

## « Immigration and Integration in Europe »

Bridge Forum Dialogue Conference – 7 June 2012

### Table of contents

1. Introductory remarks by Mr. Caldeira, President of the European Court of Auditors and Vice-President of the Bridge Forum Dialogue.
2. Statement by Mr. Karlsson, former Swedish Minister for development cooperation and migration and former President of the European Court of Auditors.
3. Statement by Mr. Özdemir, Co-Chair of the German Green Party.
4. Questions and answers

### **Introductory remarks by Mr. Caldeira, President of the European Court of Auditors and Vice-President of the Bridge Forum Dialogue**

Monsieur le Maréchal de la Cour,  
Excellences,  
Mesdames, Messieurs, Chers Amis

Welcome to this conference. I thank you for being here today despite the unusual timing. The conference concerns an extremely important and topical subject. To match the importance of the topic we are fortunate to have two outstanding speakers.

Mr. Jan O. Karlsson has had a long and distinguished career in Swedish and European politics. A Social Democrat, Mr. Karlsson held a number of ministerial posts, most notably that of Minister for Migration and Development Cooperation from 2002 and that of acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, in 2003, following the murder of Anna Lindh. In the European Union Mr. Karlsson became the Swedish Member of the European Court of Auditors in 1995. In January 1999 he became President of the Court. He resigned in 2001 in order to return to Swedish politics. It is a very special pleasure for me to welcome such a distinguished predecessor of mine here today.

Mr. Cem Özdemir is one of the most prominent active politicians in Germany today. He is Co-chair, with Claudia Roth, of Alliance '90 / The Greens. As the party leader he focuses on ecological and economic issues as well as educational reforms and migration and integration issues. Mr. Özdemir was a

member of the Bundestag from 1994 to 2002, being its first – ever member of Turkish descent. In 2003 he was Transatlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund in Washington and Brussels. From 2004 to 2009 Cem Özdemir was a member of the European Parliament where he was spokesman of the Greens on foreign affairs.

Today's subject is one of the most urgent and controversial issues in European politics. It is a major theme in European and national policy making, and a dominant issue in national elections.

To take immigration in a wide context, we should remember there is a need for immigration in Europe in order to address the demographic decline in its working population and to maintain a skilled and competitive workforce. The problems concern the criteria governing immigration and the controls to be applied, and there is a need to combat illegal immigration and human trafficking. At present we have a situation in which there is a mix of EU and national policies concerning immigration and we need to think about where it is necessary to evolve common EU approaches.

Perhaps you will bear with me if I summarize some of the main points in the EU's developing immigration policy.

The beginnings of an EU immigration policy can be traced back to the principle of freedom of movement enshrined in the former Economic Community Treaty. With successive enlargements much European Immigration became transformed from "external" immigration to "inwards" migration.

In October 2008 the European Council adopted a general European Pact on Immigration and Asylum (aimed at the development of a common policy) with five commitments: organizing legal immigration; fighting irregular migration; strengthening the external borders; building an EU asylum system; and, creating a global partnership for migration and development.

As a second major step, in May 2011 the Commission issued a communication on immigration in which it stressed:

- The need to control the EU external border effectively.
- The need for a clear system of Schengen governance.
- The prevention of irregular immigration.
- The fight against human trafficking.
- The need to achieve an effective EU return policy.
- The need to operate readmission policies effectively.

- The need to maintain a consistent policy on mobility for third-country nationals.
- The importance of agreement on a “single permit” aimed at simplifying administrative procedures for migrants and giving them a common set of rights.
- Through reunification to respect the family life of migrants.
- The need to focus on the integration of third-country nationals; and
- Finally, the need for common action concerning asylum applications and for the improvement of the resettlement of refugees.

We should note that in the EU context there are three categories of migrants. First those we could call “inwards migrants” – those who migrate from one Member State to another. The Maastricht Treaty of 1992 provided them with the status of “Citizen of the European Union”. They have many rights including those of voting in municipal and European Parliament elections in their country of residence. Second, migrants from European States which are outside the EU. Third, migrants from non-European countries. Through the “Blue Card” qualified migrants from third countries have easier access to jobs and educational facilities inside the Union. Since Maastricht a number of rules have been adopted that constitute the so-called “EU Migration and Asylum Law and Policy”. The European Court of Justice plays a significant role in supervising this régime.

As far as the Schengen area is concerned, the Commission considers it to be one of the major achievements of the Union. It provides for the free movement of some 400 million citizens between 25 countries. But the operation of the Schengen area has been criticized by certain Member States in view of the allegedly porous nature of some points of the external border. In consequence the Commission has proposed the reinforcement of Schengen governance. The European Council, on its side, has called for the creation of a mechanism which can deal with exceptional problems endangering Schengen cooperation. On 16 May 2012 the Commission adopted a report providing the basis for a debate in the European Parliament and the Council.

The “Arab Spring” provoked a dramatic crisis in immigration. Dialogue between the EU and the Southern Mediterranean countries has become a necessity. Italy, Malta, Greece and Cyprus have been more directly exposed to the massive arrivals of irregular migrants by sea and the land border between Greece and Turkey has been vulnerable. While the EU should maintain its tradition of granting asylum and protection it also requires the tools necessary to prevent large numbers of economic migrants crossing its frontiers irregularly. EU’s FRONTEX has helped Italy control vessels embarking migrants and refugees. The practice is that irregular migrants are processed by the EU State in which they first arrive.

This responsibility places a heavy administrative and financial burden on those Member States I have just mentioned. Outside the EU Turkey also faces major problems in hosting refugees from Syria.

Once legally settled in the EU the Commission considers that migrants should be integrated into all the aspects of collective life. The Commission considers that local authorities have a primordial role in bringing this about. Integration is a major challenge which, until now, has remained basically within the competence of individual Member States, with varying degrees of success.

Mr. Karlsson, after these introductory remarks, you now have the floor.

Mr. Karlsson

I listened with great interest to the introductory remarks of Mr. Caldeira. I wondered if he would leave any detail for me to comment on or whether he would cover the whole subject himself. My introduction is therefore a way to continue elaborating on Mr. Caldeira's excellent way of lining up the issue of today's meeting. I have personally been involved in the matter, not only as Swedish Minister for migration but also as one of the two co-chairs of the Global Commission on International Migration that reported to the Secretary General Kofi Annan in October 2005 on the issue of global migration. I will not refer to the findings of the commission's report. I will simply say that a good illustration that can be used are the words of a Swiss diplomat in the United Nations who once said, when we organized a meeting in order to present our findings that: 'Migration is a global thing run by national decisions.' You could add that integration is a local thing that national governments try to deal with.

The problem is that migration and integration occur in different places. What we discovered in the Commission was, amongst other things, that Europe plays a very important role in how to handle a future governance of migration. Europe is also interesting from a demographic point of view. When discussing migration, you have to start with demographics. Europe was, many years ago, the fastest growing part of the world; which was not only due to the fact that the number of people going to Europe was constantly increasing but Europe's population in the rest of the world was also increasing. Migration from a European point of view, from the medieval days up until recently; consisted in people leaving Europe and building their life somewhere else; whether it be in North America, in South America, in Australia or elsewhere. It is interesting to point out and it is not very often done, that the turning point, when net movement changed from emigration to immigration, only took place in the 1980s. Until then more people emigrated from than immigrated into Europe.

This fact is very important when we discuss why the founders of Europe have found it so difficult to adjust to the fact that, nowadays, most people want to immigrate to Europe in order to get rich and live a happy life, instead of leaving Europe to do this. I suspect that it will take another generation to get used to this fact of life.

