

# DEUTSCH-BRITISCHE GESELLSCHAFT

## 57<sup>th</sup> Young Königswinter Conference

Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> June – Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2017, Berlin

### Conference Report



### A world in motion – European, UK, and German perspectives

1. The United Kingdom and the European Union in a Post-BREXIT Europe
2. Lasting Economic Stability?
3. The world in disorder: Being safe vs feeling safe



## Programme

### Conference Venue

Europäische Akademie Berlin  
Bismarckallee 46/48  
D-14193 Berlin  
[www.eab-berlin.de](http://www.eab-berlin.de)

### Organiser

Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft e.V.  
Pariser Platz 6  
10117 Berlin  
Tel.: + 49 (0) 30 – 203 985-0  
Fax.: + 49 (0) 30 – 203 985-16  
E-mail: [headoffice@debrige.de](mailto:headoffice@debrige.de)  
[www.debrige.de](http://www.debrige.de)

### Date

13<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> June 2017

### TOPICS

1. The United Kingdom and the European Union in a Post-BREXIT Europe
2. Lasting Economic Stability?
3. The world in disorder: Being safe vs. feeling safe

### Wednesday, 14 June 2017

12:30                      Arrival and check in  
                                 Light Lunch at EAB

13:30 – 15:00           **Opening of the conference**  
                                 by the Chairman  
                                 **SIR NIGEL BROOMFIELD**, Former Ambassador to the Federal Republic of  
                                 Germany and the German Democratic Republic  
                                 and  
                                 **HANS-HENNING HORSTMANN**, Ambassador ret.  
                                 Chairman of the Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft e.V.

#### Keynote Speakers

**NICK PICKARD**, Deputy Head of Mission, British Embassy in Berlin  
**CHRISTOPH WOLFRUM**, Head of Division EU Policy Planning Staff, Federal  
Foreign Office

15:00	Coffee break
15:30 – 17:00	<b>Introductions</b> to the study group topics by selected participants
17:00	Coffee break
17:30 – 19:00	Study group sessions begin Selection of Chair and Rapporteur
19:30	Dinner hosted by NICK PICKARD <b>Deputy Head of Mission at the British Embassy in Berlin</b>

#### **Thursday, 15 June 2017**

08:00	Breakfast
09:00 – 10:30	Lecture with regard to the topic of group I  <u>Speaker:</u> DR JANA PUGLIERIN, Head of Program, Alfred von Oppenheim Center for European Policy Studies
10:30	Coffee break
11:00 – 12:30	<b>Lecture with regard to the topic of group III</b>  <u>Speaker:</u> DR CLAUDIA MAJOR, Senior Associate, International Security Division, German Institute for International and Security Affairs
13:00	Lunch at EAB
14:00 – 15:30	<b>Study groups</b>
15:30	Coffee break
16:00 – 18:30	<b>Study groups</b>
19:00 – 22.00	<b>Würth Haus, Schwanenwerder</b> Lecture Reception Concert

### Friday, 16 June 2017

08:00	Breakfast
09:00 – 10:30	Study groups
10:30	Coffee break
11:00 – 13:00	Study groups
13:00	Lunch at EAB
14:00 – 15:30	Study groups
16:30 – 18:30	Lecture with regard to group II  <u>Speaker:</u> DR MARTIN HEIPERTZ Head of Division "European Policy", Federal Ministry of Finance
19:00 – 21:00	Dinner at the invitation of the Federal Foreign Office  <u>Speaker:</u> DR CORNELIUS HUPPERTZ Deputy Head of Unit 21/Northern Europe, Federal Foreign Office

### Saturday, 17 June 2017

08:00	Breakfast
09:00 – 10.30	Study groups
10:30	Coffee break
11:00 – 12:30	Preparation of study group reports
12:30	Lunch at EAB
13:30 – 15:30	Presentation of working group results Plenary session
15:30	Coffee break
16:00 – 17:00	Continuation of presentation of working group results
17:00 – 17:45	Presentation of the Young Königswinter Alumni e.V.

