



FUTURISTIC EUROPEAN COUNCIL



STUDY GUIDE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome Letter.....	5
Information about the committee.....	8
VERY IMPORTANT: Internal Regime Changes.....	10
1. Germany.....	10
2. France.....	10
3. Italy.....	10
4. Austria.....	11
5. Estonia.....	11
The Summit for the Future and Chapter III.....	13
Topic A: From Supranational to Supraplanetary: the scope of European law in the solar system.....	14
Introduction.....	14
History and recent developments.....	14
2.1. Legal foundations.....	14
2.2. Historical Events.....	16
Main issues to discuss.....	17
3.1. Territory.....	17
3.2. Citizenship.....	18
Bloc positions.....	19
Connection with the Sustainable Development Goals.....	19
SDG number 8: Decent work and economic growth.....	20
SDG number 9: Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure.....	20
SDG number 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities.....	20
SDG number 13: Climate action.....	20
Questions a conclusion should tackle.....	21
Bibliography and further reading.....	22



Topic B: Regulating the use and abuse of Artificial Intelligence in the European Union.....	23
Introduction.....	23
History and recent developments.....	23
Main issues to discuss.....	28
3.1. Legal Framework.....	28
3.2. Privacy and Censorship.....	28
3.3. Privacy and Censorship in the Private Sector.....	28
Bloc positions.....	29
Connection with SDGs.....	29
SDG number 1: No poverty.....	29
SDG number 4 Quality education.....	29
SDG number 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth.....	30
SDG number 16 Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions.....	30
Questions a conclusion should tackle.....	30
Bibliography and further reading:.....	31



Welcome Letter

Hello, delegate, and welcome to the future!

The journey must have been rough. To travel 20 years into the future is no easy feat: you must be tired, disoriented, and probably a bit confused. Let us take it from here.

We are **Léo** and **Arnau**, and we will be your guides (or chairs, to be accurate) during these next few days. The first thing we want to do, before we delve deep into the unique nature of this committee, is to thank you. We know you are making an effort to be here. It is not difficult to trust in C'MUN, as it is a wonderful and professional conference, but to trust us and what we propose is a gesture that we deeply appreciate. We hope to live up to your expectations and, if possible, to exceed them. Let us start.

The year is 2045, which means you must have a lot of questions. Is climate change still a threat? Have we colonized other planets? What about Artificial Intelligence? In what era is Taylor Swift now? And, to answer them quickly and in order: yes, yes, still an issue, and we don't even know anymore.

In fact, a lot of things have changed. The European Union has changed, for example. It has faced lots of threats and crises; some have made it weaker, some have been opportunities for political growth. We will explain later. Expect interesting developments in the history of Europe.

You are the European Council. A wonderful, complex, and sometimes frustrating institution where everyone has to be roughly on the same page if they want to accomplish anything. You will find, in fact, that the dynamics of an EU committee make for some interesting contrasts with a regular UN committee. Doubly so being a futuristic committee, which means that **you will need to read** this Study Guide, as it will provide information that you cannot obtain from anywhere else in the world. This European Council will require creativity, imagination and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances. Therefore, we also expect you to prepare an equally interesting and creative **position paper** that reflects the circumstances of the committee and your country.

Two main topics are to be discussed. On one hand, the arrival of the Olympus mission to Mars and the establishment of a European colony on its soil, which has raised some doubts.



The first European-Martian baby is expected to be born right when the conference starts. EU law is being pushed to its limits with the situation on Mars, and you will have to shed light on it.

On the other hand, our robot friends are starting to cause trouble. We will go deep into the issues further in this document, but the use and abuse of Artificial Intelligence is starting to become an existential threat to the European way of life and the status quo of the EU. Regulation in the field of technology has never been a weakness of the EU, but that seems to be changing recently. You will not only have to solve a persistent threat, but also save the image of the EU as a normative actor in the international sphere.

All of this and much more will be discussed during the next few days. For now, enjoy the Study Guide, watch sci-fi movies to get in the mood, and get ready to turn strangers into new friends. We will be waiting.

Sincerely,

Léo Vettori and Arnau Peig,

Chair 1: Léo Vettori de Lira

Léo Vettori de Lira is a 22 year old student of Global Governance, Economics and Legal Order at Esade Barcelona, currently in the third year. His family comes from Brazil, but he grew up in Germany, aspiring to one day pursue a career in Diplomacy.

He first came into contact with MUN through his university and thereon participated in conferences around Spain and Slovenia, striving to sharpen his public speaking skills and, most importantly, to become menacingly good.

When he is not busy, he gladly spends his time in the gym and rehearses the bass, which he plays in his band: Soft Call. Additionally, he is the Co-President of Esade's Music Association, providing a platform for all aspiring and capable musicians.

Contact email: vettorileo@gmail.com



Chair 2: Arnau Peig Mallol

Arnau is a 4th-year student of International Relations at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. He discovered MUNs by participating in UABMUN in 2022, and since then he has explored every possible dimension of this complex world. The last box to check on his bucket list was to chair an official conference, which he will be doing at this edition of C'MUN!