This change can be explained by observing life expectancy and birthrate. Nowadays, the average birthrate in Europe is less than 2. It has fallen to around 1, 5. No European country is reproducing itself by itself. Almost all of the population increases that we have experienced in Europe since the 1990s are because of immigration. The other fact is that we are constantly getting older: in 2050 the proportion between those who support people and those who are supported will reach a quota of 2/2; there will be two workers for one pensioner and that of course does not work. We must change this.

In the general debate, three ways have been suggested to overcome this problem: one is to persuade people to stay on longer in the labour market and not retire too early. The day where the French Government decided to move the retirement age from 62 to 60, can be seen as a bit anachronistic but the statistics do not lie. It is absolutely clear that, in the future, people will have to stay longer in the labour market than they do today.

The second thing we must do is mobilize more women on the labour market, not only as a way to force women to stay on the labour market but also as a way to rebuild society; so that production and reproduction can be reconciled. This is a problem for many countries in Europe. As a Scandinavian, it is interesting to note that scholars claim that these two different steps are to "go Scandinavian" because Sweden and Norway have the highest rate of everyday participation on the labour market and also the highest rate of women participation. However, even if you combine these two actions in a feasible way, with the increase of pension age from 65 to 67 or even 69, even this will not be enough to cover the gap, to make social insurance, pension systems, social welfare, etc. sustainable in the long run. What we need is a strong increase in immigration in Europe. As Mr. Caldeira pointed out, this realisation is absolutely clear. This is what we need. If we want to keep a social welfare system we need more people to come to Europe to work. We also have to have a social organisation which ensures that those who come here really do have a chance to work in a capacity which involves integration. These two things are absolutely necessary.

The paradox is that, from a political point of view, this is not a very popular statement. To make a political career in Europe, we have for a long time resorted to saying in regard to immigrants. 'We are going to kick them out or let them stay out.' However, everybody knows that this doesn't work. If people in powerful positions make such statements; it doesn't mean that immigrants will stop coming to Europe.

Nowadays, in the middle of the deep crisis of unemployment in Europe, people are arriving all the time because the construction or the inconsistencies of the labour market of European countries is such, that you will always have a place for the people who come here, who need to come here.

Migration has not been on the European agenda for long. The first great step forwards occurred in Tampere (Finland), in 1999, when the first 5-year plan on Asylum and migration was adopted.

It was then followed up in The Hague five years later and then in my home city, Stockholm in 2009. These programs started out very boldly with an overall grip on the entire migration panorama, not only on asylum and refugee problems but also on migration as a whole.

I remember my first and biggest “gaffe” as a Minister for Migration which took place at my first meeting in the Council of Ministers for Migration which the Council of Ministers for Justice and Home Affairs. It was organised in Santiago de Campo Stella, in February 2002. It was an informal meeting where we discussed the action programs of the presidency and at the time the Spanish presidency had just been inaugurated. My 14 colleagues had spoken and I therefore thought I should say something as well so I asked for the floor and said: 'This is all very interesting to talk about refugees but shouldn't we also concentrate on taking a firmer grip on the whole migration issue?' Total silence followed my statement. My 14 colleagues stared down at the table, not saying a single a word on my entirely impossible statement that proved that I did not understand a single thing about the reality of European politics. The only thing that you could hear in the room was the giggling of Commissioner Antonio Vitorino. The Chair quickly suggested that we take a break. I asked Antonio if we could have a cup of coffee and I asked him why he had giggled when I had made my outrageous statement on migration policies. His answer was: 'When I was a new Commissioner a few years ago, I said exactly the same thing in Laeken at the summit meeting and Gerhard Schröder made me swear to never say such a thing again. So I was extremely happy to listen to you.' Of course, in my short career as a European refugee and migration politician, I did not pursue the matter and understood that I should 'take it easy'.

Now you could ask yourself 'What has really happened because of these 5-year programs or so-called plans? Is the bottle half full or half empty?' 'In my opinion, the problem is the reluctance of Member States or Member States governments to place responsibilities for these issues on a supranational level. They do not want people in Brussels deciding who can come into a certain country and who cannot. This is the main obstacle and will for a long time put a hall mark on what we can do together. On the other hand, I talked to Antonio Vitorino about this afterwards, and I think we agree that having a program which the European countries have established, was a great defense mechanism after 9/11 and the financial crisis.

Imagine what would have happened if we had not had this program, after 9/11; when the whole panorama shifted from mobility and openness to fighting terrorism and when the rules on border control were tightened enormously. The financial crisis has of course also created enormous difficulties for the possibility of advancement.

One of the real paradoxes here is of course the 'Spring in North Africa', when the people in North Africa and the Middle East started to orientate themselves towards openness and democracy, exactly the same values on which the European Union has been founded. The reaction of many Member States was to start a civil war in Europe over Schengen.

This was nonetheless, a short affair. I would say that, today, the attacks on free mobility that we had in Europe are over. It is thus very important that we continue, step by step, to create common ground for common action in order to ensure that we are well prepared when a new crisis challenges what we have already achieved.

Today's rhetoric of the Council and of the Parliament is of course that we should adopt a more 'European' way, as in 'go more European'. I am a member of a think-tank in Stockholm which, translated, is called 'global challenge'. We have studied, together with European scholars from all over Europe, the prospects of the present Stockholm Program on Asylum and Migration and we have also written a little book that we have presented to Commissioner Malmström which attempts to determine the steps that need to be taken. The paradox is that we must choose a more sophisticated approach since the absolutely evident fact that Europe needs more migration has not resulted in a willingness to plan for new migration but rather to fight against it. What can we do to open ourselves up? Many experts who have contributed to this book have pointed out that there is no real evidence that the right step is to go 'more European'. It is unclear what we should do but what is sure is that we should not try to harmonise things like labour market policies instead of coordinating them.

Martin Rules, an Austrian scholar from Oxford, has pointed out that the rules regulating the labour markets of the different Member States are so different that a common European activity might lead to completely different results in different Member States. If you then try to harmonise the whole labour market policy, in order to open up for a more European 'scheme' of migration, it is likely that you will hit an obstacle, that you get will 'stuck' due to the numerous differences that exist between countries.. We need to coordinate things, which will lead to further and more efficient coordination because there is, as one can observe daily, a strong need for increased European coordination on the labour market movement. Another important aspect in the labour migration context is that one has to take a look at the concrete situation. The concrete situation shows that employers demand more in order to increase their workforce.

They can choose between various types of action; one is to improve working conditions and their workplace; another is to import people who live on a much lower level. There is always a choice. One has to be incorporated into another since there is always the danger that labour unions or any other union will react against any form of social dumping or wage dumping. I will come back to the other aspects of this problem when we discuss labour integration.

The British have in this case done something very interesting. They have created a Migration Advisory Committee, where some of the leading scholars on migration in Britain are members of a very prestigious committee that is consulted on basically every migration issue before the House of Commons and the government. This has increased the level of the migration debate because this area is an area where one will find a lot of misunderstandings and myths prevailing. One of the ideas that we would like to address in our report to Mrs. Malmström is the idea that perhaps we need a similar mechanism at the European level. What we need is a more fact-oriented discussion on migration. What it is really about instead of the view that immigrants come and grab all the social welfare, all the jobs and that criminality increases. All of this is part of the discussions that we have in our home countries in regard to immigrants and that are based on myths. Even prominent politicians from time to time sink down into this kind of reasoning based on myths. This would however be absolutely impossible if they were talking about economics, social affairs or defence or security.

