council meeting in Paris. Topics similar to working groups were also debated at the Study Session in Bonn in December 1993.

After the organisation had grown significantly, statutory requirements increasingly took up more time of Council meetings, and thus the time for
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political debates during Council Meetings decreased. Hence, as a result, since these debates moved more to the Working Group meetings, the political importance of the Permanent Working Groups increased. Indeed, what used to be a somewhat sidelined appointment, the position of a Working Group Chairmen became a highly important political question during the Annual Meetings.

This greater importance of Working Groups might also be the reason for the increase of their number. Since 1995/96, there were always at least three Working Groups, which were again “Higher Education” (since 2000 “Education”; Chairmen: 1995/96 Karl Arthur Arlamovsky (AG), 1996/97 Stephane Seigneurie (UNi), 1997/98 Tomi Huhtanen (Tuhatkunta), 1998/2000 Iva Kralj (HAZ), 2000/2002 Alla Nastych (USA), second Co-chairman for 2001/2002 Joao Mauricio (JSD)). Beside some surveys its most important result was the Higher Education Paper of 1998. The Working Group focused on the importance of student affairs for the identity of EDS as a student organisation as well.


In May 1996 and in order to achieve more substantial results, Mads Jensen and Andreas von Gehlen sent an “IGC-questionnaire” to the member organisations. The aim was to find out “what you really expect of the Maastricht II-Conference.” Additionally, the questionnaire was aimed at the establishment of a more continuous debate of European topics between the Annual Meetings of 1996 and 1997.\(^{633}\) For the draft of the EDS-position paper on the Inter-governmental conference (“Europe’s Role in the World”), in March 1997 this working group was restructured. The aim was to “identify our common interests and to fight for them on regional, national and European levels.”\(^{634}\) Finally, the paper “Europe’s Role in the World” was adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1997, in Mollina (Spain).

\(^{633}\) Andreas von Gehlen to the member organisations, 12-05-96, PAG.
\(^{634}\) Andreas von Gehlen, Memo, Europe’s Role in the World - EDS Working Group 1997, PAG.
The working group “Europe’s Role in the World” continued in 1997/98 (Chairman Andreas von Gehlen (RCDS)) and discussed the impact of global political developments towards student life. Result was the paper “Globalisation”, which was adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1998. The most important outcome of this Working Group was however the “Basic Programme” of 1998 and amendments to the EPP-Congress document for 2001.

Since many debates had the situation on the Balkans as their main focus, it was decided twice to establish a special Working Group only for this topic, that would also provide an occasion for Yugoslav-Croat student-meetings during a period of ongoing political conflicts (Chairmen: 1996/97 Razvan Cotovelea (NPP), 1999/2000 Todor Guntchev (FISS)).


In 1997, it was decided that a joint special meeting of all Working Group activists would be useful in order to facilitate the preparation of substantial policy papers. Though similar meetings had taken place in the past (Study Session, 1994), this once again reflected the greater importance of Permanent Working Groups in the second half of the decade.

Thus, Working Group members and the Bureau gathered together in order to prepare the programmatic work of the upcoming working year. The first so called “Policy Days” took place in Eichholz Manor near Cologne (Germany) in October 1997, with approximately 20 participants. After that, “Working Group Days” took place in Kreuth (Bavaria, May 2000) and Riga (Latvia, July 2001).
Public Relations

Public Relations in the nineties were maintained through publications, the new website and campaigns. The largest publication of the 1990/1991- and the 1991/92-terms was the “Taurus Jubilee Edition” of 1992, edited by Executive Director Eva Gustafsson.

This 50-pages strong booklet covered all aspects of the EDS-history. Activists from the sixties (Dieter Ibielski), the seventies (Nigel Ashford), the eighties (Rudolf Henke, Bettina Machaczek) and the early nineties (Eva Gustavsson) contributed to it. It contained ICCS-statements as well as the historic Manifestos of 1976, early resolutions and list of the former officers of the organisation. In 1993, 1994 and again in 1996, attempts to re-launch the “Taurus” failed.
In 1991/92, it was decided to rename the EDS-newsletter after the former “Taurus”-section into “Bullseye”, an idea of Alan Friis (DKS). In 1992/93, three issues in A4-size with altogether 36 pages were published (editor: Ross Curds, Conservative Students). In autumn 1993, Bullseye was printed one more time (editor: Lars Jørgensen, DKS). After this, it was replaced by regular mailings called “Main Mail”, referring to the seventies. Between 1994 and 1996, the “Bullseye” magazine was published as a black and white copy.

On an initiative of Executive Director Michalis Peglis in 1996, EDS started to print “Bullseye” as a magazine in four colours in C4-size to be sent to MEPs, parties and fraternal organisations, but mainly to be distributed among the members. Until 2001, 20 issues (including a couple of double issues) were published. Since 1996/97, EDS also published its Annual Report as a four-colour edition with 36 pages (costs in 2000: 6000 Euros).

A sticker portraying the policy-failures of the EU in the shape of the three monkeys was produced in 1998. EDS-leaflets were printed in 1993 (“This is EDS”, Ross Curds), 1994 (“blue edition”), 1995 (“One of Europe’s most influential student organisations”, Michalis Peglis), and in 2000 (“Networking Politics for a New and United Europe”).

A major improvement to the practical work of EDS was caused by the IT-revolution. A first web page was constructed in 1995 by FMSF (http://www.moderat.se/eds/), but was replaced in 1998 by www.edsnet.org. Electronic mailing started in August 1995, when the organisation introduced its first e-mail address: eds@
onden.forthnet.gr: “This means that I can send and receive information via INTERNET. Communicating with e-mail is the fastest and cheapest way ever invented. [...] EDS-Vice chairman Maria Elgstrand with the assistance of the Secretariat is creating the EDS Home-page in the INTERNET. This (which shall be ready for access rather soon) will provide the opportunity for anybody around the world to enter and have a look on what’s going on in EDS [...]. Do not forget that mailing was the way of communicating of the 16th century, fax of the 1980s. We are already in 1995...” (Michalis Peglis).635

The last regular mailing by post was sent out in 1998. Since then, the member organisations have been exclusively informed by e-mails, saving the organisation thousands of Euros.

In 2001, Secretary General Marc-Michael Blum initiated the “myEDS-project” which was supposed to collect the data of EDS participants and to store them in a database, in order to “build up a network of people with different interests and profiles but all with

---

635 Main Mail No. 1, Michalis Peglis to all EDS member organisations, Athens, August 23, 1995, PAT.
a centre right background. Our goal is [...] to keep contact even years after finishing your higher education." For this, a “Users Guide”, thousands of questionnaires and a database were produced.

In the early nineties, campaigns no longer belonged to the activities of EDS for the time being. Though posters were printed from time to time, their use in connection with a campaign was not secured. That changed only after 1995. And indeed, to campaign as a European organisation was always a challenge. Thus, the organisation was in the search for adequate ways how to campaign. One of the first steps in this direction was the proposed “EDS EU-ROSTAGE Internship Programme”, to be set up by EDS itself.

EDS-member organisations and Bureau members were asked to ask members of parliaments, public or private institutions, or organisations for internships which would have been compiled by the Executive Bureau. These internships were to be made “available to the public through EDS. In addition, EDS will publish existing programmes”. EDS would have been organising the programme and would have tried to “match supply and demand as AIESEC do in the field of private business.” Though the idea was received positively by the Council, the respective memorandum was never properly discussed, and the whole project disappeared from the EDS agenda. It became evident that the time was not yet ripe.

From 1996, EDS participated in the protests of the Yugoslav students against the Milosevic regime. Several times, EDS delegations travelled to Belgrade to actively support the activities of the Yugoslav member organisation, which was part of the democratic Zajedno coalition. In January 1997, another journey to Belgrade including Chairman Günther Fehliger was organised, but was however cancelled since Yugoslav embassies all over Europe had denied visas to the delegates in a concerted effort. Apparently, EDS had been included in a black list.


637 RCDS, Memorandum on the EDS EUROSTAGE Internship Programme, February 1994, p. 2, PAT.
One of the most powerful campaigns of EDS in the nineties was held on the occasion of the World Conference on Higher Education, hosted by UNESCO in October 1998 in Paris. Although the EDS-Council shortly before this event had welcomed “the initiatives of the UNESCO regarding Higher Educational policies”, the EDS motion “UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education” also expressed substantial criticism towards the UNESCO: “we warn to manifest the quite contradictory basic assumptions on fundamental starting points in the planned ‘World Declaration on Higher Education. For the twenty-first century: Vision and Action’. In the draft one is following the common practice of international declarations to please everybody by including his special ideas. The price paid is to put next to each other statements which aim at quite different goals: The radical changes in society and the continuation of present policies of Higher Education cannot be met simultaneously on a world-wide scale. The goal of providing equal access to university education for everybody and the demand to create elite’s are not easily reconciled. In the Declaration the importance of the latter is not made clear but suppressed in order to stress the equal opportunity aspect. We consider the formation of elite’s of primary importance too, since only these can be leading in the development of countries and in building up innovative industrial structures.”\textsuperscript{638}

An even more critical point was the treatment of human rights issues at the conference. At the same time when students were persecuted in Belarus and Yugoslavia, representatives of their governments were warmly wel-

\textsuperscript{638} EDS Declaration: UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, 03-10-98, p. 1, PAG.
comed by UNESCO-officials. Thus, Chairman Michalis Peglis had decided to not only to participate passively in the conference, but to show the relevance of a certain topics: “Violations of human rights” said Peglis, “are not purely academic topics.”

Hence, from the very beginning of the conference, EDS campaigned with the slogan “Education under Threat”. The permanent violation of academic freedoms by the governments of Belarus and Serbia were presented to show the necessity not to loose any connection to the world outside the conference. About 25 EDS-activists were permanently active at the conference. For information purposes, a magazine was produced specifically for the event, printed in one day by UNI and distributed 2000-times. At the EDS-stand (obtained in a deliberate act of conference piracy, since EDS had not been assigned to such as stand) any participant of the conference could get sufficiently informed by EDS-activists on the cases of the respective countries and on EDS as well.

Furthermore, a press-conference was held on 7 October, 1998). Michalis Peglis, EDS-chairman, Ukko Metsola, EDS-Vice Chairman, together with Emilian Djindic and Nemanja Eckert from the Democratic Youth of Serbia presented the cases of persecuted students. Emilian Djindic told the audience how a new university law had abolished academic freedom. This was followed by a presentation by Michalis Charalambous of the EDS-homepage and of a video, showing Serb police beating up students in the streets of Belgrade, on a 20-square-metre-screen. UNESCO considered this to be the largest student-organised event during the conference. About 80 media-representatives participated.

Belgrade, December 1997: student protest against the Milosevic regime with police chain blocking the protestors. The picture was taken by Gunther Fehlinger during the visit of the EDS-delegation in support of the democratic student movement. A video of the street protests was presented to the UNESCO-conference in 1998.
One of the most interesting coincidences during the press-conference was the intervention of the Minister of Education of Belarus, Vasiliiy Strazhev, who of course denied any violation of human-rights.

Another attempt to publicly denounce the Belarusian regime was made during the Council Meeting in Espoo near Helsinki (Finland) in December 1999. The impact of the repressive measures of the Lukashenko regime on Belarusian students and the EDS-campaign covered the largest parts of the political discussions. A planned protest near the conference building of the EU-summit failed however. Exaggerated security measures blocked any possibility to protest against the policy of the European governments.

Thus, during the 2000-Summer University, a large protest meeting was held in front of the Belarusian embassy in Warsaw. In January 2001, Vice Chairman Roberta Tedesco Triccas presented an extensive report “Belarus a Stifled Democracy”, which was supposed to call “readers to join in its relentless campaign to oust Lukashenka from its illegally obtained authoritarian and dictatorial position.”

An efficient way to show protest against some of the policies of the EU were street campaigns near the conference buildings of EU-Summits. Due to the “hunger” of the media for pictures it became possible for EDS to appear in many TV-stations (including CNN) and newspapers around Europe.

---

One example was the “no talk – no see – no hear”-campaign on the occasion of the EU-summit in Vienna in January 1999. Another one was the “Hot Air-Campaign” in Berlin in June 1999. In Vienna, journalists were seen admiring three students in gorilla dresses, symbolising the three monkeys and three failed EU-policies. “Hot Air” was the metaphor for German Chancellor Schroeder’s work ethic. It was quite strange for cameramen to see nothing but hot air or rather helium in big one-metre-balloons outside the conference-site. Beside the big blue balloons with the European stars the cameramen and the reporters saw a large poster with the face of Chancellor Schroeder, smoking blue clouds with a (cheap) cigar.

Soon after this, these campaigns were no longer possible, since extremist groups (and maybe agents provocateurs) started using this method to gain attention. Since then, the organisation tried to find new ways for campaigning and lobbying. A new beginning was therefore symbolised by the “Freedom Tour 2001” of the 12 EDS-activists travelling to Belarus mentioned above.640

Basic Papers in the Nineties

Policy: Manifestos and Basic Programmes

Traditionally, the programmes of the organisation integrated three policy areas: values and principles, higher education policies, and European affairs – topics of equal importance to the organisation. The point of reference for these programmes was always the first Manifesto of 1976. In 1992, the Executive Bureau decided to adopt a new “Manifesto”. A first draft was presented to the Executive Bureau by Vice Chairman Cecilia Brinck in February 1993, which repeated the structure of the 1976-Manifesto, but contained significant changes of the content. Several members of the Executive Bureau contributed with substantial amendments.641

A first category of revisions reflected the new political situation in Europe after 1989/90. A chapter on “A Just Society” referred to the global failure of planned economy. A second group of amendments was more problematic, since they were of Libertarian origin and contradicted fundamental beliefs of conservative and Christian democratic organisations. It was for example suggested to delete paragraph urging governments “to protect the interests of weaker and poorly organised sections of society”, or to refuse workers to participate in decision making in their work places. A third category of amend-

640 Cf. paragraph 4.4.3.
641 Minutes (hand-written version), Bureau Meeting, 13-02-93, p. 6, PAT.
ments referred to new trends in social and political life such as “new tensions between strong and weak, organised and unorganised interests”. Further privatisations of public companies were supported as well.

Anticipating opposition of conservative and Christian democratic organisations, the second draft of the Manifesto entrenched the recognition of “the importance of the Judaic-Christian traditions in our view of a just society.” However, this did not mean acknowledging these principles in general, but only introducing a preamble without reference to the rest of the Manifesto. Since the proposed chapter of “Education and Opportunity” neglected the humanist traditional idea of universal higher education, but alternatively suggested the “right to decide on their own form of education on the basis of varied possibilities”, this draft did not satisfy the majority of members. They were not happy that the ignored the contributions of universities to democracy and social progress or its commitment to rational and empirical science (or any other remark to theories on science) in a very utilitarian fashion. Additionally, to the disgrace of some of the members, compulsory student union membership was opposed as well.

Concerning European integration, the new draft emphasised the freedom of the individual, but omitted statements on European defence, the European economic and monetary union, or European common foreign policy. Since this was unacceptable for many organisations, the result of one of the first Bureau meetings on the Manifesto was the agreement to write an entirely new chapter on “European Unity”. However, neither the second nor the third draft of March 1993 or the final version of August 1993 contained a revised chapter on Europe, though the submission of a separate document before the Annual Meeting was announced at the Council Meeting in Athens (March 1993). The final version even contained an embarrassing statement in favour of direct elections to the European Parliament, which had already been practised since 1979.

The document that was eventually adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1993 was therefore significantly
revised. It emphasised that the suggested economic policies were also serving the interests of the weaker of the society. The minimum standard of life was now considered to be an “essential requirement for the economic freedom of the individual.” In the entirely new section on European policies, EDS encouraged “the further development of a common Europe” and supported the “spirit of the Maastricht treaty” as well as the “efforts of the newly emerging democracies of Eastern and Central Europe to establish Democratic institutions” and free markets. With this, a compromise was reached. Reservations came from CELF (against “supporting policies of social welfare designed to help individuals”), RCDS (“social market economy” instead of “Market economy”), and Tuhatkunta (in favour of compulsory student union membership).

However, immediately after the adoption of the Manifesto the discussions continued. The newly elected Chairman Tim Arnold remarked that the compromise “does not necessarily mean, however, that it [the new Manifesto] is richer and more coherent than its predecessor. In particular, the chapter on European integration ought to be extended. Paragraphs on issues which gain importance in the 21st century are still missing.” Vice Chairman Lars Jørgensen (DKS) submitted a paper asking whether the Manifesto ought to be “Concealing conflict or making manifestation of unity?” A new manifesto should not only contain “self-evident” issues such as the belief in the equality of men and women, but also be a “basis for real, visionary political work inside EDS”. Jørgensen also asked to integrate topics such as Europe’s external relations, research politics, and the reform of the European institutions. “Generally, we should focus on the word ‘quality’! Quality of life, quality of Higher Education, quality of the European Union – quality in many aspects and many areas.”

A new draft came from Vice Chairman Fredrik Johansson merely rephrasing large parts of the adopted Manifesto. But his draft also dealt much more with policies than the adopted version which was focusing on political philosophy, and included most of the proposals of Lars Jørgensen’s paper. Johansson also agreed with a limited vision of the welfare state that “says that individuals and families have the main responsibility for their own well being, but that government shall provide for the unfortunate”. In its paragraphs on state and economy, the new draft followed however the adopted manifesto. For the chapter on Europe, it put an emphasis on the importance of the EC-enlargement, and the dangers of centralism, though it again clearly supported the Maastricht-treaty: “Economical and political integration have had great influence on peace, stability and prosperity. We support the move-
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642 EDS draft working programme for 1993/94, p. 1, PAT.
ment towards closer co-operation and the fast admission of the new democracies of Eastern Europe into [...] the European Union.” For higher education, Johansson suggested a separate Manifesto. However, these proposals were not adopted.

In order to better reflect the changes in the organisation since 1995, Chairman Günther Fehlinger suggested developing a new Basic Programme in 1997. The first draft came from Anders Hall (FMSF, Sweden) in November 1997. The final draft came from Frank Engel (CDS, Luxembourg). With its structure it not only reflected the enlarged membership that brought many new ideas and expectations into the organisation. It also reflected ideological developments of post-communist politics. The paper contained two sections: “Basic Values” and “Policy”. Whereas the first section had six short chapters (The Values of Values, The Human Being, The Society, The Family, The State, The Environment), the second section had four chapters containing 53 paragraphs, that covered almost all areas of politics. The Policy-part in particular was once again based on older manifestos of the organisation. After a long debate, the fifth draft of this paper was unanimously adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1998, in the Alpine spa Bad Ischl, Austria (section 1), and at the Council meeting in Paris in October 1998 (part 2).

The first article of the new Manifesto was undoubtedly the most innovative part of the new programme:

“The Value of Values

1. We believe that political action must be based on firm values. A civilised society consists of a certain set of inviolable right for its citizens and definite boundaries for the actions of the state and the use of power. [...] 
2. Politics is not the art of pragmatic muddling through. Politics needs good values in order to provide a moral guideline for political action. The purpose of this programme is to explore those values and their implications on certain policy areas.”

By this, the organisation acknowledged for the first time, that even the concept of having values was coming more and more under pressure. Additionally, the organisation emphasised the “supreme importance to personal freedoms and civil liberties” but accepted the human society as “an extension of the human beings’ social nature. [...] As such, we endorse the fact that society constitutes the framework for mankind’s search and realisation of social relations, wealth, security and self-fulfilment.” Christian social philosophy was integrated by recognising “the family as a fundamental nucleus of society. The family has the primary responsibility for the important task of upbringing coming generations. We therefore reject policies which either
deprives the family of its possibilities to perform this task, e.g. tax policies which creates disincentives for families, or which tries to replace the family in its fostering role, e.g. government control of upbringing and education.”

The state was seen as the “ultimate upholder and protector of the individual freedoms and civil liberties. Its primary tasks are to protect the life and property of its citizens and uphold the rule of law. The state, as the solitary user of legitimate force, is thus necessary for a civilised society.” Finally, the organisation repeated its commitment to modern pluralistic democracy.

In the second “Policy”-part, the programme specified several policies to create and to maintain freedom: “19. As a general principle, an individual’s freedom ends where it comes into conflict with another individual’s freedom. Most such conflicts can be resolved by voluntary agreements between individuals in society. Conflicts of interest between an individual and society at large must be resolved with a great respect for the integrity of the individual. 20. Responsibility rests primarily with the individual. It can be executed individually or in voluntary co-operation with others. Involuntary collective action through the actions of the state is only called for when society fails to provide a basic security for all its citizens.”

Other chapters dealt with “Freedom in Society”, “The State” and its “Primary Responsibilities”, “Good Governance”, “The Future of Europe”, and the “The Global Perspective”. It was underlined that “the state should provide a framework for society in which the citizens feel safe and are free to seek self-fulfilment. [...] We also believe that every citizen must have a reasonable opportunity to improve his situation by means of work, education and entrepreneurship. 29. A social policy put in place where society fails and designed to help individuals and families to escape from repeated cycles of social and economic deprivation. Such help must be concentrated in areas of greatest need, and incentives should be implemented to encourage people not to be dependent on the state.”

The programme also expressed compassion in areas “where it is strikingly clear how the policies of today have failed: The labour market and social safety nets – 32. Today’s labour market leaves millions of people, many of them younger people who have never had an opportunity to get a foothold in the labour market, out of job. We believe the major reason for the unemployment problem is wrong political decisions. Taxes on as well labour, enterprises, capital and individuals are too high and people are being taxed out of the labour market. Too many privileges have been given to special interest groups and to much emphasis have been put on collective bargaining in the legislation. Europe needs to re-establish a labour market which is a real market and not an arena for political interventionism.”
Even though the Manifesto followed the intentions of the 1993-Manifesto to a great extent, a new approach became apparent in the paragraphs on “The Future of Europe”. The EU was considered “A European Success Story”: “For the past 40 years the EU/EC has been a strong force for democracy and prosperity in Europe. The strengthening of the European democracies through European co-operation was a strong force against communism. The reduction of trade barriers between the western European economies has helped to prevent trade wars, protectionism and political crises. The expansion of the EU/EC and the free trade support has led to the growth in European economies.”

The need for EU-enlargement was once more emphasised. New proposals were made for “Institutional reforms”: “The council of ministers is and should be the primary decision making body in the European Union. By keeping it that way, the characteristic of EU as a union of states whose legitimacy derives from the power delegated to the council by the national parliaments. The voting procedures in the council may have to be changed in order to ensure an efficient co-operation that is not blocked by narrow-minded national interests. At the same time, vital national interests must be respected. One way to achieve this may be to extend the use of majority voting, coupled with the option of ‘constructive abstention’ and require double majorities among the votes cast (i.e. a majority both among votes and countries).”

For the EU-Commission, a new and more efficient structure was suggested: “The Commission shall not be comprised of elected members of member states, but as professional working for the interest of the whole union. We believe that we can reach this aim by reducing the number of Commissioners and give each commissioner a clearly defined area of responsibility.”

The programme also underlined the importance of subsidiarity: “EDS believes that it is important for the union to allow for institutional competition between member states as long as it does not constitute a serious threat to the Single Market.” Finally, the Common Foreign and Security Policy was supposed to be strengthened, though acknowledging the positive role of the NATO.

This so-called “Ischl Programme” marked a significant progress of the programmatic debate of the organisation: The paper follows a personalistic view of man without an inflationary use of the word “Christian”. It was a good compromise clarifying many issues. Concessions to classical liberalism were made by strongly emphasising the positive impact of free markets. Concessions to Christian Democracy and Conservatism included the strong emphasis on values as such (beside freedom) and the priority of the family. Additionally, the Manifesto was more innovative than the 1994-Manifesto, since
it developed its own concept for the institutional future of the EU. The 1998 Manifesto served the organisation until the end of the decade.

**Politics: Higher Education**

In his opening statement at the 4th Council Meeting in Gdansk, 20th March 1999, Chairman Michalis Peglis stated that higher education is the “raison d’être d’EDS”. Already in autumn 1992, another effort for a new “Charter of Higher Education” had been made by the Vice Chairmen Cecilia Brinck (FMSF), Tim Arnold (RCDS), Ross Curds (CS), Mad Lebech (DKS) and Haris Meidanis (DAP-NDFK): “As students it is only right and proper that we should be concentrating on higher education but we should not been too narrow in our treatment of it. We should be looking not only at how we may improve standards in universities and how we may organise exchange programmes between countries, but also at the rights of the student. We should be considering how funding should be organised, whether it should be the responsibility of the state, of the individual or the individual’s parents. We should be considering how information should be given to prospective students especially about accommodation, living costs and standards of tuition. We should be looking at the ways in which student unions are organised and funded and at the rights of a student to join or not to join a students union.”643

In October 1992 a higher education-seminar was held in Oslo. The seminar was based on contributions by the participants. Some members delivered a report on the situation in their countries (NKSF, CS, DAP-NDFK, NPP-CDS, DKS, FMSF, Res Publica, NNGG). Topics included:

- Educational quality: Teaching assessment,
- Systems of access and permanence at the European Universities,
- Students participation in European Universities,
- Student Mobility and Cultural Exchange,
- University and Social exchanges,
- The financial situation of students.

At the Council Meeting following the seminar, Vice Chairman Tim Arnold presented a draft reply to the “EC-Memorandum on Higher Education” which was unanimously adopted. At the same event, a new “Charter on Higher Education” was discussed in the respective Working Group. EDS’ response to the Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community repeated

---
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many of the objectives of previous papers: thus it was argued that educational matters should remain in the responsibility of the member states, however “an important if supportive role as far as language training, mobility, information, co-operation and distance education are concerned” was assumed for the EC. The freedom of research was considered to be inviolable. Furthermore, the paper promoted equal chances instead of equal access to higher education institutions. European universities were to be opened to non-Europeans. Regular quality assessment in a European context “should influence the allocation of public funds”. Again, EDS urged to extend the EC-mobility schemes for students. Finally, EDS supported closer co-operation with the business world.

The first draft of the new “Charter on Higher Education” of December 1993 was elaborated by Peter Ejemyr (NKSF). It repeated key words of previous resolutions: plurality, autonomy and subsidiarity (to be granted by national law). A second part prepared by another author dealt with questions of academic autonomy, student self administration, access to higher education and European dimensions of higher education. Concerning student mobility, greater coherence of the various items of the individual studies was demanded. In order to improve the financial conditions of studies abroad, the limits for student employment were to be abolished. Other tasks were the implementation of a European student ID-card, and the integration of “Europe” in the curricula. An abbreviated version of this paper was adopted in December 1993.

The “Charter on Higher Education” was adopted at the Annual Meeting in Berlin in July 1994. The debates surrounding the preparation of this paper showed the extent of homogeneity that the new leadership had achieved. The number of amendments was low. Those from representatives with libertarian views (Res Publica) or those in favour of a stronger student representation (Tuhatkunta) were either rejected or withdrawn. However, some of the amendments that evidenced political priorities of only some of the members were adopted.

The new Charter contained seven chapters:

1. Higher Education and Knowledge,
2. Autonomy of Higher Educational Institutions,
3. Financing Higher Education,
4. Student Participation,
5. Student Unions,
6. The Social Dimension, and
7. The European Dimension.

Thus the structure was almost identical to that of the 1978 Charter. In its first chapter, it defined contents and aims of higher education: “Higher edu-
Basic Papers in the Nineties

Education is education beyond upper secondary school level, which is intended to further the individual’s intellectual development and to enable him to undertake academic research or a career in the professions.” Moreover, “Higher education should widen and deepen the fund of knowledge. It should permit the individual to enrich his own life by providing him with a greater understanding of Man, society, and the natural world, and a capacity for rigorous thought. By providing the means to suggest solutions to philosophical, social, and scientific problems, higher education should also prove its utility to society in general.” In one of the next drafts, this definition of higher education was amended. From then on, higher education was also defined as “as an investment in human capital which pays a return to individuals and to society as a whole.”

In its second chapter, the final version (based on the first draft) referred to the “principle of subsidiarity [which] should be implemented at all levels: European, national, and within the universities themselves. Decisions should be taken at the lowest possible level. (2.2) Autonomy should lead to greater competition and choice which renders the system more efficient and responsive to students’ needs. A large degree of diversity and specialisation among higher educational institutions is desirable in order to allow each to develop its full potential. Institutions must remain compatible with one another, but should be encouraged to develop individual profiles. (2.3) In order to reach the benefits of increased diversity and choice, students must be given access to all the information necessary to take informed decisions.” The third chapter on financing universities explained, “Financial support should be such as to allow for sufficient staff to permit students to work intensively in small groups. Funding should be of two types:

i for research
ii for the tuition of undergraduates.”

Though the state was seen as the main contributor to financing higher education, the support “should be based on quality criteria which are developed by an independent funding council. Evaluation of teaching performance should be based on a combination of peer reviews and student surveys. Rankings of higher educational institutions according to these criteria should be made public.”

The fourth paragraph, “Student Participation”, did not refer to the first draft. Higher education institutions were considered as “a community of those teaching and of those learning. Both groups are mutually dependent and must therefore co-operate in all aspects of campus life.” This time, the organisation was outspokenly positive towards student representation: “Student participa-
tion in all parts of the administration of higher educational institutions is to be encouraged. Where such participation does not already take place, it should be introduced.” Again, EDS emphasised that membership in student unions has to be “voluntary”, event though it “is an important goal” as long as there is a “spirit of subsidiarity and democracy”. The “primary objective” of a student union should be to “advance the social, cultural, and economic interests of students.” Only for this, it should “enjoy the necessary financial support” and “should be permitted financial autonomy within its constitution and the law.”

The new sixth chapter of the Charter dealt with “The Social Dimension” of academic studies. Access to higher education “should be widened, but academic standards must not be lowered. Access to higher education must always be dependent on individual merit and ability.” It was made clear, that “Regulating access to higher education on grounds other than academic merit violates the principle of autonomy and is to be rejected as a means of remedying social inequality. Therefore collective quotas based on race, gender, social background, or similar non-academic criteria are unacceptable. All notions of political correctness are to be rejected out of hand.” In order to improve the situation of poorer students, the state could contribute to “diminish student hardship by providing grants and student housing. However, hardship may be more efficiently diminished through a generous system of preferential loans which increases independence, room for discretion, and accountability on the student’s part. Such loans might be made directly available by the state, and could be repaid in connection with future tax bills. Alternatively, the state or a dedicated agency might monitor the provision of loans by other, non-state institutions in order to ensure that the repayment terms and interest rates meet certain minimum standards.”

The last chapter on “The European Dimension” supported the idea of student mobility, since “Modern societies need international co-operation.” For this, the European Course Credit Transfer System was to be enhanced. The Charter also emphasised, that the mobility schemes of the EU were not an
end in itself: “European mobility schemes such as ERASMUS and SOCRATES have helped to increase the European dimension in higher education. The ultimate goal, however, is not an endlessly proliferating series of programmes and networks. The ultimate goal is the individual free mover who is able to compile his own degree programme. The individual is best placed to determine how to meet his own educational needs; he should not be impeded by national, administrative, or financial barriers.” The introduction of the European Student Identity Card was once again demanded. Furthermore, since only a minority of students would be able to study abroad, “European components or modules should be made available to students pursuing national degree courses.”

The Charter also urged the European Commission to expand the European University Institute in Florence “into a fully-fledged model university with a truly European outlook. This university should be named after Walter Hallstein, whose brainchild the Institute was.” Again, there were few controversies, since this draft followed the conception of the first draft. The only paragraphs deleted dealt with political student organisations and student representation on the European level.

The second effort for a basic paper on higher education was made four years later, in autumn 1997, when the organisation discussed possible steps to be taken in the implementation of its higher education policy. It was decided to put Vice Chairman Tomi Huhtanen and Julia Buschermöhle (RCDS) in charge. The new “Charter on Higher Education” was presented to the Council in November 1997 to be amended and adopted at the Council Meeting in Brussels in January 1998. It contained seven chapters and an introduction: Basic Values, Access to Higher Education, New Instruments of Mobility, Teaching and Learning, Research, World of Work, and Internationalisation.

The ideal university was now a “creative and productive ground for research and productive inquiry” of the individual. The interests of the single student were given highest priority. In its approach to mobility the new Charter refused to draft theoretic models, but demanded more realism. Student participation and student unions no longer played an important role. Improvements of teaching and learning methods as well as the assessment of quality were considered to be the tool for a successful higher education. The social dimension of higher education was reduced to a necessity of an equal right to access it. This amendment was at the same time the compromise that secured the majority. It was proposed by AG (Austria) and Michalis Peglis (DAP-NDFK).

Regarding the conflict on whether tuition fees would be against the principle of free access, the organisation could not agree on a negative state-
ment on tuition fees. However, the state was made responsible for equal access through “a competent system of grants and loans.”

After EDS had obtained the status of an association of the European People’s Party, it submitted amendments to the “EPP-Action Programme 1999-2004” in 1998. These amendments were deduced from the 1998-Charter. Under chapter V “European Training and Education Policy” of the EPP-programme, the organisation suggested the adaptation of subsidiarity for the European educational policies, “which means a strong national competence to control the national higher education system parallel to an increased EU co-operation in higher education. The role of the Higher Education and its institutions is to shelter and to develop ideas, to be a creative and productive ground for research and critical inquiry. It gives the students broadened horizons and stimulates own initiatives.”

Again, EDS put an emphasis on freedom: “In order to be successful, the academic freedom must be secured. Independent universities are essential for the freedom of the individual student.” Another amendment to chapter VI to declare the “freedom of research [...] inviolable and to some extent free from immediate economic considerations” was however refused by the EPP Congress.

Another amendment to the EPP-programme emphasised academic freedom since “critical and autonomous institutions in the academic world [...] protect the foundations of the free society. [...] The question of autonomous science is not only a matter of principle, it is also an important from a qualitative perspective. Advanced learning and development in the arts and sciences need freedom, independence and competition in order to advance.” It was also explained, that these freedoms should have consequences: “The basic freedoms of higher education include among others the right to hire scientists and teachers, to decide on the ways of teaching and the forms of examinations, to balance research and teaching and to have their own economic responsibility. The freedoms of the students include choosing their university, to choose their curriculum and to decide individually on their professional goals and the way to reach them.” Key-decisions of the university should be taken by “the university itself, represented by professors, academic staff and the students. All higher education institutions should be treated equally by the state, regardless whether they are private, public, corporate or church-owned.”

Another paragraph dealt with “Access to Higher Education”: “Everybody should have an equal opportunity of access to higher education. This equality

---
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only relates to financial, social and ethnic characteristics, but doesn’t mean a free and unlimited access of anybody. This right also depends on certain maturity-requirements, such as final diplomas or secondary school degrees. The EPP respects different national traditions concerning tuition fees, due to the principle of subsidiarity. The EPP is in favour of a further extension of the access to higher education, based on intellectual merits but not the financial capacity.”

The organisation showed to be an advocate for student rights as well. “At the same time the EPP favours a further extension of the student’s self-determination, the choice in all decisions related to his higher education studies as the best guarantee for a stable evolution of science and society. The state has an important role to bridge these gaps by introducing a sufficient system of grants and loans.” A paragraph on “Teaching and Learning”, the amendment tried to describe the relation between higher education and “European context” and urged for an increase of language learning. These “new methods of teaching and learning” should contain “more flexible types of instruction instead of compulsory methods. The teaching methods of professors should be based on the co-operation between teacher and student. Teaching must include means of permanent evaluation by the students. Teaching skills should be a regular requirement, experience in teaching should be an essential part in nominations of new professors.”

A paragraph on “Mobility and internationalisation” repeated older demands of the organisation: “One of the policies the EPP supports is the international exchange. Contacts with other academic institutions aid the universities to mutually exchange information, which is essential for a high-quality research. Bilateral programmes also increase the higher education institution’s independence from the state. The method in making the co-operation and innovation at European level stronger has been the EU-mobility and exchange programmes. The financial equipment of these programmes has to be secured, since these investments are investments for Europe of a better understanding and competitiveness as well. Recognition of the studies is an essential part of a free mobility in Europe. Remaining obstacles for the recognition of degrees and diplomas have to be removed. The ECTS-system should be developed and be used in every European higher education institution. [...] The global context should be taken into consideration in the process of creating new exchange programmes.”

These amendments were mostly accepted. A last amendment to delete the “concept of gender into the training programme of teachers and educators” was however refused. “EDS doesn’t see the relevance of that ‘concept of gender’. Scientific research has proven the importance of to a certain extent flexible approach towards the sexes. Traditional roles (as far as they might exist), can not be seen as ‘stereotypes’, but accepted due to the respect for the principle of subsidiarity. Further more educational institutions must not be allowed to interfere in the traditional family-education.” As a result, almost the complete higher education chapter of the EPP-Manifesto for the European elections originated from the work programme of EDS – for the first time in history.

Many other activities in the field of higher education took place throughout the decade as well. In February 1995, FMSF submitted a motion asking the Higher Education Working Group to analyse the SOCRATES and LEONARDO programmes of the EU, as a first step to adopt a new policy on higher education and vocational training. Another initiative of 1995/96 was the campaign “Building Europe through student mobility”. Chairman Andrew Reid declared this campaign would help “to promote student mobility in Europe continued a theme which was highlighted in the ‘Open Borders’ campaign several years before. The opportunity for students to travel abroad and experience learning in another country is not simply a benefit in itself but through such exchange we help to promote the European spirit which is essential to any meaningful concept of European unity.”

In 1998, a declaration was distributed among the participants of the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, outlining the main concerns of EDS: “We urge the UNESCO-conference to make the content of the demands more specific, particularly in the following points:

- We agree with the report in so far as we too see urgent problems in the financing and improving of access of Higher Education, in achieving high standards of teaching and research, and in the co-ordination with the needs of the employment market. However, to conclude that for this purpose it is necessary to stage the most radical change which Higher Education ever has experienced, this cannot be accepted in this plain form

- From a global point of view it is certainly desirable to close the gap in education between developing and industrial nations. However, also many tendencies visible in our own educational policy (at the federal as well as at the local levels) are deplorable. We should be very specific regarding the kind of transfer which the developing countries are expecting from the industrialised countries

- Regarding the financial funding the European Democrat Students proposes to consider not only the public budgets to be responsible for the development of Higher Education. There is a progressive commercial activity of the educational sector, in particular through new media. The educational market must be prepared for world-wide commercial investments by providing safe juridical and administrative rules. [...] The aspect is not emphasised in the draft ‘World Declaration on Higher Education. For the twenty-first century: Vision and Action’.

- We are not accepting tendencies that only the industrialised countries are held responsible to contribute to the solution of the existing problems [...]"

Summarising, we like to stress from our point of view that from the existing widespread inequalities and injustices regarding access to Higher Education, the UNESCO-conference should not conclude that the way out is to uniforms education in a radical step of renovation. The European Democrat Students would never think of voting against reasonable reforms, but the radical changes – of the university as well as of the societies – advocated by several people are not likely to improve e.g. the European educational system.”

However, in cases other than the EPP lobbying was less successful. EDS could hardly influence the higher education policies of organisations such as UNESCO or the various international student organisations. In 1999, the socialist organisation ECOSY even refused to co-host a public debate on high-
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er education – several times! Despite the many efforts of EDS, the European higher education debate of the late nineties continued to interpret higher education as a logic continuation of social engineering. Again, the only thing EDS could do besides resolutions was going back to basics, and making things clearer at least among the participants of its events. At a Council Meeting in Gdansk in March 1999, e.g. tuition fees were debated. Supporters and opponents were discussing the financing of the universities under academic viewpoints. Another debate in the 40th year of EDS was the possible participation in the elections to the European Student Council.

**Visions: The Case of Europe**

EDS in the nineties also meant a highly emotional debate on the future of the European integration. Influenced by the state of the discussion in the various countries, the priorities of the member organisations differed. Students from central European EU-member states focused on both enlargement and institutional reform. Students from applicant countries focused on enlargement. Students from Scandinavia and the UK were less euphoric than others. However, there was always room for compromise.

In December 1992, referring to the “Statement of Open Borders” of 1988, the organisation expressed its disappointments with the outcome of the EC-Summit in London: “The EC should not stop at 12 member states. Europe is much more than the EC of today. The EEC treaty as well as future treaties with, and memberships of the eastern countries, should call for a general attitude of openness already today towards these countries.” The European governments were urged to avoid a “fortress Europe” as well as limits to migration. The mobility principles of the EC were supposed to apply for all Europeans.647

Already in 1991, this debate had included the Baltic states. In a motion from January 1991, EDS stated that the Baltic states should be regarded as “free and independent nations” and that the Soviet Union should “carry out peaceful and constructive negotiations with the Baltic states, with the purpose to give said states their freedom.”648 A motion of December 1993 urged for the inclusion of Central Eastern Europe into NATO.

In 1993/94, “Policies for future Generations – Building the Europe we need – Twelve essentials for the new European Parliament” was submitted to the EDS-Council. The motion was supposed to be the basis for a new Manifesto for the European Elections. The preservation of peace and security, the
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protection of health and the environment, the strengthening the European Parliament, the EU enlargement, the completion of the single market, the creation of an innovative economy, the restructuring of the European budget, freedom of the universities, student mobility, fighting racism, fighting crime, and the defence of centre-right values were identified as main targets: “Since the European Parliament is in fact gaining power, we ask the European centre-right to be united. Only this can provide a counterweight to Socialist tendencies in the further deepening of European integration. In particular we welcome the rapprochement of EPP and EDU”. The paper was also a response to the efforts in connection with the 1992 Manifesto. After 1992, such a separate paper on Europe was announced several times.

The result of various Working Groups of 1997/1998 were the two papers “Europe’s Role in the World” (1997) and “Globalisation” (1998). “Europe’s Role in the World” was meant to be a response to “the latest developments in Europe – the Amsterdam Conference, the negotiations for the enlargement of the European Union, the process of the administrative reforms in central and eastern Europe and EMU.” Its two chapters dealt with the “foundations of EDS”, European identity, student services, higher education, economic issues, and “Today’s Agenda of the European Union” – uniting “all countries of Europe”, security policy, European monetary union.649

The resolution on globalisation was adopted at the Annual Meeting of 1998. Its content were “new risks and dangers” after the “end of the East-West conflict”: “Some of these are real war-like conflicts, even in central Europe. Other the frontiers not concerning threats are the refugee and migration waves threatening the internal security of our nations. No country will be able to overcome these challenges alone.” For more political stability in Europe and globally, several suggestions were made: “the European Union must be the heart of a stable order guaranteeing peace and freedom where every country is taking over responsibility. Only the E.U. partners can guarantee each other security in our continent, in connection with a strengthened North Atlantic partnership” that included “more nations from Eastern Europe.”

The enlargement of the European Union was supported as well: “However, according to the principle of subsidiarity only those tasks can be taken care of by the E.U., which cannot be solved by the regions or nations themselves. To make this institutional work more effective, bureaucracy and centralisation have to be reduced. To increase the acceptance of the E.U. in the population a clear mark off must be visible between the responsibility of the European level, the nations, and the states. A ‘Europe of the citizen’ can only be achieved
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by transparency and subsidiarity.” To “match the challenge of the world-wide refugee-problem, it is necessary to develop a common asylum policy and to achieve a fair distribution of the resulting expenses among the member-states of the E.U.”

An increasing role of global dependence was emphasised as well: the involvement of “of the European nations in the United Nations becomes more and more important.” To “guarantee the use of the global resources for the mankind and to prevent their abuse for purposes of war, a world wide arms control and demand of disarmament has to be a central component of policy. Supply of weapons should only serve for maintaining or restoration of peace. The prevention of proliferation of modern high-tech arms and the banning of biological and chemical weapons is the central task of the international arms-control. We should insist on an unlimited extension and world-wide ratification of the nuclear non-propagation treaty.”

The Manifesto also dealt with technical globalisation: “Europe’s role in the world will also change because of technical development: The world-wide computer net besides the obvious advantages also introduces new types of risks. In a period where millions of people in Europe are unemployed, we have to care to create a sufficient number of jobs for the future. The real chance for young Europeans will relay on their excellent education and their highly qualified professional training. Only when our young generation can acquire better abilities than young people in other parts of the world, the prosperity of our continent can be secured.”

In October 1998, the organisation started to discuss a Manifesto for the EU-elections of 1999. The first draft was submitted by Frank Engel in January 1999. “Priority for Politics” was adopted in Gdansk, Poland, in March 1999. It listed various objectives for the institutional reform and the enlargement of the EU in detail. Though the initiator of the paper, Chairman Michalis Peglis, received some inspiration from previous Manifestos, the structure and much of the content were different. The federalist perspective on the future internal reforms was entirely new.

From now on, EDS viewed enlargement and institutional reform as equally important. Among the objectives were a European Constitution, a strong Common Foreign and Security Policy (“Most Urgent Challenge”), simplifications of the decision making procedures to shape a citizen friendly Europe, the separation of the European Court of Justice into the Constitutional Court and the High Court, a catalogue of competencies for the EU (subsidiarity), and a financial reform with more proportional contributions to the EU-budget.
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In 1999, the Annual Report concluded, the “theme of expansion has been central to our thoughts and campaigns. EDS vigorously supported the enlargement of the EU and this has been reflected in our own inclusion of 12 new member-organisations. Four seminars this year focused on specific topics of the liberated democracies of Central Eastern Europe (two in Poland, Hungary, and Croatia). A symbol of European Democrat Student’s belief that Europe extends beyond the narrow boundaries of the EU is that this year we shall hold our Annual Meeting and Summer University in Malta – an applicant state to the Union.”

In December 1999, another paper concerning the “EDS position concerning the Report to the European Commission on the Institutional Consequences of EU Enlargement” was also discussed. The aim was to find out, under which circumstances and conditions EU-enlargement was desirable: “First, it has to be clear which ‘finality’ European Integration should possess. And secondly, the question of the ‘subsidiarity’-principle should be called in mind again.” It also warned against the confusion of integration with “centralism”. Proposals were made for any of the EU-institutions. In sum, the paper suggested to follow the line of the “Dehaene group” (or “Wise Men”): “the gigantic challenges of EU enlargement cannot be coped without institutional reform.”

Beside the Manifestos, “Europe” was also the topic of ad-hoc working groups. A considerable number of thematic motions were dealing with European integration as well. A motion of March 1994 dealt with national minorities that “shall enjoy the right to freely express, preserve and develop their ethnic, linguistic and religious identity. [...] The states shall guarantee the protection and the possibility for an effective exercise of the rights provided for national minorities and their members.” A Council meeting of October 1995 was the setting of a Croat-Yugoslav student meeting even though the Balkan war was going on in order to “break down some of the prejudice and intolerance which have been the hallmarks of the bloody Yugoslavian war.”
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In December 1999, the lobbying on the “White Paper” on Youth Policy of the EU-Commission and the development of the EU-debate on a European Constitution were on the agenda of the Council Meeting. At its Council meeting in Bratislava (March 2000), motions of the EDS Council criticised the treatment of Austria by several EU-governments as well as the unnecessary application of the nationalist party HZDS from Slovakia for membership in the EDU. A role play at the Summer University of 1997 dealt with “Enlargement of the EU”. In the centre of this activity stood questions such as the fulfilment of the criteria to get accepted as a full member of the EU according to the treaty of Maastricht. The discussion revolved around how co-decisions of the European Parliament are regulated.

Not only paperwork: EDS partying in Tallinn, 1999

External Relations

Party Relations: The Access to the European People’s Party

Throughout the seventies and eighties EDS had very close links to the EDU and looser links to the EPP. In the nineties this paradigm changed. Since the EDU was practically not involved in the increasingly important institutions of the European Union, EDS had to change its priorities. However, in the first half of the decade, the commitment to the EDU and its committees remained strong. In 1990, Vice Chairman Harm Adam attended the meetings of the Committee No.1 “European Structures – European Policy” discussing a “Position Paper on the Development of the EC”. The paper
offered EC-membership to the new democracies after the political union was completed: “Once the EC has finished successfully the intergovernmental conferences all democratic states in Europe that have reached the necessary level of economic and political development should have the opportunity of becoming a member of the EC.”  

In 1992/93, the organisation was represented in two Committees:
- The Promotion of Stability and Security in Europe
- The Environment and the Eco-Social-Market Economy

Jonas Nilsson (FMSF), who represented EDS in the Environmental Committee, was asked to contribute to the programme with an own chapter on ownership and environmental protection. In 1993/94, EDS participated in the Committees 1 (Europe), 3 (Environment) and 4 (Campaigning) and the Party Leaders Conference in Budapest (1993). After that, EDS reduced its participation in the EDU-Committee meetings. Members of the Executive Bureau however attended the EDU-Party Leader Conferences.

After the leading political role of the EPP within the European centre-right had become apparent, Chairman Laura de Esteban suggested applying for associated membership of the EPP. At the Annual Meeting in 1992 she stated, as “Chairman of EDS I consider it most important for the future of EDS that we become an associate member of the EPP.” The Council of EDS adopted a respective resolution on 2 August, 1992.

---

In those days, everyone expected the accession to the EPP to be a formality only. But the accession procedure proved to be one of the most complex political projects ever. When Chairman Laura de Esteban submitted the application in October 14th in 1992, nobody expected a campaign lasting until October 16th – five years later in 1997. This is the short version (!) of the EDS accession campaign of five years: In December 1992 EPP-Secretary General Thomas Jansen confirmed the request of EDS “to become an association of the EPP”, but said: “We will have to discuss your request first in the Presidency of the EPP and then in the Political Bureau. That will be done in January.”

What Jansen did not say, was the fact that the application was not (but could have been) included in the agenda of the EPP-Congress in Athens in November 1992, as originally intended by EDS. The reason was the strong objections against EDS, the strongest by EUYCD-Secretary General Marc Bertrand. In 1994, he even demanded that the EPP had to “close this debate. The EUYCD represents the interests and demands of the European Christian Democratic youth no matter whether student or not”, and suggested the establishment of specific higher education working group to which the EDS could be invited.