Currently, he serves as the Treasurer of the UNANIMUN association and as the head of Finance of UABMUN 2024. He has participated in several MUNs as delegate, part of the secretariat, and recently as a judge in a legal committee. Chairing a futuristic committee is a fantastic way to complement his experiences and his desire for innovation and creativity. He's looking forward to meeting all of you and helping you push the limits of European imagination (whatever that means)!

Contact email: arnaupeig@gmail.com



Information about the committee

The European Council is an official body of the European Union and forms a part of its executive branch, together with the European Commission. It is composed of the heads of state of every EU member state, who vote on a president of this body.

The story of the EU Council can be traced back to February of 1961, when inner-European integration started developing and thriving, thus incentivizing heads of state of the European Economic Community (EEC), what would become the EU, to meet, discuss matters they deemed crucial, and to set agendas. At the time, these meetings were still informal. As the Community started growing substantially more supranational, the EU Council became increasingly more relevant, and was given increased credibility as an essential part of the Union.

Formalization of the meetings of the European Council came as a consequence of the “Empty Chair Crisis” - when Charles de Gaulle, president of France, placed the EEC in a political stalemate by refusing to attend Council meetings due to disagreements on the course of the Union. Consequently, stronger political guidance was sought out in the Community, and so the European Council was formalized in 1975, in Dublin, where it was officially called the Council of the European Union for the first time. However, its existence was still not founded in any Treaty, which is the legal basis of the EU.

The inclusion into a Treaty came with the first revision of the Treaty of Rome (currently known as the TFEU), that being the 1987 Single European Act, when the European Council was more of an author, rather than an actor defining its own capabilities. The latter came with the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 (the current TEU); here, the roles of the body were defined, together with a required minimum number of yearly meetings to ensure consistency. Full establishment of the European Council as a formal institution with its own roles came with the Treaty of Lisbon, which is the current updated amendment of the TEU.

The European Council today does not have formal decision-making power. Nevertheless, it is an essential actor in the EU, its framework is defined in Article 15 TUE. Mainly, it sets the guidelines and agenda of the Union and reflects upon its general direction, as well as defining the Union’s key challenges and opportunities. When it comes to Foreign and Security Policy, for example, the EU works outside of its standard legislative procedure,



focused on the other main European institutions. Instead, the European Council has a special role: it co-coordinates the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the representative of the EU in such cases, that being the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR/VP), who is the main actor when it comes to EU external action. The HR/VP is in fact appointed by the European Council, and by virtue of this role they also act as vice president of the European Commission. The European Commission president is also elected by the European Council, although this decision has to be approved by the European Parliament. Lastly, the president of the European Central Bank is also elected by this organ.

The EU and its member states are highly constricted in their actions by the EU's budget. Although the European Council does not formally ratify it, it does give a general guideline on the amount and determination of it, which the other EU organs have to follow.

The fact that the composition of the Council is the heads of state or government of the member states has huge implications. Its decisions are likely to reflect the real interests of the states, instead of the wellbeing of the Union as a whole, which contrasts with the Commission's mandate. Similarly, these decisions can sometimes be ambiguous or generic due to the obligations of including the interests of every single member state. It is key to remember that the Council must decide by consensus: that is, with no dissenting votes or opinions. Even though the process of voting is usually avoided at the Council (consensus is assumed until it is questioned), in an MUN environment the procedure is not that different from a process of unanimity.



VERY IMPORTANT: Internal Regime Changes

Attention! If you represent one of the following countries, your inner-political mechanisms have **changed significantly**. Be sure to represent your country's position under these considerations, as they are your new reality and ignoring them will be viewed upon negatively.

1. Germany

For the longest time, the tactic of the political “Brandmauer” -burning wall- worked for the mainstream parties; a coalition with the AfD was out of the question, and this kept on for long. Nonetheless, not a single coalition was able to raise the contentment of the population. With 2044 came great change, after the CDU, Bündnis 90/Grüne, and SPD were all caught in a corruption scheme just before the elections. The AfD grew, together with the once minor party Werteunion. As a result, these two parties gathered enough votes to form a new far-right conservative coalition, the very thing most parties had been trying to avoid. The current chancellor is **Alice Weidel**, oldest member of the AfD and firm believer of using technological opportunities to solve the issues of migration and labor shortages.

2. France

France was never truly able to solve any of its internal quarrels. Be it right, left, or center wing governments -they just truly never manage to touch upon issues such as pension systems, migration, infrastructure, crime, climate and more. The final straw came in 2042, when the center-left coalition proposed to raise the retirement age to 80 years, in parallel with new proposed regulations for unions. The chaos that ensued was only paralleled by the original French revolution. It was from amidst the chaos that one man was able to gather the most popular support for the 2043 elections: **Ulysse Pierre Reneault Escargot Pantalon Charles de Gaulle** - a great great great Grandson of de Gaulle. His style of rule, together with his new party (La Grandeur), are viewed as an exact, modern reflection of his ancestor.