In the Global Commission that I worked in, we were unanimous in all our recommendations, that increased mobility would promote world growth, that well planned migration would overcome some of the socially negative consequences of migration and that re-admittances would play a much more important role in the growth panorama. On all these issues we arrived at the same conclusions. There was however one question that we could not solve and that was the question whether we should recommend the ratification of the convention on protecting migrant workers rights. We had a convention which had already been agreed upon and where everybody had taken part in its preparation but on the day of the convention's ratification, the members of the European Union, the United States, Canada, Australia and Japan, for a number of different reasons, decided against the convention's ratification. This has created an enormous amount of frustration in the relations between sending and receiving countries in the world.

We were then asked by the Secretary General if we wanted to recommend a general ratification. However we did not arrive at unanimity. We could not solve the problem. We took the members of the Commission who were most against the ratification and Mary Robinson sat them down and demanded that they solve the problem. But to no avail; we were left without a result. We failed.



This goes to show that one of the trickiest issues when it comes to future migration is the protection of labour migration, which is still an open question and needs to be solved. This is of course dangerous since labour migrants are the group on the labour market who are generally most subjected to harassment, to social problems, wage problems and that are in most need of protection of all the different groups on the labour market

My first statement was that migration is a global thing run by national governments. Integration, on the other hand, is a local thing. Integration takes place in numerous areas: in the residential area, at work, at school... This is where integration happens or does not happen. This is the only place where it could happen and this of course makes the nexus of migration and integration extremely complicated. Where do they meet? What are the roles of government? What are the roles of the European institutions?

First of all, we have to be clear that integration can be seen from or discussed from the point of view of integration of the labour market. Even if you cannot isolate this fact, you can focus on it; or you can look at social integration; the way in which people that come to a country, in order to work and live there, are integrated into the social system, the housing system and into the education system. When it comes to integration in the labour market, there are a few facts to be made aware of. One is that foreign labour, as in work migration, adds to mobility and as Europeans, we know that mobility in the labour market is extremely important.

Do you remember when Spain and Portugal were to become Members of the EU in the 1980s? There was a huge discussion on it in France, Germany and in other countries. We could not decide what to do because we feared that one million hungry Spaniards would cross the Pyrenees and take all our jobs. We wondered how to confront this in the name of democracy. Naturally, once Franco was dead, we had to allow them in but the question was: 'What will we do when all these people arrive?' The Iberian membership was surrounded by the most drastic rules of adaptation; some rules took twelve years to be fully implemented. We can however say that it was much worse when Eastern Europe joined a few years later. Thus the Spaniards joined the EU and some years later, some right-wing person, wrote to the Commission and asked: 'Why don't we look at what happened, why we were so scared?' We feared that the Spaniards would take over all the jobs and all the social welfare. But we analysed and calculated what finally happened and what was found? A big net change leading back to Spain. We were so worried that they would take over, become rich; that they would have the democratic Europe that Spain had always wanted to be a member of. But if we look at how people voted with their feet; they quickly decided to go back to Saragossa. The explanation for this was obvious. Those who needed to come to Europe, who did not want to live in Spain during the fascist dictatorship period, had already left the country. The problem however was that once they left, they could not go back. One did not make that trip twice.

If you had a place in France or in Germany, you stayed. When Spain became a member of the EU, you could, however, suddenly easily go back and forth between Spain and Europe. People suddenly had the possibility to try and start a new life in their home country. They suddenly had the right to return to Spain. This is very important because, since Spain and Portugal have been members, there is no longer any mobility. The mobility is as low as it is in the rest of Europe and this proves to be a serious problem for Europe. Nowadays, the most important factor of labour mobility is work migration from outside Europe.

The other thing that is important to keep in mind is that immigrants take all our jobs. This can mean competition but the general picture is that foreign labour, to a very large extent is complementary and not substitutive; which means that foreign labour seem to take many of the jobs that native labour does not want to do itself. From an integration point of view this creates another problem which is that we get a secondary labour market made up of low paid, unskilled workers, who live outside society and who find themselves isolated in housing areas. We have many examples of this kind. The tendencies, however, towards segregation, which can already be found in European countries, could be strengthened by migration; particularly when we talk about legal and illegal migration – although I find it difficult to do so - I think it is better to speak in terms of regular and irregular migration.

What we recommended in the Global Commission is that migration, in order to lead to integration, should be more proactive.

To put it bluntly, the way to get to Europe is through a refugee smuggler. It costs around 5.000 to 7.000 EUR to get to Europe. This means that already on the first day of your arrival, you are obliged to start work very quickly in whatever job you can get because you owe a smuggler between 5.000 and 7.000 EUR. Smugglers do not allow a debt to remain unpaid; they use effective threats to ensure that they will get their money, for example they might threaten an immigrant that if he does not pay his debt, they will take his parents' house in his home country. We say that this is a win/win game but the truth behind it is more serious. If we were to regularise migration, if we were more proactive, these 5.000 to 7.000 EUR could be used in a much more efficient way. It could be used to prepare the person for his entrance into Europe, for education, language, housing... If we make migration part of the public service of the receiving country, an enormous amount of criminality and a loss of financial resources could be avoided. There is nowadays a demand system in Sweden, which has its disadvantages, but it allows immigrants to get a job in Sweden in a regular way, If you do that instead of using smugglers, you could use your 5000 EUR to make a pilgrimage to Mecca for example.

I think that this is one of the most important conclusions that we need to implement in a national and European way. If we want this system to function in the future, that is migration together with integration, we need a proactive migration policy. Some countries have already come much further than Europe in this. Difficulties however still remain, even in the other systems but I would like to point out the example of Australia and Canada where I find that there are numerous elements that the EU could profit from if they were studied and steadily adopted. Naturally, we should not do it in the same way as these countries since we are different but I am certain that we can learn a lot from these two countries.

To sum up, since I promised I would not continue speaking for more than two hours, one could ask oneself: 'Why did the Bridge Forum Dialogue have a meeting today on the issue of migration?'. There are millions and millions of young unemployed people in Europe. Are we going to bring in more people from the Middle East and Latin America to add to this problem? Is that really a good idea? Isn't it a little too idealistic? The answer might be to look at it from a long-term perspective. Europe has a future. We do not know what decisions will have to be made in the next 2/3 months; which will be very important, since these decisions will determine what our future will look like but one thing that we can be sure of however is that we will have a future.

In regard to the future of Europe, we know one or two certain facts. One is that if Europe is going to be viable in the future, we need to have more Europeans working. The courage that it takes to bring up this issue, that this organization has shown amongst many others, is not at all unique but has many precedents. I will give you two examples. The ideas behind the welfare state with full employment as its goal, was conceived of in the middle of the 1930s crisis, in Scandinavia, in Europe and in the US with the New Deal. In the middle of that crisis, where one quarter of the workforce was idle, there were people asking themselves 'How do we create a society with full employment and social welfare; where everybody has a right to develop their own capabilities?' An even more dramatic example is what happened in the middle of the war, where we had Nazism and fascism in Europe; there were people incarcerated in Hitler's concentration camps and in the detention centres of Mussolini. What did they talk about? They discussed how to form Europe; in peace, not in fighting wars with one another but by creating a Union with one another, by building a society together instead of killing each other. In the middle of the blackest moment of these people's personal history, they had the courage to think about these things. We should also have the courage today, to think about the future.

