

FOLLOWING THE IV SUMMER UNIVERSITY ON EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP, WE HEREBY:

APPEAL TO THE EU FOR MORE EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

This list of demands is the result of intensive and multifocal discussions during the IV Summer University on European Citizenship in Brussels on 2-3 September 2019. Leading policy-makers, activists and members of the academia have actively participated in shaping the list of priorities for the EU institutions in the new term and the next Multiannual Financial Framework. In sum, we call on the EU Institutions to do at least three things:

- Develop their own capacity to deliver on EU citizenship, defend European rights and promote this unique transnational status in all areas of EU policy;
- Commit to an agenda for radical change of the EU Institutions to bring them closer to the citizen with measures such as a European Citizens' Agora, a wider package of reforms in a new White Paper on EU Governance and a more proactive approach to European citizenship education;
- Single out European citizenship as a priority for the future reform of the EU Treaties.

Introduction

Across Europe, from Lisbon to Riga, Athens to Edinburgh, more and more young people are becoming true European citizens, their opportunities and personal lives enriched by a Europe of freedom to live, study or work anywhere they choose. This first transnational citizenship of the modern era is both popular and spreading in sharp contrast to the doom-laden scenarios of retreat to identity politics and nationalism. Enacting EU citizenship is a way of breaking down the barriers which divide us into cliques and local identities. On a personal level, EU citizenship is about dramatically enlarging the horizon of self-fulfillment. On a macro scale, it keeps Europe together by forging connections, networks and collective values across borders. It means inhabiting a space beyond the nation-state, one which is to be imbued with equal opportunity, rejection of all forms of racism and discrimination, and mutual recognition of differences – paramount values for its proper functioning. European citizenship can only be founded on the curiosity to explore and embrace those differences, so that they enrich one's own life.

One cannot escape noticing a sharp contrast between the sluggishness of the top-down development of European citizenship on the one hand and the gleeful spontaneity with which its content is being filled by everyday bottom-up practices across the Union. Whilst the Europe of the EU is a prisoner of competing national interests, young people are escaping those constraints and taking the fate of Europe into their own hands, by building their own means of transnational communication and networking through acts of European citizenship. *Erasmus* and other EU programmes have been a catalyst for this emerging European public sphere, which goes well beyond their direct impact. Social movements, forces for change, or just the coming together of people with the same interest are less and less confined within borders or limited to people of the same nationality. Parts of our cities, university campuses, workplaces, social media and civil society are creating the **social capital of European citizenship**. The growth of transnational societies is not just due to the internet, cheaper travel and other means of communication, but also due to the resulting changes in culture in turn producing a sense of common citizenship across borders. This emerging European political determination was shown in the increase in turnout in the 2019 European elections to reach over 50% for the first time in 20 years.

Yet, the European situation is profoundly paradoxical. Transnational citizenship is surpassing expectations whilst, at the same time, a broader nationalist wave is sweeping Europe. The fragility of European citizenship and the sense that no-one knows where it is going are apparent from the pressures of repeated crises which reveal its shortcomings.

The European Parliament must lay claim to European citizenship as the basis for its own legitimacy. Such a move is necessary following the legitimisation it received from the European electorate flocking to the voting polls in May this

It is astonishing that the European Parliament of all the EU Institutions has so far not done more to take advantage of this unique and fundamental European status and the advantages it offers:

1. **Historical roots.** For over two millennia, since the Greek sense of belonging to a wider community and the inclusive citizenship of Roman times, being a European citizen has meaning. It is related to landmark struggles for rights and democracy and has, especially after periods when our continent was torn apart by war, been seen as the best hope to achieve the European dream. It is no accident, for example, that Thomas Moore's tale of Utopia emerged from a discussion among a group of Europeans and was printed with the help of Erasmus. Our artists and scholars have always travelled. For some, the birthday of European citizenship was 25 years ago when it was included in the Maastricht Treaty, but this distant echo of our identity as Europeans was born 61 years ago when the Treaty of Rome created a European Economic Community, the rules of which could be invoked by individuals in a court of law against their own government. Union citizenship finds definition in the EU context but it builds on much deeper intellectual, cultural and cosmopolitan reservoirs of meaning.
2. **Legal substance.** When Union citizenship was added to the Treaties, many observers dismissed it as mere public relations or "citizenship light". That was to overlook the impact of the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) which has turned this into a real citizenship with rights to freedom of movement and equal treatment regardless of nationality at its heart. On repeated occasions, the Court has declared Union citizenship "a fundamental status of nationals of Member States", which can be invoked as such, and challenge restrictions to the individual's rights to free movement in areas of state sovereignty, such as access to social assistance, higher education, and even how one can name one's children or risk losing nationality itself. Treaty provisions from the Maastricht to the Lisbon Treaties have been backed up by an expanding body of European Law in the areas of free movement and residence for European citizens and their family members, the coordination of social security arrangements for those on the move and the recognition of their professional qualifications.
3. **Extensive practice.** Before the 'Big Bang' enlargement of the EU from 15 to 25 Member States in 2004 and then 28, freedom of movement was at a low level and outstripped by immigration from outside the EU. Now it is catching up, not only as a result of enlargement to the East, but also because of youth unemployment in the South hit by a decade of economic crisis. The expansion of European citizenship, in practice, has been largely ignored. In the political debate dominated by disagreements within and between countries over immigration and asylum, the fact that Europeans are also on the move goes unnoticed. There has been an increase in the official numbers living and working in other Member States from 8 to 12 million in the last ten years. In turn, this overlooks the scale of cross-border commuting, temporary and unrecorded movements and simply carrying out cross-border transactions virtually without having to travel. Sociological research suggests that some 30% of Europeans are, to an extent, enacting European citizenship.
4. **Increasing popularity.** Traditionally, a roughly equal number of Europeans have seen themselves as citizens of their country and also citizens of Europe, but that figure has risen to 71% according to the latest Eurobarometer surveys. Even in the UK, where a majority voted to leave the EU, 58% see themselves as European citizens to some extent. Awareness of European rights has increased to over 40% of the EU population. A majority see freedom of movement as the greatest of the EU's achievements and good for their own country. This shift towards European identity is occurring, paradoxically, at a time of decreasing trust in the EU and its Institutions and of increasing insistence by governments of national interests.
5. **Transnational challenges.** Finally, the basic feature of the political challenges facing Europeans today is their transnationality. Migration, climate change, organized crime, and the like are all pressing issues no one government can successfully tackle alone. Transnational issues require transnational solutions which means that citizens need to look across the confines of their national political systems for answers. They are increasingly doing that but lack a more solid basis for political action.

year. This means **(a)** demanding better enforcement of European rights across borders; **(b)** giving European citizens a greater role in setting the EU agenda and **(c)** promoting a wider sense of European identity shared by all.

As a first step, the European Parliament should take on a clear responsibility for EU citizenship. Different crises facing the EU are also crises of citizenship and identity, so that a transnational citizenship relates closely to choices for the future of Europe. EU citizenship is still a practice looking for a clear concept and unequivocal political support. It raises real questions for debate. Here are 5 by way of example:

- To what extent is EU citizenship only an extension of our nationality, through the opening up of states and territories to each other? Is it also becoming a freestanding transnational citizenship in its own right? If this is the case, how can this status become as relevant to *stayers* as to those *on the move*? Like the European Union itself, is not European citizenship too much of a top-down project, its advantages enjoyed by the relatively privileged and well-educated few? Can this become a citizenship for all?
- How can EU citizenship be made to work better in practice, particularly for minorities, the disadvantaged and low-income groups? EU citizenship is part of the broader framework of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, but how can that be applied in countries where basic European values are being violated?
- Does citizenship fit with an EU decision-making process which is organised by sector of activity and dominated by expertise and lobbying for more specific interests? Can citizens really have a voice without more fundamental reforms of the way in which the EU works?
- Apart from allowing young people from Eurozone countries hit by the crisis to exercise their European rights to find work in the stronger economies, where is the sense of common citizenship, and not only that of national interest? Are Europeans really so divided on questions of the right to asylum and immigration that boat loads of people fleeing war and persecution are being sent from one European port to the next?
- Should this be a citizenship which is only gained automatically if one's State becomes a member of the EU and lost in the same way if it withdraws? Should European citizenship remain confined to nationals of EU Member States or be more expansive and continent-wide, including citizens of neighbouring countries and people resident in Europe who have come from the rest of the world?

The following **ten-point agenda** addresses these concerns following the announced structure an already recognizable ECIT methodology of looking at European citizenship in its three dimensions: rights, participation and belonging. But there is also a more immediate task facing the European institutions. The EU currently lacks the capacity to deliver on EU citizenship. **Therefore:**

- (a) the failure of the EC President-elect to get the EP approval of all the members of the College of Commissioners should be seized as an opportunity to demand the appointment of a senior vice-president responsible for coordinating all aspects of EU citizenship;
- (b) an all-party interest group of MEPs from different committees should be set up to encourage giving a higher profile to a more joined up popular European citizenship in all EU Institutions and in all areas of policy.