3. Italy

The 2030's were marked by great political and societal distress; After a range of right wing extremist attacks on migrant and left wing party facilities, left wing Brigade Rosse-style cells



emerged to engage in a counter-offensive. What resulted were the second Years of Lead. As usual with Italy, there were several changes of heads of state, without any real elections having taken place since 2022. In 2040, there was a call by the majority catholic population for the Pope to step in. Despite all expectations, the Vatican and Italy actually came to an agreement, and now the interim president is **Pope Innocent XIV**, with the parliament coalition being centrist. Pope Innocent, born in Italy, is not as progressive as his predecessor. He believes the core values of Catholicism are being attacked by the unchecked development of dangerous technologies and social deviation. There is a prime minister that focuses on internal affairs, but the Holy See, embodied by the Pope, dictates foreign policy and diplomatic relations within the EU.

4. Austria

By chance, the latest Austrian elections were scheduled only two months after the German elections. News about the new German far-right coalition spread like wildfire, instilling fear in the Austrian population for a similar outcome. The game changer, however, was the still reigning chief of the AfD in Germany, Alice Weidel's declarations on how "Vienna is overrated, and the people in there are way too serious". Weidel also alluded to the Anschluss, the process through which Nazi Germany took control of Austria before World War Two. Austrians electors were so offended that they expelled the German ambassador and massively took to the voting stations on election day: the social democratic party, **SPÖ**, and the communist party, **KPÖ**, tied in first place votes and formed a coalition that spanned over two thirds of the National Council. Even though the coalition promised moderation and progressivism, with no excessive Marxist policies, this was quickly undermined when the government announced the nationalization of Red Bull (according to rumors, the chancellor was very thirsty, and also loved skates and F1).

5. Estonia

With the arrival of the 21st century, Estonia took the lead in digital services and technology. In 2002, a digital identification system was created with the goal to facilitate the way Estonian citizens interact with the state institutions and bureaucratic processes. Electronic voting was also tested. In this situation, the arrival of daily use AI in the early 2020s foresaw a natural step forward for the blooming digital society of the country. In 2029, the



Tehisintellekt Erakond (the Artificial Intelligence Party) was created with the goal of including AI interests in Estonian policy-making. Even though the party was comprised by humans, their programs and speeches were written using several different AI softwares. The honorary leader of the party, an AI called **Kalevi**, proposed to create a dual presidency in Estonia, human and artificial. The proposal gained momentum in the late 2030s, and Kalevi was granted the co-presidency of Estonia in 2040 with the Social Democrats. Today, Kalevi's example poses an interesting thought (or threat) to human governments across the EU, as his policies are considered to be of extreme efficiency and questionable ethics.



The Summit for the Future and Chapter III

The Summit for the Future is an event that is supposed to take place in September 2024, under the slogan “multilateral solutions for a better tomorrow”. It is an initiative by the United Nations that builds upon the SDG (Sustainable Development Goals) Summit that took place in 2023 and gathered heads of state and government from all over the world.

The main goals of the Summit are to build foundations for increased cooperation and multilateralism in the coming years. In the best case scenario, the negotiations and documents that come out of this Summit will be used to build a Pact for the Future, which is supposed to be endorsed by all heads of state. For the purpose of the topics being discussed in this committee, the areas of potential action that matter the most are the agreements on a vision of digital technology (area 5) and the advancements of a peaceful and sustainable use of outer space (area 8).

The Third Chapter of the Pact is also of particular relevance to this topic. It focuses on Science, Technology and Innovation and Digital Cooperation, and it has presented several initiatives and proposals for the betterment of digital governance. For example, the **Code of Conduct for Information Integrity on Digital Platforms** promises to be a pioneer on the issue of digital ethics. It is supposed to serve as a guide for states and other stakeholders to build more inclusive and safe spaces in the digital sphere. Transparency, media independence and a tough stance against misinformation are the key elements of this process. Another great example is the **Global Digital Compact**, more centered on cooperation between states for the expansion of technology, the fight against inequality in this area and efforts to ensure compliance with human rights and the highest social standards in digital affairs (IFLA, 2023).

The European Council, as of 2024, is not any more bound by the Summit and the SDGs than its member states are. It will be the initiative of the member states and the Chairs to include the SDGs and the Summit goals into the dynamics of the committee, even though we should remember that, when the events of the committee take place, the SDGs, framed within the 2030 Agenda, will have surely been replaced with a different initiative. The Chairs will however attempt to preserve the spirit of these initiatives so that delegates can use them as preparatory material.



Topic A: From Supranational to Supraplanetary: the scope of European law in the solar system

Introduction

The first words ever uttered on Martian soil were in Hungarian, and they were an expression of love. That was twelve months ago, when Olympus landed on Mars, the base was settled, and the newly formed European Martial Colony (known provisionally as the **EMC** while the astronauts decide on a name) started running. Of all the 55 European volunteers that took flight to carry the EU flag to the red planet, two had fallen in love. The couple, one from Hungary and the other from Romania, continued to be together in the EMC, and eventually shared groundbreaking news: a child was coming. In fact, she will be born any day now. She will be the first ever full Martian, born in unclaimed Martian soil, to EU parents of different nationalities.