Mr. Caldeira

Thank you, Mr. Karlsson, for your stimulating and provocative speech. I think we have benefited enormously from your insights and experience and without any delay I would like to invite Mr. Özdemir to take the floor.

Mr. Özdemir

Dear Mr. Caldeira, dear Mr. Karlsson, ladies and gentlemen; I would first of all like to say that it is a pleasure to be here, at the Bridge Forum Dialogue in the town of Robert Schuman. When I received your invitation, I asked my staff whether they were certain that the discussion would be on immigration and integration and not on the euro crisis or German austerity or on what is happening with Angela Merkel because these days, as a German; when in a foreign country, you are mainly asked about European integration questions; you are mainly asked what is wrong and what is not wrong with Germany.

On a more personal note: I stand here as a result of the recruitment program that simply wouldn't exist if Germany hadn't made a recruitment deal with Turkey 51 years ago and invited so-called guest workers to Germany . My parents met in Germany. They probably would never have met in Turkey which is a good deal larger than Germany. This explains my personal link to the debate.

On another personal note: while I was listening to Mr. Karlsson, I thought back to my childhood and I remembered when you were talking about Schengen; that we should not forget that there was also a time before Schengen; when it was rather difficult to travel in Europe. I am not referring to the citizens of the Member States of the EU. I am talking about those people who used to live in Europe with passports from so-called third countries. I used to belong to these people. I remember when my school class had an exchange program with the UK and we went by train through Belgium towards the UK. I had to get off the train in Belgium because I did not have the transit visa that was required. I remember the faces of the border control officers; they were very nice to all the children but once I showed them the Turkish passport that I had at the time, their face expressions changed and they asked for my transit visa. I did not even know what a transit visa was since I had been born in a German town and I spoke the dialect of the region. I considered myself as part of the country. I belonged there. I did not understand what difference this passport would make. Long story short: I was forced to leave the train. They were however very kind and gave me a transit visa, so I could then jump on the ship headed for the UK.

The second thing I remember was the day when my parents told me that we could not go to France or Switzerland anymore. The reason was that the visa regime was so drastic that you could not easily get a visa under normal conditions. The efforts required to obtain a visa were practically impossible, so that it soon became pointless to apply for a visa. As a child I therefore had this map in my mind, that France was a no-go area for a person of Turkish origin if you lived in Germany and the same was true for Switzerland.

As a last personal remark would like to add that I applied to become a German citizen when I was around 16 years old and I did this for two reasons. First of all as a Turkish citizen, you have to serve in the Turkish army. When I was around 15/16 years old, I became a pacifist, a member of the Green party and a vegetarian. I try to imagine now what it would have been like if I had been a vegetarian in the Turkish army, asking for my soja beans. I think I would have received a rather unappreciative response. So I applied for German citizenship. Another reason for this decision was that I wanted to be able to vote in the country in which I had been born and grew up. I found it only natural that I should vote in the country that I knew best. That was however impossible because at the time birthright did not exist in Germany. When I finally became a German citizen, I threw a party: I invited all my German friends and the reaction I received was - I tell you this in order to underline the change we have gone through -, my leftist German friends said: 'Oh poor you. Now you're German. It must be horrible for you to be German'. I could not believe my ears. How could they say such a thing? I suddenly had a passport, with which I could travel through the whole world. I was treated as a first-class citizen for the first time in my life. I could go to France, to Switzerland, to Belgium, to the rest of the world, and people treated me in a normal way simply because I had a German passport. This was also at the time when the Turkish passport was not a very highly appreciated passport; which perhaps explains why I received such bizarre reactions. I am very thankful that the previous speaker has already explained the legal structure and the situation in which we find ourselves. So I can talk as a politician; which makes it a lot easier for me.

Now just a few brief remarks. First of all, we talk about 'immigration and integration in Europe': but we have to bear in mind that the countries within the EU all come from very different traditions. We have countries that have so-called recruitment programs like the guest worker program in Germany or the colonial past. This is one group of countries. Another group of countries are the new immigration countries – which used to be sending countries like Spain and Italy; Greece used to be on my list but Greece has now become a very special case -. We then also have new Member States from Eastern Europe who experience both of the aforementioned descriptions at the same time, which proves to be another challenging situation. So in a way, I think we can say that every Member State of the EU has to cope with immigration and emigration and these are important topics and challenges.

Another point which I think is important to point out and which is slightly different if you talk about it on the European level; is that due to historical, political and institutional factors, we are shaped very differently. All one must do is take a long look at the debate concerning the headscarf where you have a whole variety of positions. You have the UK case which I presume has now changed but where for a long time the attitude towards the headscarf was that it was up to citizens to decide what they wished to wear. You then have the radical other side - which is the French model of "laïcité" - and Germany is somewhere in between. This shows us that there is not one view on this debate but many different views. There is however one opinion that we do have in common; which is that even though we cannot agree on a number of issues; when it comes to discussing the failure of multiculturalism. It is interesting to see that the former French President Nicolas Sarkozy, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and British Prime minister Cameron have agreed that multiculturalism has failed, that it was a wrong turn. This is extraordinary, given the fact that Angela Merkel, in my opinion, is in herself the result of a multicultural society. When I look back on my first days as a politician, my home State of Baden-Württemberg was at the time a very conservative state even though nowadays the Greens have the State Prime Minister. But to imagine, back then, a woman becoming the leader of the Christian Democratic Party in Germany was in itself a revolution. A woman from Eastern Germany, who got divorced, who had no children, was completely unimaginable some years ago for the Christian Democrats. The reason that it is thinkable today is the result of a new 'reality' that we now have. So if you talk about multiculturalism, it is quite often reduced to the fact that we have people that came all the way from Kazakhstan or Turkey to Germany. That is however only one part of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, in my opinion, is also that we have gay couples, Lesbian couples, married or unmarried people. Multiculturalism is that we have all kinds of different situations in the same country and at the same time. This also belongs to a multicultural society. I always ask those who claim that multiculturalism has failed what their alternative is; do they really want to go back to the 1950s? I am sure that the majority of citizens would not be very happy with such an outlook.

Jan Karlsson has also mentioned that when we discuss these debates and questions to bear in mind, that demographics also play a crucial role. I do not want to repeat the arguments that have already been stated. It is obvious however that if you observe some Member States such as Germany, Italy or Hungary; the number of people of working age is dramatically shrinking. We are getting older. In my home country, in Germany, one could sum it up by saying that we are getting older, we are becoming less and less and that we are becoming more and more colorful. This is the reality with which we have to deal whether we like it or not.

What we need as a response to this reality, is to combine liberal and humanitarian migration policies based on our shared values concerning human rights. There should, on the other hand, be no contradiction in regard to economic interest. There is nothing to be ashamed of when we talk about economic interest; it is entirely normal for the EU to discuss this matter. But we should not use this as a contradiction of our humanitarian obligations and of the liberal values that we have in the EU. In my opinion, migration policy must be based on human rights. That is, in my eyes, a central benchmark. One challenging situation for this and that we have already heard about, were the events that occurred in North Africa. What was our first response? Our response was not to say: 'Great, we see that these people have the same dreams that we have. Their dreams are about living in a world where you do not have to give money to the Court in order to get a fair Court decision or where you have to give money to the police officer in order to be treated as a normal citizen.' The dreams of these people, often meet with the reaction, at least in my own country, of fear. People ask themselves: 'Oh my God, how many people will immigrate to our country?'