1. The European Parliament should demand a special year of European citizenship.

We appeal to the European Parliament to support this unique citizenship which often appears to be the responsibility of everyone and no-one, and it is all too easily taken for granted. The opportunity to do so will come shortly after the elections when the Commission should present the report due every three years under Article 25 TFEU on activities related to Union citizenship. In a letter to ECIT on 6 June 2018, Antonio Tajani, the President

of the European Parliament stated how much his Institution “appreciates what your initiative sets out to achieve: to bring together policy makers, civil society activists, academics and students and give them the opportunity to debate European citizenship in the context of the numerous challenges Europe is facing and with the 2019 European Elections very much on the horizon.” In response to the Commission’s report, the European Parliament should call for a special year to encourage more widespread debate, particularly in schools and universities, to raise awareness of European rights and opportunities to have a say in the decision-making of the EU. The year should be a vehicle to kickstart European civic education projects and result in an action programme on the lines of the reforms presented here. A successful year requires resources, a cross-sectoral alliance of civil society organisations and imaginative narrative, cultural and multi-media activity. It could turn this transnational citizenship around from a relatively elitist concept to a popular and diffused reality.

2. Simplify European citizenship by bringing its scattered features together.

The guidelines published by ECIT [here](#) are a first attempt to respond to this need. Even this obvious objective needs political support and is difficult to meet among a set of Institutions where responsibilities for European citizenship are so scattered with one department dealing with free movement and residence, another with social rights, another with professional qualifications and still another with the educational, cultural and youth exchange programmes. The official definition of Union citizenship is in articles 18-25 TFEU, but other aspects are scattered across other parts of the Treaties, legislation and programmes. To give meaning to citizenship at any level, the different components of rights, participation and a wider sense of common identity stand or fall together. The guidelines show that EU citizenship, despite its scattered and discreet profile, does contain the ingredients of a true citizenship even if the *rights aspects* have progressed further than the other two.

By bringing together what exists, the guidelines show that EU citizenship is more than the sum of its parts, but also where a piecemeal approach leaves gaps and suggests a need for further progress. The guidelines can encourage civil society and the academic community to relate to Union citizenship as a whole and not just through the lens of their own particular area of interest or discipline. At the beginning of 2019, following the own-initiative report by MEP Maite Pagazaurtunda Ruiz, the European Parliament promoted this approach, asked for, amongst other things, all new developments in EU citizenship to be united and codified in an EU Citizenship Statute (EP Resolution on the Implementation of Treaty Provisions Related to EU Citizenship, Article 51) and urged the other Institutions and bodies of the EU to do the same.

RIGHTS

3. Enforce European rights to freedom of movement effectively and create a free movement solidarity fund.

There is a gap between the fine principles of the case-law of the European Court and what happens on the ground where exceptions to freedom of movement can become the rule, especially for low-income groups, minorities and people who do not conform to standard classification. A long history of failure by national authorities to apply European Law properly is aggravated by anti-migration rhetoric and tensions between national and European citizenship when it comes to issues of social assistance, immigration or family law. Often very minor differences create barriers which undermine the credibility of EU citizenship. And these are becoming worse. There should be a twin-track approach to enforcement of European rights combined with non-legislative action.

There is a need for more action by the Commission to prevent barriers to freedom of movement occurring in the first place, and to introduce collective action by associations and a fast-track enforcement procedure. Reforms are all the more necessary to counteract the negative effects of Brexit. Securing European rights for 3.3 million EU citizens in the UK and 1.2 million UK citizens in the EU will be an uphill struggle for at least a generation and will have repercussions on other EU citizens and immigrants. Migrant organisations and law clinics should be given more support from EU programmes.

The main challenge is that freedom of movement is uneven and can create problems of brain-drain in specific country of origin regions and corresponding strains on local services in regions of destination, so that EU regulations and better enforcement are not the only answer. A *European free movement solidarity fund* should be created to bring the two together and support both movers and local communities. The fund should operate through partnerships at local level linked across the main pathways of intra-EU migration among public authorities, civil society and the private sector. A cross-border EU minimum income scheme should be introduced to ensure that jobseekers have less need to claim social assistance in the host country. Such action is essential to counteract calls for general restrictions on European rights to freedom of movement. New resources are not needed since such a fund can fit within EU cohesion policy and operations under the social and regional funds with contributions coming in equal measure from countries of origin, host countries and the EU budget.

