

# DEUTSCH-BRITISCHE GESELLSCHAFT

## 63<sup>rd</sup> Young Königswinter Conference

Friday 21<sup>st</sup> July – Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023, Berlin

### Conference Report



### What sort of leadership do we need?

1. How should we fight for our interests and values?
2. What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?
3. What is the future of work for the generations taking over?

## **Programme**

### **Conference Venue**

Europäische Akademie Berlin  
Bismarckallee 46/48  
D-14193 Berlin  
Tel.: + 49 (0) 30 - 89 59 51 - 0  
Fax: + 49 (0) 30 - 89 59 51 - 95  
Email: eab@eab-berlin.eu  
www.eab-berlin.eu

### **Organiser**

Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft e.V.  
Pariser Platz 6  
10117 Berlin  
Tel. + 49 (0) 30 - 203 985 - 0  
Mob. + 49 (0) 176 - 442 648 65  
Fax. + 49 (0) 30 - 203 985 - 16  
Email: headoffice@debrige.de  
www.debrige.de

### **Date**

21<sup>st</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup> July 2023

### **TOPICS**

1. How should we fight for our interests and values?
2. What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?
3. What is the future of work for the generations taking over?

## Friday, 21 July 2023

- 12:00 Arrival and check in  
Light Lunch at EAB
- 13:00 – 14:30 **Opening of the conference**
- Thomas Matussek**, Ambassador ret.  
Chairman of the Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft e.V.  
and the **Conference Co-Chairs**
- Dr Birgit Bujard**, Deputy Chair, Young Königswinter Alumni e.V.  
Senior Research Fellow, CETEUS - Centre for Turkey and European Union  
Studies, University of Cologne
- John Kampfner**, Journalist and Author
- Opening Panel Discussion**
- Guy Chazan**, Chief Germany Correspondent, Financial Times
- Dr. Franziska Hagedorn**, Head of Division 204 (United Kingdom, Norway,  
Iceland, Switzerland, Liechtenstein), Federal Foreign Office
- Natalie Toms**, Global and Economic Issues Counsellor, British Embassy in  
Berlin
- Dresscode: Smart Casual
- 14:30 Group photo take and Coffee break
- 15:00 – 17:00 **Introductions** to the study group topics by selected participants
- Group I:* Berenike Vollmer / Hugo Lucas
- Group II:* Julia Adamczewski / Dylan Topham
- Group III:* Johannes Goslar / Brigid Francis-Devine
- 17:00 Coffee break
- 17:30 – 18:30 **Study group sessions begin**  
Selection of Chair and Rapporteur

18:45                    **Transfer to dinner venue**  
British Embassy Berlin  
Wilhelmstraße 70/71, 10117 Berlin

19:30                    **Dinner hosted by Kieran Drake**  
Deputy Head of Mission, British Embassy in Berlin

as of 21:30            Time off

**Saturday, 22 July 2023**

08:00                    Breakfast

09:00 – 10:30           **Study Groups**

10:30                    Coffee break

11:00 – 12:30           **Lecture with regard to the topic of group II: "What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?"**

Speaker: Rosanna Barry  
Head of Committees Scrutiny Unit, House of Lords

13:00                    Lunch at EAB

14:00 – 15:30           **Lecture with regard to the topic of group I: "How should we fight for our interests and values?"**

Speaker: Prof. Johannes Vogel  
Director General, Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin

Coffee Break

16:00 – 18.15           ***Spare time***

18:15                    Transfer to Mitte via S-Bahn

19:00 – 22.00      **Dinner at Lawrence Restaurant**  
Oranienburger Str. 69

from 20.30      Drinks with and introduction to the **Young Königswinter Alumni e.V.**  
At Lawrence Restaurant

**Sunday, 23 July 2023**

08:00      Breakfast

9:00 – 10:30      **Study groups**

10:30      Coffee break

11:00 – 12:30      **Lecture with regard to the topic of group III: "What is the future of work for the generations taking over?"**