That was our first response. I do not think that the response was driven by a long-term future prospect. This therefore clearly shows us that there still remains a lot to be talked about. One aspect is obviously access to asylum. I think that there is one thing that should not be disputed and that is that every person who needs shelter, according to the Geneva Convention, must have the possibility of accessing a fair asylum procedure in Europe. We therefore need a reform of the Dublin II regulation. Individuals, who are deported from one EU country to another, must be guaranteed a fair asylum procedure from the first country that they entered. This is currently not the case in one of our Member States, namely in Greece. If this is not possible, then they should not be transferred. That should be a rule that is agreed upon by everybody. Following up on that, I also think it is important that Member States show more solidarity amongst between themselves when discussing burden sharing.

I shall now briefly refer to labour migration. When discussing labour migration, the first question that we should ask ourselves should be whether we really need this kind of migration. There has been no agreement on this question so far inside the EU. In the German debate, which is often used as a contradiction to the situation we are facing now, we still have the problem of unemployment of up to 3 million people, and yet at the same time Germany has a shortage of engineers and IT experts, which a lot of people do not understand. It is not easy to simply transform 3 million unemployed people into engineers overnight. Reality is more complicated. There is a mismatch of demand and supply on the labour market and this is due to a number of reasons. One reason is that the qualifications of the unemployed do not always fit job openings. We also have regional mismatches. Many companies are also unwilling to offer training for jobs. We thus have to respond to all these problems at the same time; which is why I think that a variety of different measures is needed.

One measure to be implemented should be a liberal immigration policy. I think that one of the lessons to be learnt in this area is that we must avoid the mistakes of the guest worker system. There is a famous saying that I am sure you have all heard which states that there is nothing more permanent than temporary migration. I therefore think that it does not make much sense to talk about programs based on temporary tickets that people acquire to stay for a couple of years and then have to leave automatically once the card expires. The card should include a way for the person to become a permanent resident and finally to become a citizen. It does not make sense to create new foreigners. Another thing that we should learn is that it is much easier to discuss problems between citizens than between citizens and foreigners. Once you are a citizen, the problems of your town are your problems; the problems of your children's school are your problems. It is therefore important to open the access to citizenship for those who wish to stay permanently.

In regard to the blue card, I think that in itself it is a very good idea. It is a good starting point in the debate for labour migration towards the European Union. Quite often inside the European Union, the Commissions proposal is much more ambitious than what we finally get, due to the Member States, and I therefore think that this is a good start. However, I think that we need to make sure that it is not implemented in such a way that it will repeat the mistakes made in previous periods. Another point to be considered is that: Member States could go ahead and implement a national point system similar to the one that can be found in Canada. In the point system age plays a role as do knowledge of language and educational or professional experience. This is an ideal addition to the blue card system.

Another way for highly qualified labour to enter the EU is through a system which is usually overlooked, namely universities. Universities are a perfect way to enter the EU. In my opinion, universities in the US and in Canada are much more efficient in importing highly skilled labour which unfortunately quite often bypasses Europe in favour of northern America. This is another reason for us to have attractive, international universities. It is also give us the possibility to encourage immigration to our countries. An additional note is that the people who are already studying at our universities need to have the possibility to stay in our countries once their studies are completed. I think this is a very important aspect. We have already begun this procedure in Germany with the so-called 'Red cream collision' but unfortunately, it does not go as far as I would wish.

I shall add another issue now, although it is not the topic of today, namely the visa regime. I think that the visa regime plays a very crucial role in the way people talk about the EU. It determines what people know about the EU. I am very much in favor of having a more liberal visa regime policy vis-à-vis our neighboring states. I find the situation of Turkey completely absurd.



We have nowadays an agreement with the Balkan States, which I highly appreciate but we do not have such an agreement with Turkey. This is absurd since Turkey has a very young population with more and more people attending private universities, which are highly respected. They are not allowed to study in Europe and thus bring back European ideas to Turkey. The same can be said for North African countries.

In regard to the integration debate, particularly in my own country Germany; if you asked me: 'What is your main point about integration in Germany?' without giving it much thought I would answer education. That is the key to success. That is the key to real change. You have all followed the PISA studies. You have all seen that the Scandinavian countries were very successful compared to other countries. It caused a kind of shock. The first reaction towards these studies was that people immediately blamed it on the fact that there were so many people with an immigrant background living in Germany. They believed that that was the reason why Germans had performed so poorly in the first PISA study. This is very simplistic. If it were really true all one would have to do is take out all the immigrants and then look at the education system. You would expect German working-class children to perform excellently but this is not the case. This is in the end clear proof, that it is neither a question of colour nor a question of religion but mainly a social question. If you come from a working-class family or from the rural part of your country, you cannot expect the next generation's performance to be excellent if there was no education system to prepare you yourself. Naturally the reasons are a bit more complicated than some simplistic reactions might suggest.

Another question that belongs to this debate is the fact that when we discuss highly skilled labour, the question that is gaining in importance is: 'Am I really welcome here? Do they really want me? Do they really want my family? How will we be treated?' In the German case, this plays a very crucial role; it can however also be seen when we look around Europe. We only have to look at right wing populism across Europe and then look at the so-called muslimisation. I will now add a personal note on this matter. I had two chances to meet the former American Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The first time I was invited, I was still a member of the European Parliament. I was invited as a politician to have breakfast with Condoleezza Rice together with other experts and journalists. The second time I received an invitation it was addressed to the Muslim leader Cem Özdemir in Germany. Surprised, I wondered what I had done to become a Muslim leader. At first I thought that perhaps I should not accept the invitation because I clearly wasn't a Muslim leader and asked myself. 'Who had elected me as a Muslim leader? What even qualified me as such a leader?' I was however so curious to see a real Muslim leader that I decided to go. What I found were people like me, people of Turkish or other origin, working together with Condoleezza Rice, discussing this and that. I asked my friends. 'What qualified you to be a Muslim leader?'

They replied that that was why they were there; to find out who the real Muslim leader of Germany was who he was in other countries. This symbolises how an immigrant problem in Germany, became a Turkish problem and then a Muslim problem overnight. But again this a simplified attempt to try to explain the problems you face in society in regard to religion. Everybody has their own views, and even religion plays a part, but I think to reduce a person that comes from a Muslim background to a mere person from Islam goes back to the time before the Enlightenment. This is not what Europe should stand for.

We should see that there is no longer such a thing as 'the Muslim' or 'the Christian' or 'the Jew'. We have different generations, we have conservatives, we have seculars, we have cultural Muslims and religious Muslims. I recently even heard it said that we have atheist Muslims. It makes no sense to continue this discussion. We have people of different origins and naturally some of them are unemployed, while some have PhDs, which is hard to believe sometimes when you follow public debates. Others are even elected as politicians. We can therefore see that there is a huge variety of people with a Muslim background and I think it would make certain things a lot easier if we recognised this. I do not want to conclude without saying that problems remain and that it is important to address them. First of all, it is clear that, if you move to a country or if you live in a country, you also have an obligation towards that country. Part of the obligation is to try and learn the language of the country. My personal contribution to this was to learn official German because I only spoke a German dialect, from South Western Germany. So this was my attempt at showing that I was properly integrated in Germany. The second step, besides learning the official language, is that everybody should stick to the constitution of the country. Everybody has to stick to a constitution and since a constitution is based on shared values, these can therefore also be shared by those who move to a different country, whether Muslim or non-Muslim. The last element, in defining integration, would be that you must do everything to guarantee the success of your children, to support them as best as possible and that you try to earn your living with a job.

