



ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՊԱՏՎԻՐԱԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
DELEGATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

Statement
delivered by Ambassador Jivan Tabibian
at the Opening Plenary of the
Thirteenth Meeting of the OSCE Economic Forum
23 May, 2005, Prague

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and thank you for your indulgence to extend this session's closure.

I have a couple of points to make. However, before I make them, let me not be the exception and not express in a very heartfelt manner our appreciation for the Chairmanship-in-Office, for your Chairmanship of the Forum, for the great hospitality and organizational skills of the Czech Republic and the Czech authorities, and of course, for our Coordinator, who for these Forums carries the brunt of the pressure.

I will divide my statement into three parts.

One: I want to begin with a saying and an illustration; two: I will raise a couple of analytic points that one cannot avoid raising after having heard thirteen speakers; and then, finally, I want to conclude with perhaps a humorous, but a "package" answer to some of my colleagues who preceded me.

Let me first begin with allegory or metaphor. If I understand correctly, the Italians have a saying, which says: "It is difficult to get your wife drunk and keep the bottle full". That is a dilemma: either you use what is in the bottle or your wife stays sober.

Migration related issues are not as complicated as they look, except they pose a very long list of dilemmas. As if two-dimensional dilemmas are not bad enough, they create a three-dimensional dilemma. Let me explain. On one hand, as if we needed to know all the facts, there is a tremendous need for maintaining demographic equilibrium in places where it is shrinking. Anything more is just too well-known.

The second one is that how do you address that, but not take in anybody that knocks on your door.

The third one is if you are not going to take everybody in that knocks on your door, how do you become choosy and in the act of being choosy still remain faithful to a series of human rights and other commitments that tell you there is a limit to how choosy you can get? Choosiness, by the way, is at three different points: who do you take in; who do you keep in and what do you do with them, and thirdly, who do you kick back out. Lately, we have been hearing about some people who have a greater chance to be kicked out than others.

Dilemmas are purely because of our institutional incapacity to square the circle and to resolve these things. They are not about to be resolved, they cannot be resolved,

because on one hand, governments have to do the reasonable, the rationale and the practical; on the other hand, they need, since we insisted they also be democracies, that they need to be re-elected. It is awkward that when in doubt, at the last minute candidates try, as much as they can, to ride the emigration horse and that horse is going to be around for a while to come.

Let me come to my technical, analytic observations. This is not in any order. One: one of the characteristics of immigration or migration has to do with the degree of volutariness, how voluntary is the migrant. At one extreme there is the slave; at the other one, who has already been guaranteed some kind of working permit. The range is so broad and so curiously effective in terms of shaping policy that one has to keep that distinction in mind.

The second thing is the calculation by the receiving country of the benefit of having migrants; and to see if it exceeds the cost of keeping them. I just read recently in some daily paper that the cost of keeping one of them was up to 600 euros. There are calculations that show their contribution may be 4,000 euros. Who is going to argue that cost-benefit analysis?

The third point I would like to make before I go to my concluding imagery, is that there is a great difference, at least for this issue, between tolerance and discrimination. You cannot legislate tolerance. In another forum we are doing everything to see if we can induce tolerance, encourage tolerance, discourage intolerance. But in this matter the important thing is to emphasize discrimination. How do you discriminate between who comes in, who you keep out? The question of integration, by the way, can be reformulated as an essential question of discrimination, because if you can overcome discrimination, believe it or not, people's tendency to accommodate their environment improves. Sometimes the resistance to integrate is a response to the double-track approach to people's rights, roles and benefits.

Let me somewhat disappoint all my colleagues that have been too used at the OSCE for my delegation and the delegation of Azerbaijan and incidentally one speaking on behalf of GUAM, to get into these discussions: "he said, I said". For anybody who is familiar with this issue, particularly at the Permanent Council, I hate to disappoint them, since most of the points are so worn-out, so repeated, so self-serving, so exaggerated and so much like a broken record, that I will not address them, except by proposing an imagery. I apologize to all those who have a sensitive taste. There was a time when we had some colleagues here that depending on what image I used, later told me they were offended. I am going to try to put it in such a way that no one is offended.

The story goes as follows:

There was a person, I am not saying man or woman, who decided to go to see a psychiatrist, because he said he was having problems with being obsessed by sex. He went to the psychiatrist, told him about his problem and the psychiatrist said: "Let me see if I can diagnose. First of all, let me measure the depth of your problem". In the first or second session, and the third and the fourth, the psychiatrist more and more imaginatively picked some pictures. Of course, he began with images of naked bodies and went on to various things and ultimately to toasters, cars, bicycles, clouds. No matter what image or picture he put in front of the putative patient, when the

psychiatrist asked him: "What does it remind you of, what does it make you think about association-wise?", the poor patient, no matter what the image was, even if it was a vacuum cleaner, he found a way to make vacuum cleaners look like sexual objects. He kept repeating that everything that he saw reminded him of sex, upon which the psychiatrist said: "Indeed, you have a problem. How is it that you see sex in everything?" To which the patient responds: "Because you keep showing everything related to sex".

Purpose of this story is the unbroken tradition between GUAM in general and the Azerbaijani delegation in particular, no matter what the subject, what the issue, what the general problem, like here with migration, it could have been space vehicles, ultimately the discourse comes back to the arguments: unresolved conflicts, uncontrolled territories, and the cause of all and a mother of all evil, the unresolved nature of these conflicts and, therefore, the necessity of waiting for the people on white horses to come and deliver us all from all that evil.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and my apologies.