Speaker: Dr Mahlet Zimeta

Tech policy consultant

13:00      Lunch at EAB

14:00 – 15:30      **Lecture with regard to the topic of group III: "What is the future of work for the generations taking over?"**

Speaker: Margarita Sereda-Wildenauer

Professional Coach for Personal Development

15:30      Coffee Break

16:00 – 18.30      **Study groups or *Spare time***

18.30      **Transfer to Charlottenburg**

19:00 – 21:00      **Boat trip** through the historical centre of Berlin with buffet

as of 21:00      **Time off**

## Monday, 24 July 2023

08:00	Breakfast
09:00 – 10.30	<b>Study groups</b>
10:30	Coffee break
11:00 – 12:30	<b>Preparation of study group reports</b>
12:30	Lunch at EAB
13:30 – 15:30	<b>Presentation of working group results Plenary session</b>
15:30	Coffee break
16:00 – 17:00	<b>Continuation of presentation of working group results</b>
18:15	<b>Transfer</b> to Würth Haus
19:00	<b>Würth Haus</b> , Schwanenwerder Lecture by Daniela Schily Concert Reception
22:00	<b>End of Conference</b>

## Tuesday, 25 July 2023

08:00	Breakfast and check-out
-------	-------------------------

## Conference Sponsors

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



Auswärtiges Amt



British Embassy  
Berlin

Königswinter Stiftung



DEUTSCHE BÖRSE  
GROUP



**Rud Pedersen  
Public Affairs**

:RUD PEDERSEN GROUP

west**energie**

WÜRTH  GROUP

## Topics for the 63<sup>rd</sup> Young Königswinter Conference 2023

### Topic 1: How should we fight for our interests and values?

When is military action justified?

When is direct action justified? (Strikes, street blockades, ...)

What do we need to do to strengthen parliamentary democracy?

What we each (Brits and Germans) have to learn from the other's systems?

### Topic 2: What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?

What kind of diversity do we need? Won't we end up creating a new establishment?

Should there still be quotas and if so which?

How do we best tackle regional and class disparities in job opportunities?

What role can a feminist foreign policy play?

What is best practice in the UK and Germany?

### Topic 3: What is the future of work for the generations taking over?

Between "quiet quitting" and 60 hour work weeks: Do we need to redefine the role of work in our lives, and if so how?

Are labour shortages giving employees more power and how should they exercise it?

Safety first; failing fast: the rights and wrongs of UK and German approaches to work

Is AI a helper, competitor, or destroyer?



## Report

### Background

The global climate crisis, inflation and the cost-of-living crisis, the "Zeitenwende" in reaction to the ongoing war in Ukraine, a changed working world post-covid, the advancements of AI, as well as the rise of extreme and radical right-wing parties in Europe – the 63rd Young Königswinter Conference (YKW) took place in a time of multiple crises and changes. The annual YKW at the Europäische Akademie Berlin provides the room for young Germans and Britons to engage in conversation, identify challenges and develop ideas.

From the 21st of July to the 25th of July, 46 participants, about half of them of German, the other half of British nationality, came together to discuss the overarching topic of this year's conference which was "What sort of leadership do we need?". The topics in focus were shared values and interests, the representative society of the 2020s and how to build it, as well as the future of work for the generations taking over. The participants were able to bring different expertise to the table as they work in different fields such as politics, administration, business, science, art, and media.

During and outside of the programme, the conference provided an opportunity to promote UK-German relations on a systemic as well as on a personal level. It opened the room for participants to engage in conversation with like-minded, as well as sometimes radically different perspectives, and foster mutual understanding.