That is in my opinion, the definition of integration. I am not really sure that if one went out onto the streets whether it be in Luxembourg or in any other country, that one would find values shared by everybody. It is difficult because a lot of people have an expectation that goes beyond what I just said. We need to discuss this matter. What do we really expect from the people who wish to become part of our society? If the majority does not know what it wants from people who want to become part of the majority then it is difficult to talk about the expectations that we expect from these minorities. We also have to talk about fundamentalism; about the situation of women; about education; about human rights. All this needs to be addressed but it should not be used as a scapegoat, as a way to target one group in particular. It should be used because we share these values. Everybody has to share these values because that is what the EU is about. A lot of people who live in the EU came exactly because of these values.

They fled from countries where there were dictatorships, to save their lives and to enjoy freedom, especially when they were asylum seekers or when they had to flee the military coup in Turkey or other such events. There is therefore no reason to question these values. We should not use them in order to create distinctions between religious groups.

That is my conclusion. Thank you, and I look forward to the discussion.

Mr. Caldeira

Thank you, Mr. Özdemir for your illuminating and insightful remarks. Thank you, also, for managing to find the time to be in Luxembourg between a meeting in Brussels this morning and your return to Berlin this evening. Mr. Karlsson would like to now use some of your insights and comment on them himself.

Mr. Karlsson

First of all, you pointed out one thing that I would briefly like to elaborate on: the idea that multiculturalism has failed which was voiced by Chancellor Merkel and has also been quoted positively by both Mr. Cameron and Mr. Sarkozy. When I heard such a statement, I thought first of all that it is absolutely right to point out the fact that Angela Merkel being German Chancellor is in a way a multicultural achievement in itself. One more specific aspect came to my mind however. First of all, we began the conference with the idea that we all live in a globalised world. However if we do and if Europe will have to adjust itself to a globalised world, how can we then combine that with the idea that multiculturalism has failed? What would happen if such a statement were true? Would we then have to stop globalization? Put up big walls like the ones between the Palestinians and the Israelis or on the border between the United States and Mexico? It is therefore a contradiction with deep implications when the same people who talk positively about globalization also claim that multiculturalism has failed. There is on the other hand a more specific aspect which is football. If multiculturalism has failed how was it that France became World Champion in 1998? Every player of that team was either born outside France or his parents were born outside France and if the program of the Front National had been taken into effect before that, this national team would never have existed. You cannot say that multiculturalism has failed if you see such an achievement. For me football is culture. If you do not believe me however, look at the match between Bayern München and Chelsea with the example of Didier Drogba. His mother tongue is French, he was born in the Ivory Coast and he plays for Chelsea. So if you believe that multiculturalism has failed, then you must not be very interested in football. Two of the best scorers on the German National team are Polish.

This is simply one additional thing that I would like to add to the observations made by Mr. Özdemir in order to show that the statement that multiculturalism has failed is completely absurd. It might be that multiculturalism has to be fostered with another method and that we need to create another society in order for it to work better but that is something quite different.

The second thing that I would like to elaborate on, on what Mr. Özdemir said, is labour market integration. In particular concerning his remark about how important it will be to be proactive. We are nowadays discussing labour immigration as a control issue. Of course, we have a control issue but there are control issues in every part of public administration. The most important thing however is to see that those people who come and work with and for us will have the best possible situation to do so. I will give you one example from my home country, Sweden. The biggest number of foreign workers that we have in Sweden is of course Finnish but the second biggest group coming from outside the country is from Iraq. For the next 50 years we will have intensive relations between Sweden and Iraq. More than a hundred thousand people currently living in Sweden and becoming Swedish citizens have their ancestry, relations and background in Iraq. This will of course create a corridor between Sweden and Iraq. We have many such corridors, for example the one that exists between Luxembourg and Portugal or Germany and Turkey. The way to make these things work is to start preparing people, to start educating people in matters concerning the market and the university and to be proactive. We must address these issues because we will be a neighbouring country with Iraq. We cannot deny that since they are already here. People move and public policy is supposed to adjust to that and encourage it, in order to achieve the best possible result.

As to the Canadian System, which Mr. Özdemir also mentioned, in regard to the point system and what can be used in Europe from such a system, I would like to point out that there are, in many ways, great advantages in the Canadian System. First of all, they have a point system which may be unjust to the ones who will not be let in, thus underlining the hard side of Canadian migration policy. On the other hand, once people are in, they come in on all steps of the social ladder. 40 % of the members of the Canadian House of Commons are born abroad. Integration has been fostered very much, so the fact is that people who come from abroad to Canada are very quickly integrated into the Canadian System and even become Canadian. In Sweden, when we talk about people who are born to immigrants, we refer to second generation immigrants. In Canada, when you talk about people who are born to immigrants, you call them second generation Canadians. This mentality difference is, in my opinion, extremely important. I think that it is entirely natural that Europe, which was an emigrant continent until the 1980s, needs some time to fully accept immigration but it is absolutely clear that what statesmen should try to change is thinking of second generation immigrants to thinking of second generation Europeans.

There is another point in the Canadian system, which I think is extremely interesting for Europe, which is that if there is an excess need for manpower in Manitoba or Alberta, the provinces have the right to directly organise work migration. This falls under the supervision of the federal government but there is a way of handling important matters of labour market integration and labour market immigration in the different provinces. We have a common European regime for migration and asylum but every Member State has the right to complete what is dictated by the specific needs of each country.

Finally, in regard to universities: when I was chairing the Commission on Global Migration I learnt some things about Australia. That year, in 2005, Australia had 176 000 foreign students. The Australians knew or thought they knew that half of them, having completed their studies, would remain in Australia. That is a huge donation to the Australian people from the rest of the world. The other half of them then returned to their respective home countries after completing their studies and due to this Australia has strong links with numerous countries in the world. The 80 000 remaining in Australia constitutes an enormous influx of capacity into the Australian economy. This is also interesting for Europe because if Europe could have more students from the rest of the world (like for example the USA, which also has the best university system in the world, so perhaps explaining why the United States have become so powerful) this could be an enormously important element in future European development and also mean that Europe's relation with countries from the rest of the world would greatly improve. I therefore entirely support Mr. Özdemir's statement in regard to foreign students at our European Universities.

Mr. Caldeira

If time allowed, we could continue this dialogue but, unfortunately, we cannot. But I would like to invite those who may have questions to raise them bearing in mind brevity and precision.

## **Questions and answers**

### Question 1

I am Australian and also a Luxembourg citizen. I have studied in Germany. I have a very deep and long experience of immigration. What I want to say is that I fear we are taking the problems that immigration and a lack of integration pose around the world, in particular in Europe, too lightly. Growing up in Australia in the 1960s and '70s, you came very close to a dramatic interface. The paradox of immigration is that the very countries like Australia and Luxembourg, which benefit most from immigration, are those who are most driven by xenophobia and fear of 'the other'. That is a very important point.