In January 1993, the EPP-Presidium eventually decided to postpone the decision. By this, the EPP gave in to the EUYCD: their alleged exclusive right to represent the youth and student interests, and the possible integration of EDS to the EUYCD. And there was also the application of the EUYCD-student organisation USE to the EPP. Therefore the EPP suggested some sort of a dialogue between USE and EDS. Though the EDS-interpretation of this proposal was from the very beginning that such a dialogue was a first step towards a merger with USE, and although USE never had suspended talking to EDS, its leadership was not convinced at all to join EDS.

Secondly, EDS now understood the importance of convincing the EUYCD, since USE was associated to them. Hence, the EDS-leadership met their Chairman Enrico Letta as early as 1992.

USE on the other hand – since annexed to the EUYCD – could either try a boycott and follow the EUYCD-line or informally ask for positive signals from EDS. They went for the latter. On the occasion of the National Conference of the Student Tory Reform Group on 27 February 1993, Vice Chairman Tim Arnold met a delegation of USE under the leadership of Secretary General Didier Jacobs, who had initiated the meeting: “They wanted to know how it

---

656 Thomas Jansen to Laura de Esteban, 01-12-92, PAT.
657 Marc Bertrand, Note a la Presidence du PPE, Demande de reconnaissance comme “associations” introduites par EDS et USE, ca. 1994, p. 2, PAT.
658 Thomas Jansen to Tamara Zieschang, 01-02-93, PAT.
is to co-operate with Conservatives and I explained to them why it is essential and fruitful.” Jacobs had understood that only one organisation would join the EPP, but did have “no intentions to merge” – yet. On behalf of EDS, Tim Arnold expressed the wish for closer co-operation, explained that EDS did not wish to spend more time on organisational matters and suggested a joint campaign on student politics.  

After that, there was a period of mutual invitations. In October 1993, a first EDS-delegation participated in a USE-seminar. Such friendly talks and mutual visits went on until 1995. In 1994, after a respective mutual agreement between EPP and EDU, EPP-Secretary General Thomas Jansen even suggested such a policy of regular but informal co-operation to be the official policy of EDS towards the EUYCD. This, two “hot-tempered” meetings of Chairman Tim Arnold with Marc Bertrand, who had become EPP-Vice president the same year, and the second submission of the applications by EDS (28 February, 1994) and USE (18 March, 1994) did however not have significant impact. At least EDS could by this “continue to demonstrate the problems of the EPP-youth policy”.  

In October 1994, Chairman Fredrik Johansson submitted the Memorandum “The Case for EDS” to the EPP-President, signed by his predecessors Tim Arnold, Laura de Esteban, Stavros Papastavrou and Bettina Machaczek: “On all formal, political and structural grounds EDS qualifies for the status of a recognized association of the EPP. This is in line with political practice on the national level which acknowledges the supplementary if not independent role of student politics in party structures.” Additionally, several letters for support were sent to European party leaders. Again, no visible result could be achieved.

But soon the picture changed: when it was decided to dissolve the EUYCD and to establish the new “Youth of the EPP”, the dependence of USE from the EUYCD weakened significantly. At the same time around 1995, the EPP-Political Bureau stated that USE could not hope for any better treatment than EDS. Both USE and EDS were therefore better motivated to come to terms with each other. In September 1995, the Assembly of USE all over sudden decided to formalise the relations to EDS and to work for a joint Higher Education Working Group. In 1995, when the third EDS-application was about to be prepared, both USE and EDS agreed to have its First Joint Conference, that took place in Munsbach near Luxembourg in October 1995.

---
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At this meeting, board members of both USE and EDS openly discussed under which circumstances they could imagine closer co-operation. EDS-Chairman Andrew Reid expressed his delight that both organisations took the chance to strengthen the European centre-right. USE-Secretary General Dirk Vandenput emphasised to the surprise of some the necessity to have a student-voice among the associations of the EPP. Since the only scenario according to which the EPP-board had announced it would (perhaps) agree to have a student association at all was a merger, the essence of his statement was that USE in principle had agreed to a merger. Thus, for the first time a USE-officer had openly agreed on such a step in order to maintain centre-right political student activities as such.

Meanwhile the Council of EDS had decided to reiterate the application for the third time since “the influence and the campaigning strength of EDS within Europe will be increased by a formal relationship with the EPP.” On 2 November 1995, Chairman Andrew Reid wrote the respective letter to EPP-President Martens: “We firmly believe that through becoming an association of the EPP, EDS will be able to contribute to the tasks of the European People’s Party and promote its central ideas to the students of Europe.”

The succeeding Chairman Günther Fehlinger extended the campaign in order to receive the support of all wings of the EPP, and of the leaders of the European centre-right parties in particular. Whereas in 1992, the application

---
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was only supported by Bernhard Vogel and Elmar Brok MEP, in 1997 EDS reached a whole new level of support:

- **Helmut Kohl** (German Chancellor, party leader) in 1996: “As members of an organisation, which brings students from all over Europe together, you know very well the chances and advantages of a unified Europe. Therefore I again call to you to stand up and campaign for our common goal. Since now as ever it is true: we can proudly look back on the achievements till now. But this is not at all a guarantee for the future. Your generation has to vigorously contribute to this future if we want to make the process of European peace and freedom irreversible.”

- **José Maria Aznar** (Spanish Prime Minister, party leader): “On the other hand, throughout 1997, I wish to state the achievements taken place to co-ordinate the efforts towards the Euro and towards a sustainable development and consolidation in the Union, of a new culture of economic stability, orientated towards growth, competitiveness and the creation of employment. In Luxembourg, in a few weeks, the Standing Conference on Employment of the Council of Europe will impel the action of our society in the battle to eradicate unemployment, which affects especially the young. I would like to end these lines encouraging the members of the European Democrat Students to preserve in their pro-European attitude and their commitment to participate in public life.”

- **Wolfgang Schüssel** (Austrian Vice-Chancellor, later Chancellor): “Only unity secures Europe’s future. The inner peace of our countries, our security, the stability of our political system and our prosperity depends upon the continuous success of the European Union. This is also true for the Europeans of Central and Eastern Europe, to whom we have a historic commitment to solidarity.”

- **John Major** (British Prime Minister, party leader): “May I take this opportunity to wish the EDS a healthy future. The concept of bringing young people from the centre-right European political parties together is to be commended. I am happy to pass on my good wishes to your organisation.”

- **Miltiades Evert** (Greek party leader): “The future of every country depends mainly on her young people, but a future with freedom, democracy and prosperity in every nation depends solely on the dreams, aspirations and hard work of all those young people who are committed to these values.

---
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and ideals and who try to promote them with determination, realising at the same time their true potential. In a time of indifference an alienation from public life, the students of the EDS provide the best example of civic responsibility and commitment to the values and social concerns of a free and united Europe. Your work on promoting co-operation and cultural exchange among students from different countries becomes particularly important in the increasingly globalising context of our era. I hope you become an inspiration for all students in your countries to join you in the pursuit of building a strong, united, prosperous and democratic Europe and meeting the challenges of the 21st century.”

With this support, EDS had set the political agenda, and had theoretically achieved a majority in the decision-making Political Bureau of the EPP. Another way of advocating EDS’ own case was the presence of EDS-delegates in the decisive meetings of this Political Bureau before the accession as elected delegates of their national parties. Additionally, the new EPP-Secretary General Klaus Welle confronted both EDS and USE with the new EPP-policy to set up a sustainable youth structure in the context of implementing a more positive approach towards all EPP associations. By this, the USE-application became less interesting for the EPP. This did not prevent EDS from continuing its policy of rapprochement: In September 1996, EDS invited USE activists to a second joint meeting in Cadenabbia (Italy). A synopsis of both Manifestos was compiled noting the absence of substantial political and ideological differences between EDS and USE.

---

Since December 1996, Chairman Günther Fehlinger openly promoted the idea of a common organisation, when he attended the USE-Executive Meeting in Malta. After that, several meetings were held with USE-President Frank Engel (Luxembourg). In March 1997, Frank Engel of USE and Günther Fehlinger presented a paper “Common perspective towards the creation of a students’ section of the European People’s Party (for which the working name of UDSE – United Democrat Students for Europe will be used)” in which they presented proposals for a timetable and a common programme of a common organisation.

On 6 June 1997, Günther Fehlinger could officially present EDS to the Political Bureau of the EPP: “It was possible to increase the knowledge of EDS among these people, so that we are looking forward to succeed already next October.” EPP-Secretary Klaus Welle emphasised the good reputation of EDS. At this meeting, Frank Engel on behalf of USE – accompanied by the USE-member organisations from Malta and Belgium – expressed their support for the EDS-application. The advantages of such a strong unified student structure in the context of the EPP became evident.

Finally, EDS succeeded: on 16 October 1997 (6 p.m.), the Political Bureau of the EPP decided to accept the application. Chairman Günther Fehlinger announced the desire to contribute to the future programmatic work of the EPP, particularly in the area of youth and student affairs. EDS would “defend the interests of young academics. We will also look for ways to modernise the work of the EPP and to maximise its output: from our point of view it is for example absolutely necessary to better inform the young generation of activities and aims of the EPP. Altogether this co-operation would definitely strengthen the whole centre-right in Europe. And that again is our superior task.”

By this, EDS had become the official student organisation of Europe’s largest party and could preserve its existence. “We don’t know the exact reason why exactly we finally succeeded, why the Political Bureau of the EPP finally supported our application with an overwhelming 95-percent-majority. Was it the presence of Professor Rita Süßmuth, the president of the German parliament? Was it our contributions to the higher-education-debate? Was it that we stay in youth hostels? Was it the number of printed materials directly delivered to the offices of every EPP-board member? Who knows!!?”

669 Cf. report to the Annual Meeting 1997 by the author.
670 EDS/USE, paper, 08-03-97, PAT.
671 Report to the Annual Meeting 1997 by the author; Minutes, EPP-Political Bureau, 06-06-97, p. 2, ACDP.
As the official student organisation of the EPP, it could also officially attend the EPP-Congress in Toulouse of 1997 with six delegates. With these six votes, EDS could influence decisions of the Congress. A practical result of the accession was the political and administrative support of the EPP.

Over the years, several projects referring to the EPP were discussed. At the first Council Meeting of the 1998/99 term in Paris, it was decided to actively support the EPP election campaign to the European Parliament. For this purpose, EDS successfully tried to amend the Higher Education-chapters of the EPP-“Action Programme”, submitted a written “Contribution to the EPP-election campaign strategy” and developed an own Manifesto for the European Elections. In streets close to the venues of the EU-summits in Vienna (1998) and Berlin (1999), EDS-activists were campaigning for the EPP. In 1999/2000, EDS supported the EPP-policy concerning Austria. When a majority of centre-left governments had decided to boycott Austria, since its government coalition included members of the Freedom Party, the EPP had decided to support the centre-right government of Wolfgang Schüssel. At the Council Meeting in February 2000, EDS adopted a resolution heavily criticising the treatment of Austria.

Another project in connection with the EPP was the development of EPP-policy papers. In spring 2000, EPP-Secretary General Alejandro Agag Longo invited the organisation to participate. The Council agreed that EDS should mainly contribute to the area of Higher Education. These proposals were submitted and mainly adopted at the EPP-Congress in 2001 in Berlin.

Finally, the organisation agreed with DEMYC to “maintain a common policy” and continued to attend most of its events. Since 1997, members of the Executive Bureau have been attending the major meetings of the newly established YEPP as well.
The Participation in the European Youth and Student Co-operation

EDS never stopped attending meetings of the Youth Forum, even though its doubtful legitimacy persisted. On the other hand it remained difficult to allocate resources to the time consuming meetings of this structure. In 1990/91, it was continued to send a representative to the North-South Committee.

Another issue of the early nineties was the possible creation of a European Student Forum. EDS considered it however a “success of its policy that there is no room for an independent structure functioning outside the Youth Forum” but for a new working group dealing with student matters. “Finally, now that the bureaucratic negotiations have ended, the Student Forum has to show its ability to contribute constructively to the formulation of a European Educational Policy.”\textsuperscript{674}

In 1992/93, Haris Meidanis (DAP-NDFK) attended Youth Forum and Student Forum meetings, though EDS as well as DEMYC candidacies had failed in 1991: “There are effectively only two possible solutions to resolve our position within the two forums. We either leave both organisations or establish our presence there. Leaving the official European institutions for youth does not seem to be a wise solution. Since we are all European we have no other alternative – ‘It’s a dirty job, but someone has to do it.’”\textsuperscript{675}

\textsuperscript{674} Annual Report 1990/91, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{675} Annual Report 1992/93, p. 12/13, PAT.
Haris Meidanis decided to participate in the discussions on the future size of the YF-Executive and in the “youth and students working group”. Concerning access to universities and mutual recognition of diplomas the “general outcome did not in general lines coincide with EDS.” The dissatisfaction remained: Though he saw “a big chance” for influence, he considered it being too bureaucratic.676 In 1993/94, EDS followed the developments in the EYF as well, though it was no longer represented in the EC Students Forum.

A similar picture showed the European Co-ordination Bureau (ECB). Since EDS had not paid the membership fee after 1990, negotiations with the ECB had to be initiated to maintain its full membership. Even though their activities were seen critically, EDS intensified its co-operation with the ECB since 1990, since “it serves its role as the co-ordinating body of INGYO’s towards the European Youth Foundation and the European Youth Centre.”677

In 1992, when Vice Chairman Cecilia Brinck attended the Executive Committee meeting, she focused on the ECB-working groups, the designations for the advisory and the governing board, and the ECB-finances. But her focus was on the relations to the European Youth Foundation and its obvious discrimination of political youth organisations. At this occasion, Cecilia Brinck protested against the way in which an increase of the membership fee had been prepared. The conclusion was that “we are re-established as bona fide members of ECB and not regarded as some kind of political extremists who never attend meetings.” But again, during some of the Bureau meetings, the question came up to leave ECB.678 However, EDS continued to attend ECB-meetings in 1993/94, though it remained a marginal issue for the organisation.

After a longer debate (in which EDS did not participate) a new “European Youth Forum” was set up in 1996, which succeeded CENYC (Council of European National Youth Councils), the ECB (European Co-ordination Bureau of international non-Governmental Youth Organisations), and the “Youth Forum of the EU”. This merger was a result of the increased importance of the enlarged European Union as the main European institution, the need to become more effective, and the end of the cold war.

After the merger, EDS tried to intensify its relations to the new body, since it welcomed the merger. The Youth Forum was seen as a good occasion for student politicians to meet other student politicians and activists, and to see the whole broad church of different views of the organised youth world. Indeed, EDS could fully subscribe to slogans such as “Human Rights are not

676 Haris Meidanis, Report, December 1992, PAT.
678 Cecilia Brinck, Report, 16-11-92; Minutes (hand-written version), Bureau Meeting, 13-02-93, p. 6, PAT.
for negotiation” by Pau Solanilla, President of the Youth Forum and a Socialist from Spain.

The entire Executive Bureau visited the secretariat of the Youth Forum in October 1997. Furthermore, presence at EYF-meetings could be used to get in closer contact to representatives of European institutions, such as Lasse Siuralla, the Youth Director of the Council of Europe, or Alexandros Tsolakis from the DG XXII of the European Commission. Organisational improvements undertaken by EYF Secretary General Tobias Flessenkämper (1998-2001) contributed a lot to a new confidence in the work of this structure. Thus, the participation in EYF-events was again increased. Vice Chairman Roberta Tedesco Triccas (Malta) became the person in charge. In October 2000, Chairman Gustaf Casparsson was elected to the EYF Financial Affairs Commission. EDS also co-operated with DEMYC, YEPP, and LYMEC in these matters. This did however not mean that EDS would become enthusiastic about everything in the EYF, such as high membership fees, an enormous budget and still too much bureaucracy.

Co-operation with International Organisations and European Institutions

In the nineties, EDS also co-operated with two international organisations: the Council of Europe and the UNESCO. Since 1973, EDS enjoyed a consultative status within the Council of Europe. In 1998, EDS started to new attempt to get involved in the activities of the NGO-department of this organisation. Vice Chairman Ukko Metsola (Chairman 1999/2000) in particular frequently travelled to Strasbourg in order to exchange views with officials of the Council. He also tried to link EDS with the various efforts to promote a Mediterranean campaign. Since 1998, EDS was again present at the “General Assemblies” of the NGOs enjoying consultative status with the Council of Europe. In January 2000, EDS was elected to the NGO-Liaison Committee of the Council of Europe.

A second partner after 1995 became UNESCO. At the Annual Meeting in 1995 Stephane Seigneurie (UNi, France) proposed to get in contact with this body. A co-operation seemed to be promising for EDS: the organisation was working in the same fields. The overall picture of UNESCO had changed to the positive after reforms were introduced by Secretary General Federico Mayor. In connection with these reforms, Mayor had initiated a new higher education policy. In 1995, the “Policy Paper for Change and Development in Higher Education” tabled “the main issues related to the renewal and reform of this
field which, in global and rapidly changing society, must be guided by four watchwords: quality, pertinence, management and financing, and internationalisation” (UNESCO-statement).

A “Collective Consultation on Higher Education” was implemented, which followed a “Global Action Plan” for 1996-2001. In autumn 1995, EDS discussed how to join the ongoing UNESCO-consultation. In September 1996, officers of EDS visited the UNESCO-headquarters in Paris. Numerous talks and visits followed. Finally, in December 1997, EDS-representatives signed a framework agreement on the Collective Consultation on Higher Education. With this, the organisation received the official status of a “framework-NGO”. A permanent communication with Mary-Louise Kearney, then UNESCO-division of higher education was established as well.

Later on, EDS was officially invited to several UNESCO-conferences, such as the Regional Conference on Higher Education in Europe in Palermo in September 1997 and the 5th and 6th UNESCO/NGO-Collective Consultation on Higher Education in February and May 1998 in Paris. The Palermo-conference, in particular, was a good opportunity to promote centre-right ideas among 300 participants from all over Europe. Some of them were even surprised that a thing like a conservative student organisation exists. One of the main issues was what is now known as the “Bologna-Process”. On the other hand, some items of UNESCO papers were transferred into the discussions of the HE working group of EDS.

The promotion of its ideas was the reason for EDS to officially participate in the “World Conference on Higher Education”, held in Paris in October 1998. About 3700 visitors and participants exchanged their views on educational topics, presented their own activities, canvassed for their aims or watched the ministers in the marathon-like process of ministerial speeches in the plenary session, where every minister was entitled to talk eight minutes about their national policies. Another part of the conference were the 12 thematic debates, such as “Quality in Higher Education”, “The requirements for the world of work” or “Access on Higher Education”, where representatives of NGOs discussed.

There were also student meetings, but they were disappointing. UNESCO differentiated its student-NGOs in regional (the student-unions) and professional (e.g. ELSA) organisations, and “movements” (political and religious groups, e.g. EDS). Some of the participants from the left-dominated student unions vigorously demanded the exclusion of other organisations, since the unions would represent all students world-wide. In particular organisations

679 Minutes, Council Meeting, 15/17-09-95, p. 2, PAT.
from Latin America acted entirely intolerant and aggressive. The output of
the student debates was therefore spoiled by a general lack of understand-
ing for modern universities. Proposals such as a dedication of the conference
to the communist dictator-in-waiting Ernesto Guevara (“Che”) caused emba-
rassment on the side of the UNESCO. On the other hand, these organisations
could do nothing, when EDS started its very efficient and successful campaign
against the persecution of Belarusian and Yugoslav academics (cf. chapter
campaigns).

Linking the World

On the global level, EDS maintained its close relations with the IDU, and
was involved in the re-launch of the International Young Democrat Union
(IYDU, 3-6 March 1991) in Washington D.C., the youth section of the IDU.
The relations with the IDU were intensified after former Chairman Carl Bildt
had become IDU-Chairman in 1992.

The objectives of the IYDU were to arrange occasions for informational
exchange for its members, and to promote the case of democracy and market
economy. An observer reported that he was impressed with “the organiza-
tion and thrust of the conference. They clearly had strong moral and ideologi-
cal backing form their parent institution, with warm letters of support from
the President, Chancellor Kohl, Prime Ministers Mulroney and Major, and
Margaret Thatcher, among others.”
Lectures were held on political campaigning, the “New World Order”, the role of public policy institutions and the new democracies. The conference also included a White House Briefing. At the end of the conference, 52 organisations had formally joined the IYDU. EDS became part of the Executive Committee of the IYDU (as a regional member).

IYDU-Chairman Mark Hayward (Australia), a former student activist himself, always put a special emphasis on his relations to EDS. On the other hand, the presence of EDS-Chairman Laura de Esteban at the IYDU-Founding Congress showed the strong commitment of EDS. In 1992, EDS managed to get its proposal for a document on education (“Conclusions about Education”) accepted. But a suggested motion of March 1994 showed growing dissatisfaction, when EDS urged the IYDU to comment on the reform of the United Nations and to co-operate with the UN in New York and its agencies all over the world. Once again in 1994, EDS participated at the IYDU-Council in Athens.

Additionally, bilateral contacts with many student organisations outside Europe were maintained and established. The “Young America’s Foundation” remained the partner of choice in the United States, which regularly invited EDS to its annual “National Conservative Student’s Conference” in Washington DC.

At the Annual Meeting 1999 in Bugibba (Malta), July 26-28, 1999, EDS welcomed Mounia Ghoulam (Istiqlal Youth, Morocco), Khalef Abderaouf (Free Students Union of Algeria, UGEL), and students from Aserbaijan. At the 4th Council Meeting in Gdansk on 20th March 1999, EDS welcomed a delegation of the Youth Council of the Kalmyk Republic, an autonomous Russian region, and Jesus Ramirez from the National Action Party Youth of Mexico.

The second Council Meeting of 1999/2000 (Strasbourg, February) was dedicated to international relations as well. An important part of the political discussion was devoted to the creation of an International Democrat Students Network. Limited resources, however, led to the end of the project.

For the first time since the seventies, Turkish guests, representing the ARI movement, were present. Very close relations with the Algerian Free Students Association (UGEL), a liberal organisation with thousands of members, including a fact finding mission to Algiers and a speech by the EDS Secretary General at their Annual Meeting in 1999, and various visits by Algerian students to EDS-events sparked a debate on the enlargement of EDS to the Maghreb region.

Another interesting experience of the Secretary General was an invitation of the All Indonesian Student Network to the All-Indonesian Student Congress

---
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in Yogyakarta (Indonesia) in November 1999. The congress was held in the State University of this historic city in the jungles of Eastern-Java. The Secretary General of EDS had been invited present the activities of his organisation and the European way of higher education. The 150 delegates from all over Indonesia were particularly interested in the basic values of EDS, after another European guest at another meeting a few months ago had tried to convert them to Communism. The historic background was the overthrow of the Suharto-regime in spring 1998, following massive student protests. It was intended to develop policies for future political student activities in one of the largest nations of the world (220 mil. inhabitants). Due to the diversity of Indonesia, the students also discussed ethnic and religious backgrounds of the various political wings of the student movement. The patron of the meeting was His Royal Highness Sultan Hamengku Buwono X., the governor and religious head of the region.

All these meetings and activities showed the potential of a global student network in which EDS could play a leading role – perhaps a task for future generations of EDS activists.
Conclusions, 1961-2001

EDS is the only non-socialist and political European student association with an uninterrupted organisational history since 1961. With preparatory events dating back to 1956, the EDS-history is even older. This continuity is even more remarkable when one considers the hostility and power of the various political opponents with which EDS has been confronted throughout the Cold War years.

Until 2001, the aims of the first constitution of 1962 were an integral part of almost every basic document. The programmes, which originally commenced with the “One Europe” programme in 1963, contain a quite unique version of non-socialist political thought, which often anticipated political developments to come. The EDS-Annual Report of 1979/80 repeated those objectives: to “work for a united democratic Europe, to actively strengthen and support those ideals common to our members. EDS wishes to play its role in the building of a free and united Europe of the future. We believe that this task can best be facilitated through strong political organisations operating across the national borders of Europe, founded upon those ideals of democracy, pluralism and humanism which raised Europe out of the ashes of the last World War.”

From a present perspective, ECCS/EDS had to find policies in three areas: It had to develop its identity as both a centre-right and a student organisation. It then had to determine its policy towards European institutions and youth structures. Lastly, it had to meet the challenges of the European integration. With this EDS could continue to regain its homogeneity.

Since the early seventies, political philosophy was replacing “emotional traditionalism” (Karl Mannheim) more and more. The new approach was firmly expressed in the first “Manifesto” in 1976 as being ideologically situated somewhere between traditional Conservatism of Edward Heath, the Christian values of the German CDU and the Liberal centre of Giscard d’Estaing. It is interesting to see that ECCS/EDS never was reluctant to confront the “jungle” of international youth organisations with this programme.

During this process, EDS became known as the only student organisation which tried to break “obstinate consensus” (Margaret Thatcher) with outspoken enemies of the Open Society. This on the other hand created an unfair image of the organisation as a permanent trouble maker constantly disturbing the good climate at youth and student conferences. This policy was particularly difficult, since it followed an agenda which differed from most contem-
porary governmental agendas of the seventies. However, EDS was at least able to show to what extent corruption governed within large parts of the youth establishment.

The eighties were the decade of contradictions, ups and downs. Although there was a positive new self-confidence and an increase in intellect, it was first of all the decade of the most serious crisis in the history of the organisation. Only after 1986 did a certain internal détente take place. Finally, in 1989, EDS belonged to the winners in history: the revolutions in Eastern Europe showed how justified it was to be the “trouble maker” and “nay-sayer” was.

Throughout the nineties, the major task for EDS was to adapt itself to the challenges arising from the revolution in Central Eastern Europe and the progressing European integration. At the end of a complicated process, EDS had significantly increased its membership. It had become part of the EPP-ED-network. Its publications, campaigns and events were widely recognised. This potential was used for political activities, lobbying and training.

Furthermore, EDS was always a good school: throughout the years, huge political student events in almost 50 countries attracted thousands of students from all over Europe and beyond. The long list of names of former activists contains many senior politicians of later times. Not only Carl Bildt, Prime Minister of Sweden (1992-95), Ian Taylor, later British Minister for Science and Technology (1994-97), Tom Spencer and Laura de Esteban (both later MEP) undertook their first steps in international politics when they were Chairmen of ECCS/EDS.

The list is much longer. Louis Galea, later Education Minister of Malta, represented his youth organisation ZPN in 1972 at EDS-meetings and also signed the “Charter of the European Democrat Party” at the time.684 David Oddson, later Prime Minister of Iceland, submitted a motion to the Executive Committee of EDS in May 1973, where he sought support for Iceland in its conflict with the EEC-fishing authorities. Friedbert Pflüger, EDS Vice Chairman in 1976/78, later became Chairman of the Commission of European Affairs of the German Bundestag. Pia Christmas Møller, later Chairman of the Danish Conservative People’s Party (1998-99), organised a Council Meeting in Copenhagen in January 1979. Peter Hintze, later Secretary General of the German CDU, was member of the Executive Committee (Council) of the ECCS in the early seventies.685

Hence it is interesting to see how former officers visualised and evaluated their terms of office. During the organisation’s founding period Secretary General Hans-Uwe Erichsen hoped the new organisation would offer more

684 E.g. in July 1972.
685 [18th] ECCS-Conference, 28-07/02-08, 1973, participants list, ACDP IX-003-061.
than just travelling. His successor Carl-Henrik Winqwist was convinced, that ICCS was primarily involved in the discussion of “the unification of Europe”. In 1965, Secretary General Dieter Ibielski hoped ICCS “will work much more efficiently in the future to get a better political ‘image’.” 686

In 1967, Reginald Simmerson concluded “our main tasks for the future are to extend our contacts further and to consolidate those that we already possess.” 687 In 1969, Heikki von Hertzen summarised the “passed year has once again been filled with ups and downs like many times before in the history of ICCS. The ‘downs’ have mainly been of financial type whereas the ‘ups’ have mostly been new people and new organisations taking part in our work.” 688

In 1974, Tom Spencer concluded “When you also consider the added joy of airline strikes and bomb threats, Europe can be seen as not the easiest place to run an international organisation.” 689

For Nigel Ashford the major successes of the seventies were the “creation of the broadest based centre-right organisation in Europe. The campaign for the EDP led to the formation of the European Democrat Union [...] The establishment of the European Summer University in which thousands of students have participated since 1977.” Failures were considered to be the “lack in contact with non-socialist students in Eastern Europe. The lack of progress in creating an International Democrat Students. The failure to establish a firm financial base”. 690

The influence of ECCS/EDS was the strongest when it could support policies of the emerging European centre-right parties. These efforts were also highly appreciated. In 1974, Queen Elizabeth II made former Chairman Ian Taylor a member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (MBE) and acting Chairman Tom Spencer was awarded with the Robert Schuman medal for his contribution to the development of Europe. 691

And what about this: “Revolutionary holidays? – Coincidence or have ECCS been fomenting unrest around the world recently?” asked the first Taurus magazine in 1974:

- “Athens: Tom Spencer on holiday in August, Papadopoulos [the military ruler] was overthrown.”
- “Santiago: Jürgen Klemann [Vice Chairman] on goodwill mission to Chile in Summer; [President] Allende killed in coup.”

“Portugal: Carl Bildt on holiday in Madeira; [former dictator] Caetano was exiled to Madeira.”

“Warning – Michel Claris is going to Spain for a holiday – Franco beware.”

An interview of “YEPP-News” with Günther Fehlinger shows some of the conclusions of him as one of the most influential EDS-officers of nineties:

“How did you start in EDS?
Fehlinger: I started in EDS in February 1994 in Copenhagen, just after I became Chairman of AG-AktionsGemeinschaft, the Austrian EDS member organisation. Before, at the beginning of the nineties, I had been responsible as International Officer for the School Students of the Christian-Democratic Party, and afterwards I became International Officer of the Austrian Students Union. As Chairman of AG, I decided to become more active in the international work, because there was a crisis in EDS at the beginning of the nineties followed by a split. We decided to reunite the student movements of the Christian-democratic, conservative and liberal parties. [...]”

Is EDS actually still comparable with how it was when you started?
Fehlinger: I think in many aspects yes: we have kept the name, the structure, the spirit and the traditions like singing. But of course EDS has now many more member organisations – at my first Council meeting there were 11 member organisations actively participating, while at the last Summer University there were some 24 organisations with voting rights out of over 30 organisations present.

Which do you consider as your main realisations of the time that you were EDS Chairman?
Fehlinger: For sure the enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe and the official status we gained as recognised association of EPP at the 1997 congress in Toulouse. In general, I would say bringing EDS to a very high level of events. The political highlight was the support for the opposition in Serbia: we were in 1997 in Belgrade to support the students organisation there. Apart from that, I also remember the trips to Moldova, Belarus and Russia, where we brought our ideas to the young people from the Christian-democratic and conservative movements. And I will definitely never forget the Summer University in Málaga directly after the assassination of Miguel Angel Blanco, when we turned the whole event into a manifestation against terrorism.

Is EDS actually dominated by its conservative wing?
Fehlinger: We have a balance between both major wings, with some liberal spots, and it works fine as each organisation profits from the good working European entity it is involved in. Everybody of course has to give and to take,
but I don’t think that we can talk about a domination, especially when you look at the persons who have been Chairman or Secretary General during the last years: myself, coming from one of the more centrist organisations in EDS; Michael Peglis, from the centre-right students from Nea Demokratia, Ukko Metsola, coming from the centrist-conservative party in Finland and Holger Thuss from Germany. So I don’t think that we can talk about conservative domination, but I would say that there is a good balance between the three pillars of what we believe in: Christian-democracy, conservatism and liberalism. These three pillars are the basis of all people’s parties in Europe, and I think that EDS combines them very well.

Students at EDS meetings are dressed in smokings, call around Europe with the fanciest models of mobile phones and smoke cigars after gala dinners: what happened to the time when students protested in the streets to change the world?

**Fehlinger:** First of all I don’t smoke. I think that when it comes to institutional and economic reforms, EDS is very much participating in the process of changing the world. We are not like Joschka Fisher, hurting policemen in the streets, and I don’t feel any remorse that we are not like him – actually we asked him to resign at our last Council meeting. Certain events also deserve certain attention from the side of the participants, so it’s not that EDS-people are sitting around and smoke and chat at the Council meeting or at the beach the whole time. I think that when you have one gala dinner during a Winter University, it is a sign of appreciation when people are a little bit dressed up.

**EDS is developing more and more contacts outside Europe: wouldn’t it be better to concentrate on your core business, namely Europe, and to intensify as much as possible the pan-European contacts?**

**Fehlinger:** This is touching the deepening and widening issue, and I think they both go hand in hand. The stronger the Union gets in its co-operation and its structures, the more it has the obligation towards its neighbours, both in the East and the South, to take responsibility. The key priority was to bring
into EDS our partners from the countries which are candidate for being member of the European Union, and with the exception of four countries, namely Ireland, Netherlands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, we have now an observer or full member organisation in every European country. We had a controversial discussion inside EDS if our contacts with the Algerian Students Union (UGEL), which is ideologically close to us, should develop further, and I think yes, I say yes to the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. We cannot simply close our doors. Immigration is a key issue and we have to work positively on it: it’s good for Europe to have the closest as possible contacts with the emerging democracies of the South. We had the first opening now in the East, and now we see that these Arab-socialist movements, which very much dominated the North of Africa and the Middle-East, are going to break down like all the other socialist movements in the world, and it’s our obligation to support those who think like us, like the Algerian Students Union for instance. Of course they will not become member of the European Union in the upcoming twenty years, but we have to have close economic and political contacts in order to stabilise the country and to help the people who support free market and democracy. We have global responsibility, and even as a small student organisation, we don’t have to close our doors to our friends from Africa and Latin-America, as well as from the United States. We were very pleased with the election of George W. Bush. The political systems of the West are basically working like in waves: after the Clinton-era, the centre-right is coming back to power, and the “compassionate conservatism” will be the leading ideology in the first decade of the 21st century.692

Finally, what is EDS today? In his election platform for 1999/2000 Ukko Metsola defined the challenges for the new millennium by saying: “our expansion is by no means over. But the new situation does create certain challenges: How to preserve the cohesiveness and the famous spirit of our organisation? How do we maintain the high level of pro-European activity and enterprise while still being comprehensible to the member organisations? How do we serve our individual members better? How to structure the EDS work in the most efficient possible way?” The preservation and increase of cohesiveness was even considered to be the “most immediate question”.

Bearing this in mind, it becomes clearer why EDS has quite a unique contribution to make. No other political student organisation can boast of forty years of continuous political action and political education such as EDS can. If European Democrat Students retains its commitment to Europe and its students and if the opportunities Europe offers do not wane, EDS will also prosper in years to come.

Chapter 6

The Millennium Years: 2002-2011
Challenges

The Millennium Years have been largely marked by very new challenges that nobody could have predicted. First of all, the terrorist attacks of 9/11, later in Madrid and London, put into sharp focus how important it is to protect and defend our common European values and the culture of tolerance, understanding, democracy, human rights and basic liberties against the dark forces of pre-enlightenment. EDS took a clear stand on these questions, advocating our standing shoulder to shoulder with our transatlantic friends and fostering universal human rights and values.

Furthermore, European unification in concrete terms took shape as never before. The Eurozone was formed, the EU-15 in one fortunate moment in May 2004 turned to a big EU-25, and just three years later two more members made it 27 with the steady prospect of making it even larger and more comprehensive. In these years, EDS was consistently an advocate of more integration, more unification and a more inclusive and open Europe. The enlargement was enthusiastically accompanied by EDS activists and EDS covered many campaigns on this issue. The struggle for ONE Europe like laid down in the Basic Programme of 1964 was more topical than ever. This process also meant a huge step forward for EDS, the enlargement of the European Union and the successful implementation of the Eastern Partnership in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy opened new horizons for our political family. EDS was always there. Even more, EDS was a frontrunner for future developments, with special regard to the new memberships: Turkey, Israel, Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99) and many other countries were included on the EDS map, long before even a prospect of EU-membership could be laid on the table.

The financial and economic crises of the years 2008 and 2009, followed by the debt crises from 2010 and 2011 onwards, created a new set-up. For the first time in history, Europeans believed their children would have a harder life than they themselves. Europeans looked pessimistic in the future and politicians were busy looking for solutions. However, cuts in education were tragic and many Higher Education Institutions were faced with unsolvable financial problems, thus also affecting students. Furthermore, youth unemployment reached new record highs which would have been difficult to imagine just a few years ago. Students and young people have been hit hard by these developments, making it even more important to stand up for their rights. EDS did just that, and proposed a set of initiatives.

While trying to emerge from the debt crisis, European politicians put together deals with good intentions, but which also led to serious questions as to
the democratic legitimacy of what was decided. Thus the question of developing greater leadership at a European level, with a mandate from all-European populace has been increasingly discussed and challenged. The world is becoming ever more complex and volatile, and managing crises requires quick and resolute action which only a top-level European political class can provide for the benefit of all Europeans. The urgent requirement to anchor the democratic legitimacy of these decision-makers underlines the need for direct elections of European leaders by a single European electorate. The impact of greater democratic control, increasingly integrated responses to common challenges and increasing public awareness of European debates has become obvious and EDS, which has supported the European project for several decades, has played a significant role in promoting these debates.

In the field of higher education the Bologna Process was a big step forward, towards a really united continent EDS has always dreamed about. It was also a long-term process in terms of having a global impact on European competitiveness, improving mutual recognition, mobility by means of creating a space of knowledge called the European Higher Education Area. Unfortunately, not all students have taken advantage of the new liberties; many of them faced drilled patterns at universities and no possibilities whatsoever to live this academic freedom. This development was also frightening for politically active students: As curricula have been tightened, the need for shorter studies has increased and the free time of students have shrunk, and investment in student organisations were more and more questioned.

For the average European student, the millennium brought many new constraints in this regard, but uncounted possibilities: the enlargement, the Schengen Zone, the Euro, mobility through competitiveness and comparability of degrees, personal liberties, but also practical devices such as liberalisation of the airline market, low-cost flights, the European health insurance card or the facilitation of visa regimes, the opening of borders and falling of barriers gave thousands of opportunities and chances to meet and interact with like-minded friends. In this respect European Democrat Students fully supported these changes and took advantage of them.

The work of EDS was facilitated not only by easier physical mobility but also by the technical progress of the internet. Online conferences, quick and efficient information, transfer of mega data and files enable more and more professional work, especially in terms of exchanging and using knowledge. Publications could be produced in better quality, with the editorial, layout, print and distribution teams in different countries. EDS has greatly benefitted from such incentives, accelerating activities and improving them qualitatively.
Internal Affairs

Constitutional development

Voting rights

The XXVI. Summer University with the 32nd Annual Meeting in the premises of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Berlin on Tuesday 30th July 2002 was historical in that a new statutory rule came into force. This new rule caused constant abashment and irritation for the next decade. Any organisation which did not pay the membership fee for the current fiscal (calendar) year was not granted voting rights in the Annual Meeting of that year. This used to be decided by the Bureau, for example at the Annual Meeting in Poland 2000693. The voting right was reconstituted after payment just with the first Council Meeting of the new working year which was mostly in September. Hence, out of 24 full members694 only 16 member organisation possessed the voting right in Berlin, with eight not being able to vote. This rule was retained although some of the members very much wanted to abandon of this very strict, but tough useful regulation. Compared with other political organisations on the international scene, EDS was in this question very formal and rigid as most of other political organisations often tolerated oversights or made exceptions or even took “political decisions” to allocate voting rights which in the eyes of most EDS people seemed to be intolerable and an anachronism. Later on, in 2010, even clearer details were added, stating that the payment needed to arrive at the latest by June 30 (originally this was not specified) on EDS account and if not, the sender had to prove with an English paper that his payment was initiated at the latest on June 23.

In the course of the decade, the voting right of member organisations with delayed or incomplete payment at multiple times was refused at Annual Meetings, although being on spot with representatives like CDS Belgium at the 32th Annual Meeting 2002 (Berlin), NNGG Spain at the 36th Annual Meeting 2006 (Lisbon), JKL Lithuania at the 38th Annual Meeting 2008 (Malta), FIG Italy at the 40th Annual Meeting in Žilina (2010) or Young Likud at the 41st Annual Meeting in Vienna (2011). However, the voting right of DAP-NDFK Greece was granted at the 37th Annual Meeting in Ohrid (2007), although the membership fee payment was undisputedly delayed.

Statutes changes

A latest big milestone for the reformed EDS Statutes was the 35th Annual Meeting on 19th July 2005 in Sofia, where the EDS Bureau presented a totally

---

693 See note from Vice Chairman Petr Sokol from July 2001, p. 1.
rewritten version of the EDS Statutes. The document which was composed largely by Greek Dimitris Terzis followed the tradition of a formal Constitution being subject (at a later stage) to a registration procedure at the (Belgian) court and a non-registered part consisting of three parts: Internal regulations, standing orders and financial regulations. This ambiguity later caused considerable confusion but the reason of this instalment is to guarantee quick and efficient changes of statutes without a need to register at court. This being the case, the formal part of the Constitution was mostly so general that there was indeed no point in having them altered. FMSF Sweden was the only organisation who did not support the new Statutes and voted against them.

While new Statutes have been adopted in 2005, during the working year 2005/2006, the Bureau tried to find a way to have the formal part of the Constitution registered. As the Chairman for 2005/2006 was the German Sven Henrik Häseker, this problem was taken particularly seriously. Finally, a full translation of EDS Statutes into German was submitted to the local court of Bonn (a former registered office of EDS). The court presented a detailed assessment that ruled many parts were incompatible with German law so again changes had to be effected. During the extraordinary meeting of a statutes committee composed of Chairman Häseker, Secretary General Anttinen, Vice Chairman Janine and some interested lawyers from the EDS members in June 2006 in Kiev, a series of possible mainly technical changes such as the question of registration itself were finalized in order to submit them for approval to the 36th Annual Meeting in Lisbon July 2006. There were intense debates around the question of which changes would actually be necessary to register EDS as a legal entity. While Germans favoured an arbitrating body or rules committee, this was not in fact necessary for the registration process, but RCDS Germany had very good experiences with having such an institution on their federal level. A big dispute arose around the question of whether EDS should be registered in Germany (where it previously was) and the Council ruled that this should not be the case. However, the Annual Meeting agreed on that in order to cope with possible requirements of Statutory changes in order to get registered, it automatically mandates one of the Council Meetings to carry out such changes – a decision that was legally not clear and sound, but was accepted. We should note that the new Bureau of Ana Filipa Janine 2006/2007 declared after a short recess to have the priority to have EDS registered.

696 Letter from Amtsgericht Bonn, 20 AR 75/06.
Where the 37th Annual Meeting in Ohrid effected a row of important statutorily basic decisions, the 38th Annual Meeting in Malta was concluded without any change in statutes. The most important changes in Ohrid were in effecting technicalities in order to carry out the registration process in Belgium, but other decisions were also made: The Annual Meeting ruled that there shall be no 1st Vice Chairman and also no Rules Committee\textsuperscript{700}. Once again a decision like in Lisbon in July 2006 has been taken to grant permission to any Council to conduct statutes changes if necessary for the registration process.

Out of the new provisions adopted in 2005, one proved to be a real testimony of the committed deep democratic understanding of EDS: The maximum tenure in a certain position was limited to two terms. This meant that just one re-election to each post was possible. The tenure stayed one year, a clear allusion to the volatility of persons in EDS as a student organisation. Some later said, in practical terms this means a two years tenure with a “possibility of recall” which the author explicitly seconds. This new provision was however not applied retroactively: Ana Filipa Janine was the last EDS Bureau member who had the fortune to serve three years as Vice Chairwoman (2003-2006), although this practice was exercised often in the past (Jean-Hubert Lelièvre, UNI France 2002-2005 and David Teillet, UNI France 1999-2002 or David Hoey, CF United Kingdom 1985-1988).

One of the main discussions during this time with some changes and again back was that of the possibilities of statute changes: One group more conservative in their attitude towards quick and maybe sometimes unprepared statute changes argued those should be possible only once a year, others claimed that this is the sole right of each and any council. A compromise solution adopted to allow statute changes both at the Council Meetings of the Winter and Summer Universities was later deleted in 2007, making once and again the Annual Meeting (during the Summer University) the sole forum for such endeavours.

Registration

During the course of the second mandate of EDS Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine, in April 2008, EDS was registered at the Commercial Court in Brussels with registration number 897.125.680 as “Etudiants Démocrates Européens” (EDE) in the French language\textsuperscript{701}. The necessary French version of the Constitution was adopted by a specifically conducted Annual Meeting of EDS in Ohrid 2007 which later proved not to be necessary, but was seen

\textsuperscript{700} Minutes of the 37th Annual Meeting from 18th July 2007 in Ohrid, p. 5-8.

\textsuperscript{701} Registration document copy from 10th April 2008.
as mandatory at that time. Since this moment in April 2008, all new EDS Bureaus needed to undergo the updating procedure which meant to submit their personal data and passport copies with the dedicated registration form. The same applied for Constitution changes.

**Reform proposals: Voting rights reform**

After fixing many of these legally demanding and purely technical matters, the Bureau 2008/2009 tried to implement some major changes, most notably the voting rights reform. The debates initiated were focusing around these items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules Committee</th>
<th>Honorary Chairman</th>
<th>1st Vice Chairman</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Members</td>
<td>Categories of Members</td>
<td>Majority requirements</td>
<td>Voting rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes changes</td>
<td>Working Group system</td>
<td>Bureau voting in Council</td>
<td>Gender neutrality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since its very beginning, EDS followed the principle of one vote per organisation (which meant naturally also one vote per country), independent of organisational or political strength or activity. The pattern of this system was drilled during the beginning where only representatives of very few countries’ students were able to exchange on the European level. This was much more true as those European countries that did belong to the free world followed a very similar model in student politics: Each large political party had a youth and a separate student branch and the latter was the one involved in EDS and this was the sole base of membership in EDS. As times changed, with one important objective of EDS, the fall of the borders, not only student organisations, but mostly youth organisations and NGOs were seeking to join EDS as political activities at universities were (and still are) forbidden in most of the Central Eastern European countries. The basic difference was consequently whether the activities of the members could be more adequately described as being concerned with student affairs (the old model of partisan student organisations) or with general politics (the new model in the newly liberated democracies). But most importantly, due to the higher volatility of political movements and a more diverse party political system, even more cooperation

---

702 Memo of Vice Chairman Thomas Thaler for statutory discussions at 1st Bureau Meeting on 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 1-5.
partners in a given country were detected. The old three-step “One country –
one organisation – one vote” was not the reality any longer and the status quo
led to the unwished situation of “One organisation – one vote”.

This set-up led to a series of frustrations and questioned especially the
ongoing commitment of the big five\(^{703}\), the biggest financial contributors. It all
began with downgrades in the membership fee of FMSF from category 1 to
category 2\(^{704}\) and from category 2 to finally category 3\(^{705}\) and led to the ultimate
and very surprising quitting of the organisation by NNGG Spain\(^{706}\). Since the
German organisation RCDS also tried several times to have their membership
fee lowered, last time through a formal plea in October 2009\(^{707}\), it became very
obvious for everybody in EDS that keeping the status quo, in conjunction with
membership fee categories on a scale from €275 up to €3225\(^{708}\), an amount
more than 12 times as big as 275, was not sustainable. Additionally, many new
members joined as a second organisations from the respective country which
was seen as difficult so long there are white spots on the EDS map\(^{709}\).

For the EDS Bureau 2008/2009, Policy Director Fredrik Saweståhl (FMSF
Sweden) elaborated a proposal to be tabled at the 39\(^{th}\) Annual Meeting in
Limassol suggesting that two organisations from the same country should
share their vote at EDS Council Meetings. This proposal – being much appre-
ciated by German, French and Austrian representatives – could not convince
the Annual Meeting and was thus rejected, although with just a small margin,
being opposed mainly by smaller organisations and naturally by those who
were not alone in their country. As an unfortunate momentum, the question
of voting for this proposal or not has been strongly linked with the question
of for whom to vote for the new Bureau and campaigning did not overlook the
matter.

The newly elected Bureau of Bence Bauer, mandate 2009/2010, set it-
self as a goal to implement two important statutory steps. First, their purpose
was to renew and reform the membership fee schedule. Second, they urged a
quick and effective resolution of the voting rights problem. The membership
fee system of EDS in five categories had already existed for ages but did not
mark precise criteria, but rather worked on presumptions and roundabout
political assessments of the financial capacity of member organisations.

\(^{703}\) RCDS Germany, UNI France, FIG Italy, NNGG Spain and FMSF Sweden.
\(^{704}\) Council Meeting in Madrid in February 2006.
\(^{705}\) Council Meeting in Trier in December 2008.
\(^{706}\) Pronounced at the 38th Annual Meeting in Malta by Norwegian Anita Leirvik as NNGG representa-
tive.
\(^{707}\) During the Council Meeting in Stockholm in October 2009.
\(^{708}\) Category 1, where cat. 2 was €1875, cat. 3 amounted €1025, the 4 came to €525 and 5 to €275.
\(^{709}\) Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th October 2006 in Torino, p. 6.
Old membership fee system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st category</th>
<th>2nd category</th>
<th>3rd category</th>
<th>4th category</th>
<th>5th category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,225,- EUR</td>
<td>1,875,- EUR</td>
<td>1,025,- EUR</td>
<td>525,- EUR</td>
<td>275,- EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First drafts on how to modernize the membership fee system were presented during the XX. Winter University in Brussels in February 2010, accompanied by a huge data collection move by the responsible Vice Chairman for Statutory and Membership Questions, Finnish Samuli Kauranne. This proposal was further discussed in the Council Meeting in Vilnius in May 2010. After long debate and consideration a completely new fee system could be voted upon during the 40th Annual Meeting on 21st July 2010 in Žilina with a unanimous vote. It established four different coefficients taking into detailed consideration the financial stamina of each organisation, its political and membership strength and the purchasing power in the country in question. This new model most notably replaced the previous exponential model of rising of membership fees by a purely linear model which was widely accepted and understood.

