



Final Report for the
Academic Symposium

Youth Quotas

-

The Answer to Changes in Age Demographics?

(ENRI Reference Number: 4936)

Time and Place:

Friday & Saturday, 25/26 October 2013
Commundo Tagungshotel Stuttgart (Germany)

Organisers:

Foundation for the Rights of Future Generations (FRFG)
Dr. Bettina Munimus
Mannspergerstr. 29, D-70619 Stuttgart
Tel.: +49-07 11-28 05 27 77; Fax: +49-03 212-28 05 277
E-Mail: kontakt@srzg.de
www.srzg.de

Intergenerational Foundation (IF)
19 Half Moon Lane, London, SE24 9JU
Tel.: +44- 07971 228 823
E-Mail: liz@intergenerational.org.uk
www.if.org.uk

1. Summary

The aim of the academic symposium was to give an answer to the question whether "Youth Quotas" provide a solution to changes in age demographics and a looming gerontocracy. Based on the premise that young people have the potential to act as change agents, especially with regard to ecological sustainability, it was our aim to stimulate a societal discussion and to raise public awareness on the topic of "Youth Quotas", whilst providing the discussion with a scientific basis.

The question of a power shift between generations is already discussed in many facets in the literature. Many commentators state that a shift is already visible and that the problem requires careful political management. In this sense, the implementation of youth quotas could be a possible method of protecting the interests of younger generations in politics and beyond in light of the purported power shift. The symposium investigated a topic that is greatly under-researched.

Some key questions to be addressed at the symposium were: Should "Youth Quotas" be limited to the political arena (political parties, parliaments, etc.) or should they also be implemented in other fields (economy, companies, associations, organizations, etc.)? Can "Youth Quotas" ensure that an additional sense of urgency is included in the problem-solving process of future problems like global warming? Will young people really represent the interests of the young generation as a whole, or will they just follow their own individual interests? Are "Youth Quotas" in general an effective instrument to strengthen the rights of the young generation or do we need other and more effective instruments?

It was contested whether or not "Youth Quotas" are an effective means to strengthen the rights of following generations. Some junior scientists suggested that young people can be thought of as the "trustees of posterity" as they tend to be fiercer defenders of long-termist policies since the environmental crisis will have a more concrete impact on their lifespan.

But other speakers rejected the causality that young people will have a stronger determination to solve future problems, and that they will add a new "young" perspective in the epistemic process of finding solutions to future problems. The indication by these speakers was that environmental issues are not the top priority of young people.

Regarding the composition of party lists, one speaker pointed to the problem of legitimacy of the outcome of an election. The positive discrimination of youth within a societal group has to be justified because other groups could feel disadvantaged by the implementation of such a strong instrument. Some speakers challenged the analogy of "Youth Quotas" to quotas for women or ethnic minorities, because women and ethnic minorities can't change their status whereas today's young people, in the normal course of life, will be the old people in the future. This means that the disadvantage of a person in his or her young age is just temporal. Generational effects were pitted against age effects in this context.

Some experts pointed to alternatives to "Youth Quotas". Lowering the voting age and better political education in schools, especially, would produce better results according to their view. Another strategy was seen in the implementation of proxy votes for the parents.

A vote at the end of the symposium showed interesting results: Although several problems were noted, most of the speakers voted for the implementation of "Youth Quotas". All speakers voted for lowering the voting age. The conclusion reached by the

academic symposium is that a package of measures is required, to give adequate answers to demographic change. "Youth Quotas" could be part of this package. The organisers plan to publish the outcomes of the symposium in an anthology and have submitted a book proposal to Routledge, Springer, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press (status 20/01/2014).

2. Description of the scientific content

It was a major challenge for the participating scientists to find an appropriate topic approach due to the fact that the area of youth quotas is completely unresearched so far. However, during the symposium this circumstance proved to be advantageous because the different approaches and priorities illustrated the manifold aspects of youth quotas.