### Friday, 21st July 2023

#### Opening of conference

The participants were welcomed by the Chairman of the Deutsch-Britische Gesellschaft, Ambassador ret. Thomas Matussek. He pointed out that Brexit had cut many existing links between the two countries. In his view especially the end of the Erasmus programme in the UK left a painful hole with regard to bilateral exchange of young people, one of the reasons why YKW matters now more than ever. The Co-Chair of YKW, John Kampfner encouraged participants to help drive conversations and be as innovative, original, authentic, and informal as the participants liked to be. Co-Chair Dr Birgit Bujard shared her own experiences of having been a participant of YKW and stressed the power of friendships that may evolve from it.

During their opening discussion, Guy Chazan, Chief Germany Correspondent of the Financial Times, Dr Franziska Hagedorn, Head of Division 204 which includes the UK at the Federal Foreign Office, and Natalie Toms, Global and Economic Issues Counsellor at the British Embassy in Berlin, spoke about the state of German-British relations. The opening remarks started off with an emphasis on the shared analysis and shared values of both governments for example regarding climate change, security threats and the protection of democracy. As an example of a symbolic act that mattered, one of the speakers mentioned the visit of King Charles to Germany in 2023. Later the challenges of German-British relations became clearer. One of the speakers mentioned the "trauma of Brexit" and its consequences. They said that Germany's way of thinking in EU terms might make the bilateral relationship more complicated and therefore be a "little short-sighted". They also shared

their opinion that Angela Merkel embodied a “big European chancellor”, a presence her successor Olaf Scholz had not yet achieved. Other lingering challenges for both countries

were mentioned such as the diversification of supply chains, the need for drastic measures to combat climate change and a growing societal sentiment of not being heard from which right-wing populism profits.

### **Tour de Table**

Every participant introduced themselves to the group, mentioning their name, occupation, and personal trivia often about their job or their personal German-British story, allowing a first glimpse of their multifaceted backgrounds and expertise.

### **Study Group Introductions**

Two participants of each study group were asked to present their initial thoughts on their topic.

#### **Group I - How should we fight for our interests and values?**

The exploration of the topics started with an International Relation’s approach to the first topic: How should we fight for our interests and values? The presenter gave an input on the questions: When is (direct) military action justified? And what do we (Brits and Germans) have to learn from the other’s systems? She set definitions for two key variables national interests and national values. First being a state’s national consensus on goals and ambitions - this could be economic self-sufficiency, domestic and geopolitical stability, a strong military standing, cultural, or something else and second being commonly held moral standards defining what might be acceptable and reasonable, such as regard for the rule of law, participation in and acceptance of democracy, equality, free speech, and respect for minorities. She then went on introducing four Cs in advocating and fighting for shared interests and values: collaboration which in her opinion should be the default mode (e.g. the UN sustainable development goals), competition, which in her opinion should benefit economic values, as well as crisis, and conflict. With regards to crisis and conflict, the presenter noted differences in both countries’ strategies – a hard power approach in the UK and a soft power approach in Germany, even if the war in Ukraine and the “Zeitenwende” brought the two countries closer together in this regard. She then opened the discussion for the next few days proposing questions such as: What can the UK and Germany learn and adopt from each other’s current approaches? In times of crises and conflict, what are the most effective ways to advocate for interests and values? To what extent is military action justified in these situations (and what should be done in the case of moral dilemma)? What are the aspects that countries need to consider in a formalized foreign policy and what security framework may ensure effective responses to shared challenges as well as a sustained feeling of commitment towards each other? She concluded the presentation by stating that history, and most recently Ukraine, have shown that allies and alliances matter.

The second presenter showed what would become a recurring theme of the conference: a completely different approach in answering the question starting by another definition of the “we” in the question “How should we fight for our interests and values?”. He then chose to define “we” not as

nations or citizens but as young people. He started by showing that voter turnout is lowest in the age group 17 to 24 and 25 to 34 and shared his own experiences in trying to mobilise these specific groups. He had for example seen that value-based arguments mobilise more than interest-based arguments. Thinking of pressing issues on young people's minds like climate change, a value-based communication could lead to a different narrative than an interest-based communication but the question of how far (young) people are willing to go to fight for these values often remains.