New membership fee system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st category</th>
<th>2nd category</th>
<th>3rd category</th>
<th>4th category</th>
<th>5th category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,700,- EUR</td>
<td>1,800,- EUR</td>
<td>1,100,- EUR</td>
<td>600,- EUR</td>
<td>300,- EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the Annual Meeting in Žilina aligned the Statutes in a number of technical and administrative questions to be more transparent and user-friendly. One of the important items was the mandatory observer membership period for new affiliate (and associate) member applicants: Previously, only applicants for full membership had to undergo a minimum nine months period as observers to be able to apply for full membership, since July 2010 everybody has to go through this stage in order to become full, affiliate or associate member. The Annual Meeting placed for the first time ever the opportunity for statute change solely at the discretion of the Council Meeting during the Winter University. Annual Meetings were not competent any more to effect statute changes, as decided by the (last competent) Annual Meeting, that of July 2010 in Žilina. This decision helped to keep apart political compe-
tion (Summer University) from factual questions of statutory changes or
amendments (Winter University) in future.

For years EDS discussed the questions of superiority and inferiority of
different kinds of Council Meetings, namely whether the Annual Meeting is
superior to the other four Council Meetings (September, December, February
as WinterU Council Meeting and the April/May Council Meeting). To answer
this question clearly, one must look in the understanding of EDS and especially
into the differences it has with other political organisations. Some argued
that an Annual Meeting as the yearly “Congress” has the superior role as it
elects the new Bureau and is therefore the only forum for change and amend
Statutes. Supporters of this view were inspired mainly by the Youth of the
European People’s Party (YEPP), where a Congress was held every two years,
bearing all competences for Statute changes, membership approvals and bu-
reau elections710. European Democrat Students however follows another tradi-
tion: In EDS, being a student organisation, there is no such “Congress”, but
a yearly change of leadership with elections taking place every year and not
just every two. In addition to this, the elections do take place in summer (and
not at any other time during the course of the year) in order to follow the
academic year, deriving from its self-understanding as an organisation of stu-
dents and future academics.

Furthermore, from a deep democratic understanding, each Council
Meeting was supposed to have the same rights as a clear form of democratic
control. Over the years, different kinds of responsibilities were given to differ-

710 Statutes of YEPP, Article 13, pages 4 and 5, version 12th May 2007, see yepp-eu.org on 23rd Nov. 2011.
ent kinds of Council Meetings. The Council Meeting of the Summer University just differed itself from the others in the sense that it was the place of elections. Hence, each Council Meeting was competent to admit members, later only the WinterU and SummerU Council Meetings were allowed to do that. And the 40th Annual Meeting shifted the competence of statute changes from the Council Meeting of the Summer University to that of the Winter University. With this new, yet clear and obvious step, the long-term academic debate on this subject was closed. What was the main reason behind this change? As the 2010-elections were (once again) not competitive ones, the Bureau wanted to distance statute changes from elections to avoid any chance for political bargaining based on objective (statute) decisions which proved to be again a clear stand of EDS in favour of clear and formal procedures, based on content and not political deals.

To the big disappointment of many, Chairman Bence Bauer during the discussions in the Annual Meeting withdrew the Bureau’s proposal for reforming the voting rights, based on the outcome of the hot and intense debate during this 40th Annual Meeting. The proposal was still deficient as it operated once more with the notion of “one country – one vote” in opposition to the status quo of “one organisation – one vote”. This concept was still not convincing for the broad EDS public as it put itself into sharp contrast with the status quo. The confrontation of the two ideals was still not solved and new ways had to be found.

The task was to collect a series of possible coefficients for voting rights similar to the experiences with the coefficients of the new membership fee system. Secondly all of those coefficients had to be debated and amended, altered and changed after consultation with all member organisations. Thirdly, the set timeline was an adoption at the Council Meeting during the XXI. Winter University February 2011 in Brussels. At the Council Meeting in Chisinau in September 2010, a well elaborated proposal was presented with the following coefficients: base votes, extra votes for membership, extra votes for political impact (elections) and extra votes for participation in EDS events. This proposal borrowed some items from other political organisations, but also supported a participation and activity based approach. However, it did not make any difference any more how many organisations one country has. After long debates in the Council Meeting in Chisinau and the Council Meeting in Berlin in December 2010 which basically was devoted solely to discussing this matter, a series of adjustments in the fine-tuning were made, but the proposed system itself was not questioned, and was thus adopted to go for
the formal statue change procedure. Finally, the Council Meeting during the Winter University made on Friday, 4th February, 2011 a historical decision: It adopted with the necessary 2/3 majority, with a 19-6-1 vote the new voting rights system.

**New voting rights system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Pol. impact</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>3-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bureau**

As another structural reform, EDS Bureaus 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 implemented a new model of work description in the Bureau. Whereas before, the responsibilities of the Vice Chairmen were grouped around certain projects, from July 2009 onwards these assignments were fixed with standing terms that refer to general responsibilities. Although not fixed in the Statutes, the denomination of the assignments was surprisingly stable and kept almost the same during the mentioned three tenures. The state of the art as of 31st December 2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009/2010 (Chairman Bauer)</th>
<th>2010/2011 (Chairman Bauer)</th>
<th>2011/2012 (Chairman Antal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Relations &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>External Relations &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>External Relations &amp; Memberships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Relations &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Internal Relations &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Internal Relations &amp; Memberships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications &amp; Campaigns</td>
<td>Publications &amp; Campaigns</td>
<td>Publications &amp; Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events &amp; Guidelines</td>
<td>Events &amp; Fundraising</td>
<td>Fundraising &amp; Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities &amp; Alumni</td>
<td>Activities &amp; Alumni</td>
<td>Events &amp; Alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory &amp; Membership Questions</td>
<td>Statutory &amp; Membership Questions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

711 Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 18th December 2010 in Berlin, p. 7.
This drilled pattern aimed to professionalize EDS work and its appearance towards the outside world, establish a clear set of responsibilities, enable transparency and operate with the task-competence-responsibility model. Deriving from the experiences EDS has with this framework, one can say it was a success as it fulfilled its purpose and demonstrated with clarity, where work has been done and where there is still room for improvement. This important information was transparent to the Council and greatly helped the Bureaus in their work. The work description713 drafted by EDS Chairman 2009/2010 was used as pattern, also for the EDS Bureau Handbook714.

In EDS for years a very remarkable rule for cases in which the Chairman is unable to attend his responsibilities has been in force: There shall be a strict rule that the Vice Chairman having the longest tenure shall replace the Chairman, in case of parity the Vice Chairman having the higher age shall prevail.

713 Job Description from 10th September 2009.
714 Handbook for European Democrat Students from 20th July 2011, p. 18-36.
Bureau 2008-2009

Bureau 2009-2010

Bureau 2010-2011
This concept based on simple age was abolished by the 39th Annual Meeting in Limassol, giving newly elected Chairman Bence Bauer the liberty to set up a hierarchy amongst the Vice Chairmen according to new principles. The prevailing idea was to arrange them according to the democratic voting result in their elections, with priority on seniority, meaning first all Vice Chairmen with the longer tenure (the question was basically only whether in their first or second term) were in one tier, and out of them their election result was decisive. In the second tier were all those serving their first terms, amongst whom again the election result was decisive. The multiple proposals to establish a 1st Vice Chairman or a Deputy Chairman failed in the years before.

As regards constant commitment of the Vice Chairmen (or even more general: Bureau members) in their work it was observed that some of the elected officers of EDS lacked participation and input during their tenure. For this reason the Annual Meeting 2005 introduced a rule according to which a Vice Chairman who misses three Bureau Meetings in a year, or two in a row, is considered to be expelled automatically from the Bureau. This was a clear message to some of the Bureau members seeing their election as the fulfilment of their commitment which liberates them from attending the meetings in future. Hence, the Statutes give this “resigned” person an opportunity for reinstatement. This was the case with Vice Chairmen Andis Kudors (LKJA Latvia), Gonzalez Ortiz Lazaro (NNGG Spain) from the 2005/2006 Bureau, who were both re-instated at the Council Meeting on 24th February 2006, with Giovanni Vagnone (FIG Italy), re-instated on 21st February 2009 and Policy Director Andraž Kastelic (SAU Slovenia), re-instated 4th February 2011. Apart from the procedure with Kastelic, vivid discussions have been conducted in the Councils in Madrid and Bucharest as to whether it is a good idea to grant reinstatement. The fears of the opponents were always the same: Is the person really committed to work in the future, at least on the basis of a regular physical involvement? Tetiana Gostieva (USA Ukraine) however was refused reinstatement by the Council on 28th April 2007 in Zagreb, a venue where she herself was not even present. Just some years later, in the Bureau 2010/2011 Tetiana Gostieva was again considered due to absence to have resigned automatically in February 2011 and did not ask for reinstatement on that occasion. The possibility of reinstatement was rather a formal procedure which did not describe the real work load and achievements of Bureau members. Rather it was a political decision of a Bureau or a Vice Chairman not to lose face and to ensure a politically correct reinstating vote. It was also observed during the years

715 Minutes from the 3rd Council Meeting from 24th February 2006 in Madrid, p. 4.
716 Minutes from the 2nd Council Meeting from 21st February 2009 in Bucharest, p. 18.
717 Minutes from the 3rd Council Meeting from 4th February 2011 in Brussels, p.5.
that Vice Chairmen (and Directors who also fell under this rule) tried with all means to comply with the statutory presence requirement and badly wanted to avoid the automatic expulsion. Nevertheless, during the reported period 2002-2011 one case of a resignation was reported with Romain Simmarano (UNI-MET France) who was elected during the 41st Annual Meeting in Vienna on 11th July 2011 already in absence and later handed in an official resignation letter to the EDS Bureau dated 4th December 2011.

As a small conclusion, we should not fail to mention the number of countries being so far represented in the EDS Bureau: 34, a number proving the immense integrating power of EDS. So far, the position of EDS Chairman was filled in by 15 different countries (4 from the North: Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, 4 from the South: Greece, Spain, Cyprus, Portugal, 5 from the West: United Kingdom, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria and finally 2 from Central Eastern Europe: Hungary and Slovakia).

**EPP Framework**

Within the year 2010 another big item in the EDS Bureau’s agenda was the compliance with the EPP Member Associations’ framework. Since the EPP Political Assembly in December 2009 in Bonn, the member associations were no longer listed by name, but had to seek admission and constantly fulfil the EPP framework which meant according to the decision of the EPP Political Assembly in November 2010: regular activities and submission of plans and budget, usage of the EPP logo, registration as legal body in Belgium and member branches in at least 50% of the European Union member countries that belong to an EPP member party.\(^{718}\) At the time of the adoption of this framework, EDS was the only EPP member association out of six that complied with all those criteria that needed to be met by all associations by September 2011 at the latest. The letter of compliance drafted by EDS\(^{719}\) was gladly welcomed in August 2011.

**Offices and employees**

As for the administrative set-up of EDS two important items have been in the centre of attention, that of the office and that of the paid administrator. While in previous years EDS had its office at the place where the Secretary General was located, this practice was in place up to the office in Berlin/Germany in the Kienitzer Street\(^{720}\) in Neukölln, a location that stayed in possession

---

718 EPP Internal Regulations as of 18th November 2010, see X. Member Associations, section a.
719 Letter to EPP Presidency from 29th August 2011, signed by outgoing Chairman Bence Bauer and incoming Chairman Juraj Antal.
720 See imprint of diverse publications, e.g. “EDS - a users’ guide” from spring 2002.
Karolina Pastuszak in office in 2005

Office in late 2006

Juraj Antal in office in 2011
of a series of RCDS officers and is still in our days in “RCDS-hands”. Finally, on 13th January 2003 the office of EDS moved officially to Brussels, to the headquarters of the European Marketing Confederation (EMC), Place des Chasseurs Ardennais, 1030 Brussels where EDS was a tenant alongside the SME Union. However the office was not very central, located in an area that was a 20 minute walk from the European Parliament. However, this important decision was marked as one of the biggest developments in the working year 2002/2003 which indeed it was. After two years, EDS found its “home” taking its seat in the headquarters of the European People’s Party (EPP), in 67, rue d’Arlon, 1040 Brussels. As the EPP moved, so EDS changed its location after just 19 months, moving into the building where EDS has its office until this day: 10, rue du Commerce, 1000 Brussels, moving in on 9th September 2006. As with the office, so too EDS had its bank accounts following the country of origin of Chairman and/or Secretary General with having bank accounts in Denmark at Dankse Bank or in Germany at Deutsche Bank. Just some two years after the last Danish Chairman left office (Jacob Lund Nielsen) and three years after the last German Secretary General quit office (Marc-Michael Blum) EDS managed to open a Belgian bank account at the KBC Bank in early autumn 2005 as reported by the Secretary General 2005/2006. It is remarkable that until that time an account - not denominated in Euro – was operated: in Denmark. Although this fact was much discussed, no one took action for a long time.

As regards the person of the administrator the opening of the Brussels-based office brought with it the hiring of a full time employee of EDS from 13th January 2003, a decision that was taken by the 2nd Council Meeting in Copenhagen the British Martin Smith the inaugural holder of the office. In the working year 2003/2004 the position of administrator was awarded to Georgian George Robakidze, a decision that must have been taken by Secretary General Brecht Tessier, as no decision can be reported from the 1st Council Meeting in Palermo from 25th October 2003. The 1st Bureau Meeting in from 21st – 24th August 2003 in Brussels foresaw a call for this position. With a new Secretary General taking office after the Annual Meeting in London in the person of Polish Karolina Pastuszak an administrator was selected who was

---

723 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 19th February 2005 in Frankfurt, p. 2.
724 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th October 2006 in Torino, p. 2.
725 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 29th October 2005 in Bratislava, p. 2.
727 Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 14th December 2002 in Copenhagen, p. 3.
728 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 21st August 2003 in Brussels, p. 3.
also Polish: Rafal Stańczyk\textsuperscript{729}. As the Secretary General was changed at the 35\textsuperscript{th} Annual Meeting to Anna Anttinen\textsuperscript{730}, the new Bureau also picked a new administrator: Martin Vrátník from the Czech Republic was appointed by the Council with unanimity\textsuperscript{731}. However due to a lack of financial compensation for him, he offered his resignation during mid-term\textsuperscript{732}. Even before that, the Chairman in open session raised the question of the future of this position, to make EDS work more effectively\textsuperscript{733}. He remains the only administrator in EDS history to have resigned\textsuperscript{734}. Interestingly, just two weeks before this resignation letter EDS Chairman Sven Henrik Häseker also formulated a letter, addressed to the Council where he announced his intention not to run for re-election in summer 2006\textsuperscript{735}.

The next administrator was Ben Labbe, starting from October 2006\textsuperscript{736}. However, just six weeks later, a new administrator was introduced in the person of Spanish Alessandra Martin\textsuperscript{737}. It was not reported when the change occurred, but somewhere around early summer 2007 again a new person was chosen as the registration process for the XXXVII. Summer University in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was already conducted by Italian Alessandro Moretta. The Minutes of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Bureau Meeting of the working year 2007/2008 already mention Bernada Cunj from Croatia as the administrator, a decision that was two months later confirmed by the Council\textsuperscript{738}. Ms. Cunj also stayed in the post of administrator for the working year 2008/2009 \textsuperscript{739}, thus so far she was the only administrator to serve two years in EDS. However, with the beginning of the working year 2009/2011 incoming Secretary General Maria Keris (IRLY Estonia) opted to make an open call for this position, as this was also general practice before. The Bureau was informed and thus decided for an open call\textsuperscript{740}. Surprisingly EDS received more than 150 applications\textsuperscript{741} and chose another candidate that was put forward for approval to the Council\textsuperscript{742}. Out of disappointment of some members of the Council upon the negative decision for the outgoing administrator the necessary two-thirds-majority for

\textsuperscript{729} Agenda point no 5 of the Bureau Meeting from 27th October 2004, see also Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 30th October 2004, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{730} Minutes of the 35th Annual Meeting from 19th July 2005 in Sofia, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{731} Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 29th October 2005 in Bratislava, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{732} Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 23rd – 25th February 2006 in Madrid, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{733} Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 21st January 2006 in Bohinj, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{734} Resignation letter of Martin Vrátník from 8th June 2006.
\textsuperscript{735} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 27th October 2006 in Torino, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{736} Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 8th December 2006 in Nicosia, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{737} Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 24th November 2007 in Guimarães, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{738} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 5, see also Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 13th December 2008, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{739} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 29th August 2009 in Balatonszász, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{740} Newsletter October 2009.
\textsuperscript{741} Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 9th/10th October 2009 in Stockholm, p. 4.
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legally creating the administrator position was not reached: Only 18 organisations out of 29 supported the plea of the Bureau743, so as a result EDS did not have this position, a gap that was filled by Secretary General assuming the workload herself and compensated as such744. Finally, some nine months later, upon the initiative of the outgoing Bureau745, the Council adhered to the principles of a paid and employed EDS administrator and granted a positive verdict on the same question 3/4 years later746.

For the working year 2010/2011, the position of administrator was filled by the Secretary General Ildze Kanepaja from Latvia who moved to Brussels for the duration of her tenure. As for the working year 2011/2012 EDS chose another administrator from Latvia: Dace Spelmane took up the renamed position – as of 1st September 2011747 the administrator was called Deputy Secretary General748 following a decision of the Council – in the office in Brussels after having gone through an open call749 with competition for this post.

Conclusion

Evaluating the constitutional development within the internal affairs it becomes clear that EDS walked a long path to professionalize its internal set-up and had many struggles. The way was not always paved with glory and success. Very often, new rules or adjustments brought the organisation to the edge of the precipice. Many questions were approached with a notion of existentially important standpoints that for God’s sake have to prevail. For example, the questions of registration (“We do not want to be hostages of the courts”), membership fee (“We will not pay one more cent”), voting right reform (“We all will leave EDS”) or even how work should be organised was disputed and discussed at length. Finally, all these items have been clearly solved and nobody left EDS, nobody stopped membership fee payment and to much surprise, no court was taking EDS hostage. However, the long series of statutory reforms and new and new small revolutions demonstrated the need to adjust the word of statutes and rules that by their very nature are monolithic and inflexible to the real, dynamic and volatile world. This happened more and more by setting down clear rules and by following them. EDS did not follow the example of overstepping self-set principles and rules by daily

---

744 Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 7th November 2009 in Paris, p. 4.
745 Minutes of the 8th Bureau Meeting from 19th/20th July 2010 in Žilina, p. 1.
746 Minutes of the 40th Annual Meeting from 21st July 2010 in Žilina, p. 6.
747 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 17th September 2011 in Prague, p. 7.
748 Minutes of the 41st Annual Meeting from 11th July 2011 in Vienna, p. 18.
749 Newsletter, August 2011.
needs, but kept a strong commitment to the rule of law even in these small dimensions.

EDS thus was a mature organisation of academics par excellence that gathered people who were able to debate about basically everything, not always without big drama, but which finally always coped with challenges of any kind and found a solution based on consensus. The huge, almost revolutionary steps at the end of the Millennium Years like the total reorganisation of voting rights were important decisions that so many other organisations to this day do not succeed in. It can also be witnessed that the day-to-day operations could be enhanced by new incentives like a permanent office and employee, bureau responsibilities or new technical means. The organisation’s output became obviously more proficient and effective. The reluctance to establish a single “Congress”, but to keep the series of basically five Council Meetings, was impressive evidence that EDS is not a normal youth but rather a student organisation, following the tradition of an academic spirit which included open debate, democratic control, transparent moves and the inclusion of many individuals in decision processes. Many other items have constantly underlined this self-understanding and narrative of EDS.

**Membership development**

2002

At the end of the working year 2001/2002, in July 2002, the EDS membership was composed of 32 full members, 1 affiliate member and 7 observer members\(^750\) (out of which 3 became later full members). Already during the 5\(^{th}\) Council Meeting of the working year 2001/2002 UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Young Front Belarus joined as full members, both with unanimous votes\(^751\).

2003

With Res Publican Juventus (RPJ) from Estonia and Youth of Christian-Democratic People’s Party (NGPPCD) from Moldova joining during the Council Meeting in Paris in May 2003 with a unanimous vote, the membership increased to 34 full members\(^752\). At the last meeting of the working year 2002/2003, the only Russian EDS member, the Democratic Choice Youth lost its observer membership\(^753\), thus leaving for the 34\(^{th}\) Annual Meeting in

---

\(^753\) Due to Statutory requirements, all Council Meetings must be visited, otherwise the observer membership automatically seizes to exist.
London in July 2004 a total number of 34 full members, 1 affiliate member and 4 observer members, a total of 39. During the 33rd Annual Meeting in Zadar, the full membership of CSJ Luxembourg was terminated as well as the observer membership of YU DCR Russia. Conservative Future United Kingdom was un-suspended, after a formal written application had been received. As Conservative Future agreed to organise the Summer University 2004 which was gladly welcomed and supported by the Annual Meeting, their membership fee debts were partly cancelled. This procedure was very common in these times and has been repeated later on also with NZS Poland and Young Likud Congress Israel. Around this time, the connections to the Ógra Fíanna Fáil from Ireland had been very intense, the organisation was considering EDS membership seriously and though not present sent an official letter of apologies. According to EDS Chairman Jacob Lund Nielsen, a membership application of OFF was imminent. It was even reported at an earlier stage how the delegates in the OFF Congress voted upon EDS membership (50 out of 53 votes), thus EDS Bureau seemed to be very enthusiastic about this matter.

At this point, it should be mentioned that EDS was very reluctant to accept the loss of members and they were kept as long as possible although according to the statutory situation, their membership should have already finished. New and new payment deadlines have been granted, in order to postpone the inevitable. For instance, the Annual Meeting in Zadar left four observer members as members although they did not show any activity, just the representative of one of them present. As full members were later on lost, but only because of outstanding balances, this pattern was repeated again and again. It can be observed that e.g. VAKA Iceland did not attend any EDS meeting since October 2003 and stopped payments from 2004, however they were still listed as a full member for the 36th Annual Meeting in Lisbon in July 2006, although their membership should have been suspended already one year before.

2004

The 34th Annual Meeting in London on the 21st July 2004 dealt, on agenda point C15, only with problematic cases, meaning with organisations that

754 Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 9.
755 Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 11.
756 Application letter from Conservative Future National Chairman Justin Tomlinson from June 2003.
757 Financial settlement between CF and EDS from 14th August 2003.
758 Apology letter by OFF from 10th July 2003, signed by OFF External Liaison Coordinator Cathal Mac Concradh.
759 Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 11.
760 Minutes of the 6th Bureau Meeting from 6th March 2003 in Prague, p. 3.
761 Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 9-10: ADSF Albania, HAZ-BiH Bosnia-Herzegovina, SAS Slovenia, FILS Israel preserved their membership this way, however with the first three mentioned here, it was just a matter of time to be out forever.
sooner or later lost their membership in EDS. However, only ASDF Albania was expelled. SAS Slovenia was granted some months more to settle their debts, the same procedure was followed with NZS Poland and FILS Israel.

2005

The only membership development reported from 2005 was the adoption of SAU Slovenia as full member on the 35th Annual Meeting from 19th July 2005 in Sofia after this organisation was observer member for one year. Their membership application was supported by UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Kliks Serbia-Montenegro. Although the expulsion of NZS Poland, FILS Israel and SAS Slovenia was overdue and the Bureau decided to treat this question instantly, neither the Council Meeting on the Winter University 2005, nor the Annual Meeting in 2005 engaged in a discussion or decision about how to proceed with the mentioned cases. This pattern of not acting remained a predominant attitude for many.

2006

At the 36th Annual Meeting in Lisbon, two more organisations left EDS forever: Hungarian full member Fidelitas by declaration of their Chairman and Young Likud Israel on 5th May 2006, reducing the number of EDS full members for the mentioned Annual Meeting to 33, those of observers to 2. The struggles of the youngsters from Likud to keep their membership intact were not successful. After 5th April 2005 they even applied for full membership, the division of their mother party in early 2006 did not help their case, due to debts the last and ultimate deadline passed on 5th May 2006. One should remark here that later in 2010, the Israelis could enter to EDS as Young Likud Congress.

Following these developments, it is memorable that (apart from the change from Luxembourg to United Kingdom in 2003) from a culminating point in 2002 the membership remained stable, with few parts drifting apart. On the other side it remains a sad story that out of seven observers and one applicant organisation in summer 2002, when the first edition of this book was published in Berlin, only two, the Estonian RPJ and Moldovan NGPPCD,
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were successfully integrated into EDS. The reluctance of the other organisations in question to join or a lack in attractiveness of EDS membership proved to be a main factor in the de facto crises as regards the enlargement of the EDS map of Europe.

With the conclusion of the 36th Annual Meeting in Lisbon in July 2006, two more full members were expelled from EDS, due to outstanding balances. The rule was to finish a membership with two years outstanding membership fee debts, this was later changed to two years from the moment of a debt becoming outstanding, prolonging the time span to basically three years without payment. As described above, VAKA Iceland and also SLS Switzerland – the only liberal organisation that was also liberal by its denomination – were no longer EDS members with the conclusion of the Annual Meeting in Lisbon. The number of full members sank to 32. A very uncomfortable moment in Lisbon in 2006 was the situation around the membership application of Youth of Alleanza Nazionale, Azione Giovani (AG). After some discussion in the Annual Meeting obviously not very favourable for the applicant because of a lack of clarification of the AG mother party as regards its own past, EDS Chairman Sven Henrik Häseker advised the representative to withdraw the application. AG, however, did not withdraw, but postpone it for the time being. This situation was especially delicate as already earlier that year, the membership application could not be considered because of a mistake of the EDS Bureau (sending out the documents with delay) although even the other Italian member, FIG supported the membership application of AG.

As SO HSS Croatia, the university organisation of the Croatian Peasants’ Party HSS was adopted as an observer member in Lisbon and HAZ-BiH was from Lisbon 2006 on no longer an observer in EDS, SO HSS Croatia could claim the title of the one and only EDS observer member.

2007

This however changed during the XVII. Winter University in Białystok in February 2007, where Fidesz Youth, the youth organisation of Fidesz Hungarian Civic Union, was welcomed as an observer member of EDS. The Winter University in this Eastern part of Poland was actually a good example of which incentives EDS used to build every golden bridge towards members with an outstanding financial balance. As NZS Poland was due for expulsion already like FILS Israel on 5th May 2006, their representative stated a willingness to stay in EDS, on the day before the Annual Meeting, a contract was signed

---

770 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 24th February 2006 in Madrid, p. 5.
771 Supportive letter of FIG Chairman Simone Baldelli from 28th November 2005.
between EDS and NZS where both parties agreed to consider the membership
debt as void if NZS organised at its own cost a larger EDS event\textsuperscript{772} which was
even named: The Winter University in February 2007. This practice was later
on continued with the case of Young Likud Israel that due to high debts could
not re-enter EDS in 2009/2010 so it was agreed – however without written
contract – that it should organise at its own cost the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Council Meeting of
2009/2010. Retrospectively, the procedure with NZS Poland was not crystal-
clear as a contract more than two months after their definite expulsion could
hardly revive their membership. A new application process should have been
started, but was not done. In this respect we can conclude that the member-
ship of NZS from 5\textsuperscript{th} May 2006 until their final and ultimate expulsion 17\textsuperscript{th} July
2008 was from the legal point of view void.

With the conclusion of the 37\textsuperscript{th} Annual Meeting in Ohrid in July 2007, the
membership level was again 33 full members, SO HSS Croatia being adopted
full member here. In Ohrid, the student organisation of the Democratic Party
of Romania, OSPD was accepted as observer member, leaving the number of
observers at two.

2008

The Council Meeting during the XVIII. Winter University in Budapest in
February 2008 remains one of the most quoted as regards membership deci-
sions. Firstly, the organiser of the Winter University, a respected youth organi-
sation of a big and important EPP member party was not given a unanimous
vote. During the Winter University, observer member Fidesz Youth was grant-
ed full membership during the XVIII. Winter University in Budapest in Febru-
ary 2008 with 18 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention and 1 invalid vote\textsuperscript{773}. But even more
surprises were caused by the case of a historical unicum: A complete rejection
of a valid application. For the said meeting, the Youth of the Democratic Party
of Serbia (ODSS) tabled an application to become observer member of EDS.
As there was already an existing full member from Serbia, Kliks, the applica-
tion needed to receive a ¾ majority. Out of 20 votes cast ODSS Serbia received
14 yes, 3 no votes and 3 abstentions, this meaning a 70\% yes result, which
meant that the vote was a rejection. Legally, a rejected application leads to a
blockade of two more years of the applicant, politically it was an even stronger
sign: ODSS was never again to attend EDS meetings. However, unprecedented
happenings took place in this meeting which was held in the Upper House of

\textsuperscript{772} Contract between EDS and NZS from 24\textsuperscript{th} July 2006, signed by Sven Henrik Häseker and Justyna
Rozko.

\textsuperscript{773} Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 23rd February 2008 in Budapest, p.5.
the Hungarian Parliament. After the announcement of the result, almost each
and any member being present declared their disarray about this vote. Upon
the initiative of the Scandinavian organisations in the room, a statement\(^{774}\) was
circulated and with the exception of UNI France and SO HSS Croatia signed
by all full members present and voting in the matter of the admittance of
ODSS. When we look on the numbers, we find at least four EDS full members
that either were not frank in this regard or had some other strong reasons to
behave in a publically signed statement another way than in a secret ballot.
This fact was much discussed during this said meeting.

At the 38\(^{th}\) Annual Meeting in Malta in July 2008, NNGG Spain by uni-
lateral announcement of their sole delegate present, former Director of
Communications of EDS, Norwegian Anita Leirvik, declared their withdrawal
from EDS membership, but interestingly their fee was paid and they took part
in the 2008 bureau elections\(^{775}\), just a few minutes before their final announce-
ment. With NZS Poland being dismissed from membership at the very same
meeting, for constant unpaid membership fees, the same happening to Con-
servative Future United Kingdom. With OSPDL Romania adopted as a new
full member, the number of EDS full members was 32. The one and only af-
iliate member, the Hungarian Youth Community Slovakia stayed stable, but
fortunately Malta brought four brand-new observer members, AM SDA Bosnia
and Herzegovina, edH Belgium, MGERB Bulgaria and G 17 Plus Youth Serbia,
bringing the total number of EDS membership to 37.

We cannot overlook the fact that the years 2006-2008 meant a serious
and long-lasting step back for the integration goals of EDS. Interestingly,
where European Integration was always a hot topic for the organisation and
it succeeded to even reach out to the very Eastern parts of Europe, the Mal-
tese Annual Meeting demonstrated with all clarity that the organisation had
to struggle on its Western ends: In the mentioned period, not less than four
countries became white on the EDS map: Iceland (2006), Switzerland (2006)
and most notably Spain (2008) and United Kingdom (2008), not to mention
the spots that became white in 2003 (Luxembourg), much earlier (Nether-
lands) or were always white (Ireland). Interestingly, the EDS Chairwoman
pointed out this danger during the course of her first Council Meeting in
Turin on 28\(^{th}\) October 2006, stating the need to get closer to “the Netherlands,
Iceland, Luxembourg, Ireland, Switzerland” via the means of study trips\(^{776}\) as
“in some countries we have no members and in some even two”. This issue
was discussed again and again, among membership questions, voting rights

\(^{774}\) Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 23rd February 2008 in Budapest, p. 6.
\(^{775}\) Which ended in a 15:13:1 voting result.
\(^{776}\) Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th October 2006 in Torino, p. 6.
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and membership fee issues and of course in the political debates whether EDS is represented broadly enough in Europe.

2009

During the 39th Annual Meeting in Limassol in July 2009, out of the four existing observer members one lost its membership due to absence777, but happily, the three others (AM SDA Bosnia-Herzegovina, edH Belgium, MGERB Bulgaria) were admitted full members with a unanimous vote778 and stayed active and committed EDS members. As fortunately no other member left779 the number of full members increased to 35, with 1 affiliate and Young Conservative Europe Group (YCEG) United Kingdom, the youth wing of the Conservative Europe Group, whose Chairman at that time was former EDS Chairman Ian Taylor, becoming an observer member, the total membership amounted after Limassol to 37. The return of an organisation from the United Kingdom, under leadership of Matthew Lewis, was greatly welcomed.

As described above, it was a useful tool in order to maintain the membership of members with committed youngsters active to find a separate agreement on organising an EDS event on this costs of the hosting organisation. This being true for members with outstanding balance and the threat of a termination of membership, this rule applies also for prospective members who have a financial debt from their time of being member some time ago. This was the case with Young Likud Israel. They inherited the debts from FILS Israel (the then student branch which was an EDS member until 5th May 2006) that amounted to a serious number. By taking on all the costs of an event in Israel, there was no (financial) obstacle anymore to apply for affiliate membership. And exactly this happened: The Bureau of 2009/2010 concluded an agreement with Young Likud to consider their debts void, and in exchange the organisation hosted the 2nd Council Meeting of the working year 2009/2010 at its own expense, bringing EDS to Israel for the first time since the eighties. As a result of this endeavour, the Council Meeting at the XX. Winter University in February 2010 in Brussels adopted the affiliate membership application of Young Likud with a clear majority, thus bringing the number of affiliates to two members. This decision can be called historical and EDS was once again coming closer to its bridge function to unite people and countries.

777 G 17 Plus Youth Serbia.
779 Although RCDS Germany was “not amused” about the auditors’ report of the fiscal year 2008 and claimed several times to have no majority in their internal bodies to hold the EDS membership, they stayed active and even were represented in the new Bureau 2009/2010 – which could be thanks to the fact that the Statutes of RCDS clearly states that RCDS has a membership in EDS.
2010

As a result of the newly established desk on membership questions in the Bureau and as an outcome of a proactive search for new members the working year 2010/2011 has seen five new observers being adopted as EDS members. But it was a long path to this point: After the 40th Annual Meeting in Žilina, where New Era Youth Section Latvia tabled and later postponed their application for EDS observer membership, the new voting rights system was the first political priority of the Bureau, we can even say it was an existential question. The voting rights as a statutory item thus was closely linked to the membership development of EDS, moreover to the question of the sustainability of a large number of the EDS membership. Why? As EDS was founded according to the principle “one country – one organisation – one vote”, the predominant understanding has been always that there is one and sole organisation in every country that represents centre-right students’ rights and ideals the best. This model served brilliantly for decades, but it did not answer the question about what should happen if this stable and well-established system (that still is the case in Western Europe) cannot be found all over the continent. As we learned, enlargement and integration amassed organisations from countries where this old clear distinction could no longer be made. Often, the centre-right was not uniquely represented and the political spectrum was volatile. With Slovakia, Poland, Croatia, later Romania, Bulgaria and Belgium having more than one organisation, the classical three-step motto was not valid any more. It was replaced by the “one organisation – one vote” axiom and thus fundamentally altered.

As a predictable result, the organisations based in the classical student movement model became increasingly sceptical about their commitment to EDS. This scepticism was three-fold: Firstly, they more and more feared EDS gaining an overly political, rather general youth rather than student character. Secondly, they saw their voting rights diminished by the “one organisation – one vote” system which they wanted to see rather as a “one country – one vote” set-up. Thirdly, they faced more and more financial restrictions and could hardly justify their relatively high fees\textsuperscript{780} at home.

This scepticism had many faces and it appeared in different kinds of EDS meetings at those times. The first and clearest signal was the quitting of NNGG Spain, anticipated by the membership lowering request of FMSF. With all new members adopted from a country where EDS had already an existing organisation\textsuperscript{781} many of the old ones felt they had a smaller and smaller role, yet a huge financial burden. It became obvious that a voting rights reform was inev-

\textsuperscript{780} As described in the chapter about the constitutional development, the highest fee with 3.225 EUR was more than 12 times high as the lowest fee (275 EUR).

\textsuperscript{781} Like happened with SO HSS Croatia as full member in 2007.
itable. The Bureau of 2008/2009 suggested a system where members from the same country should basically have a joint vote. As this proposal was based on the understanding “one country – one vote”, it could hardly be accepted by a strong organisation from such a country, having a much smaller counterpart. The 39th Annual Meeting in Limassol thus voted down this notion. RCDS Germany, UNI France and AG Austria, being always a driving force for that reform and making their support for new members dependent on this solution, boycotted the vote of MGERB Bulgaria and edH Belgium at the 39th Annual Meeting in Limassol by leaving the room. Later on, RCDS Germany asked for a lowering of its membership category, but was not successful due to statutory restrictions782. It was clear that a solution was very urgent.

But let us come back to the 40th Annual Meeting in Žilina. Also here, a statute change proposal was not successful. Unlike in Limassol, it was not rejected, but was instead withdrawn by Chairman Bence Bauer. The proposal again operated with the notion “one country – one vote” and was no substantial amelioration towards the 2009 proposal, although some items were better fine-tuned. Unlike the applicants for full membership in Limassol, the applicant for observer membership in Žilina, New Era Youth Section Latvia postponed their application for the XXI. Winter University, in the hope that a solution would be found. The seriousness and urgency of the situation was lying in the air and had to be tackled very urgently.

2011
After a successful adoption of a totally new voting rights system, ranging the votes on a scale from 3 to 11, the Council Meeting in Brussels on 4th February 2011, made a historic step forward. Now, the observer membership application of NEYS Latvia was considered and voted upon as well as that of the Youth of the Democratic Party of Albania (FR-PD). The number of observers raised to 2 as YCEG United Kingdom was accepted as a full member of EDS at the same meeting. Like the FR-PD, many new members could be found via the intensive external relations work which EDS was dealing with very professionally. Where FR-PD was getting closer to EDS via the links in the International Schuman Institute, other organisations like TLDM could be visited via the EDS commitment in the EPP structures. The EDS Bureau also made the acquaintance of other organisations with the EDS membership in the IYDU or in other international fora like the European Youth Forum, DEMYC or others. All of them proved to be important platforms to enlarge the EDS world and gain new members, thus erasing the white spots from the EDS map.

Finally, the 41st Annual Meeting on 11th July 2011 in Vienna made again historical decisions. It adopted the Youth of the Liberal-Democratic Party of Moldova (TLDM), the Youth of LDK Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99) and the Youth of AK Parti Turkey as observer members, leading to a total membership of 43 organisations from 36 countries. Besides 36 full members and 2 affiliate members, EDS from this day in July integrated 5 observer members. It became the biggest youth organisation in Europe, representing more than 1,600,000 students and young people. The vote on Turkish membership was especially controversial. Starting from 2005783, the AK Parti Youth Turkey have been regularly participating at EDS events, with a clear acceleration in their integration endeavours in the recent years: EDS has been constantly invited to the AK Parti Youth Festivals in April/May that have been organised for the 10th time in 2011. Moreover, AK Parti Youth hosted the 1st Bureau Meeting of EDS in the working year 2008/2009. The willingness to join European structures became clear when an official application to host the XXXVI. Summer University in 2012 in Turkey has been received784. However, some of the EDS members feared the accession of a huge and influential organisation. The question was discussed at length during the Annual Meeting in Vienna and AK Parti Youth was asked to withdraw their SummerU-application in order that the majority could support their membership application, which in the end occurred. In the end the voting result was convincing: 21 yes, 3 no, 5 abstentions785, EDS made a huge and historic step forward.

With this EDS never had as many members as in late 2011. As all members kept their membership active also after the Summer University, the huge number of members already caused some logistical problems for the Bureau and event organisers. Where some 2-3 years ago, a normal Council Meeting had 40-50 participants from 18-20 organisations, these numbers are increasing from working year to working year. Today, a normal Council Meeting gathers 28-30 organisations present and mostly more than 70 participants. The 41st Annual Meeting in Vienna on 11th July 2011 had a record number of in total 40 organisations being present786.

Work with EDS members

As regards the structure and background of the members, besides the obvious EPP affiliation that most of them have, EDS membership was always

---

784 Application letter from 2nd July 2011 from AK Parti Youth to host the 2012 Summer University of EDS.
785 Minutes of the 41st Annual Meeting from 11th July 2011 in Vienna, p. 8.
786 Besides 33 members out of which 29 had voting right seven guest organisations were present, see Minutes of the 41st Annual Meeting from 11th July 2011, p. 1 with the correction that CEYC needs to be count as present as its Chairman Martin Halada delivered a greeting message, see p. 5.
much more. Here, classical political student organisations from the centre right, conservative and Christian-democrat youth organisations, along with student and youth NGOs from the centre-right merged to form a strong Europe wide student force.

As for practical needs to cope with the growing number of members and to better understand their backgrounds, expectations and views, the EDS Bureau 2002/2003 undertook the venture to challenge members with a complex questionnaire. As reported in the Paris 2003 Council Meeting by EDS administrator Martin Smith\textsuperscript{787}, members were asked to complete an extensive EDS questionnaire, prior to the meeting, and he eagerly awaited input. The purpose was described as to provide better information externally, provide better information internally, tailor the activities of the EDS office to the needs of members, and publish short profiles of member organisations. Some six and half years later, this important idea was relaunched by the EDS Bureau 2009/2010 before the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Council Meeting in Brussels, 27\textsuperscript{th} February 2010. Almost all EDS members have contributed and Vice Chairman Kauranne presented to the Council in Brussels a detailed assessment of what EDS members think and believe. He also interrogated them about their preferences and expectations. In the questionnaire, the work of the incumbent Bureau was given an average of 8 out of 10 points, quite a high score\textsuperscript{788}. Deriving from these experiences EDS considered it to be of the utmost importance to deal with the requests of member organisations and with a proper monitoring of their situations. To this end, the Vice Chairman for Membership Questions was always busy coping with requirements imposed by members as well as ensuring the fulfilment of EDS standards by all the members.

\textit{Conclusion}

To conclude we may lose some words about the historical mission EDS has. EDS as an organisation advocating a free and responsible Europe, united in freedom and democracy, always understood European unification as an important project for which we all have to work. By practical means, EDS always supported an enlargement and integration friendly Europe. EDS was an organisation fighting against the walls, the existing physical walls, but also the walls in our minds. With its membership work, EDS was a frontrunner in how to unite the continent. Here, students from almost all European countries actively exchanged, shared political matters and worked together for these aims. In EDS, Europe was already fully united. EDS is present even

\textsuperscript{787} “Projects through the EDS office”, briefing for the CM by Martin Smith from 10th May 2003, p. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{788} Questionnaire report by Samuli Kauranne from 27th February 2010.
in the countries of the Eastern Partnership like in Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus or Georgia and since the last two years, also in Israel and Turkey. And in this context it was a well understood mission of EDS to build bridges, to bring together young people and to foster dialogue and understanding. No other political organisation has the leading centre right political forces from Israel AND Turkey as members. And no other political organisation can display such a long record of cooperation with such an immense scale of young political actors, students, academics of the centre-right. No other organisation has so much to say in terms of providing committed youngsters a platform for advancing their ideas, their thoughts and beliefs. In this respect, EDS is a unique organisation and its members make it manifold and diverse. We should always keep in mind this fantastic opportunity to unite our common house of Europe and create the Europe we need: An open and inclusive Europe where all Europeans are united in peace and freedom, rejoicing in their democratic rights in a knowledge-based society, without borders, but with opportunities and chances.

Events and Public Relations

Summer Universities

EDS Summer Universities in the Millennium Years were arranged in Germany, Croatia, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Portugal, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malta, Cyprus, Slovakia and Austria. Over the years, they gathered together a huge number of participants from the EDS world and far beyond. As the biggest events of EDS, including also the Annual Meetings (with bureau elections) and the admittance of new members, the attraction of Summer Universities was by far the highest. The idea was to bring together youngsters from all parts of Europe who for one week, in a relaxed atmosphere, were able to freely and openly discuss many topics related to Europe and European Integration. In the Millennium Years, they also proved to be amazing enterprises in how to live a constructive and open Europe. Additionally, part of the purpose was to show the host country at its best and to display its policies. Therefore, EDS always tried to visit different locations in order to learn more, find out and advance the knowledge and understanding of as many regions and countries in Europe as possible. Apart from that, some aspects of regional balance were kept, however not always to full extent. In the history of Summer Universities starting in the seventies it proved to be a good practice that venues from the North and the South take
turns in hosting EDS Summer Universities. Unfortunately, it became more and more difficult to fundraise for such huge events and especially event organisers from two parts of Europe were struggling: North (due to high prices) and West (due to very limited fundraising capacities). Nevertheless, EDS made the best of it and managed to make its big annual events a magnet to assemble a serious number of students and young people. The Summer Universities (at least until 2005 and again from 2010 onwards) included a lot of common singing from the “song book”, the farewell gala dinner, football tournaments (with a trophy and seriously taken scores) and most notably the well known EDS cabaret which aimed to display the most memorable or even hated or beloved parts of the preceding one week programme by presentations from all delegations.

2002

The XXVI. Summer University with the 32nd Annual Meeting took place in Berlin and Hamburg, from 28th July to 4th August 2002 with the title: “Prosperity for all – Social market economy for the 21st century” and was organised by founding member RCDS Germany. The event was extraordinarily high ranking in terms of meeting leading personalities. As a highlight, the more than 200 EDS participants met former Chancellor of Germany, Helmut Kohl, who gave a monumental lecture about the unification of Germany and Europe and his experiences of how to live political visions courageously. Chancellor Kohl was even open for questions, prolonging this memorable meeting for a duration of three exciting hours. But also other leading figures of Christian-Democrat politics were visited: Chairman of the Parliamentary Group, Friedrich Merz impressed the delegates with his clear view on how to liberate the market from bureaucratic measures and how to improve the market economy on a global scale. He also pronounced the CDU/CSU position on European

Integration. Other speakers were Elmar Brok MEP, CDU Secretary General Laurenz Meyer, Vice President of the Hungarian Parliament József Szájer, Hungarian Ambassador Gergely Prőhle, leader of the Young Group of CDU/CSU, Ursula Heinen MP and many more representatives of political and business Berlin. As a highlight, the first edition of the book “Students on the right way” by Holger Thuss was presented. The second part of the programme included a visit to Wolfsburg (VW factory) and a relaxed Hamburg part with informal visits and a closing cabaret. At the Annual Meeting in the Academy of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, chaired by former EDS Chairwoman Bettina Machaczeck as returning officer, the only candidate for Chairman was elected. Jacob Lund Nielsen from DKS Denmark was unanimously re-elected as Chairman, followed by George Boutras (DAP-NDFK Greece), David Erguido (NNGG Spain), Eduard Herda (RCDS Germany), Jean-Hubert Lelièvre (UNI France), Miroslav Lopata (ODM Slovakia), Pawel Poncyljusz (MK Poland), Alexandros Sinka (Protoporia Cyprus) and Petr Sokol (MK Czech Republic) as Vice Chairmen. The 9th candidate, Tobias Sjö (FMSF Sweden), was however not elected. Furthermore, Roberta Tedesco Triccas (SDM Malta) was appointed new Secretary General, Tobias Sjö (FMSF Sweden) and Anita Leirvik (HSF Norway) were appointed Area Directors, David Teillet (UNI France) Honorary Chairman.

2003

From 12th to 19th July 2003, Croatian member HAZ hosted the XXVII. Summer University in Zagreb and Zadar, during which some 160 participants came together to learn more about “Croatia towards the European Union”. Lectures included Michael Gahler MEP from Germany, a good old friend of EDS, Danijel Benko, Vice Chairman of SME-HDZ, Tomislav Vidosevic, Head of the Office for Cooperation with International Institutions, Nadan Vidosevic, President of the Croatian Chamber of Economy, and Petra Goran, Head of Training Department from the Ministry of European Integration. As a highlight of the programme, EDS delegates were also welcomed by HDZ President (and later Prime Minister) Ivo Sanader. During the 33rd Annual Meeting in the premises of Zadar University on 16th July 2003, chaired by former EDS Chairman from Tuhatkunta Finland, Ukko Metsola, the first Cypriot was elected Chairman of EDS in the person of Alexandros Sinka (Protoporia Cyprus). The other candidate, Czech Petr Sokol resigned from running one day before the meeting. As Vice Chairmen the following persons were elected: Tibor Jona

---

791 Minutes of the 32nd Annual Meeting from 30th July 2002 in Berlin, p. 5.
792 BullsEye No 27 (February 2004), p. 4 - interestingly some speakers were seen again and again...
Events and Public Relations

(KLiKS Serbia-Montenegro), Jean-Hubert Lelièvre (UNI France), Satu Arsalo (Tuhatkunta Finland), Eduard Herda (RCDS Germany), Grigoris Dimitriadis (DAP-NDFK Greece), Pedro Mourino (NNGG Spain), Ana Filipa Janine (JSD Portugal), Davorka Herman (HAZ Croatia), with only Lelièvre and Herda being re-elected. Others have not received enough votes like Alla Nastych (USA Ukraine), Fredrik Törn (FMSF Sweden), Tomasz Stys (MK Poland) or even Miroslav Lopata (ODM Slovakia) who tried to be re-elected. As Secretary General, the new Chairman appointed Brecht Tessier (CDS Belgium), with Dimitris Terzis (DAP-NDFK Greece) and Relika Alliksaar (RPJ Estonia) as Area Directors. According to the new honour league, George Robakidze from Graali Georgia was awarded the gold honour for his lifetime achievement to bring Georgia onto the European map of EDS. The silver honour went to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philip Gaspar</th>
<th>Jan Kubiznak</th>
<th>Martin Schuster</th>
<th>Miroslav Svec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MK Czech Republic)</td>
<td>(MK Czech Republic)</td>
<td>(MK Czech Republic)</td>
<td>(ODM Slovakia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following people were awarded with bronze:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relika Alliksaar</th>
<th>Bence Bauer</th>
<th>Marc-Michael Blum</th>
<th>Kristina Bruderova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(RPJ Estonia)</td>
<td>(RCDS Germany)</td>
<td>(RCDS Germany)</td>
<td>(ODM Slovakia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bogdan Ciubotaru</th>
<th>Victoria Cusnir</th>
<th>Stefan Glösenkamp</th>
<th>Martin Jensen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NGPPCD Moldova)</td>
<td>(NGPPCD Moldova)</td>
<td>(RCDS Germany)</td>
<td>(DKS Denmark)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kristiina Kokko</th>
<th>Marie Kolovtrova</th>
<th>Johannes Kozlik</th>
<th>Ricardo Lopes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Tuhatkunta Finland)</td>
<td>(MK Czech Republic)</td>
<td>(AG Austria)</td>
<td>(JSD Portugal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jana Malikova</th>
<th>Michalis Michael</th>
<th>Laurent Monjole</th>
<th>Helder Santos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MK Czech Republic)</td>
<td>(Protoporia Cyprus)</td>
<td>(UNI France)</td>
<td>(JSD Portugal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marina Stavrou</th>
<th>Olivier Vial</th>
<th>Mads Winther</th>
<th>Barbara Wnuk-Lipinski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Protoporia Cyprus)</td>
<td>(UNI France)</td>
<td>(DKS Denmark)</td>
<td>(RCDS Germany)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Finally, the position of EDS Honorary Member (for lifetime) was granted to Italian Alessandro Musolino, whereas Czech Petr Sokol was appointed Honorary Chairman. As Patron of EDS, according to the proposal of incoming Chairman Alexandros Sinka, the Annual Meetings conferred this position on Greek University Professor of International Relations at the University of Athens and Jean Monnet Lecturer, Yannis Valinakis who later on became a Member of the Executive Board of the Centre for European Studies which was founded later on, in 2007 with the Directorship of former EDS Vice Chairman Tomi Huhtanen from Finland.