Wrap-up/Feedback

18:30 Boat trip through the historical centre of Berlin with buffet

21:30 End of Conference

### Sunday, 18 June 2017

08:00 Breakfast and check-out

## Conference Sponsors

This conference has been made possible by the kind support of:



Referat 601 Kultur- & Medienbeziehungen mit Skandinavien,  
den baltischen Staaten, Großbritannien, Irland und BENELUX



Königswinter Stiftung

Frank Roberts Trust



**Vodafone  
Stiftung  
Deutschland**

**WÜRTH GROUP**



## Topics for the 57<sup>th</sup> Young Königswinter Conference 2017

### **Group 1: The United Kingdom and The European Union in a Post-BREXIT Europe**

What is the future of Europe in the age of Art. 50 and Donald Trump? How will developments in other EU member states impact EU27 and UK-EU relations?

Are there areas left where Germany and Britain might contribute to strengthened European policies together?

Do we need a common political vision for Europe's future to renew a sense of purpose for the European project? Does a European vision need a roadmap, or will the European project develop naturally and pragmatically?

Can democratic parties manage the politics of discontent? Is there a 'post-factual' world that plays on feelings rather than facts? Who are the players? How can we promote citizen engagement for politics and how can the 'political class' regain the trust of the people? What role for civil society?

### **Group 2: Lasting Economic Stability?**

How do the changing structures of world economy and trade impact our economic perspectives? Our living conditions? How will US protectionism impact the economy in the UK, Germany, and Europe in general? What are the repercussions of the UK's approach as the 27 EU members, Asia, Africa and Latin America shape their trade and commerce in multilateral systems?

Do the differences in economic performance in Northern and Southern Europe stand in the way of a further development of the EU?

Will the welfare state need to be further cut back? Is austerity the way forward or is a more effective and fairer tax system an option? How could that be achieved?

How do we secure the necessary resources for our economies in the long term? What role for improved and more cooperative education across European borders? Do we need to rethink the way education systems work in a digitalized world?

### **Group 3: The world in disorder: Being safe vs feeling safe**

Climate change, illiteracy, availability of natural resources (e.g. water scarcity) and migration are challenges since the 1960s. What state and non-state strategies can be implemented today?

How can international co-operation in matters of cyber security be brought about?

Will western European societies face less or more asymmetrical threats?

What priorities for NATO and the EU27 to meet the challenges from Russia and the MENA region?

Are the UN, G20, G7, WTO and regional multilateral institutions like the OSCE, AU, ECOWAS or ASEAN still adequate to assist in strengthening order and the rule of law?

# Report

## Background

The 57<sup>th</sup> Young Königswinter Conference was held from 14-18 June 2017 at the Europäische Akademie in Berlin and was attended by 42 British and German delegates from a range of backgrounds including think-tanks, business, civil service, politics, Parliament, finance and education.

The Conference took place a year after the historic UK referendum result, just after an unexpected UK General Election and in the context of the formal negotiations marking the beginning of the UK leaving the European Union starting the following week, as well as forthcoming German elections.

This report provides an overview of the topics that were discussed, key themes that emerged during the course of the conference and a summary of the discussions held.

## Introduction

This year's conference - *A world in motion – European, UK and German perspectives* focused on the following three topics:

1. The United Kingdom and the European Union in a post-BREXIT Europe
2. Lasting Economic Stability?
3. The world in disorder – being safe vs feeling safe

Throughout the course of the conference, it became clear that although the three topics appeared distinct, they were in fact interlinked and could not be viewed in isolation. For example, discussions about the economy were intrinsically linked to discussions regarding the world in disorder; both of these issues were regarded as key factors to the UK and Germany as we move forward post-Brexit.

## Wednesday 14 June 2017

### Opening of conference

The first day commenced with opening remarks from Sir Nigel Broomfield about the period of great uncertainty across Europe and particularly in the UK given the recent General Election result and the importance of the UK/German relationship post-Brexit.

The following speakers Nick Pickard and Christoph Wolfrum presented their respective British and German perspectives of the current landscape. Key areas that were raised in the context of Brexit included: the future status of the UK in the EU (post Brexit), the basis for future agreement and ensuring both countries maintain a close relationship as possible post-Brexit given the strong links



between both countries. Big questions moving forward included the single market/customs union, the joint fight against terrorism and opportunities for research and development.