4. Europeanise the European elections and support the introduction of cross-border universal suffrage.

Political rights are the defining feature of any citizenship. The Maastricht Treaty was a step forward by introducing the right to vote and stand in local and European elections for EU citizens living in another EU Member State. It would certainly encourage more use of these rights if political parties both decide to pitch their campaigns towards communities of European citizens and include more of their number as candidates. For the next European elections, the EU Institutions should issue guidance to national electoral authorities to make registration and voting easier for EU citizens resident in another member state, where turn out is exceptionally low. The elections must be more European by encouraging political parties to highlight their European affiliations and European lead candidates. However, the system of the single European lead candidate is not truly credible without European transnational lists, in addition to national lists, to create a genuinely democratic link with voters. In the [sixth point of her programme](#), Ursula von der Leyen, the new President of the European Commission has taken the initiative to set up a two-year citizens' conference on the future of Europe by 2020 with a mandate to come forward with proposals for these reforms.

The next European Parliament should confront the paradox that European political rights exist for European citizens living in another Member State for lesser-order elections but not for the ones that really count — the national ones — or for local but not for regional elections, even though the two are closely related. In the British referendum of 23 June 2016, which was a close call, EU citizens in the UK and UK citizens resident in the EU for over 15 years were disenfranchised. ECIT is building a partnership for a European Citizens' Initiative — "My Europe, My Vote" — in favour of full voting rights in order to remove this stain on democracy and make it more transnational. This is essential at a time when elections at all levels are becoming more and more of a platform for asserting anti-EU, populist and nationalistic agendas. The one measure which can give European citizenship more substance is to make it more political.

PARTICIPATION

5. Call on the new Commission to produce a white paper on European governance and the citizen

The [White Paper](#) of 2001 remains the basis on which the EU has developed reforms to become more transparent and reduce the gap with the citizen. It is, however, by now out-of-date and overtaken by the new opportunities offered by the internet and social media to reach out to more significant numbers of the unreached across Europe. At the same time, the challenges of disenchantment with Europe and sharp divisions across public opinion have also grown out of crises facing the EU. The need for an overall assessment and updating of the white paper are all too apparent. Reforms have tended to become increasingly piecemeal with expectations raised only to be disappointed when the latest gadget — be it citizens' initiatives or the transparency register — fails to make a noticeable difference to perceptions of the EU or its ability to reach out beyond a relatively closed bubble of insiders. Furthermore, there is consensus in the academia that the kind of participation fostered by the Commission's approach in the white paper is 'thin' since it involves citizens and associations but is not at all bound by their opinion.

From the citizen perspective, the different channels of access and communication are simply different ways of raising their concerns with EU policy makers and form a whole. A new white paper should examine European governance not just in terms of the European Commission's role but also that of the European Parliament, the Council and national governments. The white paper should propose a comprehensive reform agenda across the range of all the possibilities open to citizens: formal complaints against violations of European Law, access to documents, public — not just expert — consultations, the transparency register and rules for lobbying, petitions to the European Parliament and the role of the European Ombudsman. The emphasis should be on how to make these access points better known, multilingual, easier to use and capable of producing quick results. In the hearings for candidates for the post of Commissioner, Members of the European parliament should demand a new white paper on European governance.

6. Make deliberative and participatory democracy a permanent pillar of EU decision-making through a European Citizens' Agora

The new European Parliament and Commission should build on vast plethora of local, national and EU initiatives that had emerged in the run-up to the 2019 elections to engage citizens in local debates about the future of Europe and a transnational online consultation designed by a randomly selected panel of citizens from across the EU. The new Commission President has responded to the need to continue these efforts by proposing the two-year conference on the future of Europe: "the Conference should bring together citizens, including a significant role for young people, civil society and European Institutions as equal partners." To achieve such equal partnership, citizens should be randomly selected to be representative of the EU territory and population with sufficient access to resources, time and expertise to contribute. After the two years, ECIT recommends that participatory democracy should become *permanent*. This requires places citizens can call their own and a European law.