Prof. Dr. Dieter Birnbacher opened the symposium with his presentation. He focused on youth quotas in parliaments. Prof. Birnbacher is of the opinion that youth quotas within parliaments are insufficient to incorporate and represent the interests of young people. He doubts that young representatives (representatives of the young generation) would thoroughly represent the interests of their age group, which is the strongest argument in favour of youth quotas. Prof. Birnbacher advocated, rather, a larger package of measures. As a first step the voting age should be lowered; furthermore, parents should get a proxy vote for their children. According to Birnbacher, a parental proxy vote would enable parents to represent the interests of their children. In the following discussion, the assumption that young representatives of the young generation do not necessarily represent the interest of their generation was affirmed, but at the same time it was questioned that parents would use their additional voice to vote in the interests of their children. Some participants stated that the proxy vote would strengthen rather the parents and not the children and the youth. Nevertheless, a lowering of the voting age was considered necessary by all participants of the workshop.

Dr. Alexander Bagattini introduced the term "ageism" into the discussion. The term defines the unequal treatment of people because of their age (age discrimination). In a first step, he compared "ageism" with other negatively-charged "isms", such as sexism and racism. Alexander Bagattini is of the opinion that "ageism" carries a similarly negative connotation and thus should be rejected. From his point of view "Youth Quotas" have to be classified as ageism because a certain population group will be privileged (in this case young people). This should be rejected in our liberal-democratic society. Furthermore, he thinks that a lowering of the voting age is not necessary. In the following discussion, doubts were raised that the introduction of youth quotas or the lowering of the voting age – which privileges young people at the cost of older population groups – is "ageism". It was suggested, rather, that these measures reduce the existing inequalities between young and old society members.

In his presentation, **Prof. Dr. Dr. Jörg Tremmel** discussed the history of democracy and the extension of the suffrage. He focused on the exclusion of minors from elections. Tremmel argued that the inclusion of more and more previously excluded groups (women, dependent people, people aged 25–18 years) has made it possible that nearly all societal groups are allowed to vote nowadays. But there is one big exception: minors are still not allowed to vote. This is the last big group in society that is excluded. According to Tremmel, the main argument for the exclusion of the minors is their

alleged "lack of maturity" or the "lack of political judgment". Tremmel argued that this is epistocratic and contradicts the normative foundations of democratic theory. To overcome this deficiency, he suggests a "right to vote by registration". Every person should be allowed to vote. Minors, who are interested in voting, should first register as official voters. An age limit is thus replaced by an expression of will. This model does not mean that there is a voting age of 0 years.

In her presentation, **Anja Karnein PhD**, focused on the thesis that today's young people, who will be more affected by climate change, have a greater interest in curbing the potential impact of climate change. The assumption is that an increased participation of young people in politics, guaranteed for example by "Youth Quotas", will produce a better framework for climate politics and environmental politics.

Anja Karnein doubts these theses. Just because today's young people will be affected by the effects of climate change for longer, they are not per se more interested in a solution to this negative process. In addition, future "climate-friendly" behaviour cannot be assumed. And although in the U18 elections the Greens did get a higher percentage of votes than in the "real" federal elections, these votes also showed clearly that the established parties (CDU / CSU and SPD), did get the vast majority of votes, as they did in the real elections. Although "Youth Quotas" for other areas could be useful, they are not regarding the environmental policy; and although young people are more idealistic than older generations, she does not see any evidence that environmental policy is the top priority of young people.

Politicians tend to make snap decisions, the impacts of which will be felt in the near or distant future. They also tend to reflect the concerns of the older population more than the concerns of the youth. But politics must also take into account the problems of the distant future, like the climate change, when decisions are made. **Dr. Ivo Wallimann-Helmer** showed in his presentation three possible measures to bring politicians to a more far-sighted policy: 1) The question whether the votes of more highly-educated people should be given a greater weight than the votes of less-educated people. 2) The question whether young people should be given more influence during the elections. 3) The question whether elderly people should be excluded from the elections. Ivo Wallimann-Helmer rejects all three proposals because they undermine the normative fundament of democracy. In his view, young people need more help regarding their self-organization, so they can better articulate and represent their interests. Currently, they lack self-organization and thus influence. Like Anja Karnein, Ivo Wallimann-Helmer does not believe that "Youth Quotas" or the lowering of the voting age will produce greener policy.