### **Study Group Introductions**

Two members of each of the three study groups were asked to present their initial thoughts on the questions set for each group and consider potential areas for further exploration and key themes.

#### **Group 1 - The United Kingdom and the European Union in a Post-BREXIT Europe**

The introductory remarks by this group were around the surprise UK election result meaning there was no longer a mandate for a so-called 'hard Brexit', the empowered role of the House of Commons and the implications of the agreement with the Democratic Unionist Party for the UK and Northern Ireland.

Questions were raised around the need to consider protecting rights such as who and what to protect e.g. access to public services, ability to vote and what to do with family members of EU and non-EU citizens. Issues to consider for the post-Brexit deal included immigration, customs union, trade agreement, single market access and security.

In addition to the more immediate issues surrounding the Brexit negotiations, thought was also given to the future of the EU post-Brexit, the role of the UK and Germany in the short and long term and the lessons Germany needed to learn from Brexit given their critical role in keeping the EU27 together post-Brexit. The point was also made that the UK leaving the EU would change the relationship between Germany, France and the UK and that a discussion about German and UK relations could not be had without considering the role and relationship with France.

#### **Group 2 – Lasting Economic Stability?**

This group considered the role that globalisation has had on feelings of economic instability and whether this had resulted in a new wave of protectionism. Despite the constant political rhetoric about the benefits of globalisation, the public mood across vast swathes of Europe indicated that living in an ever-connected world had resulted in clear winners and losers. This must be taken into context when thinking about people feeling economically stable. This argument was set in the context of a long period of reductions in public spending (particularly but not exclusively to the UK) on areas such as education and the impact the cuts in public services had on the public mood both in the UK and Europe.

Questions were also posed around how to define economic stability and whether this was linked to GDP, sustainable public finances, household income or indeed all three areas. Further consideration was also given to whether to talk about economic success or stability in the context of the group topic.

### **Group 3 - The world in disorder: Being safe vs feeling safe**

The final group opened by talking about the critical role Europe could play in ensuring people feel safe by reducing uncertainties, identifying new areas of security and co-operation, shaping rule based global order and strengthening the resilience of European societies. The potential for joint cyber security co-operation between the UK and Germany as well as the EU27 was also explored, both as a new way to move forwards together post-Brexit and to ensure that the fight against security had a joined up European approach given the two countries shared interest.

The huge change in global politics and landscape was also discussed. The USA has retreated in its position on the global stage, Russia has adopted a more aggressive stance, China is emboldened and the domestic tension in western countries regarding foreign and security policy continues to rise. Questions put forward were around the survival of the international liberal order and whether this would be achieved by strengthening or dismantling links as well as whether we were in a climate in which foreign policy required the support of the majority of the public – both in country and at home. Potential UK/German areas of co-operation and commonality were also discussed which included climate change, development, defence, Russia, North Korea, the Middle East and international governance.

**Thursday 15 June 2017**

**Lecture with regard to the topic of group 1**

**Dr Jana Puglierin**

Head of Program, Alfred von Oppenheim Center for European Policy Studies, German Council on Foreign Relations

Dr Jana Puglierin's opening remarks set the context of 2016 being a seismic year as a result of the UK referendum result and the American election and the impact such events had on Germany in terms of its foreign policy and the threat to continental Europe. She outlined the paramount importance of the EU to German identity and how the unexpected events in the UK and USA could pose a potential threat to Germany's core identity role on the global stage. Despite such concerns, she affirmed that irrespective of the forthcoming German election results, whoever wins will have a pro-European stance.

The confusion that still remains regarding Brexit was discussed - even more so given the recent UK election result, and the lack of progress that has been made nearly a year since the referendum. Urgent issues that needed to be addressed were the divorce between the UK and EU, the transition agreement and the future. The need to strengthen the cohesion of the EU27 states was stressed alongside staying united in terms of the relationship with the UK. The European project was described as being at risk and, as a result, whether there was a need for differentiated integration for the EU27 with the European Union. In addition, the need for Germany and France to have better co-operation and more symmetry was outlined. Common ground for German/ UK relations and co-operation were around foreign policy and security to create bi-lateral and multi-lateral co-operation.