## **Group II - What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?**

The first presenter gave an in-depth empirical look at the question of representation, focusing on gender equality and ethnic diversity in the German and British public sector. She said that a lack of diversity in politics had a negative impact on trust and legitimacy of political institutions but also their functionality. She mentioned the two frameworks aimed to improve representation, the "Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz" (2006) in Germany and the "Equality Act" (2010) in the UK, which aim to protect characteristics such as ethnic background, sex, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation, as well as combined characteristics (intersectionality). The presenter first showed data which gave insight into the state of the gender equality in both countries as well as global. She then presented data on diversity. Many Brits in the room were astonished when she explained that Germany does not collect data on ethnic background due to the country's fascist past and therefore only polls "migration background". While the reluctance behind the decision is understandable, it also makes progress towards better representation more difficult because one does not know the exact starting position. The presenter summarized that there was still a gap between the share of women and people with ethnic minority background in population and in politics. The data also showed the need for better representation at senior grades and leadership.

The second presenter started with a personal access, pointing out through his own example that not all protected characteristics (by the 2010 Equality Act) may be visible or even seen as such. He then took a politics-based-approach and looked at the representation of politicians. He expressed his opinion that the use of a characteristics-defined shortlist – even if not always easy to implement – could be one measure to overcome mental barriers faced by underrepresented groups, who don't know or see people like them in positions of power. He further mentioned different topics which he would like to discuss with the group such as female representation and feminist foreign policy measures and the issue of devolved power. He proposed solutions as well as challenges that might come with tackling these issues. Lastly, he concluded that any proposed reforms to institutions must involve those whom it seeks to represent to give them the ownership of the intuition and the confidence they need to get involved and represent their peers.

In the following conversation, a participant commented that representation should not only try to get people in position of power but also look at who was able to thrive in society.

## **Group III - What is the future of work for the generations taking over?**

The first presenter chose a creative way to start his presentation by showing sequences of the 1920s German silent film Metropolis before diving deeper into every topic of his talk about the future of

work. He took a rather philosophical approach on the proposed questions, such as the role of work in people's lives and whether it should be redefined; the purpose of work as well as labour shortages and whether it gives workers more power and if so, how they should exercise it, but also the rights and wrongs of UK and German approaches to work, and the use and ethics of AI. His presentation did not aim to answer these questions but rather to deconstruct existing narratives by asking further questions and therefore served as a starting point for discussion.

The second presenter tackled the same questions with a more empirical look at the UK labour market. She noted that things were pretty much back to pre-pandemic levels, before pointing out the "big but": economic inactivity. She presented data which showed that long-term illness is now the leading reason for inactivity and showed underlying explanations for that problem such as access to health care with an increased number of patients waiting over a year for a hospital appointment since the start of the coronavirus pandemic. With regard to the question of re-defining work in our lives, she showed that millennials and Gen Z were working 56 hours a week less since the beginning of the pandemic and that unpaid overtime has been a key contributor to business productivity since 2008. Tackling the question of labour shortages and whether it gave workers more power, she presented data that showed a nominal total pay growth since 2010 but then put it into perspective showing that the numbers, once adjusted for inflation, have not improved since 2010. In conclusion, she painted an ambivalent picture, stating that the OBR said there will be 140,000 more people in employment by the beginning of 2028, but that some of the rise in inactivity during the pandemic will be permanent.

After these presentations the study group sessions started. The groups used the time to share their first thoughts on their topics, and by selecting chairs and rapporteurs – or discussing whether they saw a need to appoint someone for these positions in the first place. Some groups also formed sub-groups to enable in-depth conversations.

In the evening, the whole group had the opportunity to attend a dinner hosted by Kieran Drake, Deputy Head of Mission, at the British Embassy in Berlin.