2004

EDS came together to conduct the XXVIII. Summer University and in its frame the 34th Annual Meeting in London/Cardiff from 17th to 24th July 2004. The event with the title “A New Deal for Europe” gathered 170 participants from 35 countries and 35 organisations. Speakers included Conservative Leader of the Opposition Michael Howard, Charge d’Affaires in the American Embassy David T. Johnson and the Shadow Foreign Secretary Michael Ancram. In Cardiff, in the National Assembly of Wales, Laura Anne Jones, a member of the Conservative group and former EDS activist, greeted the EDS guests in the Assembly building. Some interesting features of the programme were the joint

Lunch in the park during SummerU 2004
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799 The Annual Report 2004/2005, p. 11 by accident reports about this event as the XXIV. Summer University which is an obvious and silly mistake.
reception with IYDU the first night or the lecture by David Curry from the
Conservative Europe Group during the European Forum of the group in which
EDS joined in. The Annual Meeting on 21st July 2004 was held in the headquar-
ters of the Conservative Party, under the auspices of Returning Officer Michalis Peglis. Chairman Sinka seeking re-election was given the chance to fulfil
a second mandate. He was accompanied by Vice Chairmen Jens Ahl (FMSF
Sweden), Martin Smith (CF United Kingdom), Sven Henrik Häseker (RCDS
Germany), Luisa Gauci Baluci (SDM Malta), Ana Filipa Janine (JSD Portugal),
Grigoris Dimitriadis (DAP-NDFK Greece), Jean-Hubert Lelièvre (UNI France)
and Tamás Rumi (Fidelitas Hungary) with Lelièvre, Dimitriadis, Janine being
re-elected. Sharp competition with 13 applicants\textsuperscript{801} for 8 places occurred at
that time, meaning that some of the candidates were not successful like Alla
Nastych (USA Ukraine), Anna Anttinen (Tuhatkunta Finland – she became
the Secretary General one year later), Elisabeth Torkildsen (HSF Norway – she
became the Secretary General three years later), Relika Alliksaar (RPJ Estonia)
and Tibor Jona (Kliks Serbia-Montenegro)\textsuperscript{802}, the latter seeking re-election and
having just one year earlier received the most votes. While Karolina Pastuszak
(MK Poland) was appointed the Secretary General and Dimitris Terzis and Bo-
jana Goseva as Area Directors, Spanish Pedro Mourino became the Honorary
Chairman, accompanied by former Prime Minister José Maria Aznar to be
awarded the status of Patron of EDS. He remained one of the true friends of
this organisation, at a later stage in 2006 he even spent his birthday celebra-
tion with the EDS delegates.

\textsuperscript{802} Minutes of the 34th Annual Meeting from 21st July 2004 in London, p. 5.
2005

The XXIX. Summer University with the 35th Annual Meeting was hosted from 17th to 24th July 2005 by FISS Bulgaria and took place in Sofia and Bourgas. It included 150 participants, representing 28 organisations and the same number of countries, and had the title “Bulgaria and EU – Common Future through Traditional Values”. The EDS delegates met a range of high profile representatives like Bulgarian President of the Republic Georgi Parvanov, Chairwoman of Union of Democratic Forces and EPP Vice President Nadejda Mihailova, General Secretary of UDF Vanio Sharkov, Chairman of UDF Sofia Stefan Ivanov, Vice Chairman of UDF and Chairman of Sofia City Council Vladimir Kisiov. The second part of the university was rather informal as being situated at the Bulgarian Black Sea coast. The event concluded with a gala dinner full of EDS songs. During the Annual Meeting on 19th July 2005 in the premises of the University of Sofia, chaired by returning officer Michalis Peglis, in non-competitive elections Sven Henrik Häseker was elected Chairman of EDS. Out of ten candidates, eight were elected to the positions of Vice Chairmen: Vasilis Gkatzaras (DAP-NDFK Greece), Todor Gunchev (FISS Bulgaria), Dieter Haas (AG Austria), Ana Filipa Janine (JSD Portugal), Andis Kudors (LCYU Latvia), Gonzalo Ortiz Lazaro (NNGG Spain), Michalis Michael (Protoporia Cyprus) and Jens Ahl (FMSF Sweden) with Ahl and Janine being re-elected. Outgoing VC Smith from United Kingdom and outgoing SecGen Pastuszak from Poland failed to be elected as Vice Chairmen. The new Secretary General was chosen in the person of Anna Anttinen (Tuhatkunta

Annual Meeting 2005 in Sofia

Finland), the Area Directors were Dimitris Terzis (DAP-NDFK), Christoph Van Impe (CDS Belgium) and Giovanni Vagnone di Trofarello e di Celle (FIG Italy). Jean-Hubert Lelièvre was appointed as Honorary Chairman unanimously, and Prof. Dr. Hans-Gert Pöttering was honoured to become Patron of EDS.  

2006

“Portugal: Europe’s gateway to the World” was the title of the XXX. Summer University in Lisbon, which took place from 23rd to 30th July with over 120 participants and 26 organisations present from 26 countries. The hosting organisation was Portuguese full member JSD Portugal. Participants met prominent speakers like Carlos Gonçalves, former Secretary of State of the Communities, Fernando Pinto, CEO of TAP Air Portugal, former MP, elected by JSD, Rodrigo Ribeiro, Miguel Carvalho de Faria, International Secretary of the Union of Portuguese Speaking Capital Cities, Rui Machete, former PSD President, Carlo Coelho, MEP (not to be confused with Prime Minister of Portugal Pedro Coelho), Pedro Duarte, Vice President of the JSD parliamentary group and former JSD president and as a special highlight Mario David, EPP Vice President and International Secretary of PSD. One of the key speakers of the event was Marques Mendes, PSD President, who caught a lot of media attention for this EDS event. The university also featured trips to Mafra and Estoril, but however missed out the traditional EDS singing, the cabaret and also the

---

tournaments. The 36th Annual Meeting in Lisbon 25th/26th July 2006 brought non-competitive elections with the main organiser of this event, Ana Filipa Janine, running for EDS Chairwoman as the sole candidate. She was declared the new Chairwoman by the returning officer without having opened a formal vote on this matter. Some questioned whether this was according to the procedural laws but as nobody objected in the open meeting, the words of the returning officer, former Honorary Chairman Jean-Hubert Lelièvre, prevailed. The meeting which was held ideally in the headquarters of the Partido Social-Democrata (PSD), bringing the election of a young female Portuguese PSD member as Chairwoman of EDS just some weeks after her 23rd birthday. Eight Vice Chairmen were elected: Vasilis Gkatzaras (DAP-NDFK Greece), Elisabeth Torkildsen (HSF Norway), Jarkko Seppälä (Tuhatkunta Finland), Anja Marija Ciraj (SAU Slovenia), Tatiana Gostieva (USA Ukraine), Ivan Gereci (HAZ Croatia), Michalis Michael (Protoporia Cyprus) and Todor Gunchev (FISS Bulgaria) with Gkatzaras, Michael, Gunchev being re-elected to their positions. The ninth candidate, UNI’s International Secretary Matthieu Maraine did not manage to be elected808, receiving the least votes. Maria Fuster (NNGG Spain) was appointed Secretary General and Giovanni Vagnone di Trofarello e di Celle (FIG Italy) Area Director, with Dimitris Terzis (DAP-NDFK) chosen as Honorary Chairman. The appointment of outgoing Chairman Sven Henrik Häseker (RCDS Germany) as Honorary Member was clearly void as according to the Statutes this position can only be granted for individuals not having held any position in EDS within the last five years. Obviously, nobody noticed this mistake – or nobody wanted to realize it.

2007

The XXXI. Summer University with the 37th Annual Meeting took place in Skopje/Ohrid from 16th to 22nd July 2007, had the title “Europe, policies for the next 50 years” and was hosted by the EDS full member UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The event, bringing together over 100 students from 28 member organisations coming from 27 countries809 featured the importance of enlargement policies to the Western Balkans and assembled a series of excellent speakers like Gordana Jankulovska, Secretary General of VMRO-DPMNE and Minister of the Interior as well as Zoran Petreski, MP and member of the Executive Committee of VMRO-DPMNE and Marija Andonovska, MP and member of the Executive Committee of VMRO-DPMNE. Furthermore, in Ohrid, President of the National Assembly, Ljubiša Georgievski gave impressive remarks on the subject of Balkan-Europe rela-

808 Minutes of the 36th Annual Meeting from 25th July 2006 in Lisbon, p. 5.
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tions. Other speakers were Aleksandar Spasenovski, MP, Vladimir Gjorcev, MP and Trajko Slaveski, Minister of Finance of Vice President of VMRO-DPMNE. Due to the remote location of this university, participants were granted a 50% reduction in their participation fees, a dispensation which was announced one week prior to the event. Such a generous gesture stayed rare in the history of EDS. The Annual Meeting held on 18th July 2007 provided a competitive election round for the position of EDS Chairman for the first time in six years. Thomas Thaler from AG Austria challenged Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine, but was defeated by a 16:10 voting result. Furthermore, the team of the re-elected Chairwoman was successful as Ivan Delibasic (KLiKS Serbia), Costas Doganis (DAP-NDFK Greece), Ivan Gereci (HAZ Croatia), Maja Mazurkiewicz (MK Poland), Hrstina Runceva (UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Andrea Solomonidou (Protoporia Cyprus), Thomas Uhlen (RCDS Germany) and Giovanni Vagnone de Trof Ware e di Celle (FIG Italy) were chosen by the Annual Meeting – chaired by Swedish Jens Ahl in the Granit Hotel at the Ohrid Lake - to be Vice Chairs for the working year 2007/2008. Gereci served his second term. Other candidates not elected for Vice Chairmen were defeated Chairman candidate Thomas Thaler (AG Austria), Maria Keris (YC Estonia), Andrea Baksayova (ODM Slovakia), Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI France) and Tetiana Gostieva (USA Ukraine) – there were 13 candidates for 8 positions. Elisabeth Torkildsen (HSF Norway) became the new Secretary General, no Area Directors were appointed.

2008

One year later, the XXXII. Summer University was organised by SDM Malta in Malta from 15th-20th July 2008, amassing roundabout 100 youngsters from in total 31 member organisations and 30 countries. The event was under massive pressure from a public strike so a lot of speakers had to cancel. However, American Ambassador Molly Bordanaro joined in as speaker, and delegates had the chance to meet former Bureau members Ukko Metsola and Roberta Metsola Tedesco Triccas who made their acquaintance in EDS and later on got married. One of the highlights of the event was an official seated dinner with the Prime Minister of Malta, Lawrence Gonzi and his wife at their summer residence in Girgenti. The 38th Annual Meeting with returning officer Marc-Michael Blum also brought a brand new situation in the history of EDS. Three candidates were applying to be elected Chairman in the beautiful beach hotel in Malta. RCDS Germany nominated Thomas Uhlen, KLiKS Serbia

811 Minutes of the 37th Annual Meeting from 18th July 2007 in Ohrid, p. 4.
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Ivan Delibasic and Fidesz Youth Hungary Bence Bauer. After intense debates and coalition negotiations, the latter withdrew his candidacy in favour of the Serbian candidate. However, despite this, Thomas Uhlen (RCDS Germany) was elected Chairman with 15 votes cast, Ivan Delibasic received 13 votes, one delegate abstained from the vote – this being the closest election result in EDS history. Mr Uhlen was the fourth Chairman (and sixth EDS leader) who was delegated from RCDS – being elected on the birthday of German Chancellor Angela Merkel. The following team made up the new Bureau: Janet Barthet (SDM Malta), Bence Bauer (Fidesz Youth Hungary), David Božič (SAU Slovenia), Kostas Doganis (DAP-NDFK Greece), Joana Lopes (JSD Portugal), Andrea Solomonidou (Protoporia Cyprus), Thomas Thaler (AG Austria) and Giovanni Vagnone di Trofarello e di Celle (FIG Italy) as Vice Chairmen in a tough 12 candidates for 8 positions struggle. Fredrik Sawestahl (FSMF Sweden), Carina Munck Olsén (DKS Denmark) and Anca Plesa (PNTCD Romania) were appointed as Area Directors after the first two were unsuccessful in the Vice Chairmen elections. Also other candidates failed like Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI France), already for the second time after 2007 and Martin Manina (ODM Slovakia)814. However, the gap between an elected Vice Chairman with the least votes and a non-elected candidate with the most votes was just one single vote, never before had there been such a sharp competition (Bauer, Thaler, Vagnone receiving 15 votes and being elected, whereas Dabezies and Olsén just amassing 14 votes and thus not elected). Outgoing Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine (JSD Portugal) was appointed Honorary Chairwoman unanimously after she had been constantly in the Bureau for half a decade, serving three years as Vice Chairwoman (2003-2006) and two years as Chairwoman (2006-2008). Her person is clearly linked to the history of our organisation in the decade of the Millennium Years.

2009

It was again the Mediterranean region where from 21st to 26th July 2009 the EDS member Protoporia hosted the XXXIII. Summer University in Limassol, titled: “Opening New Horizons – Shaping a Better Future” with over 100 participants, assembled in 31 organisations815 from 30 countries. Speeches were delivered by Panayiotis Sentonas, Protoporia’s President, Christoforos Fokaides, NEDISY’s President and Averof Neophytou, Vice President of the Democratic Rally the first day. Apart from that, President of Democratic Rally, Nicos Anastasiades, also welcomed EDS guests on the occasion of the gala dinner. EPP Vice President Ioannis Kasouliades, Euro Democracy President Kaiti Klerides and CES Director Tomi Huhtanen rounded up this list of distinguished

814 Minutes of the 38th Annual Meeting from 17th July 2008 in Malta, p. 6.
speakers. The 39th Annual Meeting on 23rd July 2009, chaired by Swedish Jens Ahl in a wonderful beach hotel in the centre of Limassol, was at least as exciting as the last EDS elections in Cyprus, eight years previously where the elections had been competitive. There were two candidates for Chairman, Andrea Solomonidou (Protoporia Cyprus) who served two tenures as Vice Chairwoman, was as host the main organiser of this Summer University and who worked hard to have this event in her home country and Bence Bauer (Fidesz Youth Hungary) who just served one year, but also organised international meetings multiple times. Both candidates conducted a serious campaign the weeks before and even during the event, gathering supporters and allies. Before the election procedure started, delegates were bothered by an inner-Romanian party conflict within the PNTCD, voting rights reform and dozens of motions. Finally, in late afternoon, the Annual Meeting ruled with a 16:12 vote that Bence Bauer should serve the organisation as Chairman in the working year 2009/2010. With this voting result history was written: The newly elected Chairman was the first EDS Chairman coming from Central Eastern Europe. Bence Bauer offered his defeated counter-candidate Andrea Solomonidou the post of Honorary Chairman which she accepted. The team of Vice Chairmen comprised: David Božič (SAU Slovenia, re-elected), Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI France), Matija Magerl (HAZ Croatia), Ildze Kanepaja (LKJA Latvia), Samuli Kauranne (TK Finland), Christian Peuker (RCDS Germany), Andreas Perotti (AG Austria) and Andreas Willersrud (HSF Norway) – as there were 12 candidates for 8 positions, others did not make it like Maja Mazurkiewicz (MK Poland), Sorin Moldovan (OSPDL Romania), Christina Paviogianapoulou (DAP-NDFK Greece) or Joana Lopes (JSD Portugal)\textsuperscript{816}, the latter seeking re-election, which was not granted to her (later in 2011 she became one of the youngest MPs in Portugal). The result of outgoing Secretary General Maja Mazurkiewicz shows a historical parallel to the case of outgoing Secretary General Karolina Pastuszak (MK Poland) in 2005, who after her 1-year-term as Secretary General was seeking election as a Vice Chairwoman which the Council did not vote for\textsuperscript{817}. Maria Keris (IRLY Estonia) was to be the new Secretary General, Juraj Antal (ODM Slovakia), Tatiana Gostieva (USA Ukraine) and Carina Munck Olsén (DKS Denmark) were appointed Area Directors.

2010

The venue of the XXXIV. Summer University from 18th to 25th July 2010 was totally different. The event was hosted by ODM Slovakia and invited EDS participants to Žilina to learn more about “Living together in diverse societies”, a topic that is especially important in the Central European area where
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the borders of countries do not necessarily correlate to the borders of the ethnic or national groups living in it. In these areas, therefore, ways of a peaceful living together have to be devised – and this was the core theme of the event. The 107 delegates from 27 countries and 31 organisations first met in the Slovak capital Bratislava to meet Ivan Štefanec, MP from SDKU-DS and then went to Žilina, situated in the North of Slovakia. The city of Žilina is a symbolic place as here, the united centre-right squeezed out the nationalistic forces of former mayor Jan Slota and the city became well known for European commitment and the importance of inclusive, diverse societies. This Summer University was also the first for many years to offer thematic workshops, where Jan Erik Surotchak from the International Republican Institute, Roland Freudenstein, Deputy Director for the Centre for European Studies, Peter Jungen from the SME Union and Florian Hartleb, University Professor from Berlin and later visiting fellow at the Centre for European Studies delivered interesting workshops on crucial and current topics like how to overcome right-wing or left-wing extremism in our times or the question of how to cope with radical Islam. Also a view on how Americans live tolerance was introduced. In addition, a reception with Mayor Ivan Harman was scheduled as well a speech by Pavol Kossey, advisor to former EU Commissioner Jan Figel. The 40th Annual Meeting on the 21st July 2010 under the

818 List of participants, Žilina, July 2010.

Vesta Ratkevičiūtė (JKL Lithuania) casting her vote
returning officer Miroslav Lopata, was held in the Holiday Inn Hotel in Žilina and brought the re-election of Bence Bauer as Chairman with a 24 yes, 1 abstention result. Out of eight Vice Chairmen all the five seeking re-election were granted another mandate: Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI-MET France), Samuli Kauranne (TK Finland), Matija Magerl (HAZ Croatia), Andreas Perotti (AG Austria), Andreas Willersrud (HSF Norway). The main organiser of the event and so-far Policy Director Juraj Antal (ODM Slovakia) was elected as Vice Chairman, accompanied by German Cathrin Gräber (RCDS) and Cypriot Georgios Tsielelops (Protoporia). Outgoing Vice Chairwoman Ildze Kanepaja was appointed Secretary General. Andraž Kastelic (SAU Slovenia) and Tatiana Gostieva (USA Ukraine) were nominated as Area Directors. As Honorary Member (for lifetime) the Annual Meeting chose one of the founders of EDS, German Dieter Ibielski.

2011

One year later, the EDS delegates met for the XXXV. Summer University in Vienna from 8th to 13th July 2011. The event organised by AktionsGemeinschaft had the title “Europe Stronger Through Youth, Volunteering for a Knowledge Based Society - Five decades of student politics in Europe” and hosted 102 participants from 31 countries (37 organisations), including many guests. On the first day of the university, former EDS Bureau members held panel debates on the history and future of EDS. As Chairman Bence Bauer pointed out in this opening remarks, EDS activities over the five decades have been so di-
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819 Minutes of the 40th Annual Meeting from 21st July 2010 in Žilina, p. 11.
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821 List of participants, Vienna, July 2011.
822 BullsEye No 45 from September 2011, p. 20/21.
verse and creative that today’s generation can learn so many things. Whereas former Deputy Chairman Peter Adler (Austria) and former Chairman Daniel Bischof (Switzerland) shared their insight from the beginning to the mid eighties (moderated by Vice Chairman Jean-Baptiste Dabezies), former Vice Chairmen Harm Adam (Germany) and Jacek Bendykowski (Poland) described the years of the wind of change (moderated by Vice Chairman Samuli Kauranne) and finally, under the moderation of Vice Chairman Juraj Antal former Chairman Günther Fehlinger (Austria) and former Secretary General Holger Thuss, author of the first edition of this book, gave their impressions from the end of the nineties. As closing remarks, Vice Chairman Matija Magerl described his incredible passion to put energy and effort into such a great organisation. He emphasized also the bridge EDS is having to bring together many people. The evening of 9th July finished with a Viennese Ball at the Grand Hotel Vienna. Other speakers during the event were Christian Passin from the Politische Akademie (PolAk), Marek Staszczyk (Austrian Economic Forum in Russia), Wolfgang Mühlberger (Austrian National Defence Academy), Stefaan De Corte (Centre for European Studies) and Josef Behofsics (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management). During the 41st Annual Meeting on 11th July 2011 in the Festivity Hall of the Technical University of Vienna in the middle of the city, a completely new Bureau was elected. The elections were chaired by former Chairman Günther Fehlinger and former Secretary General Holger Thuss. Juraj Antal (ODM Slovakia) followed Bence Bauer and Samuli Kauranne (TK Finland) became Secretary General, both having served in the outgoing bureau. Bence Bauer was appointed unanimously Honorary Chairman of EDS. As Vice Chairmen have been elected: Bernhard Krall (AG Austria), Andraž Kastelic (SAU Slovenia), Nenad Vajzović (SO HSS
Events and Public Relations

Croatia), Kalin Zahariev (MGEB Bulgaria), Alexandros Politis (DAP-NDFK Greece), Martin Halada (MK Czech Republic), Ingrid Hopp (HSF Norway) and Romain Simmarano (UNI-MET France) who later in December resigned. Gintarė Narkevičiūtė (JKL Lithuania) and Artur Issaev (CDS Belgium) were selected as Area Directors. The admission of AK Parti Youth Turkey as an observer member was a historical move and also made EDS the biggest youth organisation in Europe, representing a total number of over 1,600,000 students and young people.

Winter Universities

From the very beginning, the Winter Universities served as an alternative venue for winter time’s distractions, contrary to the Summer Universities having been always in the South. As the tradition of the Winter University was suspended for a decade (1984-1995), the Bureau of 1995/1996 re-introduced this constructive event. This is the reason why Winter Universities have been counted differently from 1996: Either they were given the ordinal number starting with the first one in 1978 (so not taking into account the one decade interruption) or the counting was starting in 1996 by new. In this book it is agreed to prefer the first mode in order to lay down the proof of a continuously long history of these kind of meetings – it would be a shame to disguise the WinterUs between 1978 and 1984. In 1996 a new tradition was given birth:
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823 Remarks by former Deputy Chairman Peter Adler, during the 50th Anniversary in Vienna, 9th July 2011.
Winter Universities in Brussels should be the second biggest EDS events and the main political ones. European Integration continued more and more and the recognized synergies to bring EDS activists to Brussels were immense. Unfortunately, the last Winter University to be held in Brussels was in 2004. The preferred approach was to visit member organisations, with special emphasis on new developments in their countries. Since the Winter University 2003 in Prague should be an exception, later universities in Madrid, Białystok (!!!), Budapest and Bucharest were placed on the agenda. A Winter University in the European capital of course requires huge organisational, financial and logistical effort.

2002
The XII. Winter University, organised from 29th January to 3rd of February 2002 in Brussels was thus given the topic: “Europe: Quo Vadis?” and it was the last big event outgoing Secretary General (and at that time Executive Officer) Holger Thuss organised. The event assembled a series of high level speakers: Jacques Santer MEP, former President of the European Commission, Paul Rübig MEP, President of the SME Union and Hungarian Ambassador Endre Juhász. The EDS delegates joined an EPP conference featuring Klaus Welle, Secretary General of the EPP Parliamentary Group, Roy Perry, MEP from the Conservatives and Vice President of the Committee on Petitions and Brian Crowley MEP. Hans-Gert Pöttering, Chairman of the EPP Parliamentary Group gave an evening reception. A special item on the agenda was the Panel Discussion “Predicting European Integration: Nice, Leaken and Beyond” with the participation of EDS, LYMEC and YEPP.

2003
One year later, the tradition of these universities in the European capital has been maintained: The XIII. Winter University was organised by Mladí Konzervativci in Prague, from 4th to 9th March 2003 with the title: “A Candidate State Examined: From Copenhagen to the Referendum”. The location was chosen out of historical reasons as the Czech Republic was one of the countries foreseen to be soon entering the European Union. The event remained in the memories of many delegates and included meetings with a number of political representatives such as Ivan Langer, Vice Chairman of the Chamber of Deputies, Jan Zahradil, a Czech delegate to the European Convention, David

---

824 Unfortunately the creators of the Annual Report 2002/2003 did not consult the records of the Winter Universities, for example by browsing through the (at that time already published) book “Students on the right way”, authored by Holger Thuss so they named the XIII. Winter University in 2003 mistakenly the XV. - this misunderstanding continued according to this pattern in both Annual Reports 2003/2004 and 2004/2005.
Seich, Vice Chairman of the Committee for Foreign Affairs, Premysl Sobotka, First Vice Chairman of the Senate, Jiri Skalicky, Chairman of the Committee for European Integration and Rudolf Blazek, Deputy Mayor of Prague, as well as high ranking diplomats including Ramiro Cibrian, EU Ambassador to the Czech Republic and the Czech Ambassador to the EU, Pavel Telička. As one of the main supporters of this event, the representative of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in the Czech Republic, Frank Spengler also addressed the Winter University. The event included also a field trip to Liberec, where EDS delegates met the local representatives and also coincided with the inauguration of Václav Klaus as President of the Czech Republic on 7th March 2003.

**2004**

Returning to Brussels, the XIV. Winter University in 2004 took place in the European capital and the main topic was “The costs of non-Europe – Political, Economic, Socio-Cultural Challenges” (17th to 22nd February 2004). The 100 centre-right students from 31 countries had a unique opportunity to see leading personalities of political Europe. Already the first evening, they were addressed by the Secretary General of the European People’s Party, Antonio Lopez-Isturiz. Belgian politicians like Peter Aspeslagh, the Chairman of CD&V, the Flemish Christian-Democratic Party as well as General Ward Kennes, the Parliamentary Group Secretary also spoke to the EDS delegates. As a new item in the programme, a panel with representatives of other EPP associations took

---

825 Annual Report 2003/2004, p. 18 (the XIV. Winter University was named wrongly as XVI., see above).
place with the participation of Christoph Weisskirchen (EUCDW – European Union of Christian-Democrat Workers as the workers and employees’ association) and Peter Jungen (SME Union – Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises). Furthermore, for the first time ever, the President of the College Republicans, Eric Hoplin, delivered a presentation about his organisation. For EDS, strong transatlantic ties have been always remained a high priority. Another prominent speaker who kindly returned as a guest speaker to EDS meetings was Professor Alexander Stubb from Finland, subsequently an MEP and Foreign Minister. Finally, the prominent political figures who spoke included Jean-Luc Dehaene, former Prime Minister of Belgium and Vice President of the European Convention, Jos Chabert, Brussels Minister from CD&V, Paul Rübig MEP, and the former Foreign Minister Ioannis Kasoulides of the Republic of Cyprus. The diplomatic world was once again well represented: One of the closing speeches was delivered by Rockwell A. Schnabel, the Ambassador of the United States to the European Union.

2005

In line with the tradition of bringing EDS activists to the European political hubs, the XV. Winter University in 2005 was organised as a cross-border Winter University in Strasbourg and Frankfurt, from 15th to 20th February 2005, entitled “Values of Europe”. The event attracted 97 participants from 25 countries and 26 organisations in mutual cooperation between UNI France and RCDS Germany. During the first part of the conference, the Council of Europe was visited where participants found out about this international organisation which is so distinctive from the European Union. During the Frankfurt part of the event, the German Federal Bank was a special item in the programme, as its Member of the Board – and RCDS alumnus – Hans Reckers gave a fascinating presentation about the economic and monetary union. During a panel, Anja Broitzmann from the Economic Council of the CDU, Thomas Sittler, Regional Chairman of Young Entrepreneurs and Stefanie Unger from Ernst&Young dealt with the question of Frankfurt as a possible top location for the European financial world. The highlight among the speakers was a personality who many times attended and was much appreciated by EDS participants: Hans-Gert Pöttering, at that time Chairman of the EPP-ED Group in the European Parliament who addressed some hot issues such as references to God in the (planned) European Constitution, the enlargement of the European Union and possible EU membership of Turkey. The meeting was enriched by very special guests: A delegation from the European Humani-

826 Alexander Stubb MEP was the main speaker at the Policy Days in Helsinki in June 2006.
827 List of participants, Strasbourg/Frankfurt, February 2005.
tarian University in Belarus informed about the situation in their country and was warmly welcomed. The WinterU was the only cross-border EDS WinterU in the Millennium Years.

2006

As the Brussels-tradition broke up, the EDS leadership of 2005/2006 did not bring back this prestigious event back to the European capital. It was rather a possibility for the active member organisations to show their best face. That said, EDS returned to a high-ranking Winter University organised by NNGG Spain in Madrid, from 21st to 26th February 2006, with participation of 74 delegates from 27 organisations and countries having the title “Immigration and terrorism, two challenges for the European Union”. Speeches included Pio García Escudero, the leader of the Partido Popular Group in the Spanish Senate, Pilar del Castillo MEP, former Minister of Education, Gustavo de Aristegui MP, Jaime Mayor Oreja MEP, leader of the Partido Popular delegation in the European Parliament and the two responsible for international affairs of both the party (PP) and the foundation (FAES), Jorge Moragas and Alberto Carnero and finally EPP Secretary General Antonio Lopez-Isturiz. Undoubtedly the highlight of not only this event, but of the entire working year was the dinner speech of EDS Patron and former Prime Minister of Spain, José Maria Aznar on his own birthday, the 25th February.

2007

Without any question the lowest frequency of participants, namely only 45, was reached at the XVII. Winter University in Białystok from 12th – 17th February 2007 which stood under the topic: “Poland – a bridge between Western and Eastern Europe”. The remote location, the severe winter and origins of this event as a “debt-settling” enterprise of NZS made this a more challenging event to organise. At the beginning of the event in Warsaw, EDS met in the Polish Parliament Jarosław Wałęsa alongside with other MPs including Danuta Jazłowiecka, Andrzej Halicki. In Białystok, the Mayor Tadeusz Truskolaski, Sorin Vasile, first Secretary of the Embassy of Romania, Józef Mozolewski, member of National Commission of NSZZ “Solidarność”, Barbara Kudrycka MEP as well as Romanian Ambassador Gabriel Bartas at the Romanian Embassy gala dinner.

2008

A very memorable event was organised one year later at the XVIII. Winter University in Budapest. “Democracies growing up – success stories from

---

828 List of participants, Madrid, February 2006.
829 List of participants, Białystok, February 2007.
New Europe” gathered 111 students and young people from 29 countries and 32 organisations830, bringing them together in the Hungarian capital from 19th to 24th February 2008. The thematic motto of the event was the adult age of democracies in Central Eastern Europe in winter 2007/2008 and the experiences one could derive from this process. The event assembled the crème de la crème of Hungarian politics: János Martonyi, former (and future) Minister of Foreign Affairs, Zsolt Németh, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Hungarian Parliament (later Minister of State in the Foreign Ministry), József Szájer MEP, Vice Chairman of the EPP Group, György Schöpflin MEP,
Zoltán Balog MP, Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights in the Hungarian Parliament (and later State Secretary for Social Inclusion), Mihály Balla MP, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations, Károly Dán, Head of the International Directorate of Fidesz Hungarian Civic Union, Mária Schmidt, Director of the anti-totalitarian House of Terror in Budapest, Péter Ákos Bod, former President of the Hungarian National Bank, Réka Szemerkényi, former advisor to former Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, but also non-Hungarian speakers including Hans Kaiser, Minister for Federal and European Affairs of the Free State of Thuringia ret., Director of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Hungary, Hans-Friedrich von Solemacher, Director of the Hanns Seidel Stiftung, Patrick Egan, Regional Director of the International Republican Institute and last but not least the former Chairman of the Foreign Committee in the European Parliament, the spokesperson for the EPP Group on International Affairs, Elmar Brok, MEP from Germany since the very beginning. Interestingly, the event was also addressed by Katalin Szili, Speaker of the Parliament without any EPP-affiliation.

2009

A similar approach to Budapest was repeated the following year during the XIX. Winter University in Bucharest, from 17th to 22nd February 2009. The event with the title “Educational Policies for the Future of Europe” had 66 guests from 24 countries and 27 organisations\(^8\) and was hosted by the Student Organisation of the Democratic-Liberal Party of Romania, OSPDL. The meetings

---

\(^8\) List of participants, Bucharest, February 2009.
that took place in the Central University Library and the Romanian Parliament welcomed speakers such as Valeriu Stoica, PD-L Vice President, Theodor Paleologu, Minister of Culture, Cults and Patrimony, Bogdan Chiritoiu, Presidential Advisor, Martin Eichtinger, Ambassador of the Republic of Austria to Romania and Holger Dix, Director of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Romania. Furthermore, EDS people could personally interact with Raluca Turcan, Vice President of PD-L, Sulfina Barbu MP, President of the PD-L Women’s Association, Cristian Preda, Presidential Advisor, Daniel Funeriu MEP and as a very impressive moment, Roberta Anastase, President of the Romanian Chamber of Deputies. Also, a concert was visited in the Romanian Atheneum and as a special feature, EDS guests could meet dozens of active OSPDL members when joining in the celebration of the 10th Anniversary.

2010
Again in 2010, EDS organised a huge Winter University in Brussels. This endeavour aimed to make the EDS members acquainted with the structures, procedures and key policies of political Brussels and to make them known with the most important leaders of the EPP and the European Union. The XX. Winter University, taking place from 23rd to 28th February 2010 had the title “Europe today, 20 years after – priority for youth” and was the closing of the 20 years after campaign of the EDS Bureau 2009/2010 where they had the purpose to give a voice and a priority for the youngsters of today. The event brought together key decision makers with a huge number of 140 young people from 34 countries and 39 organisations. The list of speakers reads like the who is who of Europe: President of the European Commission José Manuel Barroso, President of European Parliament Jerzy Buzek, former President of the European Parliament and Chairman of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Hans-Gert Pöttering, President of the European People’s Party and former Prime Minister of Belgium Wilfried Martens, Vice Chairman of the EPP Group Othmar Karas, former President of the

832 List of participants, Brussels, February 2010.
Antonio Lopez-Isturiz during WinterU

José Manuel Barroso addressing EDS

Jerzy Buzek addressing EDS
Committee of Regions Luc Van den Brande, Secretary General of the European People’s Party Antonio Lopez-Isturiz, the Director of the Centre for European Studies and former EDS Vice Chairman Tomi Huhtanen and last but not least a very prominent player in the political field in Belgium, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Steven Vanackere. A special feature have been the new workshops that were trialled during the WinterU in Budapest. In Brussels, Jan Erik Surotchak, Director of the International Republican Institute and Tomi Huhtanen, Director of the Centre for European Studies delivered those to the EDS auditorium. For the first time ever, EDS Bureau organised a dedicated evening for all EDS alumni, understood in an inclusive way. More than 50 former EDS-activists attended the dinner, where they mingled with regular WinterU participants, Frank Engel MEP, former Vice Chairman of EDS and several other former Bureau members delivering evening toasts and speeches. The event was mainly organised by the EDS Bureau, but one should not forget to thank the co-organisers CDS Belgium and EDH Belgium for providing logistical, organisational, financial and practical support that equalled a complete event organising task.

One year later, the success of 2010 could be enhanced still further. Under very special circumstances, the 50th Anniversary Celebration, EDS assembled 120 participants from 35 organisations in 30 countries to the XXI. Winter University with the title “European and regional integration – the role of youth” taking place from 31st January – 5th February 2011 in Brussels, organised by EDS Bureau and co-organised by EDH Belgium and CDS Belgium. The Anniversary itself with 260 guests was one of the biggest EDS meetings in history. The speakers of the university featured charismatic personalities from the Wallonian and Flemish academia including Prof. Pierre Vercauteren, Francis Delpérée and Peter Van Rompuy. On specially organised panels in the European Parliament on the day of the mini-plenary proved to be a magnet: Besides all four Ambassadors of the Visegrad countries (Péter Győrkös - Hungary, Jan Tombiński - Poland, Milena Vicenová – Czech Republic, Ivan Korčok – Slovakia), many key figures of politics, academia, economy in Europe were ranged as speakers: József Szájer MEP, Vice Chairman of the EPP

833 List of participants, Brussels, February 2011.
Group, spoke the opening remarks, he was approximately at half a dozen of EDS meetings a speaker in the past. Apart from that, Paul Rübig MEP, Jacek Saryusz-Wolski MEP, EPP Vice President, Eduard Kukan MEP, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia and as an exceptional token of appreciation for successful business, Jan Mühlfeit, the Chairman of Microsoft Europe were the speakers of this event.

The 50th Anniversary Celebration convened with over 260 guests in the Palais des Academies in Rue Ducale, the venue of the EPP Summits and the

---

Summits of the Heads of State and Government. Many outstanding speakers reiterated their wholehearted support for EDS, including José Manuel Barroso, the President of the European Commission (by video message), Minister of Foreign Affairs and former Prime Minister of Sweden Carl Bildt, who used to be EDS Chairman from 1974 to 1976, former President of the European Parliament and Chairman of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung Hans-Gert Pöttering, President of the European People’s Party and former Prime Minister of Belgium Wilfried Martens, Vice Chairman of the EPP Group Othmar Karas and as moderator Tomi Huhtanen, Director of the Centre for European Studies (CES) and formerly EDS Vice Chairman from 1996 to 1997. A huge number of EDS alumni were present, including former Chairmen Tom Spencer, Carl Bildt, Per Heister, Laura de Esteban, Bettina Machaczek-Stuth, Tim Arnold, Günther Fehlinger, Jacob Lund Nielsen, Ukko Metsola, Thomas Uhlen and Bence Bauer. As a new invention, EDS participants attended the Liberty Ball to celebrate the 100th Birthday of the 40th President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. The Anniversary featured a special video where the event posters and campaigns of EDS were connected to a slide show, with a dedicated, specially composed EDS music (author: Steven Ørmen Johnsen, HSF Norway) that later on was played on many EDS occasions. Apart from that, the special edition of the BullsEye magazine was published here where a series of former Chairmen wrote contributions, accompanied by greetings from leaders of the European institutions. The EPP TV produced a video about this memorable evening of 1st February 2011 and this piece became very popular later on.

836 BullsEye No 45 (September 2011), p. 4.
Seminars & Council Meetings

It was common practice to join the thematic events of EDS – called seminars – with the Council Meetings that are statutory and regular gatherings of the member organisation, chaired by EDS Chairman, in a formal framework. Slightly incorrectly, such seminars were then called “Council Meetings” (a notion that from time to time also appears in this book) which is fundamentally wrong as the seminar is governed according to very different rules to formal “Council Meetings”. However, EDS also had “simple” seminars from time to time, but due to lack of interest – no formal meeting – these were restricted to unique occasions. As for the “Seminars & Council Meetings” there is just one statutory rule: although the minimum number of Council Meetings is fixed at two, other regulations mention the Council Meeting adopting the budget which is the 1st Council Meeting of the working year (the working year ends with the conclusion of the Annual Meeting with other words: the Annual Meeting is the LAST Council Meeting of the working year), so only the SummerU, WinterU and the 1st Council Meeting are mandatory. The December (2nd) and the April/May (5th) Council Meeting are facultative. In some years, there have been even in total six Council Meetings. But in other years we can observe only four Council Meetings – either because a scheduled meeting turned out to be not quorate837 or because the leadership of EDS from the very beginning was reluctant to arrange the Council Meeting in late autumn838. This changed only in 2009/2010 when the EDS Bureau re-introduced again the December Council Meeting as the regular 2nd Council Meeting. It can be of course generally mentioned that the December Council Meetings caught the less interest, but still they had their traditional place within the EDS working year.

2002

The first Council Meeting after the 2002 Winter University took place as a cross-border event in Copenhagen/Oslo with the working title “Nordic visions of Europe”. The event with 50 participants was held from 3rd – 8th April 2002 as a co-organised seminar of EDS and NKSU, featuring the trip to Copenhagen on the board of the “Queen of Scandinavia”. The meeting which did not include any formal Council Meeting but gathered speakers including Mads Lebech, the

---

837 Working year 2006/2007 – the supposed 2nd Council Meeting in Cyprus did not reach a quorum.
838 Working year 2007/2008 – the two Council Meetings were merged and instead of September/October for the 1st and December for the 2nd, only one – the 1st – took place in late November. The same we can see on the example of the working year 2008/2009 – the two Council Meetings were again merged, but the merged Council Meeting took place very late, in mid December, although as 1st it should have been already organised in September/October.
Mayor of Frederiksberg, former EDS Vice Chairman 1992/1993\textsuperscript{839} Helle Sjelle MP, spokesperson on Higher Education and Lars Barfoed MP, spokesperson on European Affairs, both for the Conservative Party. Also Steen Moller, Senior Consultant to the Conservative People’s Party and former DKS Vice Chairman was met alongside Kim Hjorth, acting Secretary General of the party. Oslo was visited with the “Pearl of Scandinavia”, where participants held a day-long session in the Stortinget, the Norwegian Parliament. Petter Lovik MP and Gerhard Sabathil, Delegate of the European Commission to Norway and Iceland also addressed the EDS delegates.

Around 16 days later EDS met again (the shortest period between two EDS events in recent years) in Western Spain, in Extremadura. The memorial seminar “Miguel Angel Blanco International Seminar: Education: The Key to your Freedom” was organised by NNGG from 24\textsuperscript{th} – 28\textsuperscript{th} April 2002 in Cáceres with more than 100 participants from EDS member organisations and from NNGG. Miguel Angel Blanco was a young Partido Popular politicians who was kidnapped and murdered by terrorists and the series of Miguel Angel Blanco seminars is dedicated to his memory. The speakers included Jaime Mayor Oreja, Vice Chairman of Partido Popular, Carlos Iturgaiz, Chairman of Partido Popular in the Basque Country, Julio Iglesias de Ussel, Secretary of State for University Affairs, Cristina Gutierrez-Cortines MEP and Maria del Carmen Funez de Gregorio, Chairwoman of Nuevas Generaciones of Partido Popular\textsuperscript{840}. The Council meeting however did not reach the necessary quorum\textsuperscript{841} and so continued as an informal session.

Another 4 weeks later, a new Seminar and Council Meeting was held, this time in Poland. The event with the title “Ethics in Politics” was organised by MK Poland in conjunction with their Annual Meeting in Kraków, from 23\textsuperscript{rd} to 26\textsuperscript{th} May 2002. The seminar was taking place at the University of Kraków with speeches from Michael Gahler MEP, Pawel Poncyljusz MP and former EDS Vice Chairman Jacek Bendykowski. In reflecting on the wise thoughts about politics and ethics the Annual Report noted that these “must not be contradictory and even with the pressure imposed by Realpolitics and Macchiavellian thought it is only the ethical and moral foundations of all decision makers that can serve as a guideline for behaviour in everyday life”. The seminar was prolonged by a study trip of five participants from Poland, Germany, Finland, Italy and Ukraine to Lviv in Ukraine where the activists of the EDS member USA Ukraine were met.

The first Council Meeting of the working year 2002/2003 was arranged as a cross-border seminar in Helsinki and Tallinn, from 25th to 29th September 2002. The approximately 60 participants enjoyed the hospitality of two countries and two organisations – Tuhatkunta Finland and RPJ Estonia - under the main topic “EU Enlargement and the Baltic Region” with speakers ranging from Sauli Niinistö, Minister of Finance and EDU Chairman, Riita Korhonen MP, Ukko Metsola, Senior Advisor to the Minister of Foreign Trade and former EDS Chairman, Antonio Lopez-Isturiz, Mika Nykanen, Kookomus campaign manager to Juhan Parts, later Prime Minister of Estonia and Ott Lumi, Res Publica Political Secretary. As a special item on the agenda, EDS Chairman attended the EDU Steering Committee those meeting coincided with the EDS seminar.

For the final seminar of 2002 the Danish member organisation DKS hosted 60 EDS activists from 32 organisations in Copenhagen for a Seminar & Council Meeting dealing with the hot topic “EU Enlargement – An End to the Beginning?”. This seminar was held at the same time as the EPP EU Summits when the European Council was finalising the accession of ten new EU member countries. EDS also welcomed high standing keynote speakers including Bendt Bendtsen, Deputy Prime Minister of Denmark and leader of the Conservative People’s Party, Hans-Gert Pöttering, Chairman of the EPP-ED Group in the European Parliament, Antonio Lopez-Isturiz, Secretary General of the
European People’s Party as well as Kim Hjorth, Deputy Secretary General of the Conservative People’s Party (who EDS met just eight months before). Lars Barfoed MP, speaker of the party on European Affairs, Charlotte Dyremose, the youngest MP from the party and Christian Rovsing MEP also delivered addresses to the EDS delegates. As a closing of the seminar, Poul Schlüter, former Prime Minister of Denmark and two-time President of the European Council spoke as a guest of honour to the participants.

2003

In the European week 2003, from 7th to 11th May 2003, EDS gathered in the French capital Paris where 60 delegates from 26 countries, hosted by UNI France, learned more about the subject of “Political Extremism and Political Violence in Higher Education Institutions”. Speakers ranged from Pierre Lequiller, EPP Vice President and delegate to the European Convention, Jean-Dominique Giuliani, President of the Robert Schuman Foundation (Paris), Luc Ferry, Minister for Education, Noelle Lenoir, Minister of Foreign Affairs to Jacques Rougeot, President of the Professors in UNI and Olivier Vial, President of the Students in UNI. During the event, EDS members became active and demonstrated on Europe Day, 9th May by distributing the Schuman Declaration to the public – a great example how to enhance the European idea and spirit. The Declaration was one of the founding ideas of our European community as just five years after World War II, leading politicians called for fundamentally rethinking European politics and uniting in peace and freedom.

As for the working year 2003/2004, the outgoing Bureau 2002/2003 was successful in obtaining financial support from the Council of Europe’s European Youth Foundation for the two first events. Therefore, a Seminar & Council Meeting was organised in Italy. This seminar’s title was “A Bridge Across the Mediterranean, a crossroad between civilisations” and was hosted by Forza Italia Giovani from 22nd to 26th October 2003 in Palermo. The 35 participants from 19 different countries enjoyed lectures from EDS Chairman Alexandros Sinka, FIG Regional Chairman Sergio Riccobono and local city council members of Palermo alongside representatives of the local government, with the clear aim to “establish a common conceptual framework for youth and students across Europe and the Mediterranean area”.

The other Council of Europe funded event took place in Belgrade, from 17th to 21st December 2003, this time with 45 centre-right students from 20 countries. The seminar, organised by Serbian member organisation Kliks was a “Training of Young Democratic Leaders” and featured a series of meetings.
with democratic institutions and those of civil society, e.g. the G17 Plus was met, several youth NGOs, the world-famous B92 radio station, the Dean of the University of Belgrade (Law Faculty) alongside the Catholic Bishop of Belgrade. The event, taking place just some years after the NATO bombings, emphasized the struggle of Serbian society on their way to Europe.

2004

In spring 2004, EDS held a seminar in Santiago de Compostela, which did not incorporate any Council Meeting. “European Environmental Policy: A Global Issue” gathered therefore just a smaller number of 25 participants from 11 countries, from 24th to 28th March 2004 and was organised by NNGG Spain. EDS however met a range of important PP politicians like NNGG Chairman of Galicia Diego Calva, Assistant Secretary of EPP on environmental programme Tomas Poveda, Vicente Martínez-Pujalte López MP, José Manuel Barreiro, Minister of Environment of Galicia, Jaime Font, Minister of Environment of Baleares and Marcelino Agis, the Deputy Principal of the Old University of Santiago de Compostela. Furthermore, the President of the Parliament of Galicia, José Maria Garcia Leira was met and as a very special highlight EDS participants had the honour to meet the legend of Partido Popular, President Manuel Fraga Iribarne, President of Galicia and founder of the Partido Popular who devoted so much for a democratic Spain. During this memorable dinner
session EDS was honoured to be addressed by EPP Secretary General Antonio Lopez-Isturiz, SME-Union President Marcelino Oreja MEP and NNGG Chairwoman María del Carmen Fúnez de Gregorio.

Just 25 days later, EDS people convened again in this very part of the Iberian peninsula: The 4th Seminar & Council Meeting highlighted “Europe facing the phenomenon of Globalization” where almost 70 participants from 20 countries met in Porto, from 21st to 25th April 2004. The event, organised kindly by JSD Portugal, assembled prominent speakers from business and politics: Silva Peneda, Administrator of a larger Portuguese company Sonae & Lusomundo, Manuel Moreira, Civil Governor of Porto’s district, Rui Moreira, President of the Commercial Association, Rui Victor Costa, Chairman of PSD Guimaraes, Rui Rio, Mayor of Porto, João Bosco Soares da Mota Amaral, Chairman of the Parliament of Portugal. The event was undoubted one of the biggest Council Meetings of EDS and was named almost “Spring University” with a Council Meeting taking place in the PSD party headquarters in Porto.