I agree with you Mr. Karlsson. Like you I am a pluralist and a citizen of the world and I am glad that we are doing so much to improve things but when you say that the level of debate in the UK has been raised by a few academics, let me tell you that it started from rock-bottom. As recently as ten days ago, one of Mr. Cameron's ministers raised the spectre of introducing new immigration controls for fear that unemployed Greeks would be rushing to invade the island. I think it is important for us to notice that Greece or any of the other Mediterranean frontline countries, are the very countries that are the least well equipped to deal with the pressures of illegal immigration. The result is a rise in rightist populist parties and if Mr. Holland hadn't won the French elections, the UMP would still be seeking to come closer to the Front National's populist rhetoric about illegal immigration and the islamisation of France. These are very difficult issues because they are issues of mentality. Mr. Karlsson claimed that it takes a generation, in my opinion it probably takes longer. Even Australia which paid people to come to the empty country thus benefiting hugely in the 1980's and 1990's, had disgraceful policies towards Asian boat people. This ambivalence that exists at all levels of society burns on the fuel of immigration. I would just like to make one more point, as a question for Mr. Özdemir. As a woman, a mother of three daughters, a grand-mother with so far one grand-daughter and as a feminist, I find myself, not despite my background, since I grew up in contact and working with Jewish, Greek and Italian immigrant friends in Australia, I find myself reacting very negatively to covered women. As a supporter of the accession of Turkey to the European Union, I find myself in great difficulty when I see covered women, in particular women wearing bourkas because as the former French Minister of Justice said: ' It is a symbol of something else.' It is a symbol of the unequal status of women in certain societies and Mr. Özdemir is right, it is not just about Islam, but I think we have a looming problem unless we foster integration and the education of immigrants with Muslim cultural backgrounds.

## Question 2

At present irregular migrants coming from Southern Mediterranean countries and arriving in Northern Mediterranean countries depend on their national hosts for administration and hospitality. This imposes a huge administrative and financial burden on the host countries. If we are trying to move towards a common European Union policy on immigration, wouldn't it be sensible to start looking at spreading the burdens of administration and finance for these migrants?

## Question 3

I just want to briefly refer to the issue of the failure of multiculturalism. I think that the phrase is deliberately ambiguous coming from politicians but my reading of the statement, certainly in the mouth of Mr. Cameron, was not an attack on immigration but an attack on those who say that immigrants should remain in their own ghettos and maintain their own traditional practices and beliefs. I think what they are saying is that immigration requires integration. I don't think anyone would disagree with that statement but I do understand that it was ambiguous in the political context. I think that politicians are merely willing to say that they want to encourage immigration.

## Mr. Karlsson

First of all, in regard to the questions asked by the lady from Australia, I agree with you, that migration opens up a number of problems for Australia. I have studied them intensively myself but the sheer existence of Australia as it is today is a result of migration. I mean if I belonged to the aborigines I would perhaps see this as an enormous problem. The Australian example is, on the whole, extremely interesting, as a success and in regard to all the serious problems that you pointed out. What happened was an enormous shift in Australia from the White Australia sort of policy to the much more multicultural approach both when it comes to Australia's relations with the surrounding world and the way in which population policy or migration policy was formulated. I have also had very strong critical views on for instance the way in which refugees are being received and how they are being received in terms of political rhetoric in Australia. Instead of saying that migration creates problems, it is however much more how people react to the problem which is the problem. I therefore find the Australian migration story extremely interesting. When I came to Sydney for the first time, I thought: 'Look Australia had 6.5 million inhabitants in 1945. So did Sweden. Today Sweden has 9 million inhabitants and Stockholm is a nice small city in the archipelago.'

Sydney has 5 million and it's a marvelous city, and is a huge economic success. If Sweden, Denmark and Norway had embarked on the same population policy as Australia, we would have had as many votes in the Council of Ministers today as the Germans and then we would have played board with them.' When it comes to Mr. Palmer's' question on the administrative burden, I agree that we have created the administrative burden ourselves and we can always discuss how we can relieve ourselves from it but in the broader economic sense, I do not agree with you. I do not think that the procedures that we have to carry out due to our asylum policies are a heavy burden. If you look at the growth curve of the Swedish economy from 1950 up until now, the difference between migration and illegal migration is around one percentage unit per year which means billions of people. When the regional conference, in the Global Commission on Migration with Europe took place, a member of the Spanish labour market ministry said: 'If we hadn't had irregular migration we wouldn't have had the Spanish health sector, naturally it costs a lot but it also has to do with the fact that we have created administrative systems that are sometimes paranoiac. With a more proactive system, we could regularise most of the influxes of migration immediately instead of doing it afterwards as the Italians, Spanish and Americans do, thus relieving ourselves not only of high administrative costs but also of the huge suffering of those people who have to buy their possibility of coming to our countries by paying smugglers.

Furthermore I agree with the last question, that you could interpret Mr. Cameron's speech in different ways. It is not difficult to agree with him, that people should not live in ghettos. I do not think that it has anything to do with migrants. People should not live in ghettos, nobody should. It has nothing to do with migration but rather that if you have a system with a tendency towards segregation, then newcomers on the labour market or newcomers in society tend to be the victims of these segregation measures. Segregation can however be created even without migration and it has been occurring for a long time. I think that this might have been the reason why Mr. Cameron made such a statement. The effect was detrimental because it also opened up possibilities, as you the lady from Australia pointed out, that a British minister can now issue proposals that are not going to protect the British labour market in the least but only create a lot of suffering for those who become the victims of such a policy.

Mr. Özdemir

First of all I think that the overall question is: 'What is multiculturalism?' If multiculturalism is having parallel societies, then I am against multiculturalism. I think that there is a misperception of the words. We must clarify what we are referring to. I think this is absolutely essential. I fully agree with your statement, that we are heading towards a very dangerous situation due to the euro crisis and youth unemployment which leads us to a situation with a clear invitation to target the minorities in our society.



If you want to target xenophobia it is not enough to simply create 'nice programs' and to preach. What you have to do is deal with people's problems; you have to deal with unemployment; you have to have a very good education system; you need to have very good state infrastructure. You also need to deal with security because a society in which you do not deal with security is a society where the rich can afford security and the poor cannot. On the issue of the headscarf, it is complicated and it is not complicated at the same time. There was a Christian Democrat, the State Prime Minister Teufel who once said that it is not important what you have on top of your head but what is important is what you have inside your head and I think that expresses it very wisely. Unfortunately he did not follow his own logic because of his party base but I think he had a point. I witness women with headscarves, who are forced to wear headscarves because of their fathers or their brothers or their neighbourhood, which unfortunately can also play a very unhelpful role. It isn't always the family.

Sometimes it is also due to the fear of the 'others'. What will they say about my daughter?', which I do not excuse, do not get me wrong. I also witnessed young women with headscarves who went to universities, who were very emancipated and would never have accepted that anybody tell them who they had to marry or what they had to study. I witnessed women without headscarves who were being hit by their husbands and treated in an entirely unacceptable manner. It is too simple to reduce this issue to the simple question of the headscarf. The headscarf is only a small part of the debate; the headline is emancipation and freedom. What we mix up is that we put the headscarf as the headline but this is a mistake. The headline is freedom of women, emancipation of women; the individual decision of a woman that has to be respected by her father, by her husband, by the neighbourhood, by whomever. Her decision must even be respected by Prime Ministers. I am saying this as a reference to the current debates taking place in Turkey. It has to be respected. It is a woman's own decision if she wants to wear a headscarf or not. Nobody should interfere. Who am I to tell her that she is not allowed to study or that she is not allowed to become a teacher? If this person uses her position to tell others that they must wear a headscarf or that this is the only way of reading the Koran the right way, it is not acceptable. The tolerance you expect to receive vis-à-vis yourself should be shown to others. I expect those who wear headscarves to show the same tolerance vis-à-vis those who refuse to wear headscarves. This is I think the precondition.

I shall now make a politician's distinction. I think that there is a fine line between a headscarf and a burka or a chador. I expect to see the face of the person I am talking to. To me this is a precondition; it is a sign of collaboration in a society where we need each other. We cannot avoid communicating with one another, this is therefore my redline. I know that this issue is being greatly discussed, even in my own party.