### **Saturday, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2023**

On Saturday, the study groups started off by critically examining the content of the questions they were presented with. All three groups tried to create a common understanding and define possible blind spots. For example, group I discussed what they meant by values and interests and talked about the fine line between both. Meanwhile group III tackled the question of how to address that the future of work might look different in the "global north" than in the "global south".

### **Lecture with regard to the topic of group II: What is the representative society of the 2020s and how do we build it?**

#### **Rosanna Barry**

Head of Committees Scrutiny Unit, House of Lords

Rosanna Barry's presentation soon turned into a lively discussion. Rosanna, Head of the Scrutiny Unit at the House of Lords, started by outlining different forms of representation in society. She

discussed whether in a democracy, those who represent society should roughly correspond to the range of experiences, perspectives, and concerns in that society. She shared anecdotes of how being a woman and part of a minority had helped her to bring attention to overlooked issues. On the other hand, this responsibility could become burdensome. She added that people from minorities, and other underrepresented groups, may not automatically feel represented by someone with the same characteristics and don't automatically share the same views. She also addressed the dilemma of quotas, including what they ought to prioritise if used, and whether structural biases favouring certain groups in society are themselves a form of quota. She opened the conversation by asking the group the question: What is representation, and does it matter?

One person contributed her conflicting views to the conversation. In her view, representation may not only mean seeing oneself reflected in a group but may also mean making sure that a group is better at attracting more people like oneself. Another person expressed his opinion that representation may only be the means to another goal: inclusion. He gave the example that queer people may be represented in politics but that queer citizens may at the same time be beaten up in the streets. Rosanna Barry asked whether representation may be circular: to achieve representation, there seemed to be a need for role models.

Another person shared her experience that people from diverse backgrounds only seem to be welcomed at a workplace in the first place but may then experience unwritten rules which they don't know about at first but seem important to obey. Others added that they had experienced pushbacks by their own group. This led to a discussion whether minorities should have to show more support for each other. Controversial opinions were discussed such as the belief that representation should not be more important than competence. Rosanna highlighted the bias of concluding that broader representation would be a risk to competence. In the end Rosanna Barry praised the group for the discussion. She said that despite varying belief systems and backgrounds, there had always been an incredible level of respect and active listening.

## **Lecture with regard to the topic of group I: How should we fight for our interests and values?**

### **Prof. Johannes Vogel**

Director General, Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin

Professor Johannes Vogel, Director General at the Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin, started his passionate presentation by stating that society was facing unprecedented times and needed to find new ways of living. He shared his belief that anyone caring about democracy must also care about the destruction of nature and inequality because both were linked. The evolutionary biologist then took a rather surprising detour by talking about sex. He explained that for a long time, there had not been a need for sex. That changed when creatures faced an underlying crisis in evolution. Back to present times, he said that civilisation would have to battle a tough fight and would probably not be able to win under the circumstances it experiences now. For him, there are only two options: deep changes or slow death. The problem, in his opinion, was that people were constantly told to choose slow death. In his view, the Western World gives agency to institutions like universities to develop innovation, but nobody was brave enough to state the obvious: that the emperor was naked. He challenged knowledge institutions to self-reflect and then to engage and stimulate society, but also to learn to listen. He shared his concerns that science thrives best in democracy

but that he was not sure if it paid back because learning institutions often did not want to engage with the public. As a solution he proposed that 20 per cent of their funding should be paid for democracy and to engage with the public to bring conversations from the street to dialogue into impact. He concluded his presentation with a message: "Thoughtful committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it is only thing that ever has."