During the discussion, it became clear that the other participants agree with the democratic-theoretical concerns of Ivo Wallimann-Helmer regarding his three proposals. But also with the same argument some participants made clear that the exclusion of minors from the elections is also problematic. The same arguments for excluding the young could also be taken as arguments for excluding elderly people from elections. Young people are said to be politically immature but on the other hand the mental abilities of older people also decrease the older they get. But none of the participants recommended excluding older people from the suffrage. What is clear is the unequal treatment of young and old regarding the right to vote.

Dr. Dominic Roser deals with the question whether "Youth Quotas" could lead to better climate policy. He sees the assumption that young people are particularly affected by climate change, and thus are particularly keen to mitigate the consequences of climate change, as a central argument of this thesis. But this argument is less strong than it may seem, so Roser contests. He argues that young people today have to endure only a small part of climate change; future and yet unborn generations will be rather more seriously affected. The justification for "Youth Quotas" that they lead to better environmental policy for the young is therefore dismissed by Dominic Roser.

Another focus of Dominic Roser's presentation is the general quality of life in the future. In the past, the standard of living and the quality of life have both risen steadily. However, there is a real risk that the standard of living will decline in the future. Dominic Roser justified this view by saying that there are too many and too high risks involved in the creation of the future and future policies (environment, economy, etc.). Although the high risks can provide a high increase in the quality of life, there is also a real risk that a failure will bring a sharp downturn in the quality of living. Therefore, Dominic Roser calls for action to reduce significantly this risk in shaping the future, which could provide a small but steady increase in the quality of living.

Like Anja Karnein and Ivo Wallimann-Helmer before, Dominic Roser also does not see the causality that "Youth Quotas" will produce a better environmental policy. Most of the participants hold a similar position regarding a greener policy. Dominic Roser presented a risk-model which was very interesting for the participants. Most of them see the danger that future generations' living standards will not rise, or – in the worst case – will decrease. The main reasons are seen in today's environmental policy, economic policy, global financial policy and the regularly recurring crises. The limitation of the risk is supported by most participants, though this limitation should not tend to 0, because even stagnation means in some ways a step backwards. A certain risk remains necessary in order to favour certain innovations and developments.

Heiko Burret focused on the consequences of demographic changes, where older generations are taking over control of society at the expense of younger generations. He emphasized how politicians first and foremost are focusing on the interests of voters. Older people now represent the largest group of voters. As a result, politicians are paying more attention to their interests than the interests of other voting groups. The consequence of ignoring the interests of large voting groups is not being reelected or not being elected at all. Young politicians also have to bear this fact in mind; thus "Youth Quotas" in parliaments and political parties will have only a marginal effect. What should be introduced to prevent the strong marginalization of youth are measures linked to direct democracy as well as fiscal regulations such as debt limits, Burret argued.

The participants shared Burret's doubt concerning the possible effects of "Youth Quotas". However, they also questioned the proposed alternatives. Increased direct democracy does not imply that youth will be less marginalized; older voters would still represent their own interests and cast their votes correspondingly. Introducing measures such as debt limits does not guarantee policies that take special care of the interests of youth. Although the national debt would not rise, which is in general good regarding intergenerational justice, one can not predict how the available money will be spent. It could happen that spending for the young will be cut in favour of the old.

Dr. Rafael Ziegler discussed whether youth can act as change agents for a sustainable development or not. In conjunction with his discussion, he presented one of his own

projects, the Youth Campaign “Big Jump Challenge” (<http://bigjumpchallenge.net/>). Children and youth all over Germany organized “Bathing Activities” in rivers and lakes, to raise awareness of themes such as water protection and the prevention of water pollution. Ziegler applied the experiences of this project to a possible introduction of “Youth Quotas”. He argued that such quotas are not sufficient and effective enough to achieve more sustainable environmental policies.

Dr. Radostin Kaloianov was especially occupied with the ubiquity of quotas (that is, that quotas can be found everywhere). “What can quotas do?” was his key question. Kaloianov attempted to answer this question in two directions. First, he investigated the development and modernization of Western societies from a modernization-theoretical approach. He argued that, in modern capitalistic societies as the Western countries are today, quotas are present everywhere, particularly in the labour market. Life as a whole is regulated by invisible quotas. Kaloianov sees quotas as a means to control the occupation of jobs, especially jobs that demand explicit requirements because they are rewarding particular merits and capabilities. Kaloianov was skeptical towards the introduction of quotas for disadvantaged groups, e.g. youth. He emphasized how everyone in a modern society is already benefitting from the existing quota-policy and existing quotas. Second, Kaloianov discussed the justice of quotas. He was critical towards policies where people are favored in the labour market on the basis of sex, skin colour, ethnic origins, age etc., in front of better-qualified applicants who are not favoured because they do not belong to one of the privileged quota-groups. Rather, he emphasized how quotas are already regulating spheres such as the labour market, because merits and capabilities in the end are rewarded, and that this is also a form of quota.