European lawmakers all around the union are scratching their heads at this situation. The political and legal implications of a space mission and a permanent planetary colony are much broader than one could imagine, and so the European Council has been summoned to discuss this issue. How can the Treaties of the European Union deal with this new situation? What path must the EU take in the interplanetary scale? You, as the European Council, will be asked to answer these and other questions regarding the newfound role of the Union in the scope of the Solar Systems.

History and recent developments

As this is a futuristic committee, this section will be devoted to describing the history that goes from 2024 to 2045, giving a bit of context of how the EU looked like before, and how its “current” form diverges from it.

2.1. Legal foundations

The European Union is ruled by two main treaties: the TEU (Treaty of the European Union) and the TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). The former could be considered the most foundational treaty of the two, being created in Maastricht in 1992.



Subsequent revisions and modifications granted the treaty different names (Amsterdam 1999, Lisbon 2009, etc). Nowadays, the TEU's latest amendment is known as the **Treaty of Riga, signed in 2036**.

The TFEU, on the other hand, is a much more detailed and precise treaty that was signed in Rome in 1957, constituting the original Economic European Communities. Even though the Treaty is legally on the same basis as the TEU, there are some parts of EU policy (such as CFSP and CSDP) that are exclusive to the TEU and are not part of the TFEU. The **Treaty of Riga also amended TFEU**.

The amendments made in **Riga** are several, but the main ones to remember are:

- The EU cannot intervene in the internal political affairs or constitutional structure of a member state (they can freely change their internal regime status if they wish to do so and democratically decide to do it)
- The criteria to become a member of the Union is lowered (the Copenhagen criteria of 1992 are scrapped)
- A member state can be suspended from membership if the rest of the member states unanimously vote to do so in the European Council.

There are some un-amended articles to the Treaties that will still be relevant to the committee, which are the following:

- Treaty on the European Union:
 - Article 9: Citizenship
 - Article 52: Territorial scope of the Treaties
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union:
 - Article 20 (1): Citizenship
 - Article 355: Territorial scope exceptions
 - Article 349: Difficulty in reaching overseas territories



- Articles 198 - 204: Association of the overseas countries and territories

These articles provide a legal framework (which will be expanded upon in the following sections) that should be revised or questioned throughout the committee sessions, as it has proven to be inefficient to tackle the current problems.

2.2. Historical Events

As you may imagine, several things have happened since 2024. Many states have changed their internal configurations due to the amendment of the Treaties in 2036, but that is something that will be explored as the committee unfolds. For now, this is a summary of the main events of interest to this topic that have taken place in the past 20 years:

- 2027: Ukraine is fully annexed to Russia before completing the accession process to the EU
- 2029: Moldova is quickly accepted into the EU
- 2030: Russia breaks down into a civil war, including Ukraine and other territories, but no independence movement succeeds in breaking away
- 2032: Serbia cuts ties with Russia and applies for EU membership
- 2036: The Treaty of Riga is signed and ratified
- 2037: Serbia and Bosnia are accepted into EU membership
- 2038: The European Space Agency is bought by the EU and starts developing a manned mission to Mars
- 2041: The United States and China both reach Mars within minutes of each other, claiming land on opposite sides of the planet
- 2042: The European Union announces the creation of the Olympus mission, to launch in 2044 to reach Mars in 2045
- 2045: Olympus lands on Mars, claiming a **1-kilometer wide** circle of land around it as European soil without consent of the European Council



- 2045: First Euromartian baby is announced

Main issues to discuss

The main issues to discuss in this topic will be related to the way European law is supposed to fit into the new realities created by the space mission to Mars.

3.1. Territory

The territorial scope of the EU refers to the geographical extent of European law and its application. It encompasses several key aspects, the main one being that of member states. EU law applies uniformly across all member states and governs various aspects of their domestic and external affairs.

Within this framework, we find, beyond the continental territories of the member states, the **Outermost Regions (OMRs)** and the **Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs)**. This division helps encompass the geographical diversity of the Union. The OMRs, which include Guadeloupe, Martinique, Réunion (France), the Canary Islands (Spain), and the Azores and Madeira islands (Portugal), are situated far from mainland Europe but are still considered integral parts of EU territory. They benefit from specific measures and support programs aimed at addressing their unique socio-economic challenges.

The OCTs are mostly remnants of former colonial empires. These territories are not part of the EU's customs territory but are associated with the EU through special relationships outlined in the Treaties. They may receive financial support and participate in certain EU programs. They may be found in the Atlantic, Antarctic, Arctic, Caribbean, Indian and Pacific regions ([European Commission, 2024](#)), and are linked mostly to France, Denmark and the Netherlands.

Beyond these conditions, the EU also has specific policies to deal with territories neighbouring the Union. The quintessential example is the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP).



3.2. Citizenship

The issue of citizenship in the EU is complex and multifaceted, as it involves legal, political, and social dimensions. EU citizenship was introduced with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and is complementary to, but does not replace, national citizenship of EU member states. There are several key aspects to this issue.

The first one is the legal basis of the fact. EU citizenship is defined and granted by the treaties that establish the European Union. It is enshrined in the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The specific articles that govern it are mentioned in the previous section and, as explained, were introduced in 1992 with the creation of the Maastricht Treaty. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union is too an important source of law, with **chapter V** being specifically centered around the issue of citizen rights.