In the following Q and A he clarified his conviction that no technical invention will ever be able to save the globe from climate change. Vogel criticized innovations such as electric cars, which in his opinion were not innovation, as innovation should aim for circularity and should be mission oriented and have respect for nature, because nature does not negotiate. He made a point that he didn't see another option with regard to the climate crisis than to make sacrifices. His prediction was that people in the future will have a standard of living comparable to the 1970s. He said that a conversation about what is unnecessary was in order. With regard to science, he proposed that scientific values should not only be measured by input (money) and output (papers) but also by their normative value to democracy. Scientific institutions should be evidence-based and engage as conveners, pacemakers and change agents. In the end, he also encouraged the participants to use their agency to be the change needed and press for joint commitments.

In the evening, the whole group had dinner at Lawrence restaurant, followed by drinks with alumni of YKW who shared information about the alumni organisation Young Königswinter Alumni e.V.

## **Sunday, 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2023**

### **Lecture with regard to the topic of group III: What is the future of work for the generations taking over?**

#### **Dr. Mahlet Zimeta**

Tech policy consultant

The first lecture on Sunday addressed the question "What should work be like for your generation in the age of AI?" Drawing on what UN Secretary-General António Guterres said at the UN Security Council the week before ("Never again will technological innovation move as slowly as it is moving today"), the speaker Dr Mahlet Zimeta, a tech policy consultant and YKW alumni herself, used her own CV as a recurring theme to illustrate what work has been like for her and giving recommendations based on that.

As a pupil, she enjoyed humanities but put her focus on science as her parents thought that it may be more helpful for a good career. Ultimately, this was useful for her later career in AI because AI is fundamentally interdisciplinary, and it's good to be able to understand enough about other disciplines to be able to communicate and collaborate.

At university, Zimeta studied Ancient Greek philosophy and even though she couldn't explain at the time why she loved the degree and was willing to risk employability by studying it, it is clear to her now that in an age of automation and replication you need to be able to explain what is distinctive and what should be valued. Her MPhil dissertation on philosophy of fiction had a chapter on computer games, which was an outlier then but is a growth area now: the importance of staying

curious about old forms (of new things) so you can shape them. Her experience in teaching philosophy of science, a subject sceptical of science, she learned that one should be a critical friend to AI.

Having spoken about the technical aspects of working in AI, she moved on to the political aspects of AI as well as AI and social purpose in her experience. The LinkedIn algorithm helped her leave academic philosophy by recommending jobs in tech, even though she was not a technophile, and in doing so transformed her career trajectory. Tech platforms are currently driven by the "attention economy", but we should try to imagine and build something better. The digital economy can also be shaped so that it's not winner takes all. Her background as a person who was born in Africa and is committed to decolonisation leads her to conclude that around the world the social contract and the global order are up for negotiation in age of AI, as a result her recommendation is to be clear on your negotiating aims and resources.

In terms of interpersonal aspects of career in the age of AI, she stressed that as a first generation immigrant she has a cultural toolkit of switching contexts and switching cultural codes, which helped her when switching sectors, domains and professions. Having worked as chief of staff to a neurodiverse leader gave her the opportunity to learn from him to focus on strategy and vision, while ignoring hype. To her, this is really important in the field of AI.

From her past working at the Alan Turing Institute, the UK's national institute for data science and AI, where they had a "jamming" culture where people enjoying their work together led to innovation, she draws her last recommendation to the audience: do work you love with people you trust, because joy can be a source of creative problem-solving.

### **Lecture with regard to the topic of group III: What is the future of work for the generations taking over?**

#### **Margarita Sereda-Wildenauer**

Professional Coach for Personal Development

Margarita Sereda-Wildenauer, a personal development coach, took a less systemic and more humanistic approach on the future of work. She started the session with a guided visualisation which invited the participants to reflect on their professional development so far and to envision what each one's future of work might hold. Sereda-Wildenauer went on to argue that inner work, i.e., the internal work that a person does on a mental and emotional level to strengthen their relationship with themselves, is pivotal for the future of professional work, especially in times of growing uncertainty. According to her, an individual's life is greatly shaped by their emotions and thoughts as well as by their ability to regulate those and to make conscious decisions in alignment with one's own values and interests. Therefore, she believes that inner work offers untapped potential to build stability and well-being from within.