In the discussion that followed, the arguments of Kaloianov were assessed critically. His argument that specific requirements in a job description are equivalent to quotas was disputed. It was emphasized that explicit knowledge and capabilities are often necessary in certain jobs and positions, but that this can hardly be identified as quotas. Also the argument that quotas are unfair, and that they ultimately do not bring much to the table was contradicted. Several examples have shown that quotas and positive discrimination of certain groups (woman, minorities) unquestionably have led to fairer outcomes. The groups in question have, through quotas, been enabled to compete e.g. in the labour market on equal grounds to other groups. However, that youth quotas will have the same effect as gender quotas was disputed.

Dr. Pieter Vanhuyse presented the “Intergenerational Justice Index” (IJI) as well as addressing the question of proxy votes (that is, giving parents the right to vote on behalf of their child/children). First, Vanhuyse presented his study conducted for the Bertelsmann-Foundation. On the basis of four criteria, he generated an Intergenerational Justice Index, in which the OECD-countries were compared to each other. Several of the countries scored low on the IGI-index, depicting profound intergenerational challenges. To counterbalance this trend, Vanhuyse argues for the introduction of proxy votes. He emphasized that a proxy vote system will not only ensure a shift in the power balance between old and young generations in favour of youth, in addition it will also demand more just policies, seen from an intergenerational point of view. Through their parents, children and youth will be given influence in elections.

Several of the participants were skeptical regarding the introduction of proxy votes to improve intergenerational justice. The objections that were already raised against Birnbacher’s arguments in favour of proxy votes were repeated.

Juliana Bidadanure argued for an implementation of youth quotas and provided an instrumental justification. She claimed that youth quotas in parliaments can contribute to bringing about intergenerationally fairer outcomes.

She first presented two core challenges of intergenerational justice: (A) the challenge of justice between non-overlapping generations - or the long-term challenge of treating future generations fairly; and (B) the overlapping challenge of justice between current birth cohorts - or the shorter-term challenge of treating young people fairly. She argued that the environmental and economic prospects of younger and future generations are so dangerously threatened that it is a requirement of intergenerational justice to implement any policies that may increase our chances to improve their set of opportunities.

Juliana Bidadanure argued that there are strong reasons to believe that youth quotas can improve the chances to meet both objectives. Young people are fiercer to implement long-termist policies like environmental policies, and young people are also more innovative in solving problems. On the other hand she also rejected the assumption that young people are "greener" and that they promote the interests of future generations. But youth quotas surely will increase the chance to promote youth interests. And second, a youth presence in parliaments would make it more unlikely for policymakers to be driven by false representations and prejudices. Finally Juliana Bidadanure claimed that the involvement of each age group in social and political decision-making constitutes a crucial aspect of relational equality and that youth quotas could contribute to a symbolic acknowledgement of the equal political value of young people, as members of a community of equals. Beside the introduction of youth quotas, Juliana Bidadanure also proposed the introduction of an Ombudsman for future generations. The implementation of youth quotas will produce fairer outcomes - that was the final conclusion made by Juliana Bidadanure. But even regardless of such outcomes, there are strong reasons to find the underrepresentation of youth in politics worrying from the point of view of social cohesion and political equality.

At the end of the workshop, **Ashley Seager and Antony Mason** from the Intergenerational Foundation (IF), **Bernhard Winkler, Adrian Schell, Yvonne Eich and Danyal Bayaz** from the Foundation for the Rights of Future Generations (FRFG) organized a role-play session. All participants took part in a simulated cabinet-meeting. In this session, the different measures presented during the weekend (youth quotas, lowering the voting age to 16, voting age without age limitations, proxy votes etc.) were subjected to a vote. Before each voting procedure, the benefits and disadvantages of each measure were discussed. Despite the numerous objections to "Youth Quotas" throughout the workshop, the majority at the end favoured their introduction. Lowering the voting age to 16 was unanimously agreed upon, while half of the group voted against abolishing all voting age limitations. The introduction of proxy votes was rejected.