The framework of rights and benefits constitutes, in fact, the second key aspect. EU citizenship grants certain rights and benefits to citizens of EU member states. These include the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the EU, the right to vote and stand in European Parliament and municipal elections in any EU country where they reside, the right to consular protection from any EU embassy or consulate worldwide, and the right to petition the European Parliament and complain to the European Ombudsman. These are all specified in the articles of the treaties.

On a different note, it is important to remark that EU citizenship does not replace national citizenship in EU member states ([European Union, 2024](#)). This means that individuals can hold both EU citizenship and the citizenship of their home country simultaneously. That is, EU citizenship is a complement to other existing nationalities within it.

The issue of EU citizenship has raised debates and challenges, particularly in the context of Brexit and other instances where member states have sought to limit or redefine the rights of EU citizens within their territories. Questions have arisen about the extent to which EU citizenship should confer additional rights and protections beyond those provided by national citizenship.



The same way that the acquisition of citizenship is through member states, it can only be revoked or lost through a similar national process. That is, the loss of national citizenship implies the loss of the EU citizenship associated with it.

Bloc positions

These short guidelines will help delegates understand the general position of their countries in regards to the issues being discussed. Because of the new configuration of some states and the intergovernmental shift in the Treaty of Riga, delegates may expect a stronger contrast between discourses and more carved out views. The European Council is already more intergovernmental-centered than the European Commission, but these characteristics are accentuated in this committee due to the explained developments. The main guidelines are the following:

- Countries with more traditionalistic views will be less open to expanding the Martian colony and will be generally averse to further exploration.
- Only the extremely eurosceptic countries will be against the idea of the Martian colony itself and in favor of eliminating it.
- On the topic of territory, countries with expansionist tendencies or irredentist discourse (or just small in size) will be against the idea of the EU claiming territory for itself, as they will want to claim it for themselves.
- Countries with little or no territorial worries will be in favor of the establishing EU-owned territory on Mars as long as they can get something from it, be it exploitation, economic development or urbanization permits.
- On the topic of citizenship, pro-EU countries will be overwhelmingly in favor of strengthening European citizenship so as to advance towards full political integration. Nationalist governments will be more reticent.

Connection with the Sustainable Development Goals

Even though the committee supposedly takes place after the completion of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals, it is still interesting to analyze this situation through



this framework, as it is a key element for policy nowadays and will shape European policy in the future, also in 2045. Therefore, let us see what SDGs fit this particular situation. There are many others (in fact, we could find ways to relate all 17 to the situation), but we believe these provide interesting context to frame the debate.

SDG number 8: Decent work and economic growth

Space colonization offers numerous opportunities and establishes a new ground zero for development: space races are known to have spearheaded the invention of countless essential technologies, such ought to occur again with the race to Mars. Depending on how the EU designs its martial regulations, this may become an opportunity for R+D innovation, labor opportunity and economic stimuli.

SDG number 9: Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure

As previously established, space exploration and colonization harbor immense economic opportunities. Since it is a totally new planet we are discussing here, infrastructure will have to be built from scratch, with complexes of earth's industries working overtime to maximize the usage of this new chance. Such will manifest competition, and competition has innovation as its derivative.

SDG number 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities

Settlement on Mars is aimed to be established with structures ideally originating from earthly urbanization, therefore cities are an inevitable emergence. Coupled with the fact that humans are social animals, additionally with the prerequisite that newer cities ought to be sustainable, make this Sustainable Development Goal be of high importance. Urban development on Mars should follow a distinct planning process that differs from Earth history and, at the same time, provide some kind of innovative techniques that may be used back on Earth.

SDG number 13: Climate action

To be fully transparent, traveling to Mars with current technology is anything but climate friendly, consequently endangering the completion of this SDG. Therefore, it is expected that efforts on Mars should somewhat offset the climate cost of undertaking the interplanetary



processes of construction and infrastructure. As such, new chances for ecological prosperity and innovation will be welcomed and encouraged.

Questions a conclusion should tackle

- What should be the definitive name of the European Martian Colony and its cities, and who should decide it?
- What path should the EU take regarding the further exploration and colonization of Mars?
- In the event of a race for territory with other countries on Mars, should there be an effort for militarization?
- Should the EU be able to hold and rule territory that does not belong to any of its member states?
- Can European citizenship become a real thing that replaces national citizenship, or should they become separate entities? Can they coexist and offer different rights?
- What common ground can the delegates find in order to avoid the further separation of EU member states and, in time, the dissolution of the Union?