Questions posed were with regards to whether the European project had always been at risk i.e. before Brexit, the role of the media, and whether more substantial concessions prior to the referendum such as freedom of movement could have prevented Brexit and some of the current challenges the EU faces.

### **Lecture with regard to the topic of group 3**

#### **Dr Claudia Major**

Senior Associate, International Security Division, German Institute for International and Security Affairs

Dr Claudia Major made opening remarks about the definition of defence - namely the protection of territory, people and the political system. Notwithstanding the broad consensus of this definition, clarification was given to the term 'defence' which has different meaning to different countries due to geographical positioning and past history. These comments were made in the context of the need for European (as opposed to EU) security and defence in view of and after Brexit. Europeans have always managed their defence via various channels: nationally, in the EU, through NATO and in smaller formats. Brexit will change the way these formats function and how they interact. The likely result is greater fragmentation in European defence. This risks weakening the political and military capacity to act of the Europeans.

It was suggested that the UK leaving the EU would not compromise the Common Secure Defence Policy (CSDP) as the UK was not a key player anyway, and the intergovernmental setting might make it easier to disentangle the UK contributions (as compared for example to the single market). On the contrary, there was a suggestion that the UK leaving the EU may present an opportunity for the CSDP to become more efficient as despite the UK being a founder member, they have not played a particularly active role in the CSDP recently, rather they had turned into a blocking power. NATO might benefit from a greater UK commitment, as it will be the only defence forum in Europe in which the UK can still play a role, and which would allow London to underpin its "global Britain" ambitions. Also smaller formats, like bilateral cooperation might benefit from Brexit. Consideration was also given to whether the UK could still access the European Defence Fund post-Brexit, and how cooperation between EU countries and a non-member like the UK could look like, particularly given that the UK remains a key military player and is a leader in areas such as intelligence and cyber security - which many EU member states rely on having access to. The need for Europe to be more outward looking rather than occupied with itself in the context of defence and security was asserted as well as how European countries can intelligently share their mutual dependence.

Questions posed were around areas in which the EU could play a greater role e.g. crisis management, promoting stability and whether defence could be a potential bargaining chip for negotiations given the priority respective countries have to protect its citizens – particularly given the spate in recent terror attacks across Europe.

**Friday 16 June 2017**

## **Lecture with regard to the topic of group 2**

**Dr Martin Heipertz**

Head of Division "European Policy", Federal Ministry of Finance

Dr Heipertz opened his remarks by commenting on the tumultuous time it is to be in politics – both domestic and international. His lecture focused primarily around the immediacy of Brexit negotiations that were due to begin three days later in the context of a surprise UK election result, the future of the European Union and areas of agreement and challenge.

He re-affirmed the importance of European integration for Germany (more than customs and trade) as other speakers had iterated, and suggested that Brexit would result in the need for more European integration. In a surprise turn, the UK leaving the EU had led to serious thought about institutional progress and the need to review the EU, save money, create efficiency and promote integration. Comments were also made with regards to whether no deal was a realistic and viable option and how a transition period could best be defined.

He confirmed that the EU27 were very cohesive and a collective block whilst stressing the importance of seeing the pending negotiations and deals from both sides. A key priority throughout the Brexit negotiations from the German perspective was to ensure that interference with the internal market was minimised and solutions were found to co-operate as closely as possible. Another clear priority was the need to protect the rights of EU citizens in the UK and vice versa though this key issue of protecting the rights of citizens in each other countries did not come up as often as expected during the study group discussions.

Similar to Dr Major's comments, Dr Heipertz also reiterated that given the economies of scale, there were opportunities for defence to be more of a cross-Europe coalition, though foreign policy was a far bigger, broader question that could be dealt with at a later stage.

Questions posed were around the European Defence Fund, common military EU wide policy, differentiations of integration for EU and the European Monetary Union (EMU). On this latter point, the challenges of the EMU being designed under the Maastricht Treaty were outlined which never foresaw in its drafting that there would be so many member states and was devised in the context of between 5-10 countries forming a union.