In his dinner speech **Prof. Dr. Marcel Wissenburg** analyzed youth quotas from a libertarian perspective. He therefore opted for a more pragmatic answer to quotas. He suggested that quotas for the young can be tolerable in the context of justice between existing generations, since they may, under the right circumstances, limit abuse of negotiation power, thus guarantee a fair representation of interests, and prevent the construction of exploitative (oppressive) institutions. Where justice towards future, non-existing generations is concerned, however, it is at the very least quotas protecting minimum representation of the elderly, and perhaps even exclusion of the middle-aged

and young, that would be more appropriate. If the aim of a quota rule is to impartially represent the interests of absentees, the most sensible candidate for representation is, after all, he whose personal interests are least likely to be hurt by those represented. Finally he suggested that even in a representative, deliberative democracy a better instrument than a quota is available and is far more urgently needed: veto rights.

3. Assessment of the results and impact of the event on the future directions of the field

The numerous presentations and different approaches have shown that “Youth Quotas” is a highly under-researched topic. In contrast to other forms of quotas, such as gender quotas and immigration/minority quotas, the challenge with “Youth Quotas” is that the characteristic which the quota is based upon (being young) actually changes through the course of life. Thus, a person never remains within the alleged disadvantaged group (here, young people) throughout life, as one does when you separate groups on the basis of sex and ethnic origins. This also illustrates the legitimacy problem with “Youth Quotas”. To what extent are youth actually a marginalized and disadvantaged group? And is it really necessary to introduce strong measures such as quotas to empower youth and enhance their rights? An important question that also needs to be answered is: in what areas should “Youth Quotas” be introduced? Would it suffice to introduce quotas in the political sphere; namely in political parties and in parliaments, or should they also be introduced in business, public companies, organizations and associations? A noteworthy fact is that most of the presenters looked upon “Youth Quotas” skeptically, because they questioned whether such quotas would have any real impact. However, this does not imply that they rejected the idea of “Youth Quotas” as a possible measure (with a few exceptions), but rather that they favoured introducing other measures to strengthen the rights of younger and future generations. Lowering the voting age to 16, or even voting age without age limitations were two other measures identified. It was also suggested that organizational activity amongst youth should be more stimulated. The low participation- and organizational rate amongst youth was agreed upon as a profound challenge that needs to be addressed in the near future.

Another question that was disputed was whether youth can be said to have common interest(s) or not? Several of the presenters doubted that one can state that all youth share common interest(s). Even though it can be reasonable to assume that youth take particular interest in themes such as environmental protection and climate protection (because these themes generally are perceived as especially important for future generations), it was disputed whether youth actually see this as top priority themes or not. Further on, this led to the conclusion that stronger youth participation in politics not necessarily leads to more ambitious environmental politics. Thus, it was applied as an important argument against introduction of “Youth Quotas”.

An important part of the discussion involved further measures to strengthen the rights of youth. Particularly suffrage (and suffrage regulations) was identified as a central instrument. Two changes within suffrage regulations were suggested: on the one side altering the voting age (lowering the voting age, or even introducing voting without age limitations), and on the other side the introduction of proxy votes for parents (granting parents extra votes by giving them the right to vote on behalf of their children). Even though everyone agreed upon that introducing proxy votes would certainly raise the

awareness of family- and children-related policies, numerous presenters doubted that parents would use their extra votes with the interest of their children in mind. Rather, it was emphasized how parents might be expected to cast their additional votes for the same party as with their original vote, regardless of the preferences of their children. Consequently, the effect of proxy votes regarding strengthening political rights of children and youth was considered low. Ultimately, parents would be rewarded, not children and youth.

Lowering the voting age was perceived a better and more effective measure. It was emphasized that a change in voting age should be accompanied by more focus on political issues in schools and the educational sector. Through an extension of the suffrage, youth and children will have increased political power and influence. In addition, politicians would also have to take the interests of young voters into account when they run for election and form policies. Today, the exclusion of youth from the suffrage leads to a situation where politicians do not need to take their interests into account, because youth do not have any significant influence in elections. If more youth are allowed to vote, their significance will also increase. The most extensive proposal was voting age without age limitations (that is, everyone is allowed to vote if they want to, regardless of age). The suggestion does not imply that babies and small children would vote, because they still do not take any interest in doing so. However, children and especially youth would be granted a strong incentive to take part in politics and elections, especially if the educational sector puts more focus on politics and participation in the school system.