Space and resources should be created to bring in the citizens by reforming existing bodies. The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee on Regions see themselves as a bridge towards civil society. The staff, premises and technical equipment should serve a *European Citizens' Agora*. In the past, the European Parliament ran its own annual agora. Such a body should be composed of citizens drawn by lot or selected to be representative of the population from across all EU Member States. Such an agora should receive a mandate to make recommendations on major challenges facing the EU, such as migration, sustainable development, the Euro-zone or cross-border security where European countries may be divided in the short-term, even if, in the long-term, their interests could converge. Like the proposed Citizens' House, the Agora should not only exist in

Brussels, but be accessible from anywhere virtually and be multi-functional: formal deliberation, games and more festive or cultural activities -all should be used to bring people together. Many existing European flagship projects and programmes such as Europe for citizens fit naturally in a citizens' agora.

A European Law is needed to go beyond *case-by-case* experimentation with participatory democracy and ensure the fair and proper use of tools such as citizens' juries, assemblies, scenario-building exercises or participatory budgeting. Such a law should lay down standards so that citizens know their role and what to expect. It is necessary to establish rules for the selection of participants, access to expertise, the conduct of deliberations, ownership of the results, engagement with decision-makers and above all follow-up.

BELONGING

7. Co-create European citizens' houses

Among all the prestigious buildings of the Institutions and some 30,000 lobbyists and think-tanks in Brussels, citizens need their own place. The European Parliament should look again at an idea it supported in the past with an experimental budget line, but which ran up against resistance from those arguing for the status quo. The House would be much more than an advice service for individuals — it could provide an interactive space where proposals can be worked on, for example, to gather over one million signatures for a citizens' initiative, forge cross-border alliances and networks, and create synergy among what are often original but isolated ideas for Europe.

Proposals are being worked on for such a facility, for example at [SECO](#) (Salon for European Civic Organizations) where ECIT is based near the European Parliament. Such a space must meet a wide range of different requirements for public participation or more private deliberation and research. A European Citizens' House should be built democratically as a bottom-up creation, emerging from the local community and fitting with the local architecture and urban surroundings, therefore reflecting diversity and the organic needs of citizens and organisations involved. At the same time, such a house should not only exist in Brussels and should have at least some common features — or a "brand" — which are immediately recognizable anywhere.

Civil society activists are aware that starting successful European ventures requires a considerable investment of time and energy, mostly on a voluntary basis. The European Citizens' House is an incubator and should be adaptable to different needs. For example, to be able to respond rapidly to a local problem with a European dimension, there should be a mobile version. The new European Parliament should provide political support for a win-win project to reduce the gap between the EU and the citizen.

8. Introduce a European citizen card

Such a card, which could be the reverse side of national identity cards (or a special card in countries which do not have national IDs), would show that national and EU citizenship are complementary. In terms of the Citizenship Directive (2004/38), residence cards are not necessary for short stays in another EU Member State, but only for permanent residence. This has a disadvantage: it has encouraged the introduction of different kinds of voluntary European passes for different categories of the population and different national schemes to register as a worker or to obtain an identification number, which can be required to be able to make a start. Such a multiplicity of

different European and national schemes is confusing and creates a barrier to freedom of movement. A European card should bring them together and become instead a shared practical badge and symbol of the same transnational citizenship across Europe. It could serve objectives to establish European rights both for people moving around Europe and towards the EU Institutions:

- More and more people are coming in and out of different national systems more quickly. In a digital Europe, considerable time and money can be saved for citizens and the administration alike by an electronic card replacing the need to supply paper originals and authenticated translation of documents to establish one's status. There is already a European health card which could be extended to other social security entitlements, such as rights to a pension, for example. Differences in private civil law are problematic but at least with a card, red tape can be cut and mutual recognition becomes easier by establishing connections to family members and their rights. A card could carry proof also of one's professional and academic qualifications.
- A card could also make access to the EU and citizens' participation much easier and more extensive. For example, over 9 million people have signed over 70 European citizens' initiatives, but with a proliferation of different national requirements only 5 ECIs have reached beyond the 1 million signatures threshold to be valid. A card would make signing ECIs much quicker and easier, and it could guarantee a better success rate. It could also be used to send requests to the EU authorities, to petition the European Parliament, to participate in public consultations or to vote in European elections which could be expected to have a positive impact on turnout.
- Whilst the card should provide information for the holder on the administration of all the European rights under the Treaties and how they are applied, it should also be proof of one's entitlement to participate in a European educational, training or youth exchange programme.