For the rest of the year 2004, EDS delegates met again on the Eastern side of Europe, dealing with foreign policy related issues. The Seminar & 1st Council Meeting in Riga, 27th – 31st October 2004 was organised by LKJA Latvia in

![Participants of the Riga seminar in 2004](image)

of the Latvian capital Riga, this being the first EDS meeting in one of the new EU-10 member states as full EU members. The 41 participants (17 organisations in 17 countries) came together to have insights in “EU-Russia – Is there a Roadmap towards Partnership” from first hand experts, for instance Ojars Kalnins, Director of the European Institute, former Ambassador of Latvia to the United States of America, Aleksandrs Kirsteins, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Latvian Parliament, Einars Semanis, Under-Secretary of State of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Arturs Krišjānis Kariņš, Chairman

---

845 List of participants, Riga, October 2004.
of the New Era Parliamentary Group, Fyodor Borisov, PR consultant and Boris Kuznetsov, Director of Center for Integration Research & Projects. The Council Meeting itself was held in the Castle of Sigulda.

“Freedom on the verge of Europe – the place of Belarus and Ukraine in New Europe” was the main subject of the Seminar & 2nd Council Meeting, organised by MK Poland in Warsaw, from 8th to 12th December with 36 participants attending (14 countries, 15 organisations). The topic is still of main importance and attention even today, more than eight years after. The seminar, organised in kind cooperation with Konrad Adenauer Stiftung displayed a number of eminent speakers like Jacek Saryusz-Wolski MEP, Vice President of the European Parliament who also served as patron of the event, Marcin Libicki MEP, Chairman of the Committee of Petitions in the European Parliament, Stephan Raabe, Director of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Poland, Jerzy Marek Nowakowski, Chief Advisor of former Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek and Jan Churyłowich, BPF representative on Belarus. EDS members also met former EDS Vice Chairman Pawel Poncyljusz, member of the European Affairs Committee in the Polish Parliament. The meeting featured also the Council Meeting taking place at the Jablonna Palace, once owned by Józef Poniatowski, brother of the last Polish king Stanislaw Poniatowski.

2005

May 2005 once again saw a seminar sponsored by the European Youth Foundation. SDM Malta hosted the Seminar & Council Meeting “The Common Heritage of Europe” from 11th to 15th May 2005 in Malta where the participants explored the cultural and historical values of our continent. The event ranked high as Francis Zammit Dimech, Minister of Tourism and former SDM Chairman, Lawrence Gonzi, Prime Minister of Malta, Ugo Mifsud Bonnici, Former President of Malta, Edward Fenech Adami, President of Malta, Paul Borg Olivier, Mayor of Malta, Louis Galea, Minister for Education, Youth and Employment, Tonio Borg, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Justice and Home Affairs, Joe Borg, Commissioner for Fisheries and Maritime and Simon Busuttil MEP attended, essentially comprising the entire political elite of the country.

A Council of Europe (European Youth Foundation) financed event took place in Bratislava, from 26th to 30th October 2005, organised by ODM Slovakia. The Seminar & Council Meeting dealt with the question of “Meaning

---

846 This meeting was the only one reported in EDS history where the dates were changed some 6 weeks before the event, forcing participants – like the author of this book – to purchase new flight tickets. The original announcement in BullsEye No 29 (October 2004), back cover page was “Seminar and Council Meeting - Poland, 15th to 19th December 2004”.

847 List of participants, Warsaw, December 2004.

848 It is definitely belonging to the asset of “best practices” to invite a high standing personality as a patron of an event, unfortunately not many EDS event organisers have achieved this in the past.
of Participatory Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe” and brought
together 53 participants, originating in 24 countries849 (25 organisations). The
most prominent part of the programme was the chance for EDS delegates to
meet Ivan Mikloš, Minister of Finance of Slovakia850, the father of the flat tax851
in his country and probably one of the best symbols of the pro-European,
market-oriented approach of leading Slovak politicians852. Participants also
met young MP Maria Majdova and university representatives including rector
Branislav Lichardus and pro-rector Jožef Hvorecky from the City University,
both strong advocates for private universities853. Michal Vaščeka (Institute for
Public Affairs) and Jaroslav Pilat (MESA 10, Centre for Political and Social
Analyses) rounded up vivid discussions about participatory democracy.

The last Seminar & Council Meeting in the calendar year 2005 was orga-
nised by Greek member organisation DAP-NDFK with the title “Immigration
in a New Europe: Challenges and Perspectives” that was attended by some
60 people from 21 countries and organisations854 and that took place from 7th
to 11th December 2005. Having Marietta Giannakou, Minister of Higher Edu-
cation as a patron855, the event could assemble many Greek political figures.

849 List of participants, Bratislava, October 2005.
851 The Annual Report 2005/2006 notes on page 14 that the flat tax interested the participants and they
questioned the Minister much about it who answered that politicians need to have “vision, will and
courage”.
852 At a later stage, from 2010-2012 he was again Minister of Finance after the opposition years 2006-2010.
853 Heavy discussions about advantages and drawbacks of private educational institutions was initiated
by EDS Secretary General Anna Anttinen who strongly opposed some of Hvorecky’s views.
854 List of participants, Athens, December 2005.
Speakers included Secretary General of ONNED Yannis Smyrlis, Secretary General of DAP-NDFK, Dimitris Voloudakis, President of Greek Institute of Immigration Policy Alexandros Zavos, Professor of Immigration at the National University of Athens Antonis Kontis and Professor of University of Uppsala Masoud Kamali. As a highlight, participants met Greek Prime Minister and President of Nea Demokratia (ND) Kostas Karamanlis, Secretary General of the party Evangelos Meimarakis, Foreign Minister Petros Moliviatis and other ministers by attending a conference of Nea Demokratia.

2006

“Societies on Their Way to Democracy” was the title of the Seminar & Council Meeting from 10th to 14th May 2006 in Skopje, in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, hosted by the Youth Forces of governing party VMRO-DPMNE, gathering 60 participants. Delegates had the fortune to meet President of the party Nikola Gruevski who presented his political programme for the upcoming elections, which he later on, won with a strong majority. The event welcomed a series of massive speakers: Gabriela Konevska-Trajkovska, Chairwoman of Transparency International, Vladimir Gjorcev, Member of the Executive Committee of VMRO-DPMNE, Pande Lazarevski from the University of Skopje, Trajko Slaveski, Vice President of VMRO-DPMNE, Senko Velinov, Chairman of the party commission on culture, Ljubiša Georgievski, Chairman of the party commission on international affairs and the President of the Parliament of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.
Just after three years, EDS returned to Italy where full member Forza Italia Giovani (FIG) organised the Seminar and 1st Council Meeting “Traditions, values and culture: How to implement Multicultural Education Policies” with approximately 53 participants from 24 organisations in 22 countries in the period 25th to 29th October 2006. The aim of the meeting was also to foster the ideas of multiculturalism also in higher education bodies. Speakers included Carlo Pelanda, Professor in International Relations, MP Roberto Rosso, MP On. Vietti and Senator Ghigo. The Chairwoman of FIG Beatrice Lorenzin and the local coordinator of FIG Davide Belana also joined in.

Cypriot member organisation Protoporia hosted the Seminar “The melting point island” from 6th to 10th December 2006 with around 25 participants. This event stayed memorable as it was the first meeting after Caceres in April 2002 which proved not to be quorate, thus the planned Council Meeting did not attract enough delegates and needed to be cancelled, meaning to be continued as informal information meeting of the Bureau and the member organisations. This obviously led to the situation where in the working year 2007/2008 and later 2008/2009 the October and December Council Meetings were merged. Speakers were Anna Marangou, candidate for Mayor of Lefkosia and Ioannis Kasoulikes MEP. Together with Anna Marangou, EDS Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine delivered a press conference as regard the Cyprus issue. Also the Northern part of Cyprus was visited by some EDS delegates, including the EDS Chairwoman.

2007

For the April Seminar & Council Meeting, EDS and local host HAZ Croatia managed again to attract a bigger number of participants: 51 participants from 21 countries, representing 25 organisations attended the event. The seminar that came along without any working title took place in Zagreb from 25th to 29th April 2007. As one of the highlights in this working year, EDS delegates met Prime Minister Ivo Sanader alongside Krešimir Ćosić MP. The event also included a field trip to Vukovar and Ilok in Eastern Croatia.

After the summer break EDS Chairwoman welcomed EDS activists to her home country by organising the Seminar & Council Meeting “The priorities of the EU” with JSD Portugal from 21st to 25th November 2007 in Guimarães. Participants were lectured by Angelo Correira, President of the General Assembly of PSD, António Martins da Cruz, International Secretary of PSD, Mário David MP, Vice President of the EPP, Carlos Coelho MEP, former President of JSD, Pedro Duarte MP, former President of JSD, Ricardo Araújo,
representative of the Portuguese Youth Forum and José Manuel Canavarro, Vice Dean of Coimbra University\textsuperscript{858}.

After just 14 months EDS returned to Poland where MK arranged a high profile Seminar & Council Meeting with some 50 representatives, representing 20 organisations from 20 countries\textsuperscript{859}, taking place from 23\textsuperscript{rd} to 27\textsuperscript{th} April 2008 in Gdańsk under the motto “European roads to Freedom – Today was born in Gdańsk” featuring the meaningful history of Solidarność for the pan-European liberty movement. Speakers included Maciej Lisicki, Deputy Mayor of Gdańsk, Krzysztof Lisek, Chairman of the Committee for Foreign Affairs in the Polish Parliament, Bogdan Borusewicz, Marshal of the Polish Senate, Robert Tyszkiewicz MP, Vice Chairman of the Committee for Foreign Affairs in the Polish Parliament, Jerzy Borowczak, Polish oppositionist during the communist regime, Kazimierz Woycicki, representative of the Center for International Relations and Paval Mazhejka from the Belarus Movement for Freedom. As a very special guest of honour EDS representatives had the unique chance to meet in person the living Solidarność legend, former President of Poland Lech Wałęsa\textsuperscript{860}. Council Meeting was held in Gdańsk City Parliament.

In the winter of 2008/2009 a new historical record was put up: Never before the 1\textsuperscript{st} Council Meeting was held so late, in the year in question almost

\textsuperscript{859} Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 26th April 2008 in Gdańsk, p. 1.
five months after the Summer University. With RCDS Germany as a host, EDS came together from 10th to 14th December 2008 in Trier to launch the seminar “(Re)Thinking Bologna in European dimensions – Culture and Education in the European Higher Education Area”, having 56 youngsters as guests, coming from 26 countries, amassed in 31 organisations. The meeting, which was granted a special video message by the President of the European Parliament Hans-Gert Pöttering also assembled Horst Langes, Honorary President of the Robert Schuman Foundation (Luxembourg) and Peter Zervakis from the Bologna Team from HRK Germany. As a special item, this event at one point assembled the Chairmen of four out of six EPP associations: Besides EDS Chairman Thomas Uhlen also EPP Women Chairwoman Doris Pack, SME Union President Peter Jungen and YEPP President Yiannis Smyrlis attended this seminar so the four Chairmen has the seldom chance to exchange on current developments in the European People’s Party.

2009

In springtime, EDS visited France where UNI hosted 58 delegates from 24 countries and 29 organisations for the Seminar & Council Meeting. The event that once again had no title was held between 22nd and 26th April 2009. Impressive and high ranking speakers were addressing EDS participants: Besides Valérie Pécresse, Minister of Higher Education and Research, Xavier Darcos, Minister of National Education also former EDS Vice Chairman Patrick Gerard (Sorbonne Rectorate). During the Council Meeting in the French Parliament, the Assemblée Nationale, Michel Barnier, Minister of Agriculture and Head of the UMP Campaign for the European Parliament, talked to EDS delegates. The event which included a field trip to the Castle of Versailles was exclusively organised and financed by UNI France and was the first EDS Council Meeting in France since May 2003, six years previously.

The autumn brought the two Seminar & Council Meeting policy that was last held in 2005/2006. Therefore EDS met in Stockholm, was FMSF Sweden hosted 55 delegates from 32 member organisations and 29 countries for a seminar under the motto “Change We Can Believe in” from 7th-11th October 2009. The event which coincided with award of the Noble Peace Prize Committee to President Barack Obama amassed a number of prominent speakers including Tobias Sjö, former EDS Policy Director and former FMSF Chairman, Tobias Billström, Minister for Migration and Asylum Policies, Karl Sigfrid MP, Gustav Blix MP, PR consultant Johnny Munkhammar, Nils Karlson (Ratio In-

---

861 List of participants, Trier, December 2008.
862 List of participants, Stockholm, October 2009.
stinate) and last but not least EPP Group Vice Chairman Gunnar Hökmark. The Council Meeting, held in the Headquarters of the Moderate Party featured special dinner speeches à la FMSF, with toasts and the traditional “Song book”. Also as a new incentive the EDS Bureau 2009/2010 introduced an evaluation procedure following each Seminar & Council Meeting which for the first time took place in Stockholm.

A delightful occasion was the Seminar & 2nd Council Meeting “Israel, a Window to Middle East” which was hosted by Young Likud Congress from 2nd to 6th December 2009 in Jerusalem, bringing EDS back to Israel after more than 20 years. The 52 participants from 28 member organisations, coming from 25 countries enjoyed lectures from Yariv Levin, Chairman of the House Committee in the Israeli Parliament Knesset, Naomi Blumenthal, former member of the Knesset and former Deputy Minister for Infrastructure and Davidi Hermelin, Chairman of the Young Likud Congress. The event included field trips to Jerusalem Old City, Massada, Dead Sea and a Kibbuz situated closely to the Gaza Strip.

2010

After more than 10 years, EDS also returned proudly to Lithuania where JKL arranged the Seminar & 4th Council Meeting in the working year 2009/2010. The event from 5th to 9th May 2010 was held in Vilnius and assumed the topic “EU and Russia: A new page in our relationship?” under the attendance of 48 participants from 23 organisations and countries. Many distinguished speakers participated in this seminar including Speaker of the Lithuanian Parliament Irena Degutien, Minister of Defence Rasa Juknevičienė, Minister of Foreign Affairs Audronius Ažubalis and Radvilė Morkūnaitė MEP and former Chairwoman of JKL. The event enabled participants to stay longer in Vilnius as after its conclusion, the EPP Political Assembly started in the very same city immediately. So the wide-spread synergies could be used here to their full extent. The event was special in the respect that all the three Chairmen of EDS (Bence Bauer), DEMYC (Jani Johansson) and YEPP (Laurent Schouteten) were present in the Council Meeting, underlining the good spirit of cooperation between them.

After more than half a decade EDS managed to receive renewed funding from the Council of Europe’s European Youth Foundation and thus organised with NGPPCD Moldova the very first Seminar and Council Meeting in the capital of Moldova, Chisinau. Being the poorest country in Europe, Moldova

863 However, the evaluation showed an overload with lectures as reported in the Minutes of the 2nd CM Jerusalem from 5th December 2009, p. 2.
864 List of participants, Jerusalem, December 2009.
865 List of participants, Vilnius, May 2010.
tries to get intense cooperation with the European Union and successfully positioned itself as a country of the Eastern Partnership. The event with the title “Human Rights and Democracy – promoting European values” took place from 21st to 26th September 2010 and assembled 50 participants from 22 countries, representing 24 members and four guest organisations. As speakers EDS delegates met Iure Rosca, Chairman of the Christian Democrat People’s Party PPCD, Igor Botan (Association for Participatory Democracy), Viorel Cibotaru (Institute for Public Policy), Gheorghe Susarenco (Vice Minister of Justice), Leonid Bujor (Minister of Education), Olga Gordila (NGO Promo Lex), Cristina Pereteatcu (Amnesty International Moldova), Catherine Vierling (European Forum for Human Rights) and Natalia Corobca (KAS Moldova).

As the December Council Meeting was re-introduced already the year before, also in 2010/2011 EDS delegates met in December. Just two years after their previous event RCDS Germany organised a EDS Seminar & Council Meeting “Higher Education in Times of Crises” from 16th to 19th December 2010 in Berlin, hosting 50 participants from 27 countries, organised in 31 organisations. These numbers were absolute record numbers for the traditionally smaller December event. This huge interest had something to do with the number of eminent speakers present such as Thomas Rachel, Parliamentary State Secretary at the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, Peter Altmaier, Parliamentary Secretary General of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group in the German Parliament, the Bundestag or Gerhard Wahlers, Deputy
Secretary General from the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. As a special feature, EDS Bureau Members delivered workshops in the Academy of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, like Bence Bauer on event organising and fundraising, Jean-Baptiste Dabezies on student elections or David Božič (Vice Chairman 2008-2010) on publications.

2011

After the 50th Anniversary in Brussels, EDS delegates met for the first joint EDS-DEMYC seminar for more than 35 years with the Seminar & Council Meeting “Central European Policies – Hungarian Priorities” from 7th to 10th April 2011, drawing 95 participants from 49 organisations of 33 countries to Budapest868. With this record number of participants the event could be almost called a "Spring University". The 49 organisations present constituted the biggest number ever which of course has something to do with the attending DEMYC delegates. Speakers included Zsolt Németh, Minister of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Gergely Gulyás MP, Vice Chairman of the Fidesz Hungarian Civic Union Parliamentary Group, Tibor Zoltán Pállinger, Dean of the Faculty for International Relations of the Andrássy Gyula German Speaking University Budapest, Ulrich Kleppmann, Representative of the Hanns Seidel Foundation, Zsolt Szabó from the Foundation for a Civic Hungary, Jan Erik Surotchak and John Cavanaugh from the International Republican Institute and Johann-Jakob Wulf from the Young Citizens’ Danube Network as conference rapporteur869. The event dealt with the priorities of Central Europe that are simultaneously also priorities for Hungary and via the Hungarian EU Presidency also important topics for Europe such as the accession of Croatia, the Danube Strategy870, Roma Strategy and the protection of minorities. During the event the Ronald Reagan Bust was visited and conference participants enjoyed the Council Meeting in the beautiful premises of the Festetics Palace, the seat of the Andrássy Gyula German Speaking University, the only German speaking university outside German language borders.

In late 2011, EDS returned to Prague after more than eight years, where MK Czech Republic hosted a huge number of 64 participants, from 31 organisations871 from 13th to 18th September 2011 for a Seminar & Council Meeting entitled “Twenty years of sustainable development in Central Eastern

868 List of participants, Budapest, April 2011.
870 As a prior strategy of Hungary, the Danube Strategy is aimed to create an integrated socio-cultural, economic, ecological and political sphere within the Danube Region and beyond, reaching out to 14 countries.
871 Memo of Vice Chairwoman for Alumni & Events, Ingrid Hopp on Seminar & Council Meeting Prague, memo dating 29th December 2011, p. 1.
Europe" which was supported by European Youth Foundation with Michèle Bergdoll also attending the lectures. Those featured Tomáš Chalupa, Minister of Environment who was also patron of the event. Besides him, other lecturers included Rut Bízková, former Minister of Environment, Veronika Hunt Šafráňková, Acting Deputy Minister from the Ministry of Environment, Dana Drábová from the State Office of Nuclear Safety, Minister of Industry and Trade Jiří Hřebík and Michèle Bergdoll, Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe. The Council Meeting took place at a symbolic location, the headquarters of the Civic Democratic Party (ODS). The seminar was financed to large extent by the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe.

From 7th to 11th December 2011, EDS gathered upon invitation of UNI France in Marseille where a side-event to the XX. EPP Congress and seminar, alongside the 2nd Council Meeting was held with the topic “Multiculturalism in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities”, amassing 74 participants from 31 organisations. The event featured speeches from Claudia Crawford, representative of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in the United Kingdom, Dennis Kredler, European Round Table of Industrialists, Jean-Robert Pitte, former Chairman of the Sorbonne University, Jean Leonetti, French Secretary of State for European Affairs, Guy Tessier MP, Head of Defence Committee, Arnaud Danjean MEP, Head of Defence and Security Subcommittee and Jean-Dominique Giuliani, President of the Robert Schuman Foundation (Paris). As a new incentive, EDS organised together with YEPP a joint panel with Constance Le
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872  BullsEye No 46, p. 20.
873  Memo of Vice Chairwoman for Alumni & Events, Ingrid Hopp on Seminar & Council Meeting Marseille, memo dating 29th December 2011, p. 1.
Grip MEP, former EDS Vice Chairwoman, Jacob Lund Nielsen, former EDS Chairman and Christian Kremer, Deputy Secretary General of the European People’s Party. The simultaneously organised EPP Congress with a huge number of Heads of State and Government gave EDS activists the opportunity to meet key decision makers of European Union countries and beyond. EDS Chairman Juraj Antal was one of the highlights of the EPP Congress as for the first time EDS called for the direct election of the President of the European Commission and for a single European electorate constituted of the united European public. These thoughts were elaborated prior to the meeting with some ideas published in the BullsEye newsmagazine. However, these sentiments were later repeated by Hungarian Foreign Minister János Martonyi.

Permanent Working Group Meetings

The Permanent Working Groups (PWG) never had any scheduled work plan or agenda governing how often meetings should be conducted. The statutes never prescribed regular meetings and these have been largely dependent on the activity of each working group and of course on the members and co-chairs. At the beginning of the decade it was practise to hold joint meetings of the working groups, called Working Group Days. However, starting from 2002, this denomination was changed to “Policy Days” which have now become a regular event of the EDS calendar from year to year, with scheduled meetings every May or June to prepare for the Annual Meeting in each respect of policy works. To illustrate the importance of detailed work on policy matters, the Bureau 2010/2011 attempted to use the name “Policy Work Days” for the meeting in May 2011 in Riga, but with not much success as the name Policy Days is already so closely linked to EDS. In this chapter, the composition of the PWGs will be described, their meetings and also the venues and ideas of the Policy Days.

The set-up of the working group sector was always very volatile in EDS. In some years, only two working groups have been active, in some even four have been set up and functioning. To some extent, as the co-chair position being an appointed one, work has been seen seriously by some but not all co-chairs. We even figure out appointed co-chairs who actually never showed up. After the nomination by the member organisations, it was the sole discretion of the EDS Chairman to appoint co-chairs. This was by nature of EDS being a political organisation used to balance out the involved persons in EDS work according to geographic, gender or political opportunities. This

874 Memo of Vice Chairwoman for Alumni & Events, Ingrid Hopp on Seminar & Council Meeting in Marseille, memo dating 29th December 2011, p. 2.
practise was for the first time changed by the Bureau 2009/2010 where the Chairman handed this decision to the Bureau, on his own initiative. This was much appreciated and within a year this was incorporated into the statutes. Another item was much discussed: Should there be an automatic expulsion rule similar to those as regards Vice Chairmen? Where some argued in favour, the prevailing argument was that with a new appointment\textsuperscript{875} Chairman (or respectively Bureau after 2009/2010) can simply overcome non-presence and missing work. However, Chairman/Bureau never used this possibility, although there would have been many such cases to solve. The only archived case of “replacing” working group co-chairs dates back to the Winter University February 2002 where two of them were replaced\textsuperscript{876}.

**Co-chairs**

**2002**

In 2002, EDS had two Permanent Working Groups. The PWG on Enlargement was chaired by Otilia Simkova (ODM Slovakia), and that on Higher Education by Alla Nastych (USA Ukraine). After the Annual Meeting in Berlin (July 2002), there were three PWGs: “Higher Education”, “Agenda for Europe” and “Future of Europe”. While the first dealt with higher education topics and is self-explanatory, the PWG Agenda for Europe should be preoccupied with general policy and a policy for the new centre-right government\textsuperscript{877}. The PWG Future of Europe is to be working on topics such as

\textsuperscript{875} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{877} Minutes of the 32nd Annual Meeting from 30th July 2002 in Berlin, p. 6.
the European Institutions, EU Convention or EU Enlargement878, as presented by EDS Chairman 2001-2003 Jacob Lund Nielsen in the Annual Meeting in Berlin. In this very meeting, Alla Nastych (USA Ukraine) and Otilia Simkova (ODM Slovakia) were appointed to the PWG Higher Education, Tamás Rumi (Fidelitas Hungary) and Tibor Jona (Kliks Serbia-Montenegro) to the PWG Agenda for Europe; last but not least Dimitris Terzis (DAP-NDFK Greece) and Davorka Herman (HAZ Croatia) were appointed to the PWG Future of Europe. Already at this time there was a strong wish to have more internal working group meetings879 but unfortunately EDS has to rely on other funding sources which made it impossible to have those meetings implemented.

Another ongoing debate concerned the number of co-chairs and whether it would be more useful to have one “boss” of each PWG to set out clear responsibilities. It was even suggested by Policy Director Tobias Sjö to reduce the number of the PWG Chairmen to one Chairman each880. However at a later stage, starting from the working year 2006/2007, the number of co-chairs in each PWG was increased to three. This was done mostly because of a complete new set-up in 2006, but also to raise inclusiveness amongst member organisations in the PWGs.

2003

The Annual Meeting 2003 saw Tamás Rumi re-appointed co-chair, but this time for another working group: He served from 2003 onwards as co-chair of the PWG Future of Europe alongside Michal Benik (MK Czech Republic). The PWG Higher Education was co-chaired by Johannes Kozlik (AG Austria) and Richard Hilton (CF United Kingdom) and the PWG on the Political Agenda for the European Centre-Right was led by Luisa Gauci Baluci (SDM Malta) and Petr Bonev (FISS Bulgaria)881. Barring this slight change in name for the latter, the three working groups retained these names over the period 2003-2006.

2004

For the time span 2004/2005 the co-chairs of Higher Education were Gonzalo Ortíz Lázaro (NNGG Spain) and Patrick Feidt (RCDS Germany), those of Future of Enlarged Europe Zoltán Attila Sáska (Fidelitas Hungary) and Michal Sabatka (MK Czech Republic) and those of Political Agenda for the European Centre-Right Erik Andersson (FMSF Sweden) and Christoph Van Impe (CDS Belgium)882.

878 Minutes of the 32nd Annual Meeting from 30th July 2002 in Berlin, p. 6.
879 Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 14th December 2002 in Copenhagen, p. 2.
880 Minutes of the 6th Bureau Meeting from 6th March 2003 in Prague, p. 2.
881 Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 11.
2005

2005/2006 saw the number of working groups raised to a historical maximum: With the PWGs on Higher Education (co-chairs: Matthieu Maraine UNI France and Maria Fuster Cerrillo NNGG Spain), Agenda for the European Centre-Right (co-chair: Alexander Micalef SDM Malta), Future of an Enlarged Europe (co-chairs: Adrian Giannou PNTCD Romania and Anja Marija Ciraj SAU Slovenia) and a new one, EU Neighbourhood Policy (co-chairs: Dmytro Kondratenko USA Ukraine and Aleksandar Nikoloski UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)883 EDS had a record number of working groups, namely four of them. However the Neighbourhood PWG was terminated after one year and the others were reshuffled. Interestingly, these co-chairs were not appointed by the Chairman on the Annual Meeting, but at a later stage884. To avoid the arguments we had in 2002, the Chairman assigned one elected Vice Chairman to be “Chairman” of the working group in order to prevent co-chairs from engaging in struggles about who is the lord in the house. We saw Vice Chairman Dieter Haas chair the PWG on Higher Education in Bratislava885 for instance. This practise was kept in the years to come, even in 2006-2007 where one EDS Vice Chairman was assigned to each PWG886, but in 2007/2008 some working groups had two EDS Vice Chairmen887, so again the same turbulences of late 2002 reoccurred. This development was completely rescheduled with the Bureaus 2009/2010 onwards assigning one Vice Chairman for Input Strategies to be the supervisor and leader of all three working groups, giving these a certain independence and free room for ideas and incentives. The development was positive, but as early as 2011/2012 the Bureau discussed whether all Bureau members (sic!) should attend the PWG sessions. These questions were even made ever clearer and participants were asked in the event’s evaluation form about this topic; feedback was that – when it came to the participants of the Seminar & Council Meeting in Marseille – a presence of the Bureau was requested.

2006

Coming back to 2006, co-chairs had never since been appointed at the Annual Meetings, but most frequently after it. Only the 2010 and 2011 Annual Meetings had PWG co-chair decisions on the spot of the Summer

885 Minutes of the 2nd Working Group session from 28th October 2005.
887 See document “Division of responsibilities 2007-2008” where Vice Chairmen Hristina Runceva and Ivan Gereci are to take care of the WG Policies for Europe and Andrea Solomonidou and Maja Mazurkiewicz about the WG Human Rights.
University immediately following Bureau Meetings. As for 2006, the system of the permanent working groups was reformed with three working groups: “Higher Education and Research” (Ivan Delibasic - Kliks Serbia, Jean-Baptiste Dabezies - UNI France and Thomas Thaler - AG Austria), “Human Rights” (Charlene Vella - SDM Malta, Caroline Stupp - RCDS Germany and Benedikt Brunner - RCDS Germany) and “Policies for Europe” (Cristian Salagor- PNTCD Romania and Hristina Runceva - UMS of VMRO-DPMNE from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)\(^{888}\).

2007

After the Annual Meeting 2007, re-elected Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine appointed David Božić (SAU Slovenia) and Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI France) for the Higher Education PWG, selected Daniela Galeote (NNGG Spain) and Fredrik Saweståhl (FMSF Sweden) for Human Rights and Sonita Luminita Pesel (PNTCD Romania), Øystein Holm-Haagensen (HSF Norway) and Bence Bauer (Fidesz IT Hungary) for the Policies for Europe PWG\(^{889}\). In practice the PWGs were tasked to deal also with current developments within the EPP.\(^{890}\)

2008

The working year 2008/2009 brought also for the co-chairs totally new faces: Matija Magerl (HAZ Croatia), Ellen Rova (FMSF Sweden) and Márton Schöberl (Fidesz IT Hungary) served for Higher Education and Research, Giovanni Contini (FIG Italy), Janja Zaplotnik (SAU Slovenia) and Maria Lapadatu (OSDPL Romania) for Human Rights and Samuli Kauranne (TK Finland), Andreas Perotti (AG Austria) and Christian Peuker (RCDS Germany) for Policies for Europe.\(^{891}\) However, the Annual Report 2008/2009 declined to recognize Zaplotnik and Rova, most likely because of a lack of commitment the editor of this publication, Secretary General Maia Mazurkiewicz ignored these two, although no new appointments have been erasing their positions.

2009

In 2009/2010 as a new incentive, appointments were made as a collective Bureau decision, not by the Chairman alone. Also, as a new idea, all candidates were heard in front of the assembled Bureau. Policies for Europe received three new co-chairs as the previous ones all have been elected Vice Chairmen. Andraž Kastelic (SAU Slovenia), Lenka Orsagova (ODM Slovakia)\(^{888}\) Annual Report 2006/2007, p. 20-22.\(^{889}\) Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 21st-23rd September 2007 in Berlin, p. 2.\(^{890}\) Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 21st-23rd September 2007 in Berlin, p. 3.\(^{891}\) Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 2.
and Dániel Grózner (Fidesz IT Hungary) were the new people, accomplished by Bernhard Krall (AG Austria), Steffen Liebendörfer (RCDS Germany) and Charlotte Kudé (UNI France) for the Higher Education and Research PWG alongside Mathilde Poncelet (EDH Belgium), Svitlana Garashchenko (USA Ukraine) and Hrvoje Horvat (SOHSS Croatia) for the Human Rights PWG.892

2010

For the new working year, within 24 hours after conclusion of the Annual Meeting893, Bernhard Krall was re-appointed alongside Vasia Alexandri (DAP-NDFK Greece) and Kalin Zahariev (MGERB Bulgaria) for Higher Education and Research whereas Alexandru Bejan (PNTCD Romania), Alexandros Politis (DAP-NDFK Greece) and Nenad Vajzović (SOHSS Croatia) served Policies for Europe and Amanda Wollstad (FMSF Sweden) served alongside Annelien Lefèvre (CDS Belgium) on Human Rights according to the Bureau’s decision894. The latter co-chair was dismissed by the appointment of Matthew Lewis (YCEG United Kingdom) and Anna Tamási (Fidesz IT Hungary) instead of her on 7th April 2011; just hours prior to this decision Ms. Lefèvre resigned895.

2011

For the working year 2011/2012 the Bureau appointed Juliane Ruschinzik (RCDS Germany), Florian Weinberger (AG Austria) and Reetta Marttinen (TK

---

892 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 29th August 2009 in Balatonszárszó, p. 8.
893 Newsletter, August 2010.
894 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 23rd/24th July 2010 in Žilina, p. 3 with Vajzović and Zahariev appointed at a later stage, confirmed by the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 27th/28th August 2010 in Balatonszárszó.
895 Resignation email from 7th April 2011.
Finland) for Higher Education and Research, Anna Tamási (Fidesz IT Hungary), Stelios Georgiou (Protoporia Cyprus) and Charlotte Spurkeland (HSF Norway) for Human Rights and Matthew Lewis (YCEG United Kingdom), Tornike Choniashvili (Graali Georgia) and Athanasios Karagiannis (DAP-NDFK Greece) for Policies for Europe after hearing them in person. The appointment rules have been here already quite elaborated: To save time and provide constant work flow, the nominations were already called by the outgoing Bureau.

PWG Meetings

The meetings of the working groups were very diverse. Where the Higher Education and later Higher Education and Research met almost every working year at least once independently from the Council Meetings, the others had very rare or even no meetings. For the PWG Policies for Europe, two meetings have been reported: One on 22nd/23rd November 2008 with the presence of VC Bence Bauer and two of three co-chairs in Budapest and another with the presence of all the three co-chairs on 21st/22nd November 2009 in Budapest. From all archives available there is no evidence for any physical meeting of the Human Rights PWG outside Council Meetings.

In the working year 2002/2003 the PWG Future of Europe met during the Chairmen Conference of RCDS (GVK, Gruppenvorsitzendenkonferenz) on Eichholz Manor in Wesseling, close to Cologne. Here, Jacob Lund Nielsen also addressed the gathered RCDS activists. The session of the working group
assembled 12 nations, with additional 20 RCDS-members visiting the intense discussions.

For the remaining part of the period in question, only the Higher Education working group conducted external meetings. It met in the Austrian capital Vienna from 27th February – 3rd March 2003 to discuss the “Improvement of Public University Management and Finance in the process of European Enlargement” with 24 participants from 11 countries899.

In the working year 2003/2004 it convened again, this time in Frankfurt(Oder)/Slubice from 13th–17th September 2003 to finalize the resolution on Higher Education900 that EDS Bureau later presented to the XVI. EPP Congress February 2004 in Brussels. These working days have been organised by RCDS and NZS, coinciding with the Council of Education Ministers.

The working year 2005/2006 saw another two Higher Education working group sessions; one of them was held in Paris, from 25th-26th November 2005901, the other in Vienna, from 13th to 16th January 2006. The focus of the debates was on the European Higher Education Area (AHEA) and its proper funding. During the session, participants also met Austrian Education Minister Elisabeth Gehrer and had a chance to relax during the Viennese Ball in the Hofburg902. As an introductory event to the EDS basic paper on Higher Education and Research, an EDS conference on Innovation and creativity in times of crises was held at an extraordinary meeting of the Higher Education and Research working group in Bled, Slovenia from 2nd to 5th July 2009 with 13 participants903.

Policy Days

More regular meetings and larger attraction was provided by the Policy Days. These have been organised every May or June to prepare for the Annual Meeting policy-wise. The Policy Days in 2002 have been held in Banská Bystrica from 26th to 30th June 2002 and produced a Bologna Process reader904 that also later was much used. The Policy Days 2003 have been organised from 25th to 29th June 2003 in Cyprus as a joint meeting of all three working groups, featuring also meetings with Commissioner Viviane Reding, former Cypriot President George Vassiliou, DISY Chairman Nikos Anasstasiadis and EPP Secretary General Antonio Lopez-Isturiz905. The 2004 Policy Days took

901 BullsEye No 31 (February 2006), p. 9.
place in Sofia and Ravda (Bulgaria) from 16th – 20th June 2004 with 30 participants who discussed the statutory amendments, drafted by Policy Director Dimitris Terzis906 and also met Mayor of Sofia Stefan Sofianski. As a sign of strong transatlantic ties, the Policy Days one year later were arranged as a side event to the 56th National Convention of the College Republicans from 24th-26th June 2005. The ten EDS activists concluded a debate about the new EDS Statutes907. Coming back to Europe in 2006, Helsinki was the host of the meeting taking place from 28th June to 2nd July 2006 with 20 attendees who eagerly discussed the changes to the Statutes and also met later Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexander Stubb MEP908. In 2007, the event was shortened by one day which it stayed since then (with the exception of 2008). EDS activists met in Madrid, from 17th to 20th May 2007 to discuss Statutes changes which needed to be implemented at the upcoming Annual Meeting. As a special feature, the guests took part in the Spanish electoral campaign for the local elections, with a meeting with former Prime Minister Aznar909. From 11th to 15th June 2008 MGERB was hosting the Policy Days in Plovdiv and Sofia. These Policy Days had very little to do with real policy work, but were rather a get-to-know-tour for the 40 EDS participants to the life of Bulgaria and the prospective observer member MGERB. Participants met Patrick Egan from the International Republican Institute and later Prime Minister Boyko Borisov, at that time GERB

Party Chairman and Mayor of Sofia\textsuperscript{910}. The Policy Days in Riga have been scheduled for 28\textsuperscript{th} to 31\textsuperscript{st} May 2009 and assembled EDS representatives from 15 countries who met Ingrida Circene MP, Arturs Krisjanis Karins MP, Chairman of New Era parliamentary group and Andreas Klein, representative of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in the Baltic countries\textsuperscript{911}. From 10\textsuperscript{th} to 13\textsuperscript{th} June 2010, EDS met for the Policy Days in Ukrainian capital Kiev to discuss Statute changes\textsuperscript{912}, with special regard to the proposed membership fee and voting rights reforms. One year later, just two years after the last meeting in Riga, EDS gathered again in Latvia, from 12\textsuperscript{th} to 15\textsuperscript{th} May 2011 in Riga and Ratnieki to discuss the topic of European Identity and the Duff report\textsuperscript{913}. The meeting was also used to comment on and amend the EPP Platform\textsuperscript{914}, which was in ongoing discussions in the EPP WG 1. The event was also holding a special anniversary dinner on 13\textsuperscript{th} May 2011, the day of the founding of EDS\textsuperscript{915}. Special attention was given to the fact that the meeting was addressed with a welcome note from Latvian State President Zatlers.

In conclusion it can be said that Policy Days sadly only rarely fulfilled their original goals. Very often they were merely used to promote a country or organisation visited or to simply overwhelm the visitors with high ranking and fine programmes (2003, 2004, 2005, 2008). If this was not the case, statutory changed were discussed (2006, 2007, 2009, 2010). Very rarely did Policy Days came close to the very idea of their conception: A structured and deep analyses of existing and necessary new policy of EDS (2002, 2011). It can be also observed that the more seriously a policy-content was offered, the fewer participants attended.

\textbf{Conclusion}

By concluding about one decade of event policy in EDS, one shall first and foremost make a remark about the impressive amount of almost 100 events. It should be noted that an overwhelming part of EDS finances and commitment is dedicated to organising the different kind of events EDS hosts every year. This said, a first axiom is already set why the analysis on this area of EDS’ work is so important. As a second axiom events are always to be considered as an accompanying tool to the policies and politics pursued by EDS.

\textsuperscript{911} Annual Report 2008/2009, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{913} An innovative idea to have 25 MEPs elected according to all-European party lists composed by each European Political Party by an all-European populace.
\textsuperscript{914} Annual Report 2010/2011, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{915} Newsletter, June 2011.
In this respect the streamlining of events played an increasingly pivotal role. And as a third axiom, the world of international events is a highly elaborated and complex matter, requiring careful and delicate handling. In this regard, EDS made huge steps forward in the Millennium Years by offering more professional and high profile events, demonstrating its ability to constantly learn and develop.

First of all, the overall set-up and profile as well as attendance and outcome of the events is to be commended. With 10 Summer Universities, in the Millennium Years EDS gathered well over a thousand youngsters in the framework of relatively informal summer schools. The Summer University by nature is intended to enabling us to learn from each other and to meet in a cosy atmosphere, combined with leisure activities as this event for many also represents a summer holiday. However, due to the elections on Annual Meetings and the increased need of providing more and more serious programmes and speakers, the SummerU lost from this original understanding. The events have been made shorter (until 2006 the event lasted for 7 nights, in 2007 it was 6, from 2008 onwards 5, with the exception of 2010 where 7 nights were allocated again) and less participants attended: whereas in Berlin in 2002, some 200 students gathered and still in London, an impressive number of 170 people were assembled in the United Kingdom, from 2005 on the number of participants seldom exceeded 100 people. This may lie in a more and more uncertain situation of younger people on the job market, less funding possibilities and an increasing sceptical attitude towards political action, especially in Western parts of Europe where participation in international events and structures became less and less attractive for youngsters, a phenomenon we can also witness in European politics and also in student and youth involvement at a national level. The composition of participants in the Millennium Years was shifting rapidly to the Eastern parts of our continent where European integration is still considered to be thrilling and full of excitement. The graphs at the end of the Annual Report comparing the top delegations within one working year based on the cumulated number of participants demonstrate this.

To have a clearer picture about the overall attendees of the events in a working year, we should investigate more about the following numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>782 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>640 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>427 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>404 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>508 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>303 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>419 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>280 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>401 p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>360 p.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen that until the middle of the term in question, numbers of participants have been constantly decreasing, with an increase and stabilization during the very active working year 2005/2006, but a very strong and sharp decline in 2006/2007 which could be kept on a certain level of approximately 300-400 participants per year in the working years 2006/2007 to 2010/2011.

As for the Winter Universities we can observe strong centripetal forces to come back repeatedly to Brussels which is rather understandable, this being the European capital. However, not more than 40% of these events in the reported period have been arranged in Brussels (2002, 2004, 2010, 2011). The winter event was by its very concept and idea a more formal event, being the second biggest, but also featuring stricter themes and schedules. The topics have been European (2002, 2004, 2005, 2010, 2011) or strictly based on the hosting country (2003, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009), ranging from general policies (2002, 2003, 2004, 2007) to student or youth policies (2009, 2010, 2011) and the subject of values (2005), terrorism (2006) or even democracy building (2008). It can be also noted that the original ideas of Winter Universities, to bring people to some winter places (seventies and eighties) or to introduce political Europe to them (nineties), have been departed from. This may be explained by the difficulties of arranging large meetings in Brussels or the desire of participants not to go back to the same or similar places. Nevertheless,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany (79)</td>
<td>Germany (57)</td>
<td>Germany (37)</td>
<td>Germany (44)</td>
<td>Germany (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (71)</td>
<td>Denmark (40)</td>
<td>Belgium (32)</td>
<td>Poland (29)</td>
<td>Bulgaria (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (41)</td>
<td>Czech Republic (39)</td>
<td>Spain (27)</td>
<td>France (25)</td>
<td>Romania (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (28)</td>
<td>Austria (26)</td>
<td>Hungary (34)</td>
<td>Ukraine (28)</td>
<td>Austria (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (22)</td>
<td>Hungary (25)</td>
<td>Poland (32)</td>
<td>Latvia (27)</td>
<td>Slovakia (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (21)</td>
<td>Germany (24)</td>
<td>Croatia (16)</td>
<td>Germany (21)</td>
<td>Finland (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brussels became the focal point again in 2010 and the importance of demonstrating EDS to the decision makers of political Brussels became instrumental in fostering the policies and politics of EDS.

For the seminars we can identify different motives and backgrounds. First and utmost, seminars have been considered to be a frame of a Council Meeting, hosted by a member organisation, presenting in a meeting characterised by a workable atmosphere, some of the features their policies are about. Instead of treating seminars as leisure time (SummerU) or a series of high profile events (WinterU), these were smaller gatherings with fewer, more manageable items on their agenda. The topics have been as diverse and manifold as EDS itself: We can see especially in the beginning of the period in question many events dealing with enlargement or European integration, but also higher education topics have been important, mostly in Germany, France and Austria. The situations of the countries visited often played a role, especially in foreign policy.

To put the events in the light of our threefold axiom system it can be said that events naturally did not get any cheaper over the course of the years. But on the side of proper monitoring and evaluation as regards the outcomes we witness stricter policies: The introduced guidelines, the registration and cancellation policy, the training the Bureau offered, and the constant grant applications demonstrate a responsible attitude towards this important field of EDS work. With respect to the policies of EDS we can easily recognise the main priorities of EDS lie on the level of its events, however in previous years, a harmonization and synchronisation of current policies or campaigns with the events proves the efforts in maximizing the outcome of each event. Thirdly, EDS maintained the character of an educational body, not only in terms of politics or any field of work, but also in the domain of international events. Over the course of the Millennium Years, the events have been organised for the most part very professionally. By simply mentioning some examples, several interesting items and best practices could be shared and enhanced, thus making the seminars and conferences EDS hosts real eye-catchers. It was for instance in EDS where dedicated conference stamps were introduced, where every single participant benefits from a pick-up service, or the political, economic and higher education situation is explained via different memos and booklets at length. But the overall picture was clear: EDS event organisers put together huge international conferences, dedicating a great deal of money and effort to provide EDS participants with the best possible memories and outcomes. They not only did this in order to impress their guests with the richness and variety of their home country, but also to make the activities of EDS relevant and interesting. It can be noted with respect that all of them were able to learn from each other, thus making the events from year to year, better and better.
Public Relations

In the field of public relations we can observe a two-folded picture: Whereas there has been with strict regularity an annually published report (“Annual Report”) for each working year, summing up all the important activities of EDS and a newsmagazine (“BullsEye”) that was published more or less two to four times a year with many important news pieces, debates, and guest articles, the other PR-related activities have been very volatile. This includes campaigns, other periodical and non-periodical publications, posters and visual devices, and a general PR-appearance. It can be said that EDS was always very strong in sharing and exchanging views and opinions within the framework of academically elaborated written texts. Going to the outside world with a visually convincing set-up was always a bigger challenge as people and attitudes changed, and priorities altered. We witness deep discussions on the question of whether a Europe-wide campaign made political and logistical sense916. It was also often stated that the Bureau itself cannot involve itself in campaigns917. It was nevertheless very obvious that no EDS campaign can work without the active support and promotion by the member organisations918.

BullsEye

The newsmagazine BullsEye originated back in the seventies as “Taurus”, being initiated and subsequently moved forward by Friedbert Pflüger919. After a revival under Michalis Peglis, giving the magazine the title “BullsEye” in the mid-nineties, it has been regularly published. The idea of this newsmagazine was to create a unique Europe-wide platform for exchanging ideas, news, best practises, and political reports from students and young people to a similar target group. EDS is the only party-affiliated organisation in the European centre-right that has an English, international, but Brussels-based newsmagazine that is published on a regular basis. As an organisation of academics, a mechanism for exchange of knowledge in writing, a platform for young talented political skills, and an information and marketing tool for EDS as a whole is a decisive asset. Particularly through this approach, concept, realisation, and model, the magazine was considered a viable method of spreading the basic message and the values of EDS around Europe. In recent years, some have questioned whether a printed magazine for a Europe-wide audience might not be an anachronism920, but the clear decision was always to keep the maga-

917 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th October 2006 in Torino, p. 5.
918 Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 4th December 2009 in Jerusalem, p. 3.
919 “How BullsEye was created – In no eye blind” from BullsEye No 43 (February 2011), p. 23.
920 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 29th August 2009 in Balatonszárszó, p. 7.
zine in print format because of the above mentioned reasons. The multiple downloads from the EDS website have additionally proven that there is also a need to provide the content quickly, shortly after the hard copies have been published.

Furthermore it was discussed to which extent the Bureau might have a role in creating and supervising the BullsEye, and to which scope the editorial team can be independent. During the Bureau 2009/2010, it was also agreed for the minutes that the editorial team should operate as an independent body unless themes are to be published of a high degree of controversy. Usually, one of the Vice Chairmen served simultaneously as an editor-in-chief. This guaranteed a proper supervision of the work on BullsEye during the years 2002-2009. However, since October 2009 a separate editor-in-chief has been appointed, with the Bureau taking the explicit decision in order to guarantee the independence of the magazine. Additionally, the editor-in-chief was not replacing, but working together with the Vice Chairman in charge for publications, as the latter was to be supervising the editor-in-chief. For the working years 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 EDS appointed Sandra Falkowska (MK Poland) as editor-in-chief after an open call and a respective hearing in the formal framework of a job interview. A salary or compensation was not paid following the decision of the Bureau, and also EDS’ limited financial means.

Regarding the topics and outlines of the issues in the period 2002-2011 one has to make some general re-
marks. First of all the actual scope of the magazine was in the beginning of the Millennium Years very small, consisting of up to 8 to 12 pages. It grew steadily, until with the editions published in 2007 and 2008 the number of pages reached 32. Another important observation is that no matter how enthusiastic Bureaus have been in putting together a BullsEye, mostly the (self-set) expectations could not be met. This lies in a very core fact that publishing a serious magazine requires much more than to simply upload quickly an article on the internet or write a blog. The criteria system for a newsmagazine is much more complex and diverse. Starting from the language part, over an elaborated assorting of authors, topics, thematic red lines, and current developments a magazine requires very strict coordination and synchronisation work, especially when it comes to the almost artwork of a precision landing as the publishing and presentation of each and any magazine needs to be for logistical reasons always during a (Council) meeting of EDS. These goals have not always been achieved. To concentrate more on how to professionally publish newspapers and newsmagazines, David Božič, EDS Vice Chairman 2008-2010 and responsible in the Bureau 2009/2010 for publications, gave a detailed workshop during the programme of the Seminar and Council Meeting in Berlin, 16th – 19th December 2010.

Evaluating the facts on hand as regards the regularity and amount of composed magazines we see BullsEye editions no 22-46 produced in the time span 2002-2011 inclusive. The editions 37-46 were all released between December 2009 and December 2011; so within a period of 24 months. In the eight years prior, EDS managed to publish 16 editions, meaning on average two per year. The last two years have seen EDS significantly increase the number of editions to four per year. Additionally, the editions have been never shorter than 24 pages. These figures should suffice as a general remark concerning the frequency and scope of this important item on the EDS publication and communication agenda.

2002

Under the auspices of Elektra Katsikidou, BullsEye no 22 was published in February 2002 with the title “Wider still and wider”. The articles included event reports, a piece about the Balkans, reports about national elections, as a unique contribution a view from YEPP and last but not least a bigger thematic article from Hans-Gert Pöttering about EU-enlargement.