If a person believes that women must wear a burka or chador, I think that this is a clear sign that they want to push women into the home, that they do not accept women as part of public life, that they believe women are a problem. My final remark is that what we get confused is the discussion about Islam and holy books. First of all I am a politician, I am not an expert on theology so I am the wrong person to determine whether certain quotes from the Koran are unconstitutional or not but the same is also true for other holy books. If we start to compete there, we will be completely lost. Unfortunately some of my colleagues believe that we must do just that. The question is not whether the Koran is constitutional or not but rather whether citizens or individuals of any belief behave in a constitutional manner or not. That is the question we must ask ourselves. That is my redline. I expect everyone who wants to live or who lives in the EU to stick to the constitution. I do not accept any excuses. I do not accept statements such as: 'But my religion tells me I cannot accept equal rights for men and women.' My response then, even if this may sound surprising to a person from a background of colour or a Green Politician, is : 'Well sorry, you are not forced to live here, if you do not like it then go to another place'.

#### Question 4

I myself come from a former colony and I was called an 'Indigène', a savage that lives in a certain part of Algeria. I have done my best to integrate myself despite the fact that I am different but I have still been submitted to incredible acts of non-integration by the people I have met, not only in France but also in other European countries. Integration is therefore a word that I do not like very much because it presupposes that you have to adapt completely and totally to the place where you want to integrate yourself and this, in my opinion, is contrary to the status of mankind. We are different. We come from different countries, different cultures, and so difference has to be accepted. When people talk about integration in Europe, particularly in France, they mean that the foreigner has to adapt completely to the mentality, to the way of life of the country. I find that the 'integrator' because if there is a relationship where there is an 'integrator' and an 'integree', the integrator has to make as many efforts as the one who wants to integrate himself has to make efforts to be part of the society in which that person wants to live. Unfortunately integration or immigration has become, in the political debate, a way for politicians to obtain votes because they have nothing else to fall back on. I find it extremely worrying that despite the philosophers, the academics and the incredible number of groups who have met to talk about immigration in the last 30 to 50 years because this problem had already begun just after decolonisation, there has been so little achieved in moving towards better integration. In Germany or France, people are starting to question the future of their identity because of the presence of millions of foreigners and constantly talk about values that are going to be lost.

I am going to be quite frank and brutal here but if the values of a population of nearly a hundred million people or sixty five million people can be put into question by the arrival of five million foreigners with supposedly different values, doesn't that mean that the values of those countries are really of little value?

Mr. Özdemir

I will try to be very brief. I think that you are right in what you said but still I think, as a person coming from a different background, living in a European society, it is also important that you do not accept it if extremist right wing politicians or populists try to target you, try to separate you from the rest of society. There are two sides. There is one side which is targeting people and the other side which agrees to be targeted. So I think it is important to repeat: 'I am sorry, I was born in this country so I belong to this country. It was not my personal choice; nobody asked me where I wanted to be born.' We simply have to accept it. Whether you like it or not, we are citizens; we are neighbours and nobody can choose his or her neighbour. My second remark is that I believe in politics and paradoxical interventions. Sometimes you have to surprise the person you are talking to. Not everybody who has concerns is a racist. Just think of those people, those citizens who were never told by the politicians that their parents were going to stay. They were invited as so-called guest workers with the intention of going back after a couple of years and unfortunately politicians from all parties shy away from telling them that they completely misread life. This is completely unrealistic. These people have children, they are going to stay here and we have a new reality: nobody told them. I can understand an elderly woman who only saw Islam on TV and all of a sudden she has a mosque in front of her nose. She hears people talking about the Imam and she is shocked when she sees all the images that are on TV about Iran and Saudi Arabia. It is only natural then that she begins to wonder if the same is going to happen in her own country. It is not very easy for everybody to understand that this is a small minority, not the majority. We all have our stereotypes. I could tell you a long story about stereotypes of people of colour vis-à-vis other people of colour, for example the way Turks used to talk about Kurds and you mentioned the woman question or how some people talk about gays and Lesbians. We all have our minorities within the minorities. On a rather optimistic final word, I was invited to a mosque in Bavaria, close to Munich, in the town of Pensberg and the Imam there invited me to the roof deck which is very unusual. The reason was that he wanted to open the solar panels together with me and I asked him why he had done such a thing. He replied that in one of my speeches I had claimed that it is important that the competition between religions turns into a competition of who does more to save the planet for future generations. This should be the competition between religions and upon hearing this the Imam had agreed with me. He invited all of his neighbours and everybody was asking themselves: 'A mosque with solar energy? Does our religion really care about the environment as much as we do?'

This is a very important starting point. Why do we have to rebuild mosques from Turkey and Germany? Is there any reason? Does the Koran say anything about how mosques have to look? I haven't found anything. Do they really have to be horrible concrete buildings which are bad copies of Turkish mosques and by the way there isn't even such a thing as a Turkish mosque it is the Byzantine Basilica that was taken over by the Ottomans. Look at Northern Africa where the mosques look completely different so why do we have to repeat that? Can't we adapt to the architecture in the country which we live in? There is nothing wrong with it. This is the debate we need, the debate that brings us forwards not the debate that brings us backwards.

Mr. Karlsson

I think I understand the question and one of the explanations for this confusion is that the word integration is used to denote very different things. First of all, in the Commission that I was chairing, we avoided the expression for basically the same reason as you do. When people say integration they are often referring to assimilation, which means that the minority should be like the majority. But that is not integration. Integration is a mutual process which is very difficult. In my home country for instance, they claim that integration policies have failed but this is a completely meaningless statement because you do not know what the speaker means when he says integration; does he mean assimilation or does he mean a mutual process of coming to grips with a new situation where the country consists of a population with 70% of the people born abroad? We therefore avoided the expression in our report. We talked about cohesion as the goal and the phenomenon that we wanted to foster was respect for differences. So when I used the word integration here today, it was more of a technical term, in terms of seeing that people who immigrate also get a job which is also a mutual process of course. On the other hand, I completely agree with you in regard to the difference in traditions of European countries. France has been a country of assimilation whereas other countries have a different solution. We have met a lot of confusion, when national leaders didn't clarify what they meant, when they use the word 'integration'. This confusion is dangerous and may lead to myths and misconceptions. But I agree with your skepticism, normally I try to avoid the expression because it creates more misunderstanding than understanding.

Mr. Caldeira

Thank you for all the questions that have been put. Thank you also for all the replies. It is now time to draw the conclusions of this conference. I will first refer to the last remark made by Mr. Özdemir. I think that in regard to these issues we must look forwards not backwards and that is probably the key in terms of where the European Union is to move.

The first thing that I think we can conclude from today's debate is that, whereas the EU has started to move towards a common policy on immigration there remains much to be done. A step by step approach should be used, which looks for more coordination and leaves room for national states to take their own problems into account. This means that we need a common culture or a new culture in order to develop or encourage controlled and regular immigration in order to enrich the European Union. This shall be my second point. Clearly the EU needs a skilled and competitive labour market and that has to be addressed and cannot be avoided. My third point is that we need to do more in order to have a more successful 'integration' process of migrants into the European Union. The benchmark has been set which should be Fundamental Human Rights and the EU has already made some progress in this area. The Treaty of the European Union is a fundamental anchor of European values which should, in my opinion, inspire a long-term vision for this topic in the EU. So these are my three conclusions

Thank you for participating in today's Conference, and a special thanks to our speakers.

The meeting is closed.