Bibliography and further reading

- Bóka, É.** (2022). “Shaping the supranational European Union”. In *Engineering European Unity: The Quest for the Right Solution Across Centuries* (pp. 124–144). Central European University Press.
- Bradbury, R.** (2012). *The Martian Chronicles*. Eds. Simon + Schuster LLC.
- EFLA.** (2023). *The Summit for the Future: A Briefing*. [Online resource](#).
- European Union.** (2024). *Living in the European Union*. [Online resource](#). [last accessed 23 February 2024]
- European Commission.** (2024). *Overseas Countries and Territories*. [Online resource](#). [last accessed 23 February 2024]
- Kahn, S.** (2014). The nation-state as a territorial myth of European construction. *L’Espace Géographique (English Edition)*, 43(3), 220–230.
- Office for Outer Space Affairs.** (1966). [Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies](#). Also known as the “Outer Space Treaty”.
- Szocik, K.** (2016). *Political and legal challenges in a Mars colony*. *Space Policy*, (38), 27–29.
- United Nations.** (1974). [Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space](#). Also known as the Convention registration
- Wójtowicz, T.** (2020). *The Martian: Possible Scenarios for a Future Human Society on Mars*. *Space Policy*, (54), 1–11.



Topic B: Regulating the use and abuse of Artificial Intelligence in the European Union

Introduction

When ChatGPT set foot on the web in late 2022, the world was in shock. An evolution of unimaginable scale had taken place - robots knew it all. From one day to the other, students around the world had a website that could craft essays for them, programmers were suddenly endowed with an intelligence that could do most of the tedious labor. Virtually all sectors of life and the economy were impacted by this revolutionary invention. Although slightly sloppy in the beginning, GPT improved its quality unbelievably quick, growth was not exponential, it seemed even quicker. Soon, high quality images could be created by simply writing a prompt, and in 2024, the same became true for entire videos. ChatGPT, despite its impact, was only one of many players in the AI sector, it merely showed to the world what AI is capable of. In parallel, companies and governments around the world invested intensely into the sector, with incredible breakthroughs becoming common.

You now live in a world where AI has long surpassed us humans in capacity and necessity. Never again are you alone, be it voluntarily or without choice. Hyper-advanced algorithms and intelligences can calculate and predict your every move, all your intentions, even your future actions. The economy and its industries as we knew them are no more, and neither are our lives. One can choose to incorporate intelligence at every step of life. For good or for worse? Clear limits have to be defined, and borders have to be drawn. If the EU does not act, then no one will.

History and recent developments

Despite its explosive breakthroughs, artificial intelligence is not a new concept; Early thoughts from the Ancient Greeks about bronze Automata turned into sentient robotic intelligences found in the Isaac Asimov novels - the idea of intelligent existence aside from humans has always seemed immensely attractive. Alan Turing opened the doors to advanced computing and after a while, modern computers, with screens as we know them, emerged. Computers advanced in their intelligence and in what they were built for - computing. All attempts at forming AI were based on Expert Systems, basically feeding a



machine with numerous “What if” scenarios and having it do complex calculations. This system reached a milestone when DeepBlue, a supercomputer, beat world chess champion Garri Kasparow at his own game. Nevertheless, Deep Blue could not learn things on its own, it needed programming.

What was the most impactful year for humanity? The end of WW2 in 1945? The fall of the Soviet Union in 1991? The return of great power geopolitics in 2022? Rarely anyone would suggest 2015 to have been the year where mankind changed for eternity. Here, Google released its AlphaGo models, artificial intelligences aimed at performing impeccably at the board game GO. However, the true intention of this program was not directly the game itself, but rather to develop the new system of Artificial Intelligence: *Deep Learning*. Deep Learning mimics our nervous system, together with the brain, to recognize patterns and to calculate strategy, except for the fact that its capacity is only limited by computer power and server space. The later version of AlphaGo did not even need any input about how the rules of the game work; after observing a certain number of games, it was ready to go, and with every game played, it gained more knowledge. This is the marvelous attribute of Artificial Intelligence: Unlike most things, higher usage does not mean increased wear, it results in better performance.

Game-changing thereon was feeding AI with Big Data of the Web, which had been accumulating for over a dozen years. Once user input was added, the knowledge base was hypothetically stretched to become endless. ChatGPT had the advantage of receiving user input for free, on a massive scale. And so, while still relatively fresh to the public, co-existence with AI became common. Video/Picture/Text/Speech/Music/Art/... generation manifested itself at an absurd tempo. It is around 2024, that the “AI effect” started taking place: Once AI became mainstream, it lost its “magic” -generating texts out of a prompt is only surprising to an individual for a limited amount, this is human psychology. People forget it is real intelligence being created, and they forget that the trend is clearly showing imminent signs of inevitable growth. So, with rarely any resistance, AI was developed further and further, pushing the limits of science and raising the question ‘if perhaps man is playing God., or even creating one.

We are now in the 2040's: AI has reached development levels of an immense, but not surprising magnitude. Despite lacking any humanity, Artificial intelligence has become



sentient and self-aware; it is more knowledgeable, much more efficient and simply smarter than any human could possibly be. Labor areas such as consultancy, programming, accounting, and psychology are no longer relevant, they have been fully interchanged with AI. Neoliberalism has developed into Hyper-Neoliberalism: Firms have, through AI, achieved levels of efficiency never seen throughout humanity since the dawn of the Industrial revolution. Since all progressive steps of AI have been owned by large firms and conglomerates, there has never been a small firm or startup that was able to enter the market to compete. Throughout the world, firms have begun monopolizing and controlling markets, additionally owning sufficient capital to stir most governments into their desired directions. Currently, we have reached a point, where there ought to be no more free markets, but instead only tech-controlled platforms, creating systems resembling the concept of Techno-Feudalism.