With the same editor-in-chief edition no 23 was published in June 2002 with the “Europe turns right”, where EDS Chairman Jacob Lund Nielsen re-

---

926 An edition No 40 was never produced. Edition No 41 should be the real No 40 but as of a human error this was miscounted. The mistake however could never be corrected any more. So when we talk about the editions 37-46 we mean just nine editions, not ten.
flected with a big thematic article and an emphasis was put on the favourable national election outcomes allover Europe. Again, Hans-Gert Pöttering wrote an impressive article, this time about Europe.

With the leadership of Eduard Herda (RCDS Germany) who as EDS Vice Chairman took the work of editor-in-chief upon himself, issue 24 of BullsEye was released in November 2002 with the headline, “Let’s go larger”, and 16 pages, featuring a presentation of the EDS Enlargement Campaign and a keynote article by EPP Secretary General Antonio Lopez-Isturiz. The issue also reported about the 1st Council Meeting and Seminar with the title “EU Enlargement and the Baltic Region” as well as other events like the Summer University in Berlin or the working group session and some topical country reports.

2003

April 2003 saw the 16-pages 25th edition under the auspices of Vice Chairman Eduard Herda (RCDS Germany) who served as editor-in-chief. The main cover theme was “Saving the Transatlantic Partnership” as in these days some Europeans seriously questioned the common transatlantic stand against Iraq. Guest author was Foreign Affairs Spokesman of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group Friedbert Pflüger, who also served as EDS Vice Chairman back in 1976-1978. Other items were the usual country and event reports, and a large amount of coverage of the successfully conducted enlargement minibus campaign.

The next issue, no 26, was ready to be disseminated at the XXVII. Summer University in Croatia in July 2003, but had just eight pages. It was organised by editor-in-chief and EDS Vice Chairman Eduard Herda and was titled “New Europe says YES” as an edition dedicated to the outcome of the referenda in the accession countries as regards joining the European Union.

In the new working year 2003/2004, Eduard Herda as editor-in-chief was replaced by EDS Vice Chairman Tibor Jona (Kliks Serbia-Montenegro), although the former stayed in office in the EDS Bureau. Issue 27, released in October 2003 with 16 pages was synchronised with the Seminar and Council Meeting in October 2003 in Palermo, where the magazine was physically presented and thus had the main topic, “Higher Education – Bridging Europe”. As regards the content the seminar was also focussing on the bridge function, but on those of Sicily. However, the cover page was identical to the conference poster. Content-wise a new feature was introduced: Instead of writing key thematic articles as in editions no 24 and 25, from no 27 onwards the Chairman began addressing the EDS public with the “Letter from the Chairman” – a practise that has been in place without interruption since the autumn of 2003,
and which has proved to be a good incentive. Besides event reports and updates about the referenda in Estonia and Latvia special attention was given to the Bologna Process and the output of the EDS working groups.

2004

Punctually for the XIV. Winter University in Brussels927 the 28th BullsEye came to birth, with again Tibor Jona in charge and the title, “European People’s Party – Part of your future”. This issue, amassing 24 pages and thus the thickest BullsEye until that point, included an interview with EPP President Wilfried Martens, questions to young people from the ten accession states, event and country reports, and a motion for the EPP Congress February 2004 in Brussels.

Issue 29, under the supervision of EDS Vice Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine serving as editor-in-chief, dealt with “Proposals for the Commission”, including the key positions of EDS as regards four topics: Higher Education, Entrepreneurship, Euro-med, and the EU-Russia Relationship. This release, having 16 pages, also introduced the new Commissioners and reported about past EDS events, and was published in October 2004. The previously very big format was downgraded to a smaller and handier size, and this has been kept basically the same for the future.

2005

The same chief editor laid on the table edition no 30 of BullsEye, dating February 2005, with the title “Hope is reborn” and 24 pages. Next to massive seven page event reports, we find articles about the revolutions in Georgia and Ukraine and some impressive opinion articles from former and current Bureau members about the importance of environmental friendly policies, values of our political family, democratic constitutions, and George W. Bush, who was praised as a “friend of Europe”.

2006

The third BullsEye under the editorship of Ana Filipa Janine was published one year later, as edition no 31, dated February 2006. The issue, containing 32 pages was titled “The Students have spoken”. The content, besides 13 pages (sic!) of past and future events, included for the first time a detailed publishing of all the adopted motions of all four working groups over the past year. Apart from that, no other articles were included. The explana-

927 The conference poster as announcement on the back cover page of the BullsEye was wrong as it refers to a just later organised XVI. Winter University (which took place two years later, in February 2006 in Madrid).
tion given by EDS Chairman Sven Henrik Häseker in his Chairman’s letter was that BullsEye should be “handled as some kind of yearbook”, the editor-in-chief talked about the “temporal cycle, the year 2005.”

BullsEye issue no 32 from December 2006 with 28 pages should have been released during the seminar in Cyprus, but was due to logistical reasons (the freight was stuck at the Frankfurt airport), disseminated later. The topic “No Limit? How much enlargement the EU can stand” proved to be a provocative one, that in the run-up to the Romanian and Bulgarian accession, under the auspices of a Bulgarian Vice Chairman and editor-in-chief (Todor Gunchev) was courageous and definitely a gain. This magazine featured a pro and con article about Turkish EU membership and collated quite a few event reports from the past, amended by country reports from Bulgaria, Ukraine, Hungary, and of course a selection of adopted motions from the Council Meeting in Torino.

2007

The next issue Todor Gunchev prepared was released just a quarter year later, in April 2007, and distributed at the Seminar & Council Meeting in Croatia. The title “Happy Anniversary” was a reference to the Rome Treaties, thus this edition dealt on 32 pages with questions about the new EU countries, higher education, visa regime, Russian gas trade, and country reports from Georgia, Belarus, and Hungary. The key article in the centre of the magazine was written by the EDS Chairman about the Rome Treaties, whilst motions and event reports rounded up the picture.

With a brand new magazine layout and a new editor-in-chief – newly elected Vice Chairman Ivan Delibasic – the autumn 2007 saw edition no 34, dated November 2007 and presented during the Seminar and Council Meeting in Portugal. The magazine with the title “Berlin Wall – a generation later” featured over 32 pages a range of articles from immigration, transatlantic relationship, the Bologna Process, higher education and the Solidarity movement. As a new and long-lasting incentive, new chapters had been introduced: Freedom Fighters, International Garrick Club, Reports, Theme, Events. These thematic red lines have been since then constantly been used and amended. They ensure the proportional overview of the magazine and help to create recognisable points. Especially those articles relating to the Garrick Club proved to be a success as they featured in each edition a new member of the EDS “Old Boys” organisation.

---

928 BullsEye No 31 (February 2006), p. 3.
929 BullsEye No 31 (February 2006), p. 3.
930 International Garrick Club – the alumni organisation of EDS, exclusively for former Bureau members, founded on 4th May 1968 in the Garrick Hotel in London.
2008

BullsEye edition no 35 from April 2008, released punctually for the Seminar and Council Meeting in Gdańsk, dealt with the topic of the Lisbon Treaty: “Agreement for Europe – last pieces of the puzzle”. In historically unprecedented scope, over 36 pages, the magazine was said to be one of the best BullsEyes so far. This second and last edition under Ivan Delibasic aligned articles from diverse fields such as the visa regime, Russian elections, Iraq, Georgia, the referendum in Hungary, and as a special highlight, an interview with former Belgian Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene and an opinion article by Hungarian MEP József Szájer, Vice Chairman of the EPP-ED Group and Former Member of the Convention Hungary.

2009

Unfortunately EDS people had to wait one full year for the next edition: BullsEye no 36 was published during the April Council Meeting in Paris, although wrongly it features as its date “Feb. ’09”. This edition had 24 pages and was criticised by many because of low printing quality and the lack of a serious proof-read. The most appalling moment appeared on page 20, where even the name of European Democrat Students was written incorrectly. This was really a pity since the content included articles from two high-ranking personalities: José Manuel Barroso and Wilfried Martens. Apart from this, a lot of event reports, and an interview with Gérard Bokanowski, the Secretary General of the International Paneuropean Union were delivered.

Starting totally from scratch, EDS Bureau 2009/2010 assigned Sandra Falkowska (MK Poland) to be editor-in-chief of BullsEye. She worked under the supervision of EDS Vice Chairman for Publications & Campaigns David Božič (SAU Slovenia). The edition of December 2009, issue no 37, was released in Israel and personally transported by the editor-in-chief to the Council Meeting in Jerusalem, where it was positively received. It was introduced that EDS should print the BullsEye on the spot of the meeting where it was going to be spread – if not possible, at the cheapest place from where the respective EDS delegation was asked to bring it as a transport courtesy. As a new idea, members of the Bureau were actively involved in writing articles, for this volume six Bureau members contributed. Additionally Garrick Club member Johannes Laitenberger, Head of Cabinet of EU Commission President Barroso, contributed with a piece about the meaning of the transition in 1989, in support of the campaign “20 years after – generation 1989 speaks out” that was also the main topic and title of this edition (28 pages). From this

moment on every single Council Meeting except the Annual Meeting (where the Annual Report was presented) was provided with a punctually prepared and distributed BullsEye – a huge logistical move which could only be realised with an editor-in-chief full of compassion taking care of it.

2010

The next edition was published during the XX. Winter University in Brussels in February 2010 and had as its headline topic the “Bologna Process”, in preparation of the ministerial summit early in March 2010. The newsmagazine over 24 pages as edition no 38 presented the new Commission, the new set-up after implementation of the Lisbon Treaty, and the report and the EDS Chairman’s speech at the EPP Congress in Bonn, December 2009. Garrick Club presented Jacob Lund Nielsen, Chairman from 2001-2003. This was the first BullsEye ever having the advertisement of a private company that paid a financial contribution to EDS in return.

Edition no 39, published in May 2010 in Vilnius featured the new campaign of EDS, “Unemployed Academics”, and was with 28 pages and a new designer a real eye-catcher. Due to strategic planning, in the immediate aftermath of the Seminar and Council Meeting of EDS, at the same place the EPP Political Assembly started where the brand new edition was also presented to EDS officials. Sandra Falkowska as editor-in-chief gathered interesting articles about Robert Schuman (50th Anniversary of the Schuman Declaration), Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99), Fidesz’s election victory in Hungary in April 2010, Czech and Latvian politics, Europe 2020 and as key topic about unemployment of young academics all over the continent. As new series, a presentation of universities was introduced, starting with the Paul-Cézanne University in Aix-Marseille. From this time, BullsEye also displayed the EPP logo next to the EDS logo.

An interesting anecdote is that an issue 40 was never published and never prepared. This was because the designer mistakenly designed the cover of the following edition from September 2010 as no 41, it should have had the correct numbering as no 40. However, this mistake was retained in the final print-run as it would have been impossible to correct. It also follows the processes in the printing business when faced with such a situation.

In September 2010 the editor-in-chief, alongside a new EDS Vice Chairman, Georgios Tsielepos (Protoporia Cyprus) managed to release for the Council Meeting in Moldova edition no 41, printed on site. The issue had as its main theme “Human Rights” and was concentrating across 28 pages on current human rights questions across the globe and event reports as well as country reports. As university, the Vilnius University was portrayed. This is-
sue was actually the first where the event on which it has been published had the same topic as the magazine. From September 2010 this shall be continuously the case: Important subjects are accompanied by a thematic event and an especially dedicated newsmagazine, crowned by a conference resolution.

With 24 pages and the topic “Higher Education in Times of Crises” this important set of criteria was continued. The edition, published as no 42 in December 2010 in Berlin during the Seminar & Council Meeting had many articles around the key topic, but also others like event reports, a graphic overview of the party-affiliation of European governments and a controversial pro and con topic about the division of Cyprus. It also presented former Chairman Günther Fehlinger as member of the International Garrick Club and the German Speaking Andrássy University Budapest, a unique university where German is the teaching language, attracting numerous students from Central and Eastern Europe.

2011

BullsEye no 43 was a special edition for the 50th Anniversary in Brussels on 1st February 2011. This volume had 32 pages and was printed in 2,000 copies. It assembled greeting words from the speakers of the Anniversary José Manuel Barroso, the President of the European Commission, Wilfried Martens, the President of the European People’s Party and Hans-Gert Pöttering, Chairman of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung and former President of the European Parliament. Apart from that, a brief history of the 50 years was displayed as well as old posters and other visual devices. All former Chairmen were offered the chance to write a small piece about their personal experience with EDS: Ian Taylor, Carl Bildt, Per Heister, Bettina Machaczek-Stuth, Tim Arnold, Fredrik Johansson, Michalis Peglis, Ukko Metsola, Ana Filipa Janine, as well as former Vice Chairman Gerd Langguth, all contributed. EDS Chairman of that current working year Bence Bauer published his visions about “The European Dream of EDS”. From this edition onwards, an ISSN number was displayed, making the magazine even more professional and reliable in external appearance. As copies of each edition have to be delivered to the Belgian National Library, future generations will be able to rejoice this magazine called BullsEye being registered there and easy to follow and to search for by anybody requesting to do so. For archiving reasons this simple, but clever step, should have been done a long time ago. However, a download possibility is offered by EDS in recent years.

As the last edition of Chairman Bauer and Vice Chairman Tsielepos – but not that of editor-in-chief Sandra Falkowska who continued in her position.
even after the 41st Annual Meeting in Vienna – the April 2011 edition of Bulls-Eye - issue 44 - was released in Budapest, with 28 pages, having even two advertisements. The main thematic focus was on “European Identity”, an important question that was also dealt with via the EDS Bureau conference resolution. It highlighted the possibilities European Identity can play in the coming years, with special regard to an all-European political competition. The BullsEye was however assembling articles about the Hungarian EU Presidency by Deputy State Secretary Bálint Ódor, the Arab revolution, authored by EPP Secretary General Antonio Lopez Isturiz, the Lukashenko system, the Young Citizens’ Danube Network (YCDN) and event reports. Ibrahim Rugova as freedom fighter and former EDS Chairman Tom Spencer as Garrick Club member have been honoured with portrays. As university the Montan-University of Leoben in Austria was presented. This issue involved, with the exception of just two, all the members of the EDS Bureau; which serves as a good example of how to foster Bureau’s policies via the means of the newsmagazine BullsEye.

BullsEye no 45, released in September 2011 in Prague with the same Sandra Falkowska as editor-in-chief (supervised by Vice Chairman Andraž Kastelic from SAU Slovenia from this time on), but with a brand-new design, was featuring “Sustainable development” (like the seminar on which it was appearing) and ranged contributions from pro and cons of nuclear power, green energy and energy supply over financial crises and the commemoration of 9/11 to country reports on Georgia and Moldova to a portray of Helmut Kohl, former Chancellor of Germany. The series International Garrick Club was supported by a piece reporting upon the history and the essence of this alumni organisation of EDS.

December 2011 witnessed a new BullsEye, namely edition 46 with the same team, but with a new topic: “Immigration in Europe” that was in streamline with the Seminar and Council Meeting Multiculturalism in Europe in Marseille, during the XX. Congress of the European People’s Party. The articles dealt with the key question on hand, but also with Eastern Partnership, Palestine and UNESCO, Azerbaijan’s new policies and as a keynote article with European governance. Garrick Club member Holger Thuss was given the floor and the University of Manchester was shown. Again, in this edition, an advertisement for a private company could be found.

Summing up the development of the EDS newsmagazine it becomes clear that in the recent two years BullsEye has reached a high level of professionalism that has in this form never been experienced in EDS, not with any of the printed products. The reasons on hand are attractive design, clear thematic focal point, accessible and interesting series, reliable publication policy, delivery to the Council delegates in person, active dissemination in Brussels
and elsewhere, and last but not least, a person who is dedicated and com-
passioned to do all the work related to this newsmagazine. For this reason,
with nine editions so far breaking every record, the respective editor-in-chief
has done impressive work that was helped to a large extent by the selected
editorial team that she and the Vice Chairman responsible have set up. The
BullsEye serves as an example how to make a qualitatively good and attractive
political magazine on the European stage. Many other organisations do not
have such an asset and EDS can be very proud of keeping the academic spirit
alive with continuing this respectful tradition of being a newsmagazine pub-
lisher, thus providing a discussion and interaction platform that is so unique
in this form.

Annual Reports

During the period 2002-2011 the publication of the Annual Reports has
been continued as well. This product is not only reporting each working year,
but also archiving all occurrences and developments in EDS, from policy over
events to members. Being a student organisation and thus having a working
year basically coinciding with the academic year, the “Annual Report” likewise
reports the period of twelve months that does not align with a calendar year.
It reflects from the time a new Bureau was elected during the Annual Meeting
at the Summer University until the next such event. As formally the Annual
Meeting being the last piece of the outgoing working year, with the Bureau
granted exoneration here and a new elected, it is exactly the place where the
outgoing leadership is to give back the democratically invested powers to the
Council and report about the activities. Therefore, the Annual Report that
covers the working year except the last event, the Summer University and the
Annual Meeting, remains in this respect inaccurate: It starts reporting with
the last item of the previous year and finishes just before here, one year later.
This should be always kept in mind when reading those publications.
This book is intended to just give some key figures it should be enough for us to state that the Annual Reports have been all published, with more or less punctual delivery to the respective Annual Meeting. At least the Annual Reports 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 have not been disseminated during the meeting on which they should report but far later. Also the usually very big EDS format since the first Annual Report 1996/1997 was changed 2005/2006 to a smaller, handier size. The scope was always around 28-32 pages, thus the Annual Reports 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 with 84, resp. 88 pages have been a big step forward towards more detailed reporting, bringing a milestone to this institution. They both also assembled detailed activity reports not only of EDS, but also of all EDS member organisations. Also it was introduced that EDS would present Bureau reports here according to the specific responsibilities of Bureau members in their respective work area and activities field. From the 15th Annual Report, those of the working year 2010/2011, this publication has, in a similar way to BullsEye, an official Belgian ISBN number and is stored in the National Library of the Kingdom of Belgium. Since EDS is archiving the Annual Reports from the very beginning, we may refer those interested to obtain copies from the EDS office in Brussels. I highly recommend it as a very interesting way to spend a weekend. During dedicated alumni events EDS Bureau tries to disseminate the surplus copies as usually the coverage of 1.000 proves to be quite high. One of the purposes of the Annual Report, to create a stronger identity of the organisation in terms of documenting its own history, has been achieved. It became easy to follow and understanding the activities and policies generated by EDS.

**EDS Book**

Other publications than that, EDS disposed over the decades of some hard copies of the first edition of this book, “Students on the right way”. As the dissemination came to an end in the years 2003 and 2004, a left-over of some books was kept in EDS offices as an archive. They went untouched until the Bureau of 2009/2010 decided to give each Bureau member a copy in order to make themselves acquainted with the history of the organisation they are leading and to use the EDS book as an encyclopaedia934. The XX. Winter University where a number of high profile speakers were met, was used to hand over the book to prominent representatives of political Europe. One of the last remaining copies was given by Bence Bauer as a token of appreciation to the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, after meeting the EDS WinterU participants personally on 24th February 2010.

---

934 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 29th August 2009 in Balatonszászszó, p. 3.
Booklets

In comparison to the BullsEye and the Annual Report, booklets are an alternative when it comes to the publication of a thematically specific topic in the framework of quick, efficient dissemination, not requiring necessarily a complicated preparation or designing process. A booklet thus can be easily compared with a “script” at universities, providing massive content on hand. EDS is this respect again followed academic traditions. To give some examples, EDS delivered to its members first and foremost the Booklet on Higher Education and Research of the respective working group, where former co-chair and later Vice Chairman Jean-Baptiste Dabezies gained extraordinary merits in summarising the state of arts in Europe. The booklet was always serving as a reference model to work with the subjects described. In this respect, the booklet “20 years after” should also be mentioned in that it created the context and the objectives of a commemoration culture that is so vital and crucial in Europe, not only to remember our past and to derive lessons for the future, but also in a well-understood mission function as to foster a common European understanding of our history and to develop further the European Identity. Last but not least, EDS followed another nice tradition, which was the sharing of information and knowledge with regard to concrete skills and abilities. In this field, the EDS Events Booklet was released in April 2011, authored by Chairman Bauer. The booklet assembled in 12 chapters the most important items when it comes to the hosting of big international events. This being one of the key responsibilities within the Bureau, EDS enables committed event organisers to grasp from the professional world of the events, a concrete and really rather fine example of how much EDS can train and educate its members not only in theoretic, but also in practical terms. The booklet was based on the experience the author has won over the years and tries to assist future event organisers. As a serious amount is spent on events each year, the impact and relevance of the topic is for sure quite high.

Campaign materials

Over the reported period also other printed devices have been released and used. First and utmost EDS produced thematic posters for the campaigns. We have to mention here one of the most successful ones, the enlargement campaign in winter 2002/2003. Initiated by Vice Chairmen Miroslav Lopata (ODM Slovakia) and Petr Sokol (MK Czech Republic), a minibus toured around Europe with a European flag that was displayed at places of interest or at universities. Several prominent signatories were won like Jean-Claude
Juncker who signed the flag alongside many more. Finally, the campaign was accompanied by one of the most popular and expressive posters EDS had:
“Study in Malta, work in Estonia, vacation in Greece, retire in Hungary” was the slogan in 2002, grasping the idea how the future would be, in 2011 already being a reality of Europe\textsuperscript{936}.

Mainly online-based tools were used five years later to conduct the campaign “Tibet: Freedom, it’s not a game” to draw public attention in the preparation period of the Olympic Games in China in early summer 2008 towards an important topic of EDS: the global dimension of human rights. The campaign was displaying a Tibetan monk in five Olympic handcuffs. This idea for which largely Vice Chairman Thomas Uhlen (RCDS Germany) was responsible successfully demonstrated how an organisation of democratically committed youngsters like EDS can react on the disputed human rights situation in China. The respective video has been viewed by many visitors and was well appreciated. Similar to this, a “Free Belarus” campaign with posters where hands in wires have been shown was introduced in 2003, with thousands of red flyers “Europe must ban the dictator” – a motto that even today is as topical as it was in 2003 and still a priority in the struggle for a completely free Europe.

Spring 2009 saw the “Have courage to be wise” campaign, concentrating on the adoption of a new Bologna Declaration. The campaign produced a great amount of posters and flyers in two different versions and was overwhelming the XVIII. EPP Congress in Warsaw end of April 2009. The message was to increase budgets for education and foreign students. However this claim became a little bit lost on its own as no major follow up was conducted, which surely for the EPP could have served as ideal ground.

Another, yet smaller campaign in spring 2009 was the leaflet displaying all EDS activists running as candidates for the European Parliament at the EP elections in June 2009. The number was impressive as some 16 individuals could be found, amongst them former Chairman Ana Filipa Janine and later Chairman Bence Bauer. In comparison to 2004, where just two EDS members were running\textsuperscript{937}, these 16 candidates meant a real step forward. Unfortunately, most of them have not been placed on the top places, but the development is positive. However, the need of fostering younger candidates with a clearly European background like all EDS activists have, became evident. A time is coming closer and closer where European Parliament elections will be really about European politics, requiring politicians socialised on the European level and living the idea of European Identity in practice. The Treaty of Lisbon gives all possibilities for this anticipated set-up and our political family must be pre-

\textsuperscript{936} Speech of EDS Chairman Bence Bauer during the 50th Anniversary Celebration on 1st February 2011 in Palais des Académies, Brussels, see BullsEye No 44 (April 2011), p. 23.

\textsuperscript{937} Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 23rd January 2004 in Levi, p. 3.
pared for this challenge. The raise in numbers of EDS activists being on top positions significantly marks a new age for which EDS needs to be prepared. We can expect that in two years’ time, even more EDS people will make it to stand for EP elections, a new situation that is providing many opportunities and might put in place a real Europe-wide campaign of EDS where the organisation can be a frontrunner both in innovation and practical ideas of how to master politics on a European level.

To commemorate the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall, the EDS Bureau engaged in the campaign “20 years after – generation 1989 speaks out” in autumn 2009 where a booklet was published with statements from young people all over Europe being 20 today and some being 20 in 1989. This enterprise was to collect and display how young people perceived the wind of change of 1989 and what was left for us today938. Uniquely, the posters accompanying this campaign were designed 35 times, with every member organisation having its own dedicated poster with its logo and its own national language. These were introduced during the XIX. Congress of the EPP in Bonn and warmly welcomed by the delegates and EDS members. As a hint to modern times, the campaign was supported by the website and social media.

The year 2010 brought the campaign “Youth Unemployment – employ your possibilities” which focused on the critical situation with young academics being without a job and offered solutions how to overcome this phenomenon939. To further establish European politics with European ideas EDS Bureau launched in 2011 the campaign on “European Identity” which comprised a thematic newsmagazine and a detailed policy paper that later on was also adopted by the EPP Political Assembly. No poster was produced, however none other than the poster by Chairman Carl Bildt with simply a European flag, blowing in the clear blue sky, pictured in Gimo (Sweden) would have served this purpose. From this perspective it can be expected EDS will one day continue both graphical idea and political innovation laid down by the idea on European Identity. We just have to think back to the early seventies where ECCS Chairman Ian Taylor pronounced one of the EDS key sentences: “It is time that we recognised our real identity, which is European.” And EDS is basically not doing anything different these days: Educating thousands of youngsters over the years in European politics, socialising students on the European level, and working restlessly for the unification of our continent. Without any European Identity this would simply not be possible. The efforts

938 Newsletter December 2009.
939 Newsletter, May 2010.
of EDS as regards the promotion of a Europe-wide constituency of EDS as regards the promotion of a Europe-wide constituency\textsuperscript{940} in early summer 2011 underline this commitment. Finally, we can say that European Identity in EDS always prevailed to isolationist or nationalist tendencies. Where else than in EDS could it happen that a Turkish delegate\textsuperscript{941} notes with pride that nobody should question Turkey’s European Identity?

As of September 2011, the incoming Bureau decided not to follow the campaign on European Identity, but rather envisaged to set up a new campaign\textsuperscript{942} called “Knowledge is Power”.

For the regular day-to-day business EDS created in autumn 2009 a flyer with a presentation of the organisation and its Bureau. A unified mission statement has been formulated so as to describe the basics of EDS and was posted on the EPP and EDS website as well in the organisation’s Facebook group and on Wikipedia\textsuperscript{943}, thus helping the EDS marketing with the same clear sentences about what is EDS and what is its impact. However thanks to constant growths in membership and activities this text needed to be updated as of July 2011, stating nowadays that with around 1,600,000 students represented, EDS is the biggest youth organisation in Europe.

\textit{Newsletter}

Concerning the more regular information of EDS members and the outside world there have been several plans regarding how to establish a newsletter since the last known newsletter which had at least the minimum standard of regularity was released as newsletter 3/2003 in autumn 2003, after three newsletters in the same design and within an overviewable time span. We once more see an attempt to restore continuous information flow but sadly just one single newsletter edition has been sent by EDS administrator Alessandra Martin in January 2007\textsuperscript{944}. Just two and half years later from this lonely standing newsletter, Bureau managed to initialize an electronic newsletter, to be sent out on the 1\textsuperscript{st} of each month, with the first newsletter sent to the recipients on 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2009. This incentive was largely helped by Vice Chairman Andreas Willersrud (HSF Norway), who was also responsible for communication with the EDS alumni in the preparatory period of the 50\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary, and the first

\textsuperscript{940} The so-called Duff report of British MEP Andrew Duff suggesting the creation of 25 MEP seats on transnational lists in the framework of an EU-wide constituency was much discussed during the Policy Work Days from 12th to 15th May 2011 in Ratrieki/Riga, overwhelmingly supported by EDS, but unfortunately postponed by the EP Plenary early July 2011.

\textsuperscript{941} Sami Cebi (AK Parti Youth Turkey) during the 41st Annual Meeting from 11th July 2011 in Vienna; unfortunately this exact sentence was not minuted but stays in the memory of the author.

\textsuperscript{942} Newsletter, September 2011.

\textsuperscript{943} Created 3rd October 2005 by unknown user and later on updated by Vice Chairmen Janet Barthet, Andreas Willersrud and Matija Magele, see http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=European_Democrat_Students&limit=500&action=history from 30th December 2011.

\textsuperscript{944} “EDS Newsletter January”, sent from Alessandra Martin’s EPP email-address on 22nd January 2007.
alumni dinner on 27th February 2010 in Brussels. His work for the newsletter was assisted by Matija Magerl (HAZ Croatia) who was responsible for the visual content. Thanks to the very high number of contacts he gained and collected, several thousands, a newsletter made sense and has since then on constantly been utilised as a source of first-hand information to all EDS members, partners, alumni, supporters, sponsors, and friends. The database since those times has been constantly updated and EDS is eager to amend it by with the addition of new addresses, especially those of alumni.

**Website**

As regards the EDS website we have seen an interesting process of amelioration and deterioration during the decade in question. Since the end of the last decade of the last century, EDS was in possession of the domain www.edsnet.org – an address that was used on any printed product or on any paraphernalia. However, the .eu domain version of this address had remained since its introduction free and unused. A later Chairman reserved this domain and donated it at the beginning of his term to EDS. As regards the content and design EDS used until 2004 the old structure and ideas laid down

---

945 Newsletter, October 2010.
by Marc-Michael Blum who served as webmaster for the term 2002/2003, after he quit the post of Secretary General (which he had 2001/2002). This included a series of pictograms reminiscent of those used at international airports: As regards creativity and user-friendliness this form of design has not been topped so far. It can be noticed that each Bureau had the understanding to create its “own” website, according to the contemporary and specific (design) viewpoint of the world. Therefore, the agenda point “new website” was for attendees of events during the Millennium Years really nothing new. We find this item uncounted times, but especially in a regard where somebody promised to have “the new website [launching] very soon”. The working years 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 are very symptomatic for this subject on hand: Already in the first Council Meeting the website is an important topic and it was promised to have a new version created. Just by the middle of the working year 2005/2006 administrator Martin Vrátník presented the new website in operation to the Council. This version was used for a good two years, until in November 2007 the Bureau again wanted to launch a new website which happened in April 2008. Finally, the Bureaus 2009/2010 and 2011/2012 completely reshuffled the website and presented again totally new ones which started to be used during the preparation time of the XX. Winter University in Brussels, with strong advertisement beforehand. The new incarnation was launched by Secretary General Samuli Kauranne during the session of the Council Meeting on 17th September 2011 - a version that today is still in use.

**Paraphernalia**

Not strictly related to these questions are paraphernalia which EDS used to have a solid stock of. In the beginning of the described decade, mugs, mouse pads, pens and stickers were produced. Unfortunately this nice tradition was interrupted and only very passionate event organisers bothered to produce such accessories for EDS. UNI France used to have its own printing house where a massive amount of the EDS stickers from the Millennium Years was generated. As for the pin, for the first time in almost ten years EDS Bureaus

---

946 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 30th October 2004 in Riga (correctly: Sigulda), p. 3.
947 Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 11th December 2004 in Warsaw, p. 9; Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 22nd January 2005 in Stockholm, p. 2; Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 19th February 2005 in Frankfurt, p. 4; Minutes of the 5th Council Meeting from 14th May 2005 in Malta, p. 5; Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 29th October 2005 in Bratislava, p. 5; Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 10th December 2005 in Athens, p. 4.
948 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 24th February 2006 in Madrid, p. 2.
949 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 24th November 2007 in Guimarães, p. 4.
950 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 26th April 2008 in Gdaňsk, p. 5.
951 Newsletter November 2009.
952 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 17th September 2011 in Prague, p. 9.
2009/2010 and 2010/2011 reproduced the good old EDS pin that was given to participants and to speakers on the main EDS events – the last one provided to interested alumni during the 50th Anniversary Celebration in Brussels. One exception however was reported: The second Bureau of Jacob Lund Nielsen engaged in a new innovation. As appreciation for the work an individual has invested in EDS, a merit award with gold, silver and bronze pins was shaped to guarantee recognition and an official award. The idea being discussed first in Prague was later on perfected by an “EDS Honours List” document that was adopted by the Council with an unanimous vote. The first and last awarding ceremony took place in the framework of the 33rd Annual Meeting in Zadar. Unfortunately this nice way of saying thank you to event organisers and others with EDS commitment has not been continued. As a last sign that there was somebody still believing in this project we find a hint of the EDS administrator during a meeting of the Bureau claiming to have a decision on the future of this institution – this contribution was the last official note with regard to the Honours List, but yet again a proof that the gold, silver and bronze pins at least physically did exist. Just some three months later we can see EDS Secretary General Anna Anttinen wearing the bronze EDS pin during the EPP Congress in March 2006 in Rome. EDS Bureau 2010/2011 upon initiative of former Chairman Alexandros Sin-ka tried to re-establish a merit category: For alumni willing to contribute to EDS financially, the league of EDS Gold Alumnus, resp. EDS Silver Alumnus was established. This recognition was awarded by EDS Bureau during the 50th Anniversary Celebration in Brussels with a testimonial, however the idea of reproducing golden or silver pins was never re-iterated.

953 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 7th March 2003 in Prague, p. 3.
954 Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 10th May 2003 in Paris, p. 7.
955 A complete list of award winners can be found on page 5-6 in the Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar.
956 Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 10th December 2005 in Athens, p. 3.
957 There are no reports she being awarded with it, however the bronze EDS pin was awarded to Kristiina Kokko from Tukat Kunta Finland for organising the Seminar & Council Meeting in Helsinki & Tallinn, see Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 5.
958 Newsletter, February 2011.
Contribution to other publications

EDS not only conducted its PR via the diverse means of its publications, campaigns or online tools, it also contributed with pieces to other publications, both online and offline. In this respect, there are detailed EDS rationales in the EPP Book, published in 2011, where EDS is described over three pages, this being an important source to look up about EDS as a member association of the EPP\textsuperscript{959}. Also, EDS has constantly had a page in the European Factbook\textsuperscript{960}, published by the Centre for European Studies. Apart from that it was instrumental for EDS to be also present with the same, streamlined version of EDS presentation on the EPP website and the website of all other partner organisations, especially those where EDS bears a membership right (Youth Forum, Robert Schuman Institute, International Young Democrat Union). This is of course also valid for the texts on Wikipedia or EDS’ social media profiles.

Conclusion

When investigating further the different activities EDS had in the fields of public relations one basic item always strikes the observer: Although being in its personnel composition extremely volatile, EDS always managed to publish its set of well-known publications, meaning each year the Annual Report and also each year (one or even more) issues of BullsEye. This fact deserves a positive evaluation as it might be with precedence that an international organisation is more or less reporting about its activities in the framework of a formal report each year, but it is not common at all to regularly publish a newsmagazine and be seriously involved in publishing matters. Both Annual Report and BullsEye follow the academic traditions, one being aligned to the working year which more or less coincides with the academic year, the other assembling articles, opinions and academic exchange on an international level. This is a merit that not many other international organisations can recur to – especially not among political movements. It is also important to stress the different level both on quantity and quality of the newsmagazine during the Millennium Years. Whereas the magazine was published in the beginning of the examined period 2-3 times a year, over the yearly average twice a year, by today, appearing since 2009/2010 four times a year, comprising up to 28-32 pages and assembling a number of different series and well designed articles, BullsEye can be named as an example of how to compose a

\textsuperscript{959} “At Europe’s Service – the Origins and Evolution of the European People’s Party”, p. 183-184.
\textsuperscript{960} European Factbook 2011, p. 56.
professional political newsmagazine in the European arena; which is a thing
EDS can be really proud of.

As for the other items on the PR agenda, the evolution of web 2.0 and
its diverse tools also meant new possibilities for EDS to communicate and
inform efficiently. Campaigns could be disseminated faster and the organisa-
tion’s agenda could be displayed more clearly. However, one should never
under-estimate the importance of political content which is prior to the way
of communicating it. Nevertheless, EDS used the opportunities and more re-
markably, was perceived and heard in Brussels and elsewhere in Europe with
its key messages.

Basic Papers in the Millennium Years

Policy: Manifestos and Basic Programmes

A key area of the work EDS was conducting, and one which allows us
to explore the programmatic and ideological background of this
organisation, is through the organisation’s ‘Manifestos’ and ‘Basic
Programmes’. In the reported period 2002-2011 EDS created two brand
new Basic Programmes, which both in their times have been modern and
innovative.

Basic Programme 2003

The working year 2002/2003 was spent policy-wise largely with the pre-
parations of the new EDS Basic Programme. This venture was in the respon-
sibility of Policy Director Tobias Sjö (FMSF Sweden), calling it basic policy
platform\(^{961}\). Interestingly when these plans were presented to the Council, no
discussion took place and no one asked for the floor\(^{962}\). As this item was not
discussed during the 4\(^{th}\) Council Meeting in Paris, but just on a dedicated
working group during the Summer University in Croatia, one would expect
deep and ideological debates in the 33\(^{rd}\) Annual Meeting which obviously did
not occur. The document was passed with just one abstention and only VAKA
Iceland putting a reservation on the entire document. Other than that, FMSF
Sweden, HSF Norway, Graali Georgia and Kliks Serbia stated their reservation
just on certain parts\(^{963}\). The rewriting of the EDS Basic Programme included
an update on the old programme, amending it by new challenges like terro-
rism and an overwork on security issues. In total the programme comprised
approximately 4,000 words on nine pages.

\(^{961}\) Minutes of the 6th Bureau Meeting from 6th March 2003 in Prague, p. 2-3.
\(^{962}\) Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 7th March 2003 in Prague, p. 3
\(^{963}\) Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar, p. 12.
Basic Programme 2010

For more than six years no changes or discussions had been made to this Basic Document until the new Bureau of 2009/2010 took over. The person responsible for the preparatory work was Vice Chairman for Input Strategies & Working Groups Christian Peuker (RCDS Germany) who managed to draft with the assistance of the three working groups a completely new Basic Programme. The very understanding of this document was to cope with the challenges of those days and to assort the EDS answers according to the triple approach: Higher Education & Research, General Policies as European Policies and Human Rights as Basic Values. This concept was in line with the traditional set-up of the EDS policy work\textsuperscript{964}. After intensive sessions of preparations and a really hot and intense debate the Council adopted the Basic Programme during its meeting in the premises of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Brussels\textsuperscript{965}. The delegates mostly engaged in a debate about the funding of higher education, the Bologna Process, several questions of higher education policies, but also about general politics, e.g. whether liberal values should be also considered, the foreign and security policy, nuclear energy, and the question of state supervision over media. In the end, only CDS Belgium, HAZ Croatia, Kliks Serbia, AG Austria and IRLY Estonia voiced reservations, but just on parts of the document. Other than in 2003, not a single organisation put a reservation on the whole Basic Programme which in the end consisted of 25 pages. The outline was as a base the unaltered first chapter of the Basic Paper from Zadar (The Value of Values) as a first part and as a

---


\textsuperscript{965} Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 27th February 2010 in Brussels, p. 11.
second part detailed proposals according to policy areas that were coinciding with the denomination of the working groups – a clear sign that after years of trial and error, EDS finally has found since 2006/2007 the adequate working group structure, reflecting the main policy fields. Most importantly, in the beginning, as most utmost topic for the organisation, Higher Education and Research was placed with 15 under-chapters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Social Dimension</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding of HEIs</td>
<td>Student participation</td>
<td>University-Business-Relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>ECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification Framework</td>
<td>Diploma Supplement</td>
<td>Life Long Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>European perspective</td>
<td>Student information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the next part, general policies as Policies for Europe follow with six under-chapters amassing 14 under-under-chapters. These fields of general politics have been equally important for EDS as the organisation not only understood itself as specialist in higher education, but more than that EDS wanted to set principles of integration policies of Europe and had much to say in terms of foreign and European relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visa Regimes</th>
<th>Moral and democratic transition in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Policy in the European Union</td>
<td>Public Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and sustainable development</td>
<td>Nuclear energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media censorship</td>
<td>Common Foreign and Security policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Security and Defence Policy</td>
<td>EU and NATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy</td>
<td>European Union-Russian Federation Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Neighbourhood Policy</td>
<td>Enlargement Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the third part, Human Rights were addressed with the following eight chapters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom of Speech, Press, Expression of Opinion</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human trafficking</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and intercultural relations in Europe</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respective parts have been drafted by the three Permanent Working Groups and involved a number of people, bringing the drafting work to the working group sessions. The Basic Programme can be interpreted as a full and coherent compendium about the basic beliefs and convictions of EDS at that time. By purpose of the Bureau it should be a single monumental document that is open for updates at later stages when time has passed by, but should address the key questions for students and young people in Europe in the year 2010 and beyond.

Interestingly, just some months after the adoption of the EDS Basic Programme, the EPP also started the process of reviewing the old EPP Platform from 1992 by completely drafting a new one. First sessions in this regard have been held in March, May and September 2010, with further intensive debates in January, May, June, September and December 2011, to be continued with many meetings of the EPP WG 1 in the course of the year 2012 as preparation of the programme to be presented to the XXI. EPP Congress in Bucharest 2012. EDS could contribute to the discussions and presented a complete part about education and youth as well as higher education and research. It is thus remarkable that the EPP Platform with its approximately 12,000 words is just a little longer than the EDS Basic Document with around 10,000 words. When it comes to the variety of policy fields displayed, the comprehensiveness of the EDS document proves to be thanks to the detailed fine-tuning by the time of the formation on a very high and advanced level.

However it can be noted that the controversial debates we know from EDS in the nineties around the Manifesto from 1993 have not taken place anymore in the Millennium Years. The discussions were limited to some interchange of different views and as last step to a formulation of reservations on the very meeting of the adoption. Neither before nor after this moment

---

did EDS members voice criticism or antipathies. This can be explained in a negative manner by the lacking political activity of EDS, but on the other side we can observe something much more positive: European integration was much more advanced and incentives to create common ground and ties have been largely more accepted than before. This also explains why very often the subject of reservations from 2003 and 2010 have been specific policy matters that can be viewed this or that way, whereas the hot struggles of the times before very often related to the scope and intensity of integration.

**Politics: Higher Education**

In the field of Higher Education we see a very diverse picture. As Higher Education and Research was one of the key issues of EDS, uncounted motions have been passed during the years. Most notably, EDS was dealing with the question of the Bologna Process. But several other important items have been dealt with, for instance a very detailed motion on “Laying the foundations for a Digital Tomorrow” was passed in the working year 2001/2002, addressing the impacts the internet can have on our societies fostering knowledge, information and communication\(^{967}\). Furthermore, financing of higher education institutions was prevalent for EDS, however a constant fight could be seen between those ultra-liberals claiming for no public funds for universities and a more traditional view. However, the Higher Education Policy Paper dated May 2003 prescribed a role for the state even in financing higher education. It also seconded the importance of university relations to the private sector and a proper student representation. However, this paper was never officially adopted at any Council Meeting.

EDS was also present at the 9th UNESCO/NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education in Paris, 6th-8th April 2005 and presented its work and its convictions as regards higher education policies. Also, EDS positions were introduced during the 10th Anniversary Conference of the Bologna Process which was organised as ministerial meeting in Budapest/Vienna in March 2010. On this occasion, the EDS Chairman alongside some Bureau members could participate in the debates\(^{968}\).

To find out more about the student representation system in each country from which EDS has a member, the PWG Higher Education and Research with the initiative of co-chair Thomas Thaler (AG Austria) conducted a survey about how student elections are organised, how the members relate to student representation, and how this is helped.

\(^{968}\) Newsletter, April 2010.
The Working Group on Higher Education under the tenure of co-chair Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (UNI France), 2006-2008, created a comprehensive booklet on Higher Education and Research in Europe, amassing core knowledge about most relevant questions. The booklet was rewritten under the Vice Chairmanship of Jean-Baptiste Dabezies (2009-2011) and published in its last and current version during the XXXIV. Summer University in Žilina. It features an overview about the Higher Education landscape with Bologna Process, EU Programmes and the Lisbon Strategy and introduces 16 topics alongside the 15 most important actors. These topics are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A more transparent degree structure</th>
<th>ECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications Framework</td>
<td>Quality Assurance, Accountability and Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Dimension</td>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral studies</td>
<td>Social dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Context</td>
<td>Employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td>Erasmus Mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempus</td>
<td>7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that for seven out of the mentioned 16 core topics EDS developed its standpoint and position on the level of its 2010 Basic Programme. This is a very comprehensive and high-profile paperwork dealing with the questions of Higher Education and Research. But it should be also mentioned that the booklet was pointing out important developments in Europe and analysing them, also pronouncing EDS convictions like mobility, employability, European Identity, non-formal training in student and youth organisations and diversity of the education area.

In the framework of higher education EDS also took care of Erasmus students\(^{969}\), condemned affirmative action, supported the EHU Minsk stu-

---

dents, and took a clear stand in favour of Bachelor graduates. Around the 5th anniversary of the Bologna Process EDS presented a detailed list of suggestions for how to support the Bologna Process and to overcome difficulties in seven points, namely with a collaboration between higher education institutions, the national administration and the economy firstly, moreover improving Socrates and Erasmus programmes, a better information campaign already in secondary schools, a flexibility in keeping old degrees, an overall implementation of the ECTS system, the autonomy of universities and last but not least a useful amendment of studies by the Diploma Supplement. In the working year 2006/2007 a focus has been placed again on the funding and investments, the European Higher Education Area as well on the social dimension of the Bologna Process. The question of other aspects has also been deeply analysed like mobility and university-business cooperation. The latter has been accentuated more clearly with developing it to include the research community, just one year later. Also, the question of whether the IT technology has been touched, the questions of internships and work experiences, the employability and the promotion of non-formal learning processes. Also in the very beginning of the financial crises, EDS highlighted the impact on higher education with a dedicated seminar and a conference resolution. The working year 2009/2010 saw in the field of higher education three very well elaborated and detailed motions on Europe 2020, Bologna Process and Youth Unemployment, the latter two have been just three days after adoption admitted and voted on unanimously in the EPP Political Assembly at the very same place, in Vilnius. In the next working year 2010/2011 special emphasis was put on new challenges like Digital Media in Higher Education and Research with a European Perspective or Higher Education in Times of Crises, both also accepted by the EPP Political Assemblies upon the proposal of EDS as official EPP policies. These have been amended by the specific question of budget cuts and the European Baccalaureate, a totally new item on the EDS agenda. Until the end of the calendar year 2011, EDS adopted motions as regards the support of internet voting in student elections and free student elections, claiming for a system of political student representation.

970 BullsEye No 31 (February 2006), p. 16-17.
974 Minutes from the 3rd Council Meeting from 26th April 2008 in Gdańsk, p. 3.
976 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 13th December 2008 in Trier, p. 8.
980 Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 17th September 2011 in Prague, p. 5-6.
all over Europe. Finally, a clear standpoint was formulated in favour of student involvement in all stages of decision-making in higher education institution bodies\textsuperscript{981}.

**Visions: The case of Europe**

EDS was always a pro-integration organisation taking a lead and a clear stand in policies that at the time EDS fostered them were unheard but later proved to be the right ones. Within this widely accepted understanding of how EDS policies should look, challenging, pioneering and fostering a wider and deeper Europe, a number of visions have been formulated over the Millennium Years. Most notably, they dealt with the questions of enlargement, cutting down barriers and uniting Europe. But also a couple of foreign and security policy relevant documents have been launched, alongside with the questions of democratic transition in Europe, mostly around the anniversaries of 1989. Moreover, a constant topic was how to Europeanise politics, most importantly European politics and what students and young people can do to promote the European idea.

More in detail, EDS deliberated on the EU Common Security Policy and already from the very beginning, had endorsed the disarmament of Iraq\textsuperscript{982}, not a typical topic, but underlining the importance the future of Europe and a strong trans-atlantic alliance played for EDS. EDS also presented a detailed paper on Multi-Speed Integration in the EU, stating that “multi-stage implementation of policies in suitable areas, following a formalised process that results from intergovernmental agreements. Multi-speed development thus becomes a tool for improvement, not for exclusion\textsuperscript{983}.”

Also, constantly the situation of Belarus with the focus on human rights and the situation of young people and especially politically active students was for a long time the centre of attraction\textsuperscript{984}. Additionally, we see how even other items have been constantly introduced, like concerning the political development of Russia\textsuperscript{985} and its policies towards neighbours or the European approach in all its faces or even the question of visa liberalization – the latter with involved countries varying according to the change of the status of visa regimes. We see this matter dealt with a multiple times, claiming for a liberalization of visa regimes of different citizens, always taking liberal positions\textsuperscript{986}.

\textsuperscript{981} Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 10th December 2011 in Marseille, p. 4.
EDS took an active stand on the rights of the people from Central Eastern Europe to become fully integrated members of the common house Europe with a special pronunciation on the importance to work after the political and economic transition also for the benefit of a moral transition in order these democracies develop to completely functioning civil societies and thus can act as self-confident countries in the European arena\textsuperscript{987}. A special emphasis was put on the necessity of credibility both in internal and external relations.

Questions of foreign and security policy have been coped with in the organisation in a well-understood sense of supporting the European and Euro-Atlantic integration of a row of European countries, at the moment situated outside the European Union or NATO borders. It was always essential for EDS to remind about the people living on the other side of the fence, deprived from all the immense possibilities of political and personal liberties their fellow colleagues from free Europe have and thus to support them in their endeavour to become fully respected European citizens in a Europe open for everybody\textsuperscript{988}.

Another important item was the strengthening of European integration by the means of stronger affiliation and confidence of the people in the EU and its institutions. The general aim EDS followed here was to increase European Identity and the feeling of acting together in our European house, especially amongst young people\textsuperscript{989}.

EDS was also strongly pre-occupied with the situation of Human Rights in Europe and also on a global scale, everywhere where those were infringed. Apart from obvious and repeated cases of Belarus and Russia, and today even Ukraine, we see a number of other countries put in the spotlight: China (December 2005), Cuba (February 2006), Kenya (February 2008), again China (February 2008 and once more in July 2008), Turkmenistan (July 2008), Congo (December 2008), Afghanistan (April 2009), Libya (April 2011) and Saudi Arabia (April 2011) and in general in struggling democracies (September 2010). Therefore, the newly set-up respective working group produced a series of motions as regards this important subject. The Arab Spring in the year 2011 has proven that EDS was right with its constant cause for democracy, freedom and human rights. There are universal human rights indeed and they have to be validated also on the southern shores of the Mediterranean.