Sereda-Wildenauer presented data from a representative survey focusing on the intersection of mental well-being and professional work of generations Z and Millennial, which depicted the decline of mental health as one of the main concerns. Some participants seemed conflicted about the presented contents and the importance of inner work, and raised several points. The first one was

that the notion of inner work may distract from structural changes. Sereda-Wildenauer said that systemic and individual change aren't exclusive. Moreover, she shared her hope that change on a personal level will eventually be reflected in societal structures, for those are man-made after all. Another participant said that personal development may also lead to even more stress, becoming just another chore and create feelings of failure. Sereda-Wildenauer replied that inner work aims at achieving more authenticity and integrity, progress over perfection.

The lecture was concluded by the presentation of a tool that can be a helpful starting point in building a better connection to oneself by assessing different life areas.

In the evening the whole group had the opportunity to experience a boat trip on the Spree river through the centre of Berlin.

## **Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> July 2023**

On the last day of the conference each group presented their results.

### **Study Group Presentation**

#### **Group I - How should we fight for our interests and values?**

Group I started their presentation with an interactive element to get everybody involved and get them thinking about the topic. They sent a link to the participants and asked them what their core values and interests were (see photos). Afterwards the participants were asked to stand up and individually react to a proposed scenario. If a person agreed with a statement, they were asked to stand at one side of the room, if they didn't, they were asked to stand at the other side.

Scenario 1: "You are a single parent with two kids on an average salary, you are concerned of the future of the kids, 30 per cent of your income goes to childcare. There is severe water shortage, and the government does not do enough. You are asked to work as a community organiser for Fridays for Future, if you don't engage, your community will not be organised, but if you do, you will sacrifice a day of work and with your children."

Scenario 2: "A person is an average German or UK taxpayer; public services has been underfunded, but the tax burden is already quite high. The G7 has agreed to hugely ramp up the funds for mitigation and climate change for the global south. It will increase the tax burden on your household. Do you support the party who is in support of it?"

Scenario 3: "The year is 2030, you are a middle-class family. But the future is bleak. You are allowed one child. Will you bring this child into the world? Most people decided they would. The next scenario played out 2035: "global temperature is still on the rise, you are a committed climate activist, you are part of an influential but radical group. The government is taking on outphasing coal. You have the decisive vote. Will you vote for direct action and participate?"

Scenario 4: "It is 2040, temperatures are soaring again. Someone proposes to release chemicals into the atmosphere which may reduce the temperature via geoengineering. If it works, it would



enable the status quo to continue, but the risks are huge. There is a national referendum". Most people in the room decide to vote no.

Scenario 5: "the year is 2050. The UK and Germany have reached net zero, but Brazil has proven to be a huge polluter with disastrous outcomes on the climate and wants to further destruct the Amazon rainforest for economic prosperity. There is a G7 plan to invade Brazil to stop the destruction of the Amazon rainforest. Your country holds a referendum to vote yes or no."

Afterwards the participants discussed the outcomes. A participant felt that there must be a bottom-line of action – even for something a person really believed in and that there were nuances even in one's core values. Others pointed out that Scenario 5 showed tensions in terms of Western and non-Western perspectives but that these labels might sometimes also be short-handed as people often came from dual backgrounds and unite diverse values. The issue of social desirability was also discussed. Group I concluded the session by asking the participants to not only reflect what was important for oneself and for society (even if that may differ), but also by asking what people were willing to stand up for and at what cost. They asked the group to start or join action advocating for their values and that they, as future leaders, should use their positions to make a change.

## **Group II - What is the representative society for the 2020s and how do we build it?**

Group II began their presentation with a question: Who will the YWK participants nominate for next year's conference? This made people think about their own priorities when it came to representation. The group asked participants to put their hands up and down in response to multiple questions such as: Will they nominate someone from a small town, someone who went to university, someone from the same field, from a different ethnicity or from the LGBTQIA+ community. They also asked if they would choose nominees who share their own political views and if they would nominate someone who is not a man.