## **Study Group Presentation**

### **Group 1 - The United Kingdom and the European Union in a Post-BREXIT Europe**

The Chair opened by commenting that the topic was too big a subject to go through all the details and that Brexit negotiations were both variable and granular. With that in mind, the group had taken a longer term view to see what could be done to promote a positive relationship between the UK and Germany and the EU by dividing into subgroups focusing on three topics: drivers, process and the future of Europe.

In terms of drivers, the group considered the politics of discontent and the short and long term economic and social drivers of such feeling. The long term goal was for a European Union that contributes to safeguarding the liberal international order and prevents a return to 19<sup>th</sup> century multi-polar politics. In order to achieve this, the EU needed to consider the road ahead and address the drivers of discontent with the Union which included reforming its decision-making structures, finding credible policy solutions to migration, monetary policy co-ordination, external security threats and disparities of wealth.

Long term economic drivers that had led to an apathetic and somewhat hostile public mood towards the EU included the impact of the economic crisis, the changing working landscape and the nature of work and security (or lack of).

Social drivers included inequality and perceived injustice, hostility towards immigration, xenophobia/hypocrisy and feelings VS facts which had been exacerbated by the influx of social media echo chambers.

Underlying themes that cut across both these economic and social drivers were the pace of change and the different starting positions of Germany and the UK regarding their relationship with the EU. Reference was also made to the role of the media (particularly in the UK) in exacerbating the politics of fear and discontent.

The discussion around process was very much linked to the UK referendum result and the subsequent triggering of Article 50. Whilst the referendum not being legally binding surprised friends in the continent, politically it had to be seen through as it was the will of the British people. Consideration was given to whether an implementation period was needed for Brexit as Article 50 does not specifically reference a transition or implementation period, only an extension period. The potential for the UK to re-join at a later stage as per Article 49 was also raised, though it was unclear whether the declaration under Article 50 could be revoked at a later stage.

The types of Brexit were explored and categorised under a spectrum of 'soft', 'medium' and 'hard' in terms of approach. The commonly held view was that the best possible outcome for both the EU and UK was to ensure a 'medium' Brexit i.e. a bespoke agreement that would meet the needs of both parties. Policy recommendations of a 'medium' Brexit included:

- UK not being a member of the single market
- UK not being in the customs union, but having a better agreement than the World Trade Organisation
- European Court of Justice oversight, exclusively for UK-EU matters
- Some movement of people through work visas and student visas for UK and EU citizens
- No hard border in Ireland

In terms of approach, negotiations needed to be carried out with co-operation, positivity and a desire to make the best of Brexit. The need for transparency from both parties throughout the negotiations was affirmed as well as ensuring democratic accountability. The introduction of an implementation period was recommended as this would leave a gap between agreeing the final deal and it coming into effect, therefore giving people and businesses the time to make practical changes.

With regards to the future of Europe, the point was made about the need for EU reform particularly with regards to organisational structures and the need to create more efficient ways of policy and decision making, strengthen democratic accountability and be more transparent.

Conflicting views from EU countries regarding the direction of travel – such as speed, depth and areas of integration led to the proposal for differentiated integration with a baseline commitment to the single market and the four pillars of the EU. This type of tiered integration would require reform of third country association agreements, creating institutionalised opt-out mechanisms (without leaving the union), harmonising entry criteria for permanent structured co-operation and strengthening the EU institution enforcement mechanisms in core areas.

Recommendations put forward were around the need for the EU to implement an engagement strategy with its citizens so that they understood the role of the Union, having a domestic debate about European (rather than EU) identity, having a stronger voice for national Parliaments and a more effective code of conduct for MEPs. There was also a suggestion to differentiate between freedom of movement and freedom of labour to help address some of the concerns around public attitude towards immigration.

Questions put forward to the group centralised around the practicalities of separating freedom of movement and freedom of labour and the additional bureaucracy this would cause. For example, would it be administered by governments or led by business - in which case, what would the threshold of payment for e.g. work visas be? This led to a wider conversation about cheap labour in the UK dominating certain markets such as hospitality, the services sector and agricultural labour. The group responded by saying that immigration has become such a politically dominant topic since 2010 that it would have to feature in some sort of restriction.