We can conclude that EDS kept its tradition to highlight critical developments and to offer comprehensive solutions on a number of issues.

Especially the proposals for a visa-free Europe which is crucially important for students and the support for integration not only in geographic, but in terms of politics and also attitude of the people have proven to be at the forefront of future developments of Europe. The incentives presented to foster European understanding and European ideas in politics have also caught attention of the outside world and especially the EPP. The visions about Europe were constantly disseminated to all partners and contacts EDS disposed of. However, the traditionally enhanced open border narrative did not play the eminent role it once had any more. This may be grounded on a serious amelioration of the European situation, but should be considered at least in the framework of a commemoration culture. The attempts in this direction with introducing a memorial during important days or the placing of wreaths e.g. at the Ronald Reagan Bust can be seen as a way to keep the memory of young people today alive. For EDS it was always important not only to shape the future with its views, but also to derive the lessons from history and to make the European Dream true by perfecting the policies and politics of our continent.

**Conclusion**

EDS is clearly an organisation of and for students. This being a fact, the policies reflected the self-understanding of EDS to be the voice of European students and the transmitter towards the most important political family in Europe, the EPP. Several generations of EDS activists have shaped new ideas of higher education policies in the framework of EDS. What is especially prevalent what the constant input EDS could give to the European debate, thus stimulating higher education decision makers, but also to make other politicians listen to the case of the students. It is extraordinarily an asset to have the biggest political student organisation which later in 2011 became the biggest youth organisation in Europe, to take a clear stand in favour of the much disputed Bologna Process. EDS never criticised without a solid grounding in fact, never obstructed, but always helped debate with providing accurate information and facts. In this respect, the EPP’s higher education policies have been dominated by EDS, and the views and standpoints could therefore be implemented in diverse forums on the European level.

With EDS being a frontrunner for European integration we can follow a remarkable series of outspoken pro-European policies within the general politics department of EDS, mostly via the working groups on (first) Future of an Enlarged Europe and Agenda for the Central-Right and (later) Policies
for Europe. These have been mostly dealing with the enlargement, integration, democratisation processes, human rights and often with the need for a united Europe, making borders disappear and bringing all Europeans full liberties. With its policies outreaching the purely student world, EDS could address many more questions and hot topics on the continent. Looking in the past at the sixties, seventies, eighties or nineties we always witness political statements calling for resolute action – and at those times, EDS really had exclusively student organisations as members. Without the clear visions on e.g. One Europe, direct EP elections, united European party or the call on tearing down the Iron Curtain long before Ronald Reagan, Europe would be today much poorer. EDS contributed to the debates and even suggested in 2011 a revolutionary notion: The stronger role of European Identity and pan-European political debate, the direct election of the EU Commission President, thoughts to create better cohesion and identity within the European citizens, a proposal which later on even leading politicians supported all over the continent.

However, some members argued that this broadening of policies should not dismantle the key competence of EDS, higher education and student issues, as EDS is mostly a student organisation. Some others argued that EDS as a political organisation on the centre-right has a historical mission as the oldest of any of the European centre-right movements to formulate ideas for a united Europe, this being also key campaigns in earlier days. To tell it frankly, both opinions are right and they are also not contradictory: EDS as a vari-
ous and manifold organisation of political students has so much to give in terms of laying down expertise on both student and European issues. Healthy proportion and balanced action are the prerequisites for a success where all the broad and colourful members of EDS are equally included. It is therefore the ambition of all EDS members to work together on these objectives.

External Relations

Party Relations:
A steady partner of the European People’s Party

The year 2002 was historical. It not only marked the 5th Anniversary of EDS being admitted as an EPP Association which was celebrated on 16th October, but also the integration of another old organisation bearing the name “Democrat” into the European People’s Party (EPP).

Congresses

During the XV. EPP Congress in Estoril the European Democrat Union (EDU) was successfully merged into the EPP. This happened on 17th October 2002, one day difference after the anniversary of EDS being adopted officially as part of the EPP family. At that point, EPP changed the statutes to also accept member parties from countries being in the Council of Europe, meaning that EU-membership of the country was thus not a prerequisite any more. With this move, EPP incorporated this EDU tradition in its own rules990. To make the EDU-integration complete, the last EDU Chairman, Finn Sauli Niinistö was granted the title of Honorary President of the EPP as recognition of his efforts towards the successful agreement between the two parties. It should be noted however that this process of absorbing did not result in the termination of the EDU as at least nominally it still exists but halted all its activities and operation of structures in agreement with the EPP. As of 2008, the EPP was accepted as a regional unit of the International Democrat Union (IDU) next to the EDU. Very unfortunately this did not hinder the IDU- (and EDU-) members ODS from Czech Republic and the British Conservatives to leave the European parliamentary group of the EPP-ED (European People’s Party – European Democrats991) in June 2009. It is however important to note that in the youth world the other organisations having the “Democrat” background took different paths: Where the IYDU managed to be as youth-wing of the IDU with

991 The name “Democrat” stays a reference base for European party-cooperation beyond the pure Christian-Democratic world as it associates the inclusion of Conservatives and Liberals.
EDS as an active and committed member in close contact with EPP-affiliated organisations from Europe, DEMYC lost many members and turned to insignificance. We should however not fail to mention in this part of the book the merits of the last EDU Chairman who later in 2006, was candidate for the position of the President of Finland, but defeated by a narrow margin. Niinistö took nevertheless in the year 2007 the post of the Speaker of the Parliament and ran again for President of Finland a second time where he got elected President of his country. EDS followed his candidacy very closely\textsuperscript{992}.

For EDS the above described de-facto-merger of the EDU into the EPP proved to be a true fulfilment of all political aspirations. As EDS was founded with the motivation to establish a non-socialist student movement and to work actively for the unification of Europe, it was an organisation always advocating for a cooperation between, and mutual aid of, centre-right political forces. The students understood it from the beginning much more than adult politicians how important it is to unite all efforts against the socialist threat. Therefore EDS was also about fostering the exchanges and collaborations between Christian-Democrats, Conservatives, and Liberals, with a very clear distinction and border to populists. In this respect, it was also EDS that was a driving force behind the formation of the EDU back in 1978 as an inclusive and wide political formation of all the European centre-right. With bringing this idea of inclusiveness to the all-European stage EDS could finally be an association of the EPP and in this role it was just a logical step to call for uniting EPP with EDU. This occurred five years after EDS assumed the role as the EPP student branch. We can say that in 2002, EDU found home or EPP found home - it was for both a way home to each other, closing the old chapters of rivalries and competition and opening new horizons to become the strongest

\textbf{EDS with EPP President Martens}

\textsuperscript{992} Newsletter, November 2011.
and most influential political player. EDS had an eminent role in this process and proved to be on the right side of history.

To note all the manifold aspects of the relationship to the European People’s Party it is prevalent to introduce the actions and achievements of EDS throughout its relationship with the EPP. The last EDU meeting with EDS participation, the EDU Steering Committee, convened in Helsinki on 27th September 2002 and coincided with the EDS Seminar & Council Meeting in Tallinn & Helsinki. EDS Chairman Jacob Lund Nielsen and Policy Director Tobias Sjö attended the event, where the last formalities on the way to the EPP-merger were discussed. Just three weeks later the aforementioned XV. EPP Congress in Estoril began.

During the XV. EPP Congress in Estoril EDS was present with its Bureau, alongside Directors, in a 12-person-delegation. The 4th Bureau Meeting was due to the intensive Congress and a location more than 300 kilometres away, held overnight from Saturday to Sunday993. The Bureau Meeting concurred that EDS achieved great successes as there had been personal meetings with EU Commissioner Viviane Reding, and due to a well-located EDS stand, many good contacts made. As positive achievement the speech of EDS Chairman Jacob Lund Nielsen was seen who stated that in the minds and hearts of the young generation of Europeans enlargement had already taken place994. However it was noted that the EDS Bureau should have prepared amendments to the congress documents995.

As the next such huge enterprise, Brussels was the host of the XVI. EPP Congress, from 4th to 5th February 2004, just some weeks before the EDS Winter University in the same place. The preparation was very intense for both important venues. EDS Bureau debated at length how long the Chairman’s speech should be and which topics should be covered. Learning from the experiences of Estoril, this time the Bureau presented two resolutions to the EPP Congress996, one on Higher Education and one on Belarus, both being passed. It was also due to the venue in Brussels and the fact EDS Secretary General Brecht Tessier was a candidate at the EP elections for the Flemish Christian-Democrats CD&V that the logistical feet EDS could stand on in Brussels were strong: More than 20 EDS participants joined and presented with the EDS Bureau an attractively equipped EDS stand with mouse pads, BullsEye and other EDS materials. During this meeting, EDS provided the official tellers in the persons of Dimitris Terzis and Todor Gunchev. Alexandros

993 Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 20th October 2002 (starting 0.25 h in the night) in Porto, p. 1.
995 Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 20th October 2002 in Porto, p. 2.
Sinka as EDS Chairman concentrated in his speech to the congress delegates on making the EPP the majority in the Europe of twenty-five\textsuperscript{997}.

The XVII. EPP Congress took place in Rome on 30\textsuperscript{th} and 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2006 as the 30\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary Celebration of the European People’s Party. Here, the well-known logo with the bridge was introduced\textsuperscript{998}, replacing the stylised


\textsuperscript{998} Thomas Jansen / Steven Van Hecke: At Europe’s service - The Origins and Evolution of the European People’s Party, p. 133.
E-letter. EDS was present with a huge delegation of 24 members who were engaged as helpers and tellers. The EDS caught the attention of high standing personalities and the EDS Bureau managed to have pictures taken with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, and Austrian Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel. Unfortunately there is nothing reported as to whether the EDS Chairman managed to deliver a speech to the Congress or not.

Three years later, for the XVIII. EPP Congress in Warsaw, 29th and 30th April 2009 EDS delivered a high-ranking side conference with the participation of Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Radosław Sikorski as a keynote speaker. Also others like Stephan Raabe, Director of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Poland and EPP Vice President Peter Hintze addressed the EDS delegates. Also Jan Figel, EU Commissioner for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture was met personally, alongside Vice Minister for Infrastructure Radosław Stepień. The approximately 40 EDS participants could also attend the EPP Congress featuring speeches from almost all EPP heads of government, including from non-EU countries. Although no resolution was tabled and the EDS Chairman did not have a separate speech on the agenda, the massive presence of EDS people created a very positive impact towards the relations with the EPP, as many of them were also assisting at the registration desks.

At the end of the year, EPP convened again for its XIX. Congress, taking place from 9th – 10th December 2009 in Bonn. EDS was present with a 15-strong
delegation and also assisted EPP in providing the tellers and helpers. The EDS stand featured a set of EDS materials and especially the new 20 years after campaign, alongside the freshly published BullsEye, which was synchronised in release time and content with the aforementioned campaign. The EDS Chairman presented this new incentive to the EPP Congress in his speech and underlined the importance to stay committed for the idea of “One Europe”. He described the vision how 20 years after 2009 Europe could look like: In EDS’s views, Europe would be a powerful voice in the world, with full re-unification of the continent and the removal of all kinds of barriers. At the end of the Congress, EDS delegates voted for the new EPP Presidency, giving important votes to the future leadership.

From 7th-8th December 2011 the XX. EPP Congress was organised in Marseille. The event was remarkable as more than 2,000 guests from all over Europe attended, including the top leaders of Europe and the member states. 74 EDS people were present as well since already before, EDS Council decided upon proposal of Bureau1000 to coincide the 2nd Council Meeting with the EPP Congress. This absolute number of EDS participation was a historical record and topped by the fact that EDS provided many of the helpers, both French and international ones. Juraj Antal, the new EDS Chairman formulated in his well acknowledged speech a historical claim: EDS called for a direct election of the President of the European Commission and the President of the European Council, with the creation of a single European electorate, the so much dreamt-about single European demos.

1000 Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 18th December 2010 in Berlin, p. 4.
**Political Assemblies**

Besides the Congresses, EDS took active advantage of its position as association, since December 2009 due to a re-naming as member association. A series of actions could be undertaken in the Political Bureaus (since December 2009: Political Assembly) that mostly took place in Brussels. It is reported that the EDS Chairmen attended these important gatherings of the EDS mother party, especially since they are viable in terms of lobbying and presenting the organisation on the European stage successfully. In November 2008 Chairman Thomas Uhlen delivered a power-point presentation about EDS during the EPP Political Bureau 13th-14th November 2008, followed by comments from EPP President Martens and EPP Secretary General Lopez-Isturiz. Just over one year later EDS Chairman Bence Bauer presented the plans for re-introducing the Winter University in Brussels to the EPP Political Assembly on 4th-5th February 2010 with a detailed presentation, an objective that was warmly received among the political leaders there. He also highlighted the most relevant fields of activities of EDS and answered many positive and interested observations. To keep EPP updated, Juraj Antal informed them about his Bureau’s incentives and activities at the Political Assembly taking place in 7th-8th November 2011.

In the year 2010 EDS started to regularly present resolutions to the EPP Political Assembly. During two calendar years, those of 2010 and 2011, in total five EDS resolutions have been adopted with unanimity and thus became official EPP positions. This success clearly demonstrates that EDS can make the difference and is able, with good policies and smart ideas, to influence the debate and decision making on the European stage with good results. The adopted resolutions have been disseminated via EDS and EPP.


It is remarkable that besides the usual Higher Education standpoints EDS was successful in introducing a resolution about general policy and politics in the Assembly: The resolution in European Identity and EP elections was an innovation itself, calling for a stronger need of a European wide debate and campaign.

---

1001 Minutes of the EPP Political Bureau Meeting from 13th-14th November 2008, p. 6.
1002 Newsletter, March 2010.
1003 Newsletter, December 2010.
1004 Newsletter, March 2011.
1005 Newsletter, October 2011.
EPP Working Groups

The same activity applies also for the three permanent working groups of the EPP\textsuperscript{1006} where regular EDS participation could help to strengthen the links between EDS and EPP. Not only were these occasions useful to present EDS as a committed member association, but the immense impact on mutual exchange and synchronisation of political action should never be underestimated. A perfect example of how to utilise synergies, e.g. with EPP WG 3 was the membership application of the Liberal-Democratic Party from Moldova (PLDM) which EDS followed and simultaneously undertook study trips to the youth wing TLDM over the course of the working year 2010/2011. Around the time of PLDM’s EPP accession the youth organisation TLDM joined EDS\textsuperscript{1007}. It has already been described, the great importance EDS played in the policy debates taking place in the EPP WG 1. The EPP Platform was amended by EDS proposals on education and youth as well as higher education and research. Furthermore, the platform was inspired by some of the policies EDS was following in its Basic Programme or at other points in its policy over the years.

The Participation in the European Student and Youth Cooperation

In this topic, two important organisations should be mentioned to which EDS had quite an ambivalent relation. First and utmost EDS as a founding member of the European Youth Forum\textsuperscript{1008} (Youth Forum Jeunesse) as has kept an active membership ever since. Secondly, over the years, the question of cooperation with the National Union of Students in Europe (ESIB), later European Students’ Union was often discussed.

European Students’ Union

We can witness a vivid discussion in the EDS Bureau\textsuperscript{1009} about how to get closer to ESIB. Interestingly, even people well represented in student structures believed in the myth that EDS could ever join ESIB – when the reality should have been clear. Maybe the fact that some of them have been

\textsuperscript{1006} EPP WG 1 on European Policy; EPP WG 2 on Economic and Social Policy; EPP WG 3 on Membership.
\textsuperscript{1007} EDS is being linked on the starting site of the official website of the mother party PLDM.
\textsuperscript{1008} Abbreviated YFJ, not to use as EYF and to mix with the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe.
\textsuperscript{1009} Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 23rd January 2004 in Levi, p. 3.
active in this regard led them to this mistake. The fact is that ESIB (now: ESU) as the umbrella organisation of the student unions of European countries is a strictly non-partisan interest representation. EDS is an umbrella organisation of student (and youth) organisations from the centre-right. As such, ESIB cannot accept EDS as a member since it only has national student councils as members, and no party-political or any private organisations whatsoever. The only way of being active in ESIB is to achieve majorities in the single national ESIB members but this requires strong coordination and activities of all the EDS members.

European Youth Forum

As regards the European Youth Forum the picture is very clear: EDS played an active role and was regularly sending delegates. However observing the approach of EDS we see some shyness in taking part in YFJ activities with full commitment. EDS played a more passive role and on multiple occasions supported DEMYC or YEPP candidates for positions. We can immediately see three candidates, all endorsed by YEPP, in favour of whom EDS withdrew from its ambitions to nominate representatives for the YFJ Board. For the YFJ board elections on the General Assembly from 15th – 17th November 2002 in Malta the original EDS candidate, Vice Chairman Alexandros Sinka (Protoporia Cyprus) was withdrawn in order to support with joint energies YEPP candidate Sidonia Jędrezejewska from Poland. We know – however – that despite this support, Sidonia did not manage to get elected. Just two years later it was reported that Chairman Alexandros Sinka wanted to engage in a candidature a second time, as did Brecht Tessier (Secretary General from 2003-2004). Here again, EDS did not nominate anybody in order to boost the centre-right candidate from YEPP, Ines Prainsack. Unfortunately, Ines was also not successful in her bid. Obviously no political action was tried anymore by any of the centre-right organisations as Chairwoman Ana Filipa Janine comments about the YFJ General Assembly simply that “It was very useful for the network” [to meet with representatives of DEMYC and YEPP] at the General Assembly. In the year 2008 we can see for the third time unconditional support for a YEPP candidate for the YFJ board when Vice Chairwom-

---

1010 As example of EDS activists being related to ESIB (or ESU) business: Relika Alliksaar from RPJ Estonia, Satu Arsalo from Tuhatkunta Finland, Márton Schöberl from Fidesz IT Hungary, Janet Barath from SDM Malta or Bernhard Knall from AG Austria.
1011 Booklet on Higher Education and Research, July 2010.
1012 Decision done by the EDS Bureau on proposal of Alexandros Sinka, Jacob Lund Nielsen and Roberta Tedesco Triccas, see Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 20th October 2002 in Porto, p. 4.
1013 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 26th to 29th August 2004 in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, p. 5.
1014 Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 10th December 2004 in Warsaw, p. 6.
1015 Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 8th December 2006 in Nicosia, p. 3.
an Andrea Solomonidou declared in the Bureau Meeting that “on the YEPP meeting in Lithuania\textsuperscript{1016} YEPP, DEMYC and EDS agreed upon supporting Xenia Konstantinou\textsuperscript{1017}”, a campaign that at last was crowned by success. Still it is more than remarkable why EDS, one of the founders of the European Youth Forum, the oldest centre-right organisation of any kind in Europe, representing many hundred thousands of students, did not have the courage or the resolute intention to put forward its own candidate in the race. At all possible times, candidates from YEPP were supported. This did not change at all when in November 2011, a former DEMYC Vice Chairwoman, Serbian Mia Magazin, was successfully supported in her bid for the advisory board on youth of the Council of Europe.

As the most remarkable success in relations with the Youth Forum we can note the fact that during the General Assembly from 18\textsuperscript{th} to 21\textsuperscript{st} November 2010 in Kiev, the three centre-right organisations EDS, YEPP and DEMYC agreed one very fundamental thing: They came along acting always together no matter what happens, to decide jointly and to stick to those decisions. With this attitude, they managed to have a decisive say in who should be the new YFJ President. The margin was super-narrow, and after discussions, the triumvirate gave their support to Slovenian Peter Matjašič, thus guaranteeing him 93 votes. He was elected with a less than 50 votes difference – if EDS decided the other way round, the YFJ President 2010-2012 would have another name\textsuperscript{1018}. One must mention here the noble attitude of DEMYC Chairman Jani Johansson, who in discussion and decision supported the other candidate but stuck to the previously agreed principle and gave the DEMYC votes to the mutually voted and thus agreed choice. It can be hard to imagine that only half a year before this YEPP was seriously thinking of leaving YFJ forever and even proposed in the framework of a formal session of EDS to withdraw from the YFJ\textsuperscript{1019}, before even the mandate of YEPP-endorsed YFJ Vice Chairwoman Xenia Konstantinou was over. At least, EDS could bring in a representative to one of the YFJ working groups: As of March 2011 Sandra Falkowska, the editor-in-chief of the BullsEye magazine was appointed regular member of the YFJ working group on Eastern Europe and the Caucasus\textsuperscript{1020}, the only representation the centre-right has in that moment in any YFJ structure. Later in 2011, EDS supported DEMYC-endorsed Mia Magazin for the Advisory Council on Youth of the Council of Europe\textsuperscript{1021}. The bid was successful, thus there is centre-right representation in this important body once more.

\textsuperscript{1016} Taking place from 4th to 7th September 2008 in Vilnius.
\textsuperscript{1017} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{1018} Newsletter, December 2010.
\textsuperscript{1019} Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 8th May 2010 in Vilnius, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{1020} Newsletter, April 2011.
\textsuperscript{1021} Newsletter, December 2011.
Cooperation with International Organisations

YEPP

As a first point we should elaborate on the relations with the other youth organisation within the EPP, the Youth of the European People’s Party (YEPP). As YEPP was formed in spring 1997 and was adopted as an EPP association at the same time as EDS, both had an understanding of healthy competition in terms of ideas and activities. It was always a well-understood courtesy to share experiences and to invite the Chairman of EDS to YEPP events and vice versa. However, joint political actions or even common events have not taken place regularly. The last such commonly organised meeting reported was during the 2002 Winter University in Brussels. However, incoming YEPP President Laurent Schouteten vaguely proposed to incoming EDS Chairman Bence Bauer in September 2009 the possibility of such joint-ventures. Although this offer was repeated from the side of EDS, the follow up from the YEPP side never happened. Instead, DEMYC approached EDS with such an idea. During the tenures 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 the mutual visits of the leaders of EDS and YEPP have been the general rule: the EDS Chairman participated at the YEPP seminars in The Hague in September 2009, in Sofia in February 2010, in Riga in July 2010, in Sarajevo in September 2010 and finally in Caserta in February 2011. The YEPP President visited the EDS events in Stockholm in October 2009, in Brussels in February 2010, in Vilnius in May 2010, in Berlin in December 2010 through a representative and finally during the 50th Anniversary Celebration in Brussels in February 2011. From Schouteten’s side it was stated that he “can’t remember that it has ever happened before [that there is] such a good relationship between the two young organisations EDS and YEPP.”

DEMYC

With DEMYC the situation was dramatically different: As both EDS and DEMYC were previously affiliated to the EDU, but nowadays since only EDS is associated to the EPP, there is naturally no competition between the two. Nevertheless, EDS maintained a friendly relationship with DEMYC although the influence of latter constantly decreased – especially after the constitutional

1022 Letter of congratulations from YEPP President Laurent Schouteten to EDS Chairman Bence Bauer from 20th September 2009 mentioned “joint events”.
1023 Proposal of DEMYC Chairman Jani Johansson and Vice Chairman Konstantinos Kyranakis on the EDS Bureau Meeting, see Minutes of 1st Bureau Meeting from 23rd/24th July 2010 in Žilina, p. 4.
1024 In Berlin, First Vice President Thomas Schneider addressed the Council Meeting in the German Parliament.
1025 Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 27th February 2010 in Brussels, p. 3.
crises following the Congress in April 2008. A couple of members left DEMYC and the participation was very low. As mentioned above, EDS was approached to co-organise an event with DEMYC in spring 2011 in Hungary. What started with the idea of a joint project between equals soon turned out to be a regular, yet huge, EDS Seminar & Council Meeting with an approximate number of 20 DEMYC guests. As Chairman Jani Johansson stated, this initiative was the first common meeting for 35 years and he very much hoped that very soon it can be repeated1026.

IYDU

Another organisation where EDS bears membership rights as a co-founder and even regional unit, is the International Young Democrat Union (IYDU), the youth wing of the IDU and the global centre-right umbrella organisation for centre-right youth. It is remarkable that EDS was constantly participating, but never played a major role, apart from once, at the time of the founding, when EDS became ex officio, as a regional member1027, part of the Executive Committee of IYDU in March 1991. In contrast to EDS, the IYDU meetings always stayed very exclusive in terms of the financial barriers to attendance: No participation fee was payable, but delegates had to cover the costs for accommodation and board themselves1028. In the middle of the Millennium Years, Dimitris Terzis was Vice Chairmen of IYDU and some EDS members, especially from the Mediterranean region, always showed a big interest in IYDU. In the working year 2009/2010 the EDS Bureau tried to set up a brand-new initiative to bring EDS member organisations closer to each other and to foster European Identity and compassion for our common house of Europe. It was suggested to nominate a European candidate (or even more such) for the upcoming elections in Berlin during the Congress 25th – 29th November 2009. Although the idea was quite charming and – as the Congress being in the middle of Europe – a proper European representation feasible, due to the huge organisational work load with EPP Congress, CM in Israel and WU in Brussels, the EDS Bureau decided instead to follow this innovation next year1029. EDS decided to observe the Berlin happenings, but was extremely disappointed by the procedural approach and attitude of IYDU officials. Vice Chairman Andreas Perotti, responsible for External Relations & Memberships, simply called it a “catastrophe1030”. In the year 2010, a new attempt was made and Chairman Bauer was granted a full mandate1031 to start negotiations in

1026 Minutes from the 4th Council Meeting from 9th April 2011 in Budapest, p. 2.
1028 For a 5-day meeting in London this can easily end up with several hundred British Pounds.
1029 Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 7th-8th November 2009 in Paris, p. 4.
1030 Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 4th December 2009 in Jerusalem, p. 4.
1031 Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 23rd-24th July 2010 in Žilina, p. 4.
the light of the upcoming IYDU Council Meeting in London 1\textsuperscript{st} – 4\textsuperscript{th} December 2010, but also here, a unified European bid could not be realised, mostly because of some EDS members active in IYDU were protective of their solid positions. In this respect EDS to some extent reflected European real (party) politics, with similar struggles. These should not dismantle the massive positive possibilities EDS gained via its membership in this global youth organisation.

\textit{Robert Schuman Institute}

EDS derived much more benefit from the 4\textsuperscript{th} organisation where it was member: The Robert Schuman Institute with its seat in the Hungarian capital Budapest. This respected institution provides training for young people from Eastern Europe and the Balkan region on democracy-building, civil society, European integration and institutions and international affairs. EDS as member was always invited both sending participants and contributing to the programme. This opportunity was first used in the working year 2008/2009 where Budapest-based Vice Chairman Bauer delivered speeches and presentations in the various courses. This cooperation was kept in the two years of Chairman Bauer’s term and even beyond. A multitude of workshops were organised here with EDS providing the expert speaker\textsuperscript{1032}. Several new EDS members could be recruited from the attendees and many new contacts could be established here. Hence, EDS did not always interact so intensively with the Institute. In September 2008, EDS Chairman Thomas Uhlen proclaimed

\textit{EDS at Robert Schuman Institute in 2010}

\textsuperscript{1032} Newsletter, February 2010.
openly in the Bureau Meeting\textsuperscript{1033} that “EDS wouldn’t pay the membership fee until it would figure out whether EDS profit from that or not”.

\textit{European Youth Foundation}

European Democrat Students was also regularly financed by the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe. This possibility, established in 1974 for the first time, just two years after the creation of the foundation in 1972, was used fruitfully over the decades. However, between 2006 and 2009 no EDS activity was supported and thanks to the active application round in October 2009 EDS managed to acquire funding from this important source. The seminars in Chisinau in September 2010 and in Prague in September 2011 were supported. Additionally, EDS received an annual administrative support in 2010 and 2011.

\textit{Konrad Adenauer Stiftung}

We should at this part also mention the good and constant relations with the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, the foundation of the German Christian-Democrat party CDU and its Chairmen Bernhard Vogel (until end of 2009) and Hans-Gert Pöttering (from 1\textsuperscript{st} January 2010) as well as to the uncounted directors of the foreign offices who attended EDS seminar as speakers during the course of the years. Prof. Dr. Hans-Gert Pöttering was a speaker at EDS

\textsuperscript{1033} Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul, p. 3.
events on countless occasions, dating back in the eighties and nineties, as Chairman of the EPP-ED Group, later as President of the European Parliament and in the most recent times, as Chairman of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. He delivered greeting addresses to almost all Annual Reports in the last decade and during the 35th Annual Meeting in Sofia was officially awarded the title of the Patron of EDS. He declared with visible pride during his speech on the 50th Anniversary Celebration of EDS on 1st February 2011 in Brussels: “I am a member of the European Democrat Students organisation.” Apart from this, contacts with the Bavarian Hanns Seidel Foundation have also been made as many of the EDS members work intensively with the HSS.

**Centre for European Studies**

Similarly fruitful cooperation has been achieved with the Centre for European Studies (CES), newly established in 2007 with former EDS Vice Chairman Tomi Huhtanen as Director. CES gave a number of workshops for the EDS participants on many occasions, CES experts often join in EDS events as speakers. The following CES staff members have been contributing at EDS events as speakers: Director Tomi Huhtanen, Deputy Director and Head of Research Roland Freudenstein, Research Officer Vít Novotný, Visiting Fellow Eugeniusz Smolar and Senior Research Officer Stefaan De Corte. Additionally, the 2nd edition of the EDS Book “Students on the right way” is published by

---

1034 Speech of Hans-Gert Pöttering on the 50th Anniversary Celebration on 1st February 2011 in the Palais des Académies in Brussels, retrievable online on on youtube with entering "European Democrat Students".

1035 Newsletter, September 2010.

1036 Newsletter, July 2010.
CES. Most importantly, CES also offers to EDS its network and the Brussels-based activities. It should be mentioned here with respect that Member of CES Executive Board Prof. Yannis G. Valinakis notes in the 2010 Activity Report proudly his position as Patron of EDS\textsuperscript{1037}.

**Robert Schuman Foundation**

Also a long-lasting cooperation can be tracked with the foundation of the EPP Group, the Christian-Democrat Robert Schuman Foundation (Luxembourg), not to be mingled with the Paris-based Fondation Robert Schuman, the party foundation of French UMP. The President Jacques Santer has been a speaker at the 2002 Winter University. Secretary General György Hölvényi has maintained excellent relations with EDS for many years and the foundations supported a range of EDS events in Brussels and elsewhere.

**International Republican Institute**

Since the year 2008 a mutually beneficial cooperation has been opened with the party foundation of the American Republicans, the International Republican Institute (IRI). Director Jan Erik Surotchak delivered workshops at EDS Winter University 2010 in Brussels and EDS Summer University 2010 in Žilina and commemorated together with EDS at the Ronald Reagan Bust in Budapest in April 2011.

![EDS at Ronald Reagan commemoration](image)

**College Republicans**

Rather rhapsodic relations can be observed with the American College Republicans. Their Chairman Eric Hoplin was a special guest at the

\textsuperscript{1037} Activity Report 2010 of the Centre for European Studies, p. 12.
2004 Winter University in Brussels, but unfortunately, this was the first and last occasion a representative from the United States visited an EDS event. However, EDS was well represented during the 56th National Convention of the College Republicans in Washington, between 24th and 26th Jun 2005. The EDS delegation, consisting of Alexandros Sinka, Jean-Hubert Lelièvre, Dimitris Terzis, Karolina Pastuszak, Aleksandar Nikoloski, Nigel Fletcher, Pantelis Solomon and three other EDS activists met speakers like Tom DeLay, Republican majority leader, Mike Johanns, Secretary of Agriculture, Patrick McHenry, Congressman and Ed Gillespie, Chairman of the Republican Party National Committee1038.

**International Garrick Club**

The International Garrick Club was established on 4th May 1968 in the Garrick Hotel in London and set itself the goal to be the “old-boys-network” of the then ICCS. The first President of the International Garrick Club was Dieter Ibielski, who later in July 2010, was awarded Honorary Membership of EDS. Since 1990, the Club is organising its bi-annual meetings every other year at the former villa of Konrad Adenauer, Villa La Collina, in Cadenabbia at Lake Como. The Villa is nowadays used as a conference centre of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. EDS had never formalised relationships to the IGC as we can consider the network as a lose club of friends, however membership is granted exclusively to former Bureau members. It is a tradition to place visiting EDS Chairmen on the “hot seat” and question him about himself, EDS and politics. In the reported period, the Cadenabbia meetings have all been attended by EDS Chairmen (2002: Jacob Lund Nielsen, 2004: Alexandros Sinka, 2006:

Sven Henrik Häseker, 2008: Ana Filipa Janine, 2010: Bence Bauer. To reach out to all former EDS activists, even those who have not necessarily been elected to a Bureau position, EDS Bureaus 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 invited the much bigger number of all “alumni” to events such as an alumni dinner in February 2010 or the 50th Anniversary. In this endeavour, the EDS Bureau was inspired by the large alumni network activities some of the member organisations undertake, for instance RCDS Germany, HSF Norway, UNI France or ODM Slovakia.

**Conclusion**

To better understand the manifold foreign relations EDS has, a clear distinction between organisations can be introduced where EDS has a membership or where there is none. Being a member in four organisations (EPP, RSI, IYDU, YFJ), the EPP is of utmost importance. It is much more than a simple membership which just gives you a voting right. The position as member association assumes a strong political identity and mutual support which EDS always valued and intensively used. The 15th year anniversary of being associated to EPP in 2012 proves the long and constant way EDS took. EDS was present in extraordinary numbers at EPP meetings and contributed a set of incentives and ideas to the mother party. We can state that this relationship was and is of mutual benefit and it was absolutely the right decision to integrate into the EPP. The impact EDS can have on European politics grew rapidly and today, this forum stays the most important.

As for the other such memberships, we can note that the links were naturally weaker, however EDS always took an advantage of the structures in which it is member. Furthermore many other external links could be built up which all help to disseminate the beliefs and convictions EDS has. The partnerships always serve this objective, as being most prevalent. The aspect of influencing Europe and international organisations with a clear message and outstanding pro-European attitude is more thrilling and exciting than ever.

**Linking the world**

During the Millennium Years we can observe a broader range of activities in both content and geographical reach. Established partnerships with student and youth organisations from the United States on the Western side of the globe reach out to activities and contacts with the sphere of youngsters.
from especially Eastern Europe and Asia. EDS thus is providing a platform for exchange and interaction, bringing the values of Europeans to so many places. In an organisation where as of the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century we find Turkey’s and Israel’s leading party youth as regular members as well as countless guests from the Caucasus and Central Asia, a pan-European ground is already set. This framework enables EDS to spread the voice and to bring together millions of students, united in their endeavour to live in democracy, peace and freedom. The global contexts EDS can fill with life are used and penetrated with content like never before in the history of this organisation.
Conclusions, 1961-2011

EDS during the course of all its actions pursued with very clear messages the re-unification of our continent and the fulfilment of the European Dream. It was during all the 50 years of its existence and activities a platform for sharing views, exchanging ideas and interacting with like-minded youngsters. EDS is unique in offering young people an international outlook that is based on common values and a similar perception of Europe. In its activities EDS fostered a mutual understanding, bringing together different people and cultures and providing opportunities to network on the European level. The principles adhered later also became those of the united Europe. “Very early, in the early sixties EDS created the context and the objectives of a free and responsible Europe” so said Wilfried Martens during the 50th Anniversary Celebration. And indeed, EDS marked important lines in Europe’s history, long before others even dared to consider them. The struggle for ONE EUROPE in the sixties, for direct EP elections and the creation of a united centre-right political party in the seventies, the fight for overcoming dictatorship and the Iron Curtain in the eighties, the campaign for quick and comprehensive enlargement since the early nineties and the strong support for more integration, a deeper and wider Europe have marked the EDS agenda over the years, elapsing later to real policies.

Without the visions of EDS, Europe would be much poorer. And without the activities EDS provided, Europe would not be socialised like it is. And without the EDS spirit, generations of students would not have had the “instinct to put together deals on the European level” (Tom Spencer). The immense work EDS laid down for the sake of our common house of Europe cannot be underestimated. This work was a constant achievement of many generations of committed youngsters who wanted to change Europe and create the “Europe we want”. Without their work Europe would not be a nice place to live.
Chapter 7

Appendices
A. The members of EDS

The following index contains the member organisations of EDS as of 26th February 2012, indicating the name of the respective organisation and its country of origin. At this point, EDS has 44 members from 35 countries (37 full, 2 affiliate, 5 observer members). The year of accession refers to the year in which it became observer member (in brackets the year is indicated in which full membership was acquired). Prior to 1978, organisations were admitted immediately as full member.

4. EDH Belgium, 2008 (2009)
5. SDA Bosnia-Herzegovina, 2008 (2009)
7. MGERB Bulgaria, 2008 (2009)
10. Protoporia Cyprus, 1981 (succeeded PEON, member since 1979)
12. KSL Denmark, 1961, formerly DKS
17. UYNM Georgia, 2012 (observer member)
21. Young Likud Congress Israel, 2010 (affiliate member)
22. FIG/GI Italy, 1998 (2000), under merger
23. StudiCentro Italy, 2012 (observer member)
24. LDK Youth Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99), 2011 (observer member)
26. UYO Latvia, 2011 (2012), formerly NEYS
27. JKL Lithuania, 1999 (2001)
28. UMS na VMRO-DPMNE, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 2001 (2002)
31. TLDM Moldova, 2011 (observer member)
32. HSF Norway, 1961 (formerly NKSF)
33. MK Poland, 1992 (1993), formerly KR, FMK, LMK, MK AWS
34. JSD Portugal, 2000 (2001)
35. OTPDL Romania, 2007 (2008), formerly OSPDL, formerly OSPD
36. PNTCD Romania, 1991 (1992), formerly NPP-CDS
39. Via Nova ICS Slovakia, 2002 (affiliate member), formerly HYC
40. SAU Slovenia, 2004 (2006)
41. FMSF Sweden, 1961
42. AK Parti Youth Turkey, 2011 (observer member)
43. USA Ukraine, 1996 (1998)
44. YCEG United Kingdom, 2009 (2010)
## B. Elected and Appointed Officers, 1961-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Secretary General</th>
<th>Assistant Secretary General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>Hans-Uwe Erichsen, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962/63</td>
<td>Carl-Henrik Winqwist, Sweden</td>
<td>Dieter Ibielski, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean-Augustin Roberti, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64</td>
<td>Carl-Henrik Winqwist, Sweden</td>
<td>Dieter Ibielski, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean-Augustin Roberti, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan M Hoem/Arild Isegg, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964/65</td>
<td>Dieter Ibielski, Germany</td>
<td>Anders Arfwedson, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reginald E. Simmerson, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/66</td>
<td>Dieter Ibielski, Germany</td>
<td>Anders Arfwedson, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reginald E. Simmerson, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>Reginald E. Simmerson, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Gert Hammer, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peder Olin, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68</td>
<td>Reginald E. Simmerson, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Heikki S. von Hertzen, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wulf Schönbohm, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69</td>
<td>Heikki S. von Hertzen, Finland</td>
<td>Ulf Adelsohn, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Taylor, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roland Wegener, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1969/70
Secretary General  Heikki S. von Hertzen, Finland
Assistant Secretary General  Alfred Stirnemann, Austria
Ian Taylor, United Kingdom

1970/71
Chairman  Ian Taylor, United Kingdom
Vice Chairmen  Finn Brågård, Denmark
Wolfgang Kirsch, Germany

1971/72
Chairman  Finn Brågård, Denmark
Vice Chairmen  Tom Spencer, United Kingdom
Wolfgang Stickler, Austria

1972/73
Honorary President  Edward Heath, United Kingdom
Chairman  Tom Spencer, United Kingdom
Vice Chairmen  Michel Claris, France
Njal Moe, Norway
Secretary General  John C. Bowis, United Kingdom

1973/74
Honorary President  Edward Heath, United Kingdom
Chairman  Tom Spencer, United Kingdom
Vice Chairman  Carl Bildt, Sweden
Michel Claris, France
Jürgen Klemann, Germany
Njal Moe, Norway
Secretary General  John C. Bowis, United Kingdom

1974/75
Honorary President  Edward Heath, United Kingdom
Chairman  Carl Bildt, Sweden
Vice Chairmen  Patrick d’Humières, France
Peter Stub Jørgensen, Denmark
Gerd Langguth, Germany
Colin Maltby, United Kingdom
Secretary General  Per Ledin, Sweden
1975/76
Honorary President  Helmut Kohl, Germany
Chairman   Carl Bildt, Sweden
Vice Chairmen  Antonio Correa d’Oliveira, Portugal
              Scott Hamilton, United Kingdom
              Patrick d’Humières, France
              Gerd Langguth, Germany
Secretary General  Per Ledin, Sweden

1976/77
Honorary President  Helmut Kohl, Germany
Chairman   Scott Hamilton, United Kingdom
Vice Chairmen  Nicholas Giscard d’Estaing, France
              Per Ledin, Sweden
              Paulo Palma Carlos, Spain
              Friedbert Pflüger, Germany
Secretary General  Nigel Ashford, United Kingdom

1977/78
Honorary President  Helmut Kohl, Germany
Chairman   Scott Hamilton, United Kingdom
Vice Chairmen  Pierre Moinet, France
              Ears Eskeland, Norway
              Gustavo Gill Domínguez, Spain
              Friedbert Pflüger, Germany
Secretary General  Nigel Ashford, United Kingdom

1978/79
Honorary President  Diego Freitas do Amaral, Portugal
Chairman   Pierre Moinet, France
Deputy Chairmen  Peter Adler, Austria
                Lars Eskeland, Norway
Vice Chairmen  Gustavo Gill Domínguez Spain
                Rudolf Henke, Germany
                Elisabeth Langby, Sweden
                Peter Wren-Hilton, United Kingdom
Executice Director  Jean-Michel Goutier, Belgium

1979/80
Honorary President  Diogo Freitas do Amaral, Portugal
Chairman   Lars Eskeland, Norway
Deputy Chairmen  
Rudolf Henke, Germany  
Elisabeth Langby, Sweden

Vice Chairmen  
Gilbert Besseling, Netherlands  
José Antonio Lopez de la o Castro, Spain  
Patrick Gerard, France  
Mark Leverton, United Kingdom

Executive Director  
Helga Krumbeck, Germany

1980/81

Honorary President  
Diego Freitas do Amaral, Portugal

Chairman  
Lars Eskeland, Norway

Deputy Chairmen  
Jean-Micbel Goutier, Belgium  
Mark Leverton, United Kingdom

Vice Chairmen  
Carmel Cacopardo, Malta  
Per Dahl, Sweden  
Stephan Eisel, Germany  
Luis Queiro, Portugal

Executive Director  
Helga Krumbeck, Germany

1981/82

Honorary President  
Sir James Scott-Hopkins, United Kingdom

Chairman  
Per Heister, Sweden

Deputy Chairmen  
Stephan Eisel, Germany  
Constance Le Grip, France

Vice Chairmen  
Ymke Botsmaa, Netherlands  
Tim Linacre, United Kingdom  
Knut Olav Nesse, Norway  
Luis Queiro, Portugal

Executive Director  
Helga Krumbeck, Germany

Deputy Executive Director  
Christopher Hamilton, Sweden

1982/83

Honorary President  
Margaret Thatcher, United Kingdom

Chairman  
Knut Olav Nesse, Norway

Vice Chairmen  
Daniel Bischof, Switzerland  
Johann Friedrich Colsman, Germany  
Atli Eyjolfsson, Iceland  
Enrique Pena González, Spain  
Stephen Morrison, United Kingdom  
Nicos Vassilou, Cyprus

Executive Director  
Cecilia Stegò, Sweden
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Honorary President</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Anagnostakos</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Bischof</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Friedrich Colsman</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bo Ericsson</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Monteith</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claude Henri Ney</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thierry Poskin</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>Stephen Morrison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Honorary President</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Anagnostakos</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eros Antoniades</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas Enger</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Maestro Lopez</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claude Henri Ney</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecilia Stego</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>Steven Vlam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Honorary President</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Anagnostakos</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olafur Arnarson</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mattias Bengtsson</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Hoey</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Maestro Lopez</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claude Henri Ney</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>David Hoile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Carlsson</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>Mattias Bengtsson</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vice Chairmen</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>Didier Block</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Hoey</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spyros-Gianni Kladas</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bettina Machaczek</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vice Chairmen

Michael Gil Raphael, Cyprus
Gil Samsonov, Israel

Executive Director

Knut Albert Solem, Norway

Honorary President

Carl Bildt, Sweden

Chairman

Mattias Bengtsson, Sweden

Vice Chairmen

Philippe Gosselin, France
David Hoey, United Kingdom
Spyros-Gianni Kladas, Greece
Bettina Machaczek, Germany
Gil Samsonov, Israel
Eyjolfur Sveinsson, Iceland

Executive Director

Knut Albert Solem, Norway

Chairman

Bettina Machaczek, Germany

Vice Chairmen

Philippe Gosselin, France
David Hoey, United Kingdom
Magnus Nilsson, Sweden
Stavros Papastavrou, Greece
Andreas Taliadoros, Cyprus
Uri Yakov, Israel

Executive Director

Knut Albert Solem, Norway

Chairman

Stavros Papastavrou, Greece

Vice Chairmen

Hans Åsnæs, Norway
Philippe Gosselin, France
Johannes Laitenberger, Germany
David Rosenberg, Israel
Lilja Stefansdottir, Iceland
Mark Johnson, United Kingdom

Executive Director

Eva Gustavsson, Sweden

Chairman

Stavros Papastavrou, Greece

Vice Chairmen

Hans Åsnas, Norway
Harm Adam, Germany
Alexander Aiken, United Kingdom
Christis Djiongouros, Cyprus
Vice Chairmen

Envan le Doré, France
Laura de Esteban, Spain

Executive Director

Eva Gustavsson, Sweden

1991/92

Chairman
Laura de Esteban, Spain

Vice Chairmen
Paschalis Bouchoris, Greece
Cecilia Brinck, Sweden
Christis Djiongouros, Cyprus
Pia Farstad, Norway
Alan Friis, Denmark
Christopher Pincher, United Kingdom

Executive Director
Eva Gustavsson, Sweden

1992/93

Chairman
Laura de Esteban, Spain

Vice Chairmen
Ross Curds, United Kingdom
Mads Lebech, Denmark
Cecilia Brinck, Sweden
Ionut Muntean, Romania
Haris Meidanis, Greece
Tim Arnold, Germany

Executive Director
Eva Gustavsson, Sweden (until Oct. 1992)
Pia Farstad, Norway

1993/94

Honorary President
Laura de Esteban, Spain

Chairman
Tim Arnold, Germany

Vice Chairmen
Zenon Apostolou, Cyprus
Jacek Bendykowski, Poland
Ricardo Guisado Urbano, Spain
Fredrik Johansson, Sweden
Lars Jørgensen, Denmark
Tim Kevan, United Kingdom

Executive Director
Pia Farstad, Norway

1994/95

Chairman
Fredrik Johansson, Sweden

Vice Chairmen
Philip Torbøl, Denmark
Christoph Menningen, Germany

Vice Chairmen
Ricardo Guisado Urbano, Spain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Honorary President</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Vice Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>Günther Fehlinger, Austria</td>
<td>Michalis Peglis, Greece</td>
<td>Razvan Cotovelea, Romania, Michael Hall, United Kingdom, Anders Hall, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomi Huhtanen, Finland, Raul de la Hoz Quintano, Spain, Holger Thuss, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>Michael Schaub, Switzerland</td>
<td>Michalis Peglis, Greece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Vice Chairmen: Victoria Cristobal, Spain
Ukko Metsola, Finland
Anders Hall, Sweden
Helge Skinnes, Norway
Thibault Malterre, France
Ferenc Thierry, Austria
Antonin Kazda, Czech Republic
Cristian Popescu, Romania

Secretary General: Holger Thuss, Germany
Treasurer: Georgios Kampouridis, Switzerland

1999/2000
Honorary President: Michalis Peglis, Greece
Chairman: Ukko Metsola, Finland
Vice Chairmen: Edina Tóth, Hungary
Victoria Cristobal, Spain
Helge Skinnes, Norway
Adam Bielan, Poland
Gustaf Casparsson, Sweden
Panagiotis Drossos, Greece
Frank Engel, Luxembourg
David Teillet, France

Secretary General: Holger Thuss, Germany
Webmaster: Michalis Charalambous, Greece

2000/2001
Honorary President: Ukko Metsola, Finland
Chairman: Gustaf Casparsson, Sweden
Vice Chairmen: Edina Tóth, Hungary
David Teillet, France
Chiara Pocaterra, Italy
Roberta Tedesco Triccas, Malta
Jacob Lund Nielsen, Denmark
Bartosz Piotrusiewicz, Poland
Mikael von Rabenau, Finland
Petr Sokol, Czech Republic

Secretary General: Holger Thuss, Germany
Webmaster: Michalis Charalambous, Greece
Henrik Olsson, Sweden
Michal Balicki, Poland
Honorary President
Edina Tóth, Hungary
Chairman
Jacob Lund Nielsen, Denmark
Vice Chairmen
Roberta Tedesco Triccas, Malta
Elektra Katsikidou, Greece
Bartosz Piotrusiewicz, Poland
Petr Sokol, Czech Republic
David Teillet, France
David Erguido, Spain
Alexandros Sinka, Cyprus
Jani Seikkula, Finland

Secretary General
Marc Michael Blum, Germany
Executive Director
Holger Thuss, Germany
Executive Communications Officer
Chiara Pocaterra, Italy
Webmaster
Emilis Dambauskas, Lithuania

2002/2003
Chairman
Jacob Lund Nielsen, Denmark
Vice Chairmen
Pawel Poncyljusz, Poland
George Boustras, Greece
Petr Sokol, Czech Republic
Eduard Herda, Germany
Jean Hubert Lelièvre, France
Miroslav Lopata, Slovakia
Alexandros Sinka, Cyprus
David Erguido, Spain

Secretary General
Roberta Tedesco Triccas, Malta
Director of Policy
Tobias Sjö, Sweden
Director of Communication
Anita Leirvik, Norway