Having started the participants thought process, group II asked everyone to step outside and then split into two groups – a participating and an observing group. The individuals of the participating group were asked to stand next to an imaginary person (impersonated by members of group II) who they felt represented them best; and to step outside of the game if they did not feel represented at all. The impersonators embodied characteristics such as nationality, religion, age, but also political beliefs. What became very clear for the observing group was that the identity characteristics were only partly what the participating group looked for in representation and that their political beliefs often seemed more important. Also, the game showed that representatives may have conflicting views on certain issues which on the first glimpse may seem contradictory, e.g., a person with migrant background who opposes immigration often occurred. What was also demonstrated was how difficult it was to feel completely represented. Instead, the participating group was forced to prioritise their own values. It also showed how difficult it may feel to not opt-out if you don't feel represented.

Further, the group raised two questions not formally discussed before: Do we need diversity of characteristics for good representation? Participants had different opinions on the issue, but the common ground seemed to be that diversity of characteristics would not be able to ensure good representation alone, because it was not always aligned with values. Despite that it might

nevertheless be an important first step to ensure more diversity and may therefore encourage more people to participate in leadership. Participants also discussed what good allyship was and how to incentivise it. The participants shared their own experiences of best practices.

### **Group III – What is the future of work for the generations taking over?**

Group III set the stage with a theatre play. Five years from now, three YKW alumni meet again in the metaverse. All three of them deal with the effects AI has had on their jobs: a click worker who feeds the algorithm information all day long. His workload is huge but monotonous, which leaves him feeling stressed and bored out at the same time. A seemingly irreplaceable lawyer with a respected university degree who fights to prove that her judgement is more trustworthy than the algorithm of the AI – and a person who works in marketing and is happy that AI has lifted unnecessary tasks from her job which now allows her to spend more time with her kids. With this example group three elaborates on the already existing transformations AI has had on work.

The first worker stands for the often-overlooked fact that AI relies on a huge amount of manual work. In Bangladesh it has created rather unglamorous jobs for people who label information to help the algorithm learn. The lawyer stands for the group's conviction that whenever people work with AI there is still a need for people with domain expertise. Research has shown that algorithms used in the criminal justice sector often had racial biases encoded which underlines the importance of skilled, critical thinkers who ensure that no fatal mistakes are made. The group also touched upon class disparities that may lead to an educational system which leave imparting skills such as robust critical thinking, creativity and problem solving to wealthier schools whereas less affluent schools only train their students in skills which they believe make students employable such as coding and math.

After their first input the group went on by introducing a manifesto for the future of work. Whilst stressing that they believe collective action such as unionizing is important, they emphasized the individual efforts one can make by leading by example. They encouraged the participants to redefine the concept of work, e.g., by having a conversation about the relationship between paid and care work. They spoke about job satisfaction which may be realized by doing the best to contribute to a positive change for society. They also shared their opinion that in their view the culture of work must change. Ways to achieve this cultural change may be a regulatory framework which implements flexibility as well as pension funds and a basic income, another aspect mentioned was the shift from a culture of unpaid overwork to compensation for labour and to accept boundaries but also being open for change such as reskilling and reprioritization.

The following the discussion critically touched upon the fact that the definition of job satisfaction may be very individual and range between financial security and the ability to provide for one's family and creative expression. This led to remarks that this may also change between a more western – individual – and non-western – collective – standpoint. It was also discussed that flexibility has two sides and that whilst giving employees more self-determination over their everyday life it may also lead to a dissolution of boundaries between the private and the work life.

**Lastly**

The grand finale of the conference took place at Würth Haus in Schwanenwerder, where participants enjoyed a private concert and a selection of food and drinks.

**Miriam Dahlinger**

**Berlin, August 2023**