At the end of the symposium, several of the presenters stated that it had been difficult to define “Youth Quotas” as a concept for scientific investigation. After the plenary discussions, the concept was made more comprehensible. Amongst others: what areas “Youth Quotas” encompass, the complexity of the concept and the fact that it is a highly under-researched topic demanding thorough investigation. A number of the participants indicated that they would continue conducting research connected to the topic in the future. They also announced that they would make contributions for the forthcoming anthology “Youth Quotas – And other efficient forms of Youth Participation in Ageing Societies”. One of the main aims of the anthology is to provide the first systematic contribution to a topic that seems to be greatly under-researched. As mentioned above, topics such as gender quotas and immigration/racial quotas have been investigated extensively in recent years, while “Youth Quotas” have not. No earlier projects, anthologies or books relate directly to the “Youth Quotas”, hence there is no other academic work that is in direct competition with this project. The anthology will sum up the findings and experiences from the symposium and present them to a broader academic audience, and will hence be important in reaching one of the main goals of the symposium: provide the first firm academic contribution to “Youth Quotas” as a topic of scientific investigation. The demographic changes and the ageing of societies currently taking place in several European countries are demanding measures to prevent a political and societal marginalization of youth and future generations. “Youth Quotas” as an instrument has the potential to become one of these measures. However, the topic needs to be carefully investigated in the coming years. The results of the symposium will also be published in the Intergenerational Justice Review.

Documentation

In order to spread the results of the symposium, a special issue of the peer-reviewed “Intergenerational Justice Review” is planned. A translation for the German-speaking “Journal für Generationengerechtigkeit” should serve the German-speaking audience. The print run for each journal will be 1,000 copies. OBLA design will be contacted to prepare the layout of the journal. According to previous experience, it costs €2,004.72 to produce a journal (layout, print costs and distribution costs). Thus we calculate €4,009.44 for the production of both journals.

Three publications are underway:

1) A special issue of the peer-reviewed “Intergenerational Justice Review”:

The **Intergenerational Justice Review**, IGJR, (ISSN 2190-6335) is an English-speaking annual journal on intergenerational justice, seeking to publish articles of the most important research and current thinking from political science, ethics, and law.

The peer-reviewed IGJR aims to improve our understanding of intergenerational justice and sustainable development through pure and applied ethical research. Published annually in English, the IGJR seeks articles on the cutting edge of research in politics, law, and philosophy of intergenerational relations. It is published on a professional level with an extensive international readership. The editorial board comprises over 50 international experts from ten countries, representing eight disciplines. The IGJR is not only read by the scientific community but also by members of parliaments, decision-makers from the global economy and persons with a general interest in intergenerational justice.

2) A special issue of the peer-reviewed “Journal für Generationengerechtigkeit (JfGG)”

A translation of the IGJR into German, that will become a special issue of the German-speaking journal “Journal für Generationengerechtigkeit” (ISSN 1617-1799).

3) An anthology on “Youth Quotas”

Beside the IGJR and JfGG, we are also working on an **anthology on “Youth Quotas”**. Many of the participants of the symposium will contribute an article. The anthology will consist of 9 articles/specialized chapters, as well as an introductory chapter written by the editorial board and a conclusive chapter. Two out of nine articles have already been submitted, and the remaining articles have been confirmed. The final deadline for submitting articles has been set to 15th March 2014. We are currently in the process of finding a publishing house for the planned anthology. We have already submitted the complete book proposal to three publishing houses (Routledge, Springer, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press). Regarding expenses in connection with publishing the anthology, the total costs are at the moment estimated to 1.856,00 €

The provided funds of ENRI-Future will be used for covering the costs of both publications. Attached you can find the cost planning for the journals. The costs for the anthology are uncertain yet and not listed in the cost plan.