9. Create equal rights to be informed, educated and enjoy the benefits of European citizenship.

Whilst reforms are needed to make the EU more democratic, this is not enough unless they resonate with the majority and are actively taken up by more people. European citizenship must become a condition of civil equality and rest on a wider sense of shared identity in a European public sphere. As a first step, there should be an obligation on EU and national authorities to ensure that all Union citizens and residents should be informed about their European rights and the activities of the EU, but that will not be sufficient unless people have had, from an early age, the necessary education in and out of school about the EU and what it means to be a European citizen. In turn, more information and education about Europe can only work if it is seen as relevant and everyone is given the opportunity to experience Europe in practice. For example, the age at which it should be possible to sign a European citizens' initiative should be lowered to 16. European citizenship education can be taught as a stand-alone subject or linked to others such as languages. English has increased exponentially in use, particularly among the younger generation, and this should be recognised and encouraged by the EU. Use of a *lingua franca* should be counterbalanced by learning from an early age at least two other European languages apart from one's mother tongue and being encouraged to recognise that the best option is always to speak the local language.

As a counterpart to the new programme on fundamental rights and European values, there should be a *special programme on European citizenship education* without prejudice to member states' competences. There should be room for such an initiative in the context of the new multiannual budget for education which the European Parliament and Commission want to see trebled, not just doubled which was the original intention of the previous Commission. This should start from a young age. Citizenship education has spread across Europe, albeit unevenly, following the [Council of Europe Charter](#). The EU, which does have competence for Union citizenship, should propose a model for the European addition to these efforts following the 2015 *Paris Declaration* by EU

ministers for education aims at promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education.

The Erasmus+ programme should give the majority and eventually everyone the possibility of participating at some time in their life in a European exchange programme. This should become a European right — a universal entitlement of a European citizenship of greater equality. Such an objective could only be achieved gradually and through the introduction of an increase in European revenue or a European tax to produce the necessary resources. Only in this way would the EP goal of assuring full inclusion into the Erasmus+ be achieved. The new European Parliament should support such an objective and introduce a feasibility project. Last but not the least, European citizenship education has an untapped potential to dramatically increase the success of Europeanization efforts of the Union in the process of EU enlargement/accession of the Western Balkan candidates for EU membership. Whilst the accession negotiations are conducted between the EU institutions and national governments involving the 35 chapters of the *Acquis*, the effect of these comprehensive reforms on the wider citizenry are uneven and fuzzy. Assuring the timely sensitization of future EU citizens to the political culture of active transnational citizenship and the rules of the game of EU politics would guarantee that, once their country enters the EU, the citizens are also ready to play an active and constructive part. The experience of some of the more recently joined member states and their state of democracy and rule of law warns us that this is a necessary lacuna to fill.

10. Revise European citizenship itself in the next revision of the EU Treaties.

When Union citizenship was introduced in the Maastricht Treaty, it was welcomed by civil society organisations but with strong criticism of the status being based on nationality of Member States rather than residence. Human rights and migrant organisations, as well as a broader alliance during the European Year of Citizens in 2013, have highlighted the dangers of discrimination between two groups of migrants — EU citizens and those from third countries outside the EU. This argument is especially relevant today when there are major challenges of integration of migrants facing European societies stemming from asylum and immigration. In the European Parliament, there was support until recently of the idea that legally resident third country nationals could become European citizens after 5 years. Issues of access and loss of the Union citizenship status are once more on the agenda and should be considered for future Treaty revision. With Brexit, the automatic and involuntary loss of European citizenship status is legally possible in terms of the current Treaties, but unprecedented and arbitrary by the standards set by democratic countries and the international community. Does the EU want an expanding or shrinking European citizenry? Efforts have been made in the context of regulations on social security, freedom of movement, professional qualifications and EU programmes for the integration of migrants to close the gap between legally resident immigrants and EU citizens, but the gap remains and has widened in a climate hostile to migration. A revision of the Treaties and in particular Article 20 TFEU which reserves EU citizenship to nationals of Member States could resolve this problem. Union citizenship could be extended, for example, to all residents in the EU and to citizens of neighbouring countries, or an associate citizenship could be introduced — an idea floated in the European Parliament.

In this list of proposals, most reforms can be introduced without major new European laws because they build on what exists, but the legislative development of Union citizenship itself and the introduction of new European economic and social rights should be made easier. For any Treaty revision, the European Parliament should earmark Article 25 TFEU to provide for majority voting and proper control by the European Parliament itself, instead of unanimity and an intergovernmental approach, when it comes to measures to develop Union citizenship.