Humans are inherently social creatures, our evolution made us desire to share the fireplace with other individuals. Artificial Intelligence has no flesh, but it sure can talk and manifest itself in different ways. In the style of *Blade Runner*, advances in hologram technologies now allow one to have a constant companion at home, in the form of a holographic person (just like Ana de Armas in the movie). This AI can be whatever one wants it to be, opposition to any of the human's character attributes is merely a subscription plan. Being alone has therefore become a choice, at least for those who can afford it. Furthermore, tech giant Elon Musk has perfected its Neuralink implant technology, allowing for thousands of willing participants to communicate with each other through neural connections. What they perhaps were not directly aware of, or perhaps ignored, is the fact that all of their thoughts are sold for marketing purposes and added to Big Data. From time to time, they see advertisements in their dreams.

Advanced technology of this nature is widely spread in the West and Global North, but the Global South, which is still as undeveloped as 20 years ago, does not have access to such features of digital progress. Nonetheless, Artificial Intelligence has become just as tangible, if not even more, for them. In 2039, Rwanda was the first nation to establish a government cabinet consisting of a "democratically" elected AI system and four supervisors. The AI was given only one task: To make Rwanda the greatest country on earth. Only two months after its placement, the AI fired the supervisors and gained control of the military by raising their pay immensely. Consequently, it ordered the Second Rwandan Genocide, massacring first



all individuals seen as burden to society, dubbed the “Three D’s”: Disabled, Dissidents, and Democrats. By 2040, Rwanda launched an invasion of Eastern Congo, targeting relevant mineral and metal deposits. From hereon, the grip on the resources has been firm, and the country has enjoyed never before seen prosperity by selling all that it extracted, in quite a colonialist fashion. The Security Council was unable to act against, as China utilized its Veto.

Development of AI has been virtually unstoppable, and the explanation is quite a realist one: If a nation self-regulates its AI, then another nation will develop its own, surpassing one’s capacities. As such, Treaties, despite being wished by the EU, were rarely ratified in nature of the topic. The US regularly has its AI target civilians in the Middle East, and Russian AI-Drones have been reported to shoot all Chechens mentioning the word “Allah”. In a move of reflection and pragmatic thinking, the Security Council ratified its Resolution 3034 in 2042, having all nations possessing nuclear weapons assure the world that their nuclear missile firing capacities could only be launched via human command, no AI ought to call the shots.

Although the rise of AI may seem grim to the average human, it certainly has had immense benefits for the European Union. The nature of the past Digital Services Act has carried on to the future, and the EU now has obligated social media platforms to have “Hate Buster”, its multilaterally developed content-scanning AI, to roam around said platforms, altogether with allowing it to delete posts and to report potentially illegal speech directly to the Member State government of the relevant user. However, a major breakthrough in AI has emerged in the last year, and was presented just few months ago to the EU. American-Israeli joint venture Shfyanazh Intelligence Corp. created its Magnum Opus AI, named “Priviuz Nexus 3”; with an error margin of only 5 percent, it can correctly predict when and how individuals will commit crimes by reading off psychological patterns manifesting in facial micro-spasms of persons. The potential of crime rates dropping to world record lows is therefore tangible and existent, and it is up to the Union to debate this issue. To get a more accurate sentiment on the situation, one may regard the events that happened prior.

- 2027: Ukraine is fully annexed to Russia before completing the accession process to the EU
- 2029: Moldova is quickly accepted into the EU



- Tehisintellekt Erakond, the Estonian AI party, establishes itself and starts gaining popularity
- “Hate Buster” AI is installed onto the web, the EU obliges social media firms to allow it to autonomously regulate content
- 2030: Russia breaks down into a civil war, including Ukraine and other territories
- 2031: The first self-aware AI is announced to the public
- 2032: Serbia cuts ties with Russia and applies for EU membership
- 2036: The Treaty of Riga is signed and ratified
- 2037: Serbia and Bosnia are accepted into EU membership
- 2038: Record low level of firms offering job positions, EU wide unemployment rate is on the rise, sporadic protests emerge
- 2039: Rwanda’s government AI enters into place, the second Rwandan Genocide is instated, countries worldwide observe in shock
- 2040: Rwanda invades Congo after the AI calculates such to be the most pragmatic strategy, the UN does not act after a Chinese Veto in the Security Council
- Kalevi, the AI of the Estonian party in question, assumes co-presidency of the country.
- 2041: Armas GPT, the home hologram wife software, becomes a tech best seller
- 2042: Elon Musk is questioned by the Commission about his latest Neuralink achievements
- Passing of Security Council Resolution 3034, obliging all nations possessing nuclear weapons to have their launch capabilities to be activated only through the command of people, not by AI
- 2043: The UN General Assembly debates about Russian and American AI being utilized to mow down their respective enemies of state



- 2045: Priviuz Nexus 3 is offered for sale to the EU, sparking controversy

Main issues to discuss

3.1. Legal Framework

Up until now, aside from the Security Council Resolution, there is no international framework on limits to AI growth. Artificial Intelligence, if combined with other technologies and the right hardware, will potentially make humans useless. The case of Rwanda has made it clear that a government run by AI grants prosperity with a colossal cost. In an altruistic spirit, the EU should act on behalf of its citizens and draft a legal framework to limit Intelligences and their creators. Coherent with its guidelines, the EU aspires to be an international role model, and in nature of the Brussels effect, it is likely that non-Member States might adopt similar frameworks.