4. Annexes

4.1. Schedule:

First Day (Friday, 25 October 2013):

- 14.00 - 14:30: Arrival, Registration
- 14:30 – 15:00: **Welcome from the Organizers**
Dr. Bettina Munimus (FRFG)
Antony Mason (IF)
- 15:00 – 15:45: **Presentation**
Prof. Dr. Dieter Birnbacher
Future Generations: Institutional Arrangements should be motivated by
Considerations of Motivation
- 15:45 – 16:30: **Presentation**
Dr. Alexander Bagattini
Children, Age-Based Discrimination, and the Voting Age
- 16:30 – 17:15: **Presentation**
Prof. Dr. Dr. Jörg Tremmel (Jun. Prof.)
Democracy or Epistocracy? Age as Criterion for the Suffrage
- 17:15 – 17:45: **Coffee Break**
- 17:45 – 18:30: **Presentation**
Anja Karnein, PhD
The Hopes and Limitations of Asking the Young to be Green
- 18:30 – 19:15: **Presentation**
Dr. Ivo Wallimann-Helmer
Who Should Save Our Planet from Environmental Disaster? Science,
Youth or Common Citizens?
- 19:15 – 21:00: **Dinner**
End of First Day

Second Day (Saturday, 26 October 2013)

- 9:30 – 10:15: **Presentation**
Dr. Dominic Roser
Could the Promotion of Youth Quotas Initiate a Measurable Change in
Environmental Policy?

- 10:15 – 11:00: **Presentation**
Heiko Burret
 Benevolent Politicians through Youth Quotas? A Public Choice Analysis
- 11:00 – 11:45: **Presentation**
Dr. Rafael Ziegler
 Young People as Change Agents for Sustainability? Lessons from a Collaborative Youth Campaign for the Youth Quota Proposal
- 11:45 – 12:30: **Presentation**
Dr. Radostin Kaloianov
 The Ubiquity of Quotas – what can quotas do?
- 12:30 – 13:30: **Lunch**
- 13:30: - 14:15: **Presentation**
Dr. Pieter Vanhuysse
 Giving Children Proxy Votes: A New Defence in Light of the Intergenerational Justice Index
- 14:15 – 15:00: **Presentation**
Juliana Bidadanure
 Better Procedures for Fairer Outcomes: Are Youth Quotas Required by Intergenerational Justice?
- 15:00 – 15:45: **Presentation**
Fatema Jahan
 ‘Youth Quotas and Youth-i-zation’ Or ‘Youth Leadership and Youth Movement’? – A response to age demographics
- 15:45 – 16:20: **Presentation**
Tobias Hainz
 The Logic of Quotas and Discrimination
- 16:20 – 16:55: **Presentation**
Elias Naumann, Moritz Heß
 The Intergenerational Conflict in Europe – Demand for a Youth Quota?
- 16:55 – 17:45: **Coffee Break**
- 17:45 – 19:15: **Panel Discussion**
Moderated by Ashley Seager, Antony Mason, Adrian Schell, Bernhard Winkler, Yvonne Eich and Danyal Bayaz
- 19:30 – 21:00: **Dinner & Dinner Speech**
Prof. Dr. Marcel Wissenburg
 Justice and Youth Quotas: Comments from a Libertarian Perspective
- 21:00: **End of Symposium**

4.2. List of Speakers and Participants

- 1.) Dr. Bettina Munimus (Project responsible)
- 2.) Adrian Schell
- 3.) Igor Dimitrijoski (Moderator)
- 4.) Danyal Bayaz
- 5.) Bernhard Winkler
- 6.) Petter Godli (Co-Moderator)
- 7.) Antony Mason
- 8.) Yvonne Eich
- 9.) Ashley Seager
- 10.) Prof. Dr. Dr. Dieter Birnbacher
- 11.) Dr. Alexander Bagattini
- 12.) Prof. Dr. Dr. Jörg Tremmel (Jun. Prof.)
- 13.) Anja Karnein PhD
- 14.) Dr. Ivo Wallimann-Helmer
- 15.) Dr. Dominic Roser
- 16.) Heiko Burret
- 17.) Dr. Rafael Ziegler
- 18.) Dr. Radostin Kaloianov
- 19.) Dr. Pieter Vanhuyse
- 20.) Juliana Bidadanure
- 21.) Fatema Jahan
- 22.) Tobias Hainz
- 23.) Moritz Heß
- 24.) Elias Naumann
- 25.) Prof. Dr. Marcel Wissenburg