## **Group 2 – Lasting Economic Stability?**

The Chair of the second group started by outlining the process in which the group had reached its conclusions which included: defining sustainable economic development, identifying key focus areas for sustainable economic development, analysis, synthesis and discussions. Group 2 had also divided into sub-groups focusing on three topics in the context of lasting economic stability: the development of international trade, role of the European Economic Monetary Union (EMU) and engagement with the strategic/smart state.

Key features in the development of international trade were the increased mobility of business, capital and people and the liberalisation of trade. The impact of this has been increased global competition and downward pressures on labour laws and taxes. Competition and globalisation has created winners and losers and had a financial, social and psychological impact on individuals and resulted in inequality. There is a tension between the goal of embracing global free trade and domestic dis-satisfaction created by winners and losers.

The United States of America trade agenda was seen to risk posing a threat to the traditional global rules based system. In addition, we are entering a period of global instability with the UK leaving the EU and seeking to forge new global links given the potential barriers post-Brexit to trading with the EU.

In terms of reform to ensure the benefit of globalisation and international trade can be felt more widely, recommendations put forward from a national perspective included: having a strong set of labour standards with strict enforcement to ensure that people were not being undercut by low wages, having an industrial strategy with a focus on retraining and lifelong learning, including an investment fund, broader public engagement and analysis, a more nuanced welfare state and trade defence measures. International approaches to promoting the development of international trade could include having a common policy on labour standards, international aid and development.

The EMU in its current form must be considered an incomplete monetary union. There was broad consensus within the group that the stability of the Eurozone is an important pillar of overall economic health for continental Europe. The question was therefore put forward to what extent further integration and centralisation of macroeconomic policy, fiscal policy and sovereign debt may mitigate certain shortcomings of the status quo. The group challenged the "conventional wisdom" of solely strengthening the supranational level and discussed stabilisation mechanisms including counter cyclical funds, unemployment benefits support schemes as well as a review of co-financing rules. The need to create and engage with a more strategic/smart state was outlined as a key necessity for creating lasting economic stability. Distribution and public perception matters and people need more positive interaction with the state. The status quo of intervention has often fallen to classic welfare components such as income redistribution, social security payments, taxation and borrowing. The group proposed a toolkit for a smarter state which would include tailored flexible regulations, digital transformation and interaction, nudge tactics and soft incentives in three key areas: education and skills, health and care and industrial strategy.

The group concluded by summarising the growing fear and scepticism when thinking about globalisation and the associated need for a new national approach supported by international alignment re: global trade to ensure fairer participation. The EMU needed to be called upon to engage more in economic development and the strengthening of subsidiarity and federalism was seen as a way forward. Alongside this, the role of the state required fundamental review given current challenges and needed to move towards more strategic engagement.

Questions posed to the group were around commercial capability in the public sector, and how interventionist Governments should be in business. There was a long discussion about the how the state could be more strategic given the increasing move towards devolution in the UK and how this compared with the well-established German system of federalism and the Länder. Interesting parallels were drawn between Germany moving towards increased centralisation by bringing more devolved powers back to the state and the UK seeking to devolve more power and de-centralise.

### **Group 3 - The world in disorder: Being safe vs feeling safe**

The chair made opening remarks about how the group had focused on people in terms of citizens and migration. The group had also sub-divided to focus on four phases of the migrant journey namely the causes, journey, entry and integration as well as Brexit risks and opportunities.

Migration was at the heart of the debate about security and was described as a local, national, regional and global problem. The perceived threat of insecurity and instability both at home and

abroad had led to the sentiment of people not feeling safe. Short-term interventionism had been inefficient and a lack of long term thinking meant there was an urgent political and security imperative to ensure Europeans could live in safe and prosperous neighbourhoods.