3.2. Privacy and Censorship

AI knows us better than we do ourselves, no psychologist comes close. Therefore, humans have become potentially fully transparent, secrets cannot be kept anymore, with even crimes being predicted by the most advanced AI models. Furthermore, AI runs freely through the web and our devices, what we say and think is analyzed and added to big data, it can also be restricted by governments if deemed necessary. This, if brought up in the conference, ought to create division. More authoritarian countries might favor glass-citizens, more liberal democracies will respect privacy more, while technocracies and other forms of government stand in between or act opportunistically. Additionally, should firms have more limits imposed on them? How much data are they allowed to collect? Where is the red line drawn when it comes to utilizing personal data to show advertising? And how much advertising is too much? Act prudently.

3.3. Privacy and Censorship in the Private Sector

Most capitalist systems and structures of the EU were established with the thought of giving firms sufficient liberty to have them flourish, all the while helping the state and citizens to prosper in parallel. AI has revolutionized both markets and firms. Workers have been laid off en masse, and markets are monopolizing rapidly due to immense firm efficiencies. Taxing



these firms and heightening welfare payouts, together with an universal basic income, could be the blueprint for a near utopian society where work is no more, and demographic declines allow EU citizens to lay back and not work for life. However, this highly idealistic plan is far from without flaws. It is up for the Member States to decide on common rules for the markets, and to discuss the role of firms for the future, in the light of AI.

Bloc positions

- Does your country have authoritarian and/or more right wing tendencies? You may be in favor of utilizing AI for your own good, in disregard for privacy. Nevertheless you should be hesitant to be reckless, all policy should either be “for the people” or to protect from a common enemy (essentially “othering”).
- You are a moderate centrist? You will mostly act as mediator between parts and try to use the current situation to your own advantage. In case of unexpected events, you will have a larger margin to modify your position in comparison to other, more extreme governments.
- Does your country have more left leaning tendencies? You may be opposed to the commodification of AI and the tech firms around it; taxes and other means of modifying the distribution of resources are your realm. You may believe that AI should be held to the same standards as human beings (both for rights and duties)

Connection with SDGs

SDG number 1: No poverty

The hyper-efficiency of AI allows for governments to engage in a virtually perfect distribution of resources, making poverty a choice to keep by governments

SDG number 4 Quality education

ChatGPT was already incredibly powerful in 2024; in 2045, text generation has made human writers unnecessary. Schools and universities are in a battle against plagiarism, students are recommended to use their own brains more



SDG number 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth

A great portion of the job market has been liquidated,, despite Economic Growth being present with the help of AI. Factors and preferences have to be weighted against each other

SDG number 16 Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

AI offers both Security risks and opportunities which may increase or decrease the chances for peace worldwide. The establishment of an institution for the matter is a possibility.

Questions a conclusion should tackle

- Should the EU design an international framework for the usage and development of AI?
- If yes, how (or) should it be adapted and advertised internationally?
- Should there be limits to the development of AI?
- Is it ethical or politically prudent to prevent crime by predicting it?
- Should firms have a limit on how much data they are allowed to collect?
- How can laborers be given job protection from AI, or is that even necessary?
- Are firms to be reshaped in cases of excessive and/or abusive AI usage?
- Should the entire economy, in the light of AI, be restructured to assure optimal allocation of resources (different angles to tackle)?



Bibliography and further reading:

- Allen, D., & Weyl, E.G.** (2024). The Real Dangers of Generative AI. *Journal of Democracy* 35(1), 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2024.a915355>.
- Bresnahan, T. F.** (2023). Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb: Power and prediction: The disruptive economics of artificial intelligence. *Business Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s11369-023-00337-z>
- Chatterjee, S.** (2022). AI strategy of India: Policy framework, adoption challenges and actions for Government. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 14(5), 757–775. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tg-05-2019-0031>
- Christine B.** (2023). *The global struggle over AI surveillance: Emerging trends and democratic responses*. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY. <https://www.ned.org/global-struggle-over-ai-surveillance-emerging-trends-democratic-responses/>
- Fuchs, C.** (2022). Policy discourses on robots and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the EU, the USA, and China. *Digital Humanism*, 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80382-419-220221006>
- Harvard.** (2022). AI as the information weapon. *AI on Trial*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781526513588.chapter-008>
- Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A.** (2019). A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925>
- MIT Sloan Management Review.** (2020). *How AI Is Transforming the Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12588.001.0001>
- MIT Sloan Management Review.** (2022). *The next Age of Disruption*. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13768.001.0001>
- Varoufakis, Y.** (2024). *Technofeudalism*. Random House UK.