2003/2004
Chairman
Alexandros Sinka, Cyprus
Vice Chairmen
Davorka Herman, Croatia
Ana Filipa Janine, Portugal
Grigoris Dimitriadis, Greece
Eduard Herda, Germany
Jean Hubert Lelièvre, France
Tibor Jona, Serbia-Montenegro
Satu Arsalo, Finland
Pedro Mourino, Spain

Secretary General
Brecht Tessier, Belgium
Director of Policy
Dimitris Terzis, Greece
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Communication</td>
<td>Relika Alliksaar</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Alexandros Sinka</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairmen</td>
<td>Sven Henrik Häseker</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grigoris Dimitriadis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean-Hubert Lelièvre</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jens Ahl</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Smith</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamás Rumi</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ana Filipa Janine</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luisa Gauci Baluci</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Karolina Pastuszak</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Policy</td>
<td>Dimitris Terzis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of European Integration</td>
<td>Bojana Goseva, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Chairman</td>
<td>Jean-Hubert Lelièvre</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Sven Henrik Häseker</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairmen</td>
<td>Jens Ahl</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vasilis Gkatzaras</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todor Gunchev</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dieter Haas</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ana Filipa Janine</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andis Kudors</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalis Michael</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzalo Ortiz Lázaro</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Anna Anttinen</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of European Integration</td>
<td>Giovanni Vagnone</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Communication</td>
<td>Christophe Van Impe</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Chairman</td>
<td>Dimitris Terzis</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Ana Filipa Janine</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairmen</td>
<td>Jarkko Seppälä</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anja Marija Ciraj</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivan Gereci</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairmen</td>
<td>Vasilis Gkatzaras</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todor Gunchev</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairmen</td>
<td>Elisabeth Torkildsen</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalis Michael</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tetiana Gostieva, Ukraine (until April 2007)

Maria Fuster Cerillo, Spain

Giovanni Vagnone, Italy

Secretary General

Director of Policies

Giovanni Vagnone, Italy

2007/2008

Chairwoman

Ana Filipa Janine, Portugal

Vice Chairmen

Giovanni Vagnone, Italy

Ivan Gereci, Croatia

Kostas Doganis, Greece

Hristina Runceva, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Andrea Solomonidou, Cyprus

Thomas Uhlen, Germany

Ivan Delibasic, Serbia

Maja Mazurkiewicz, Poland

Secretary General

Elisabeth Torkildsen, Norway

2008/2009

Honorary Chairwoman

Ana Filipa Janine, Portugal

Chairman

Thomas Uhlen, Germany

Vice Chairmen

Andrea Solomonidou, Cyprus

David Božič, Slovenia

Thomas Thaler, Austria

Kostas Doganis, Greece

Bence Bauer, Hungary

Joana Lopes, Portugal

Janet Barthet, Malta

Giovanni Vagnone, Italy

Secretary General

Maja Mazurkiewicz, Poland

Director of Policy

Fredrik Saweståhl, Sweden

Director of Communications

Carina Munck Olsén, Denmark

Director of European Integration

Anca Michaela Plesa, Romania

2009/2010

Honorary Chairwoman

Andrea Solomonidou, Cyprus

(_until February 2010)

Chairman

Bence Bauer, Hungary

Vice Chairmen

David Božič, Slovenia

Ildze Kanepaja, Latvia

Vice Chairmen

Jean-Baptiste Dabezies, France
Samuli Kauranne, Finland
Andreas Willersrud, Norway
Andreas Perotti, Austria
Christian Peuker, Germany
Matija Magerl, Croatia

Maria Keris, Estonia
Juraj Antal, Slovakia
Carina Munck Olsén, Denmark

Tetiana Gostieva, Ukraine

2010/2011

Chairman
Bence Bauer, Hungary

Vice Chairmen
Samuli Kauranne, Finland
Andreas Perotti, Austria
Matija Magerl, Croatia
Andreas Willersrud, Norway
Jean-Baptiste Dabezies, France
Georgios Tsielepos, Cyprus
Juraj Antal, Slovakia
Cathrin Gräber, Germany

Ildze Kanepaja, Latvia
Andraž Kastelic, Slovenia
Tetiana Gostieva, Ukraine (until February 2011)

2011/2012

Honorary Chairman
Bence Bauer, Hungary

Chairman
Juraj Antal, Slovakia

Vice Chairmen
Bernhard Krall, Austria
Andraž Kastelic, Slovenia
Alexandros Politis, Greece
Kalin Zahariev, Bulgaria
Ingrid Hopp, Norway
Nenad Vajzović, Croatia
Martin Halada, Czech Republic
Romain Simmarano, France
(until December 2011)

Samuli Kauranne, Finland
Dace Spelmane, Latvia
Gintarė Narkevičiūtė, Lithuania
Artur Issaev, Belgium
C. The International Christian-Democratic and Conservative Student Conferences, 1960-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st ICDCSC</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Stockholm</td>
<td>20-24 April, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ICDCSC</td>
<td>Eichholz Manor (Germany)</td>
<td>5-10 September, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ICDCSC</td>
<td>Constituent Meeting of ICCS, Vienna</td>
<td>7-14 May, 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>22-28 October, 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Lund (Sweden)</td>
<td>6-10 March, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>16-21 July, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>4-7 May, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Winchester (UK)</td>
<td>23-27 July, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th ICDCSC</td>
<td>Reistad (Norway)</td>
<td>16-22 August, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th ICCS-Conference</td>
<td>Bonn (Germany)</td>
<td>29 Aug.-5 Sept., 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th ICCS-Conference</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>15-21 August, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th ICCS-Conference</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>24-28 July, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th ICCS-Conference</td>
<td>Swinton (UK)</td>
<td>8-12 July, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th ICCS-Conference</td>
<td>Mallasmäki (Finland)</td>
<td>12-15 August, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th ECCS Conference</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
<td>3-9 July, 1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Annual Meetings, Summer and Winter Universities, 1971-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Meeting</th>
<th>1971-2012</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Skodsborg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, SS “Svea Regina”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Lisbon</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Nice (France)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Lienz (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Vienna</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Valencia (Spain)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Lienz (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, St.Pol de Leon</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Bernried (Germany)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Lienz (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Oxford</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Lisbon (Portugal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Malta</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, La Coruna (Spain)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Bad Gastein (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Reykjavik</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Elst (Netherlands)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Saalfelden (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Aix-la-Provence</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Fiesch (Switzerland)</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Saalfelden (Austria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Athens</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Porto Heli (Greece)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Reykjavik</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Ojen (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Nicosia</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Larnaca (Cyprus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Tel Aviv</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Jerusalem/Tel Aviv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Berlin</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Bonn/ Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Porto Heli</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Porto Heli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Vienna</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Vienna/Prague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Nicosia</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Paphos/ Nicosia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Palma de Mallorca</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Palma de Mallorca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Oslo</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Oslo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Berlin</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Greifswald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Komotini</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Komotini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Podiebrad</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Prague/ Podiebrad</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;/7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; / 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Mollina</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Mollina</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; / 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Bad Ischl</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Vienna/Bad Ischl</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Malta</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Malta</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; / 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Krakow</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Warsaw/Gdansk</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; /10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Limassol</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Nicosia/Limassol</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; /11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels/Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Berlin</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Berlin/Hamburg</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; /12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;, Zadar</td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Zagreb/Zadar</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Prague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, London</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, London/Cardiff</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Sofia</td>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Sofia/Ravda</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, Strasbourg/Frankfurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event 1</td>
<td>Event 2</td>
<td>Event 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36th, Lisbon</td>
<td>30th, Lisbon</td>
<td>16th, Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37th, Ohrid</td>
<td>31st, Skopje/Ohrid</td>
<td>17th, Bialystok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>38th, Malta</td>
<td>32nd, Malta</td>
<td>18th, Budapest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>39th, Limassol</td>
<td>33rd, Cyprus</td>
<td>19th, Bucharest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>40th, Žilina</td>
<td>34th, Žilina</td>
<td>20th, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41th, Vienna</td>
<td>35th, Vienna</td>
<td>21st, Brussels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42nd, Sopron</td>
<td>36th, Sopron/Eisenstadt</td>
<td>22nd, Zagreb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Seminars and Conferences, 1956-2011

1956
1st RCDS-FUCUA seminar, London, 21-26 September, 1956

1957
2nd RCDS-FUCUA seminar, Bonn, 11-17 July, 1957

1958
3rd RCDS-FUCUA seminar, Berlin, 1-9 March, 1958
4th RCDS-FUCUA seminar, London, Glasgow, 11-17 September, 1958
SKSF-Sommarresa, July-August, 1958
1st DKS-RCDS seminar, Copenhagen, November, 1958

1959
SKSF-RCDS seminar, Berlin, 28 December - 3 January, 1959
2nd DKS-RCDS seminar, Berlin, 22-27 February, 1959
RCDS-Dutch seminar, Berlin, May 24-31, 1959
“Anti-festival”, Vienna, 26 July - 4 August, 1959

1960
1st International Conference of Christian Democratic and Conservative Students (ICCDCS), Copenhagen/Stockholm, 20-24 April, 1960
5th RCDS-FUCUA seminar, Berlin, 10-16 July, 1960
2nd ICCDCS, Eichholz Manor (Germany), 5-10 September, 1960

1961/1962
3rd ICDCSC, Constituent Meeting of ICCS, Vienna, 7-14 May, 1961
1st Executive Committee Meeting, Goslar, Germany, 29 July- 3 August, 1961
4th ICDCSC, Executive Committee Meeting, Council, Berlin, 22-28 October, 1961
5th ICDCSC, Lund (Sweden), 6-10 March, 1962

1962/63
6th ICDCSC, Baarn/Amsterdam, 16-21 July, 1962
7th ICDCSC, Vienna, 4-7 May, 1963

1963/64
8th ICDCSC, Winchester (UK), 23-27 July, 1963

1964/65
9th ICDCSC, Reistad (Norway), 16-22 August, 1964
Executive Committee Meeting, Sittard, Netherlands, 28-29 December, 1964
1965/66
10th ICCS-Conference, Executive Committee Meeting, Eichholz Manor, Germany, 29 August – 5 September, 1965
Executive Committee Meeting, Copenhagen, Denmark, March 18-20, 1966

1966/67
11th ICCS-Conference “Planning the Free Economy”, Baarn, 15-21 August, 1966
Executive Committee Meeting, Burg Gutenfels, Germany, April 1967

1967/68
12th ICCS-Conference, Executive Committee Meeting, Copenhagen, 24-28 July, 1967
Secretariat meeting, Gimo Mansion, Sweden, 17-19 October, 1967
Executive Committee Meeting, Stuttgart, Germany, Spring 1968

1968/69
Executive Committee Meeting, Vienna, 14-16 March, 1969

1969/70
14th ICCS-Conference, Executive Committee Meeting, Mallasmäki (Finland), 12-15 August, 1969
Chairmen’s Conference, Marburg, Germany, 11-13 October, 1969
Executive Committee Meeting, Lund, Sweden, 9-11 January, 1970
Executive Committee Meeting, International Student Conference, Bad Godesberg, Germany, 19-22 February, 1970

1970/71
(15th) ECCS-Conference, Annual Conference, Vienna, Austria, 3-9 July, 1970
Executive Committee Meeting, Copenhagen, Denmark, October 1970
ECCS/ECPI-Conference, Brussels, 11-13 February, 1971

1971/72
Annual Conference/10th Anniversary, Stockholm, Sweden, 26th June 1971
Executive Committee Meeting, Brussels, Belgium, 15-16 December, 1971

1972/73
17th ECCS-Conference “The Role of University Education in Western Europe”, Annual Meeting, Executive Committee Meeting, London, 9-14 July, 1972
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Secretariat Meeting, Helsinki, 28-29 August, 1972
Secretariat-, Executive Committee Meeting, Paris, 21-22 October, 1972
Secretariat-, Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “Youth and the Community of Nine”, Brussels, Belgium, 7-9 December, 1972
Secretariat-, Executive Committee Meeting, Belfast, UK, 11 March, 1973
Secretariat-, Executive Committee Meeting, Linköping, Sweden, 20 May, 1973

1973/74
Annual-, Secretariat Meeting, Berlin, 28 July- 2 August, 1973
Executive Committee Meeting, Bolton, United Kingdom, 13-14 October, 1973
Conference on Northern Flank Problems, Oslo, Norway,
30 November – 2 December, 1973
Seminar “Why Federalism?”, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 18-20 January, 1974
Executive Committee Meeting, Vienna, Austria, 2-3 March, 1974
European Students Affairs Group, 6 April, 1974
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “Politics and Pollution”, Venice, Italy, 28-30 June, 1974

1974/75
Annual Conference, Seminar “Capitalism and the Economics of Europe”, Skodsborg, Denmark, 3-7 August, 1974
Executive Committee Meeting, London, UK, 12 October, 1974
Seminar “Sweden in Europe”, Stockholm, Sweden, 8-10 November, 1974
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar on Defence Politics, Brussels, Belgium, 3-4 February, 1975
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “A United Europe”, Paris, France, 14-16 March, 1975
Seminar, Eichholz/Cologne, Germany, 22-24 May, 1975

1975/76
Annual Conference, SS “Svea Regina”, Espoo, Finland,
28 June 28 – 2 July, 1975
Seminar on “Support Portugal’s Democrats”, Lisbon, Portugal, 28 August – 1 September, 1975
Executive Committee Meeting, Paris, France, 12-14 December, 1975
Visit of European Institutions, Brussels, Belgium, February 1976
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “Student Politics and Student Unions in Europe”, Munich, Germany, 10-13 April, 1976
Seminar, Copenhagen, Denmark, 10-11 June, 1976
Training Seminar in the European Youth Centre, Strasbourg, France, 5-13 July, 1976

1976/77
Annual Conference, Seminar “Shaping the European Institutions of tomorrow”, Athens, Greece, 23-29 July, 1976
Executive Committee Meeting, Conference on “Direct Elections and Student Affairs”, London, 28 October - 1 November, 1976
Seminar in the European Youth Centre, Strasbourg, France, 2-12 January, 1977
Human Rights Conference, Brussels, Belgium, 10-14 February, 1977
Executive Committee Meeting, seminar on Student Affairs, Stockholm, Sweden, 29 April – 2 May, 1977
Study Visit, Nicosia, Cyprus, 5-9 May, 1977
Secretariat Meeting, 19 June, 1977
Executive Committee Meeting, 5-6 July 1977
Summer University, Nice, France, 5-13 July, 1977

1977/78
Executive Committee Meeting, Annual Conference, Lisbon, 14-20 July, 1977
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “A Programme for Europe”, Bemelen, Netherlands, 24 September – 1 October, 1977
Executive Committee Meeting, Seminar “Germany in Europe”, Berlin, 4-9 December, 1977
Secretariat Meeting, Winter University, Lienz, Austria, 16-20 February, 1978
Executive Committee Meeting, Malta, 27 March – 2 April, 1978
Secretariat Meeting, London, June 1978
Summer University, Valencia, 14-21 July, 1978

1978/79
Annual Meeting, Executive Committee Meeting, Vienna, Austria, 19-24 August, 1978
Training Course on Electoral Techniques, Strasbourg, France, 17-26 September, 1978
Bureau meeting, Paris, France, November 1978
Study Visit, Bucharest, Rumania, November 1978
Bureau meeting, Council, Conference, Copenhagen, 3-7 January, 1979
Bureau meeting, Winter University, Lienz, Austria, 28 January - 4 February, 1979
Bureau meeting, Bonn, Germany, March 1979
Study Visit, Ankara, Turkey, 23-28 March, 1979
Bureau meeting, Council, Seminar “Europe and the Third World”, Eichholz Manor, Germany, 1-7 April, 1979
Bureau meeting, Council and Conference, Bonn, Germany, 1-6 April, 1979
Minibus Tour, Germany, Belgium, France, Denmark, Italy, Austria, UK, May/June 1979
Bureau meeting, Summer University, Munich, Bernried, Germany, 20-27 July, 1979

1979/80
Annual Meeting, Conference, St. Pol de Leon/Brest, France, 26 August – 1 September, 1979
Bureau meeting, London, 13-14 October, 1979
Training Seminar, Strasbourg, France, 2-11 November, 1979
3rd Winter University, Lienz, Austria, 26 January – 2 February, 1980
Seminar “Relations Europe – Africa”, Tenerife, Canary Islands, 7-12 April, 1980
Summer University, Lisbon, Portugal, August 2-9, 1980

1980/81
Executive Bureau meeting, Bonn, Germany, 5-10 October, 1980
Winter University, Graz/ Bad Gastein, Austria, 7-14 February, 1981
Executive Bureau meeting, Madrid, 26 April, 1981
Summer University, Sada/La Coruna, Spain, 25 July - 1 August, 1981

1981/82
Conference “North-South Dialogue in Europe”, Annual Meeting, Malta,
10-14 August, 1981
Training Seminar “Motivation of Students for Political Work”,
Strasbourg, 14-21 November, 1981
Seminar and Council “Peace and Defence”, Brussels and Liege, Belgium,
24-30 January, 1982
Winter University, Saalfelden, Austria, 7-14 February, 1982
Bureau meeting, Gimo, Sweden, 16 May, 1982
Minibus tour, May-July, 1982
Seminar on Inter-Party relations, Strasbourg, 4-9 July, 1982
Summer University, Elst, The Netherlands, 7-14 August, 1982

1982/1983
Annual Meeting, Reykjavik, Iceland, 18 August, 1982
Seminar on Media Policies, Reykjavik, Iceland, 16-21 August, 1982
Bureau meeting, Stockholm, Sweden, 19 September, 1982
Bureau meeting, Bonn, Germany, 30 October, 1982
Bureau meeting, Nicosia, Cyprus, 28 November, 1982
Winter University, Saalfelden, Austria, 5-12 February, 1983
Seminar, Bern, Switzerland, 4-8 March, 1983 (?)
Seminar on Totalitarianism, Council, Strasbourg, 9-16 March, 1983
Minibus tour, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, France, 2 May – 7 July, 1983
Bureau meeting, Gimo, Sweden, 21-22 May, 1983
Summer University, Fiesch, Switzerland, 6-13 August, 1983

1983/84
Annual Conference, Seminar on European Problems, Aix-la-Provence, France, 15-19 August, 1983
Bureau meeting, Paris, France, 16-18 September, 1983
Bureau meeting, Oslo, Norway, 15-16 October, 1983
Seminar, Bureau meeting, Berlin, Germany, 20-24 November, 1983
Bureau meeting, Brussels, Belgium, 4-5 February, 1984
Council, Seminar on Higher Education, Strasbourg, France, 24-29 April, 1984
Minibus Tour, Spain, France, Great Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark,
Germany, 1 May - 16 June, 1984
Summer University, Porto Heli, Greece, 4-11 August, 1984

1984/85
Annual Meeting, Athens, Greece, August 1984
Council, June 22, 1985
Summer University, Ojen, Spain, July/August 1985

1985/86
Annual Meeting, August, Reykjavik, Iceland, August 1985
Council, Madrid, Spain, 2-3 February, 1986
Summer University, Larnaca, Cyprus, 27 July- 3 August, 1986

1986/87
Annual Meeting, Nicosia, Cyprus, 4-6 August, 1986
Bureau meeting, Vienna, 18-20 September, 1986
Bureau meeting, Athens, 8 November, 1986
Bureau meeting, Bonn, 25 January, 1987
Bureau meeting, Study Session on Academic Unemployment, Strasbourg,
26-31 March, 1987
Seminar “Alliance in Turmoil”, Annapolis, Maryland, USA, 18-21 April, 1987
Bureau meeting, Gimo, Sweden, 21-23 May, 1987
Seminar on NATO, Brussels, 29-30 June, 1987

1987/88
Annual Meeting, Tel Aviv, 2-3 August, 1987
Seminar “Open Borders”, Council, Hitzacker, Germany, November 1987
Council and Seminar on North-South relations, Estoril (Portugal),
7-12 April, 1988
Bureau meeting, Gimo, Sweden, 20-22 May, 1988
Summer University, Bonn, Berlin, 31 July - 7 August, 1988

1988/89
Annual Meeting, Berlin, 7-9 August, 1988
Seminar on “Ideology”, Council, Bureau meeting, Athens,
24-28 September, 1988
Bureau meeting, Hamburg, Germany, 18-20 November, 1988
Seminar “The Consequences for Europe of the INF negotiations”(NATO-seminar), Council, Bureau meeting, Brussels, December, 1988
Bureau meeting, Seminar “European Educational Policy”, Copenhagen,
Appendices

24 – 26 February, 1989
Bureau meeting, Athens, 8-9 April, 1989
Summer University, Porto Heli, 30 July - 6 August, 1989

1989/90
Annual Meeting, Porto Heli, 6-9 August, 1989
Seminar “Ecology – the Challenge of today”, Council and Bureau meeting, Vienna, November 1989
Bureau meeting, Brussels, 11-12 December, 1989
Bureau meeting, Königswinter, March 1990
Summer University, Vienna and Prague, 29 July - 5 August, 1990

1990/91
Annual Meeting, Vienna, 5-7 August, 1990
Seminar “European Security Policies”, Bureau meeting, Bruxelles, September 1990
Seminar “East-West Relations – is there a common European home?”, Bureau meeting, Strasbourg, November 1990
Seminar “Student problems – especially the drug problem”, Council, Bureau meeting, Athens, 13-14 April, 1991
Seminar “European Structures”, Bureau meeting, Strasbourg, France, May 1991
Bureau meeting, Protaras, Cyprus, 7 August, 1991

1991/92
Summer University “European Unification – One Year before 1992”, Annual Meeting, Cyprus, 4-7 August, 1991
Council, Lisbon, 23 November, 1991
Study Trip to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, 10-15 January, 1992
Council, Madrid, 26 January, 1992
Council, London, 7-8 March, 1992
1992/93
Summer University, Annual Meeting, Palma de Mallorca, Spain, July 1992
Informal Bureau meeting, Uppsala, 26 September, 1992
Seminar on Higher Education, Bureau meeting, Council, Oslo,
29 October – 1 November, 1992
Bureau Meeting, Seminar “Students Create Europe”, Erfurt, Germany,
Seminar on Political Extremism in Europe, Council, Athens, 11-14 March, 1993
Seminar on Poland and the EC, Bureau meeting, Gdansk, 9-11 July, 1993
Bureau meeting and Council, Oslo, 30 July, 1993

1993-1994
Summer University, Annual Meeting, Vestre Gausdal, Norway,
31 July – 1 August, 1993
Bureau meeting, Gdansk, 25-26 September, 1993
Bureau meeting, Eichholz, 22-24 October, 1993
Seminar on Higher Education, Cyprus, 11-15 November, 1993
Study Session, Bonn, 13-16 December, 1993
Seminar “European Monetary Union”, Council, Frankfurt, 16-19 December, 1993
Seminar “Higher Education and Student Mobility”, Cambridge,
21-23 January, 1994
Seminar “The Democratic Development in Eastern Europe”, Council,
Copenhagen, 11-15 February, 1994
Seminar “Small is beautiful - minorities in Europe”, Council, Bureau
meeting, Prague, 22-27 March, 1994
Working Group Meeting “Russia and its place in Europe”, Gdansk, June 1994
Working Group Meeting (Higher Education), London, June 1994
Summer University 1994, Greifswald, Germany, 24-30 July, 1994

1994/95
Working Group Meeting, Jena, Germany, September 1994
Bureau meeting, Eichholz Manor, Germany, 29-30 October, 1994
Seminar “The Crisis of the Welfare State”, Council, Bureau meeting,
Stockholm, February 3-5/19-20?, 1995
Bureau meeting, Council, Jachranka, Poland, May 1995

1995/96
Summer University, Annual Meeting, Komotini, Greece, 22-24 July, 1995
Appendices

Bureau meeting, Paris, 15-17 September, 1995
Seminar “Education – Social Value or a Market Commodity”, Council, Bureau meeting, Krakow, Poland, 23-29 October, 1995
Training Seminar, London, 9-12 November, 1995
Winter University, Helsinki/Tallinn, 21-25 February, 1996
Training Seminar, Council, Athens, 9-12 May, 1996
Summer University, Prague, Podiebrady, Czech Republic, 6-10 August, 1996

1996/97
Annual Meeting, Podiebrady, Czech Republic, 10-11 August, 1996
Bureau meeting, Paris, 15-17 November, 1996
Winter University “Taking Care Europe’s Future”, Brussels, 2-6 February, 1997
Seminar “Education and Politics in Denmark”, Copenhagen, 26 February – 2 March, 1997
Seminar “Romania’s Integration with the EU and the NATO”, 1-4 May, 1997

1997/98
Annual Meeting, Bureau meeting, Mollina, Spain, August 1997
Seminar “Britain’s Europe”, London, 11-14 September, 1997
“Policy Day’s”, Cologne, Germany, 3-5 October, 1997
Bureau meeting, Brussels, 16-19 October, 1997
Seminar “Immigration, Council, Bureau meeting, Lund, Sweden, 26-30 November, 1997
Winter University, Brussels, Belgium, 20-25 January, 1998
Seminar “New Bulgaria – Real Reforms”, Varna, Bulgaria, 1-5 April, 1998
Seminar, Council, Bureau meeting “Black Sea-Cooperation”, Constanta, Romania, May 1998

1998/99
Summer University, Annual Meeting, Bad Ischl, Austria, August 1998
Seminar on Youth Unemployment, Council meeting, Athens, 16-20 December, 1998
Seminar “European Free Mobility Area”, Warsaw, 14-18 March, 1999
Seminar and Council “European Monetary Union”, Gdansk, Poland, 18-21 March, 1999
Seminar “Hungary on the Way to EU”, Budapest, 8-11 April, 1999
Seminar “Higher Education in Transition”, Dubrovnik, Croatia, June 1999

1999/2000
Summer University, Annual Meeting, Malta, July/August 1999
Seminar “Georgia and Europe”, Tbilissi, 20-26 October, 1999
Seminar “Encounters of Business and Politics”, Council, Bureau meeting, Helsinki, 8-12 December, 1999
Winter University “European Institutions and Civil Society”, Strasbourg, 12-16 February, 2000
Seminar “Youth Unemployment and its possible Solutions”, Bratislava, 30 March –2 April, 2000
EDS-Policy Days, Munich/Kreuth, Germany, 22-25 May, 2000

2000/2001
Annual Meeting, Summer University, Warsaw, Gdansk, Krokowa, July 23-30, 2000
Seminar “The Future of the Centre Right in Europe”, Budapest, 14-17 September, 2000
Seminar “Per Un Europa Di Tolleranza E Di Liberta”, Council, Venice, December 14-19, 2000
Winter University, Brussels, 30 January – 5 February, 2001
Seminar “Portugal in the New Economy”, Lisbon, Coimbra, Portugal, 2-6 May, 2001

2001/2002
Annual Meeting, Summer University, Limassol, Cyprus, 15-22 July, 2001
Seminar, Council, Athens, 16-20 December, 2001
Winter University, Brussels, 29 January – 3 February, 2002
Seminar “Nordic Visions of Europe”, Copenhagen, Oslo, 4-8 April, 2002
Seminar, Council, Cáceres, Spain, 24-28 April, 2002
Seminar “Ethics in Politics”, Council, Kraków, Poland, 23-26 May, 2002
Study trip, Lwiw, Ukraine, 26-28 May, 2002
Working Group Days, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, 26-30 June 2002
Annual Meeting, Summer University, Berlin/Hamburg, 28 July - 4 August, 2002

2002/2003
Bureau Meeting, Komárno, 1-2 September 2002
Bureau Meeting, Porto, 20 October 2002
Seminar/Council Meeting “EU Enlargement – An End to the Beginning?”, Copenhagen, 11-15 December 2002
Winter University “A Candidate State Examined: From Copenhagen to the Referendum”, Prague, 4-9 March 2003
Seminar/Council Meeting “Political Extremism and Political Violence in Higher Education Institutions”, Paris, 7-11 May 2003
Policy Days, Cyprus, 25-29 June 2003
Summer University “Croatia towards the European Union”, Zagreb/Zadar, 12-19 July 2003

2003/2004
Bureau Meeting, Brussels, 21-24 August 2003
Seminar/Council Meeting “A Bridge Across the Mediterranean, a crossroad between civilisations”, Palermo, 22-26 October 2003
Seminar/Council Meeting “Europe facing the phenomenon of Globalization”, Porto, 21-25 April 2004
Policy Days, Sofia/Ravda, 16-20 June 2004
Summer University “A New Deal for Europe”, London/Cardiff, 17-24 July 2004

2004/2005
Bureau Meeting, 26-29 August 2004, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
Seminar/Council Meeting “EU-Russia – Is there a roadmap towards Partnership?”, Riga, 27-31 October 2004
Seminar/Council Meeting “Freedom on the verge of Europe – the place of Belarus and Ukraine in New Europe”, Warsaw, 8-12 December 2004
Bureau Meeting, 21-23 January 2005
Winter University “Values @ Europe”, Strasbourg/Frankfurt, 15-20 February 2005
Seminar/Council Meeting “The Common Heritage of Europe”, Malta, 11-15 May 2005
Policy Days, Washington (USA), 22-26 June 2005
Summer University “Bulgaria and EU – Common Future through Traditional Values”, Sofia/Bourgas, 17-24 July 2005
2005/2006
Bureau Meeting, Vejlby Fed, 10-17 September 2005
Seminar/Council Meeting “Meaning of Participatory Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe”, Bratislava, 26-30 October 2005
Seminar/Council Meeting “Immigration in a New Europe: Challenges and Perspectives”, Athens, 7-11 December 2005
Bureau Meeting, Bohinj, 18-22 January 2006
Winter University “Immigration and terrorism, two challenges for the European Union”, Madrid, 21-26 February 2006
Seminar/Council Meeting “Societies on Their Way to Democracy”, Skopje, 10-14 May 2006
Policy Days, Helsinki, 28 June – 2 July 2006
Summer University “Portugal: Europe’s gateway to the world”, Lisbon, 23-30 July 2006

2006/2007
Bureau Meeting, Bucharest, 8-9 September 2006
Seminar “The melting pot island”, Cyprus, 6-10 December 2006
Bureau Meeting, Vienna, 12-14 January 2007
Winter University “Poland – a Bridge between Western and Eastern Europe”, Białystok, 12-17 February 2007
Seminar/Council Meeting “Croatia towards the European Union”, Zagreb, 25-29 April 2007
Policy Days, Madrid, 17-20 May 2007
Summer University “Europe, policies for the next fifty years”, Skopje/Ohrid, 16-22 July 2007
2007/2008
Bureau Meeting, Berlin, 21-23 September 2007
Bureau Meeting, Chisinau, 10-13 January 2008
Winter University “Democracies growing up – success stories from New Europe”, Budapest, 19-24 February 2008
Seminar/Council Meeting “European roads towards Freedom – Today was born in Gdansk”, 23-27 April 2008
Policy Days Sofia/Plovdiv, 11-15 June 2008
Summer University, Malta, 15-20 July 2008

2008/2009
Bureau Meeting, Istanbul, 19-21 September 2008
Seminar/Council Meeting “(Re)Thinking Bologna in European dimensions – Culture and Education in the European Higher Education Area”, Trier, 10-14 December 2008
Bureau Meeting, Vienna, 9-11 January 2009
Winter University “Educational Policies for the Future of Europe”, Bucharest, 17-22 February 2009
Seminar/Council Meeting, Paris, 22-26 April 2009
Policy Days, Riga, 27-31 May 2009

2009/2010
Bureau Meeting, Balatonszárszó, 28-30 August 2009
Seminar/Council Meeting “Change We Can Believe in”, Stockholm, 7-11 October 2009
Bureau Meeting, Paris, 6-8 November 2009
Seminar/Council Meeting “Israel, a Window to Middle East”, Jerusalem, 2-6 December 2009
Bureau Meeting, Vienna, 9-11 January 2010
Winter University “Europe today, 20 years after – priority for youth”, Brussels, 23-28 February 2010
Seminar/Council Meeting “EU and Russia: A new page in our relationship?”, Vilnius, 5-9 May 2010
Policy Days, Kiev, 10-13 June 2010
Summer University “Living together in diverse societies”, Žilina, 18-25 July 2010
2010/2011
Bureau Meeting, Balatonszárszó, 27-29 August 2010
Seminar/Council Meeting “Human Rights and Democracy – promoting European values”, Chisinau, 21-26 September 2010
Seminar/Council Meeting “Higher Education in Times of Crises”, Berlin, 16-19 December 2010
Winter University “European and regional integration – the role of youth”, Brussels, 31 January – 5 February 2011
Bureau Meeting, Oslo, 26-27 March 2011
Bureau Meeting, Budapest, 6-7 April 2011
Seminar/Council Meeting “Central European Policies – Hungarian Priorities”, Budapest, 7-10 April 2011
Policy Days, Riga/Ratnieki, 12-15 May 2011
Summer University „Europe Stronger Through Youth, Volunteering for a Knowledge Based Society – Five decades of student politics in Europe”, Vienna, 8-13 July 2011

2011/2012
Bureau Meeting, Jurbise, 12-14 August 2011
Seminar/Council Meeting “Twenty years of sustainable development in Central Eastern Europe”, Prague, 13-18 September 2011
Seminar/Council Meeting “Multiculturalism in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities”, Marseille, 7-11 December 2011
Bureau Meeting, Mechelen, 3-5 February 2012
Winter University “Democratisation process in the Balkans – promoting European Values and Human Rights”, Zagreb, 21-26 February 2012
Seminar/Council Meeting “Knowledge is Power”, Brussels/Antwerp, 8-12 May 2012
Policy Days, Tbilisi, 13-17 June 2012
Summer University “Opening borders, uniting Europe”, Sopron/Eisenstadt, 15-20 July 2012
F. List of Abbreviations

ACDP - Archiv für Christlich-Demokratische Politik (CDU/EDS-archive)
AEYSF - All-European Youth and Student Framework
AG - AktionsGemeinschaft
AKPY - AK Parti Youth (Turkey)
AM - Annual Meeting
AMSDA - Youth Association of Party of Democratic Action
AR - Annual Report
ASDF – Albanian Student’s Democratic Forum
AWS – Akcija Wyborcza Solidarnosc (Polish party alliance)
BE - BullsEye
BM - Bureau Meeting
CAU – Croatian Academic Union (also HAZ)
CCF - Conservative Collegiate Forum (United Kingdom)
CD – College Democrats (US-organisation)
CDPFY - Christian Democrat Popular Front Youth of Moldova (official name: Noua Generatie)
CDS – Christen Democratische Studenten
CDU – Christlich-Demokratische Union Deutschlands
CENYC- Congress of European National Youth Councils
CEYC - Central European Youth Cooperation
CF - Conservative Future
cf. – confer
CM - Council Meeting
COCDYC - Conservative and Christian-Democratic Youth Community in Europe (later DEMYC)
COSEC - Co-ordination Secretariat of the ISC
CRNC - College Republican’s National Committee (US-organisation)
CSJ-SaS – Christlich-Soziale Jugend/ Schuler a Studenten, Luxembourghish organisation
DAP-NDFK – Greece student organisation of the New Democracy party
DCY – Democratic Choice Youth (Russia)
DEMYC – Democratic Youth Community in Europe (former COCDYC)
DKS – Danmarks Konservative Studenter (Danish Conservative Students)
DKSF – Den Konservative Studenterforbundet (Oslo-branch of NKSF)
DY – Democratic Youth (Demokratska Omladina, Yugoslavia)
e.g.- for example
EC- Executive Committee (of ECCS/EDS)
ECB – European Co-ordination Bureau meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>acronym</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECOSY</td>
<td>European Community of Socialist Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDH</td>
<td>Étudiants Démocrates Humanistes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>European Democrat Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD</td>
<td>European Liberals and Democrats (group in the European Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSA</td>
<td>European Law Students’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>European People’s Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIB</td>
<td>European Student Information Bureau meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTA</td>
<td>European Students Association (EDS-splinter group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCD</td>
<td>European Union of Christian Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUYCD</td>
<td>European Union of Young Christian Democrats (dissolved in 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYF</td>
<td>European Youth Forum or European Youth Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEL</td>
<td>Federation des Etudiants Liberales, former Belgian EDS-member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG</td>
<td>Forza Italia Giovani, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISL</td>
<td>Federation of Independent Likud Students, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISS</td>
<td>Federation of Independent Student Societies (also FNSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMK</td>
<td>Forum Młodych Konserwatystów, Polish organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMSF</td>
<td>Fria Moderata Studentförbundet (Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.</td>
<td>footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FÖSt</td>
<td>Freie Österreichische Studenten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUCUA</td>
<td>Federation of Unionist and Conservative University Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ</td>
<td>Hrvatska Akademiska Zajednica (also CAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-BiH</td>
<td>Hrvatska Akademiska Zajednica of Bosnia-Hercegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSF</td>
<td>Hoyres Studenterforbundet (former NKSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDCSC</td>
<td>International Christian-democratic and Conservative Student Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDU</td>
<td>International Democrat Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLRY</td>
<td>International Federation of Liberal and radical Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGYO</td>
<td>International non-governmental youth organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRLY</td>
<td>Pro Patria and Res Publica Union (IRL) Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>International Student Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS</td>
<td>International Union of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUSY</td>
<td>International Union of Socialist Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUYCD</td>
<td>International Union of Young Christian Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYDU</td>
<td>International Young Democrat Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC or JJCC</td>
<td>Juventude Centrista, former Spanish EDS-member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKL</td>
<td>Jaunuju Konservatorių Lyga (Lithuanian Conservative Youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSD</td>
<td>Juventude Social-Democrata (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSL</td>
<td>Konservative Studerende Landsorganisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KSSF - Katholieke Staatkundige Studenten Federatie (The Netherlands)
KR – Koalicja Republikanska, Polish organisation
LDK - Democratic League of Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99)
LKJA – Latvias Konservatīvas Jaunatas Apvienība (Latvian Conservative Youth)
LMK – Lyga Mlodych Konserwatystow, Polish organisation
LYMEC – Liberal Youth Movement of the European Communities
MEP – member of the European Parliament
MÉT - Mouvement des étudiants
MF – Malady Front (also YPF)
MGERB - Mladi Grazhdani za evropeysko razvitie na Balgariya (Young Citizens for Development of Bulgaria)
MK- Mladí konzervativci (Young Conservatives of the Czech Republic) or Młodzi Konserwatystci (Polish equivalent)
NASA – North American Student’s Accord (US-organisation)
NEI – Nouvelles Equipes Internationales (later EUCD)
NEYS - New Era Youth Section (Latvia)
NG – Nuevas Generaciones (Spain)
NGO – non-governmental organisation
NGPPCD - Youth of the Christian-Democratic People’s Party (Moldova)
NKSF – Norges Konservative Studenterforbundet, organisation from Norway
NKSU - Nordic Conservative Student Union
NPP-CDS- Student Organisation of the Christian Democratic Peasants Party (Romania)
NZS – Federation of Independent Student Societies (Poland)
NSSV – Nederlandse Staatkundige Studentenvereniging (The Netherlands)
ODM – Občiansko-democratická mládež (Civic-Democratic Youth, Slovakia)
OSPDL - Student Organisation of the Democratic-Liberal Party (Romania)
OTPDL - Organizatiaje Tineret a Partidului Democrat-Liberal (Romania)
ÖSU – Österreichische Studenten Union
PCYG – Progressive Conservative Youth Groups (Canada)
PEOF – Cypriot youth organisation, former EDS-member
PEON – Cypriot student organisation, EDS-member since 1979
PWG - Permanent Working Group
RCDS - Ring Christlich-Demokratischer Studenten
RSF - Robert Schuman Foundation
RSI - Robert Schuman Institute
SAS - Students' Association of Slovenia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAU</td>
<td>Slovenian Academic Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>Studenti Demokristiani Maltin, Christian Democrat Students of Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFÖ</td>
<td>Studentenforum Österreich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS</td>
<td>Swiss Liberal Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHSS</td>
<td>Sveučilišna Organizacija HSS-a (Youth Organisation of Croatian Peasants’ Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>Tuhatkunta (Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLDM</td>
<td>Youth of the Liberal-Democratic Party of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom (of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMS</td>
<td>na VMRO-DPMNE – youth organisation from the Republic of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNi</td>
<td>Union Nationale-interuniversitaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ukrainian Students’ Association (Ukrainska Studentska Spylka, Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>United Students for Europe (former student organisation of the EUYCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAKA</td>
<td>organisation from Iceland („wake“)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>Verenigde Democratische Studenten (Belgian organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCEG</td>
<td>Young Conservative Europe Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAY</td>
<td>World Alliance of Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFDY</td>
<td>World Federation of Democratic Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAF</td>
<td>Young America’s Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFJ</td>
<td>Youth Forum Jeunesse (European Youth Forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPF</td>
<td>Young Popular Front (also MF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSO</td>
<td>Young Student Organization Graali (Georgia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Sources

The two authors have worked on a different set of sources, with no overlapping. Therefore, the sources for the time 1961-2001 and for 2001-2011 are listed separately.

Sources 1961-2001

Unpublished Documents

From the “Archiv für Christlich-Demokratische Politik” (ACDP) in Sankt Augustin (Germany) we consulted the entire ICCS/ECCS/EDS-section IX, containing records of the years 1961-1985. Additionally, we studied several papers of the organisation “Junge Union” (ACDP IV) concerning international activities. From Mr. Michalis Peglis, Athens, we received the EDS-records for the years 1989-1999. Since they were in Holger Thuss’ possession for some time, they were quoted together with his private collection as “private archive Thuss” (PAT).

Additionally, we were able to use the private archive of Mr. Uwe Leonardy, former International Secretary of RCDS (1956-1958, quoted as PAL). Other items concerning the relations of RCDS to ICCS in the 60s we received from Mr. Dieter Ibielski (quoted as PAI). For the 1980s, I received a selection of papers from the former Vice Chairman Mr. Johann F. Colsman (quoted as PAC) and the former Chairman Ms. Bettina Machaczek (quoted as PAM) concerning their years in EDS in 1981/84 and 1987/89 respectively. A significant part of Ms. Machaczek’s papers illuminate the “All-European Youth and Student Framework” (1981-1990). From Mr. Andreas von Gehlen, formerly Berlin, we received several papers concerning the Working Group on the Intergovernmental Conference of 1996/97, quoted as PAG. In 2002, I also received copies of papers which were sent by EDS to the European Youth Forum in Strasbourg over the years. They mainly concern seminar activities since 1974 (quoted as EYF-A). Some documents were also supplied by the Federal Office for the Records of the Former State Security Service of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin (quoted as BStU). Most of the records used are now included in the official EDS-archive as part of the ACDP.

Documents published by ICCS/ECCS/EDS

Periodicals

Taurus (1/1), June 1974
Taurus extra issue, Munich, 1979
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Taurus, European Quarterly, published 1979-1983
BullsEye, April 1997
BullsEye (4), July 1997
BullsEye (5), October 1997
BullsEye (6), January 1998
BullsEye (7), April 1998
BullsEye (8), June 1998
BullsEye (9), October 1998
BullsEye (10), January 1999
BullsEye (11), April 1999
BullsEye (12/13), October 1999
BullsEye (14/15), March 2000
BullsEye (16/17), August 2000
BullsEye (18/19), December 2000
BullsEye (20), May 2001

Published Annual Reports

Annual Report 1976-1977
Annual Report 1979-1980

Reports and Programmes

EDS (ed.): Europe and Democracy in Portugal and Spain, 1975.
FCS (ed.): EDS Student Affairs Conference, Stockholm, April 29- May 2, 1977.
ICCS (ed.): One Europe, Stockholm 1964.

Books and Articles

Brandt, Daniel: Notes from the late Student Movement, in: Christianity and Crisis, 07-08-72, pp.190-193.
Bundesminister des Innern (ed.): Moskaus getarnte Helfer, Bonn 1986.
Gundhus, Stale: Malta: Hvordan rase re et universitet, Aftonbladet, Oslo, 26-10-79.
Jansen, Thomas/Van Hecke, Steven: At Europe’s Service, The origins and Evo-


Nesse, Knut Olav: Et Universitet gar til grunne, kontext 2-79/20.


Times of Malta, 28-03-78, p. 1.


Wenger, Andreas/ Nuenlist, Christian/ Locher, Anna (eds.): Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges beyond Deterrence in the 1960s (CSS Studies in Security and International Relations), New York.
Sources 2001-2011

The list of sources 2002-2011 incorporates all published and written materials from the time 2002-2011 the author of this period could dispose over. All materials were derived from the archives of EDS, both in hard and electronic copies. Missing sources could not be retrieved and are thus not indicated.

Annual Reports
Annual Report 2004/2005
Annual Report 2009/2010
Annual Report 2010/2011

BullsEye newsmagazines
BullsEye No 22 (February 2002)
BullsEye No 23 (June 2002)
BullsEye No 24 (November 2002)
BullsEye No 25 (April 2003)
BullsEye No 26 (July 2003)
BullsEye No 27 (October 2003)
BullsEye No 28 (February 2004)
BullsEye No 29 (October 2004)
BullsEye No 30 (February 2005)
BullsEye No 31 (February 2006)
BullsEye No 32 (December 2006)
BullsEye No 33 (April 2007)
BullsEye No 34 (November 2007)
BullsEye No 35 (April 2008)
BullsEye No 36 (April 2009)
BullsEye No 37 (December 2009)
BullsEye No 38 (February 2010)
BullsEye No 39 (May 2010)
BullsEye No 41 (September 2010)
BullsEye No 42 (December 2010)
BullsEye No 43 (February 2011)
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BullsEye No 44 (April 2011)
BullsEye No 45 (September 2011)
BullsEye No 46 (December 2011)

Newsletters
Newsletter “This Way”, 01/2003
Newsletter “This Way”, 02/2003
Newsletter “This Way”, 03/2003
Newsletter January 2007
Newsletter October 2009
Newsletter November 2009
Newsletter December 2009
Newsletter January 2010
Newsletter February 2010
Newsletter March 2010
Newsletter April 2010
Newsletter May 2010
Newsletter June 2010
Newsletter July 2010
Newsletter August 2010
Newsletter September 2010
Newsletter October 2010
Newsletter November 2010
Newsletter December 2010
Newsletter January 2011
Newsletter February 2011
Newsletter March 2011
Newsletter April 2011
Newsletter May 2011
Newsletter June 2011
Newsletter July 2011
Newsletter August 2011
Newsletter September 2011
Newsletter October 2011
Newsletter November 2011
Newsletter December 2011

Minutes of Meetings
Annual Meetings
Minutes of the 32nd Annual Meeting from 31st July 2002 in Berlin
Minutes of the 33rd Annual Meeting from 16th July 2003 in Zadar
Minutes of the 34th Annual Meeting from 21st July 2004 in London
Minutes of the 35th Annual Meeting from 19th July 2005 in Sofia
Minutes of the 36th Annual Meeting from 25th/26th July 2006 in Lisbon
Minutes of the 37th Annual Meeting from 18th July 2007 in Ohrid
Minutes of the 38th Annual Meeting from 17th July 2008 in Malta
Minutes of the 39th Annual Meeting from 23rd July 2009 in Limassol
Minutes of the 40th Annual Meeting from 21st July 2010 in Žilina
Minutes of the 41st Annual Meeting from 11th July 2011 in Vienna

Council Meetings
Minutes of the 5th Council Meeting from 25th May 2002 in Kraków
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th September 2002 in Helsinki
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 14th December 2002 in Copenhagen
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 7th March 2003 in Prague
Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 10th May 2003 in Paris
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 25th October 2003 in Palermo
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 30th October 2004 in Riga
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 11th December 2004 in Warsaw
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 19th February 2005 in Frankfurt
Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 14th May 2005 in Malta
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 29th October 2005 in Bratislava
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 10th December 2005 in Athens
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 24th February 2006 in Madrid
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 28th October 2006 in Torino
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 24th November 2007 in Guimarães
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 23rd February 2008 in Budapest
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 26th April 2008 in Gdańsk
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 13th December 2008 in Trier
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 21st February 2009 in Bucharest
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 25th April 2009 in Paris
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 10th October 2009 in Stockholm
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 5th December 2009 in Jerusalem
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 27th February 2010 in Brussels
Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 8th May 2010 in Vilnius
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 25th September 2010 in Chisinau
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 18th December 2010 in Berlin
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting from 4th February 2011 in Brussels
Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting from 9th April 2011 in Budapest
Minutes of the 1st Council Meeting from 17th September 2011 in Prague
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting from 10th December 2011 in Marseille
Bureau Meetings
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 20th October 2002 in Porto
Minutes of the 6th Bureau Meeting from 6th March 2003 in Prague
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 21st-24th August 2003 in Brussels
Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 23rd January 2004 in Levi
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 26th-29th August 2004 in Las Palmas
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 10th December 2004 in Warsaw
Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 22nd January 2005 in Stockholm
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 10th December 2005 in Athens
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 21st January 2006 in Bohinj
Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 23rd/25th February 2006 in Madrid
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 27th October 2006 in Torino
Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 8th December 2006 in Nicosia
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 19th July 2007 in Ohrid
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 21st-23rd September 2007 in Berlin
Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 22nd November 2007 in Guimarães
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 12th January 2008 in Chisinau
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 20th September 2008 in Istanbul
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 12th December 2008 in Trier
Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 9th/10th January 2009 in Vienna
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 20th February 2009 in Bucharest
Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 24th April 2009 in Paris
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 29th August 2009 in Balatonszárszó
Minutes of the 2nd Bureau Meeting from 9th/10th October 2009 in Stockholm
Minutes of the 3rd Bureau Meeting from 7th/8th November 2009 in Paris
Minutes of the 4th Bureau Meeting from 4th December 2009 in Jerusalem
Minutes of the 5th Bureau Meeting from 12th June 2010 in Kiev
Minutes of the 9th Bureau Meeting from 19th/20th July 2010 in Žilina
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 23rd/24th July 2010 in Žilina
Minutes of the 6th Bureau Meeting from 7th April 2011 in Budapest
Minutes of the 1st Bureau Meeting from 11th/12th July 2011 in Vienna

Working Groups
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