Immigration was described as being negatively perceived in UK media, often portrayed as a one-sided argument that presented a threat to British people. Germany has taken in a huge number of refugees which has had consequences for public services and security. The tendency to amalgamate various groups due to interchanging of issues from people stealing jobs (migrant labour) to the threat from terrorism due to the influx of refugees (refugee crisis) had led to a feeling of distrust from domestic citizens. There was a need therefore to understand the different types of migrants (refugee, asylum-seeker and economic) and their status was crucial in helping inform public opinion.

The landscape is complex as there is no 'one size fits all' view or approach to migration as it wholly depends on which country is affected (usually based on geographical location). For example, Italy faces a very different challenge to northern European states and UK is an island so the issues are different to countries that share borders. As a result, countries have differing approaches and attitudes to dealing with this crisis and it is more difficult to find a common united policy solution.

Big questions remained over Brexit and the impact this would potentially have on security at a European level. The withdrawal of British surface vessels of the military mission in the Mediterranean post-Brexit was seen to have damaging consequences though the suggestion was put forward that much like Switzerland who are still involved in the CSDP, there was nothing to stop the UK continuing to play an active role in defence. The other big question was about borders post-Brexit and what to do particularly with regards to the Irish border and the impact this may have on imports/exports.

The need to re-think a more effective integration strategy was seen as a key solution to deal insecurity and public perception. This issue has not been managed in a state interventionist way and in most cases people were left to get on with having to integrate or indeed segregate from other sects of society. Alongside this, the debate on integration and cultural norms and values needed to be tackled through funding as budgets to promote these things have been squeezed and the media. Schools and colleges could play a key role (if sufficiently resourced) to aid integration through providing English as Speakers of other Languages (ESOL) and evening classes. The potential for an immigration impact fund which could be raised by creating a hypothecated tax on immigrants earning a certain amount of money, to then be re-distributed to promote integration was also discussed, notwithstanding the practicalities of monitoring such a scheme. The introduction of a Minister for Integration was suggested to ensure this issue is considered at a national level, with the highest levels of Government and to work across Departments.

The need to establish a new narrative on migration was made in the context of a landscape in which Europe was becoming increasingly secular whilst large numbers of people coming from abroad were more non-secular. The importance of foreign policy in addition to security and defence were made, and it was suggested that we may be moving into an era in which the majority of the public needed to support foreign policy and the media would need to play a key role in influencing support for foreign intervention at home.



The defining issue of Brexit was immigration. Moving forwards, we need to be clearer in our obligations as international leaders to this issue and better at defining who these people are rather than simply conflating them all in one issue. The migration agenda needed to be better understood, people needed to be re-assured and informed through an active integration strategy, education and more language classes need to be offered, and more labour opportunities need to be created.

Questions posed to the group were around the role of the Minister for Integration, EU relocation policies, how to define integration, whether structural problems create a parallel system for immigrants and if a top down approach was the best way to deal with this whether it needed to be locally driven. Interestingly, the debate around safety and security was intrinsically linked to the migration debate and the issue of EU citizens being/feeling safe in the UK and vice versa did not come up as much in discussions.

### **Closing remarks from Sir Nigel Broomfield**

In closing the conference, Sir Nigel and the delegates thanked the Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft and its Chairman Hans-Henning Horstmann for their continued support for the Young Königswinter Conference. The mood of the conference had been energetic and full of high spirits, and the delegates had lasted over 75 hours! He also told delegates of the importance of giving back to their communities as they had attended the conference because of family, colleagues and friends who have invested in their education and supported their careers.

On behalf of all the 2017 delegates, I would like to thank the organisers - particularly Lucie Kretschmer, for organising a seamless programme full of brilliant professional and social opportunities during a few beautifully sunny days in Berlin.

Our thanks also goes to the range of speakers who helped inform our knowledge of the current climate, particularly as we go through a period of great change and uncertainty in Europe - from both the British and German perspective.

Finally, thanks to Sir Nigel Broomfield and Hans-Henning Hortsman for their expert insight, humour and patience in bringing together young people from the UK and Germany. Over the course of a few days, we built professional relationships and friendships and will take this experience in order to 'give something back' – the very essence of the spirit of British/German co-operation the Königswinter Conference was developed to promote.

**Piran Dhillon-Starkings**  
**United Kingdom**  
**July 2017**