Symposium on Youth Quotas in Stuttgart 25/26. October 2013

| Table of Costs | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Travel costs |
| 2 | Meals |
| 3 | Accommodation |
| 4 | Administrative costs (Booklet) |
| 5 | Other costs |
| 5.1. | Meeting Room |
| 5.2. | Publications |
| 5.3. | Office Expenses |
| 6. | Final Financing of the Project |

Explanation:

1. Column: Number of the post
2. Column: Description of the post
3. Column: Date of the receipt
4. Column: Amount

| 1. | Type | Date | Amount |
|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| | Travel costs | | |
| 1.1. | Tobias Hainz | 21.11.2013 | 129,00 € |
| 1.2. | Prof. Dr. Marcel Wissenburg | 21.11.2013 | 184,00 € |
| 1.3. | Prof. Dr. Dr. Dieter Birnbacher | 21.11.2013 | 119,50 € |
| 1.4. | Anja Karnein PhD | 21.11.2013 | 130,00 € |
| 1.5. | Dr. Rafael Ziegler | 21.11.2013 | 160,70 € |
| 1.6. | Bernhard Winkler | 26.11.2013 | 147,00 € |
| 1.7. | Dr. Dominic Roser | 21.11.2013 | 199,88 € |
| 1.8. | Heiko Burret | 21.11.2013 | 110,00 € |
| 1.9. | Ashley Seager | 21.11.2013 | 305,40 € |
| 1.10. | Dr. Pieter Vanhuysse | 21.11.2013 | 304,24 € |
| 1.11. | Dr. Radostin Kaloianov | 21.11.2013 | 195,63 € |
| 1.12. | Dr. Alexander Bagattini | 21.11.2013 | 90,00 € |
| 1.13. | Dr. Ivo Wallimann-Helmer | 21.11.2013 | 48,00 € |
| 1.14. | Dr. Bettina Munimus | 21.11.2013 | 166,30 € |
| 1.15. | Adrian Schell | 21.11.2013 | 132,00 € |
| 1.16. | Antony Mason | 21.11.2013 | 242,49 € |
| 1.17. | Yvonne Eich | 21.11.2013 | 63,60 € |
| 1.18. | Danyal Bayaz | 21.11.2013 | 78,00 € |
| | | | 2.805,74 € |

| 2. | Type | Date | Amount |
|-----------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| | Meals | | |
| 2.1. | Lunch and dinner | 21.11.2013 | 1.370,90 € |
| | | | 1.370,90 € |

| 3. | Type | Date | Amount |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| | Accommodation | | |
| 3.1. | Accommodation costs | 21.11.2013 | 1.491,40 € |
| | | | 1.491,40 € |

| 4. | Type | Date | Amount |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Administrative costs and booklet | | |
| 4.1. | Printing costs | 19.08.2013 | 55,38 € |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 4.2. | Printing costs for the booklet | 23.10.2013 | 695,72 € |
| 4.3. | Printing costs | 30.10.2013 | 48,54 € |
| 4.4. | Postal costs | 07.11.2013 | 24,33 € |
| 4.5. | Printing costs | 20.11.2013 | 54,49 € |
| | | | 878,46 € |

| 5. | Type | Date | Amount |
|------|----------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Other costs | | |
| 5.1. | Meeting room | 21.11.2013 | 1.526,30 € |
| 5.2. | Publications (IGJR + JfGG) | | 4.009,44 € |
| 5.3. | Office expenses | | 5.800,00 € |
| | | | 11.335,74 € |

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Total: | 17.882,24 € |
|---------------|--------------------|

The costs for travel, meals, accommodation, meeting room, administrative costs (booklet) and office expenses amounted to 15.882,24€ were born by Fritz Thyssen Stiftung and FRFG. Thus the ENRI-Contribution is solely dedicated to the documentation costs of the project.

| 6. | Final Financing of the Project | Amount |
|------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| 6.1. | Fritz Thyssen Stiftung | 7.600,00 € |
| 6.2. | ENRI | 2.000,00 € |
| 6.3. | FRFG | 8.282,24 € |
| | | 17.882,24 € |