

PIERRE MOREL

Special Representative for Central Asia and for the Crisis in Georgia, EU

Thank you, Thierry, and thank you to everyone who has remained for this austere yet major topic.

I will address it directly by saying I believe it is a major problem, but one that is experiencing a major resurgence and that we will have a hard time finding a real solution for. A major problem with a long history: Abraham was the first migrant and you might say that since then, the migrant's psychological and moral truth has come down through the ages.

At the same time, we are in Morocco, which has the rather rare trait of being a country of origin, a country of transit, a country of destination, a country of return and also a country with a rather high proportion of so-called circular or temporary migration. Therefore, a case of great interest and importance for migration issues.

Now let me jump ahead into current times: President Barack H. Obama, President Nicolas Sarkozy, [UK Foreign Secretary] David Maliband and German Green Party President Cem Ozdemir are four personalities who have either migrated themselves or experienced the consequences. So we can assess the human consequences in a contemporary world globalised in its own way. At the same time, it is time to pay tribute to demographers who have long been cast aside and largely ignored; Alfred Sauvy is just one of many names that come to mind. The coming years will bring major demographic challenges.

I. The migration issue is experiencing a resurgence for many reasons.

Firstly, because of information, with the widespread use of satellite dishes. We are witnessing a levelling of aspirations as opposed to the traditional rural exodus, which was the normal way for societies to function for many centuries. A levelling of aspirations occurs when individuals come in direct and immediate contact with other ways of life on a global scale, as speakers have noted several times today. It's no longer a matter of moving to the nearest city, but of trying to get what you see.

Another factor is the incentive for mobility. From the heart of Eastern Europe today, a few dozen euros will take you to the European Union, whether you're from the Balkans, Kiev or Russia.

The result is a considerable rise in migration flows.

Other factors are the aging of the host country populations, a striking fact in most EU countries. The baby boomers are retiring and we're beginning to see the direct impact on the life of our societies. At the same time, another factor, migration, has become a job – let's be blunt – a dirty job, meaning human trafficking, exploitation, modern slavery and the slave trade.

The traditional phenomenon of integration, which should be the outcome of migration except in cases of circular migration, has become increasingly urgent – but it has also become increasingly difficult. Those are the rising contradictions in societies that have grown weaker due to their openness and complexity.

Lastly, I want to discuss the impact of the crisis that forces migrant workers to return unexpectedly to their home countries. One example is the central Asian country of Tajikistan, where some 600,000 to 1 million migrants work outside their country, with their incomes representing half of Tajikistan's GDP.

It is estimated that 30% have returned from Russia – young unemployed men at home with repercussions that can already be clearly seen. M Zinsou was talking about hunger riots and here you can also see an increase in trafficking, especially drug trafficking in a country located right next to Afghanistan. What else can they do? It's so easy, so tempting because they have no other source of income.

The other factor is radicalisation and extremism. Women comprise 55% of the Islamic Renaissance Party, which is the only legal Islamist party in all of Central Asia. They have become heads of family by necessity. With difficult living conditions leading to frustration, unmet expectations and a need for support, they reach out to a community, to a movement that expresses a fundamentalist vision of society. This movement provides the practical help they need, in return for which they must wear the veil, etc. even though that is not common practice in post-Soviet Tajikistan.

II. These are some effects of the crisis and the indirect effect of migrations.

The problem is growing because regional migrations are still poorly controlled, but it is clear that climate change has begun to have an effect. Dakar would not be the huge conurbation it is without the drought in the Sahel, for example, and many other examples could be cited as well. We do, of course, have a tendency to dramatise climate migration, but it is a reality. The EU published a report by Javier Solana and Benita Ferrero-Waldner a year and a half ago called "Climate Change and International Security". The main argument is that there will be no global climate change crisis strictly speaking but that climate change will instead intensify crises.

On that basis, it is very difficult to develop a solution. Where does the difficulty lie? I see three key areas.



Firstly, the problem has become essentially regional in nature. Even though it has a global aspect, it is largely handled at regional level for obvious reasons of public authority, migration and border control, and societal management in a certain, consistent manner.

Diplomats have noted that nearly every country, including European Union Members, have moved visa policy from the Foreign Affairs Ministry to the Interior Ministry in recent years. That says a lot. Consulates are increasingly working with Interior Ministries. While they previously consulted with the ministry, they now practically take direct orders or at least co-manage visas. This took place in just a few years. The same holds true in Brussels, where the Interior Ministry Council has taken over policy-making from the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The changeover is revealing: the response is regional.

Secondly, the response has an emotional aspect. It is linked to identity, to a societal reaction to the migration flows and consequences of globalisation, with a political dimension as well. It's obvious, but we also see it in governments' behaviour as they oscillate between stronger border controls and then, from time to time, waves of regularisations in response to an otherwise untenable situation. These zigzags are good illustrations of the way policy choices occasionally take one step backward, then one step forward. In other words, it's not easy to follow a perfectly rational and consistent path or develop a long-term policy.

I would also point to certain phenomena that have been poorly understood until now. One example is the remittances transferred by migrant workers to the south, which represent some \$300 billion a year, compared to \$120 billion in annual public development aid. We talk constantly about public aid and we try to achieve certain objectives, but what do we know about these transfers? What do we know and to what extent do we take them into account?

Another example, which the G8 did not address until recently, is the reduction in costs for transferring these remittances to immigrants' home countries. There has clearly been a proliferation of transfer agencies, which are well-positioned to profit handsomely from this service. The G8 belatedly announced the need to better coordinate matters and lower fees for transferring remittances.

What are the consequences? Now we have come to a real discussion about development. How can we address development in relation to migration? The concept of co-development has taken root, and it's about time. We should have practiced co-development from the outset, meaning we should have jointly managed a programme rather than bringing it in as a turnkey project and saying, "I did what I was supposed to".

At the same time, co-development encourages a more intelligent management of migratory phenomena, which is all to the good. But we can no longer confuse co-development, development aid and development policy, which represents an infinitely more complex approach.

Selective immigration is another recent idea that could lead to a brain drain. Let me point out, for example, that the WHO is trying to prevent the health sectors from facing paralysis and a reduction in standards due to massive transfers of medical personnel to developed countries, which offer better compensation at the expense of their home countries.

So those are the areas that require major efforts. We currently have a world forum on “Migrations and Development”, which was specifically created to integrate these two issues.

European policy has also tried to do so through the simple concept we all know – the Schengen system – that is, freedom of movement within the zone and control of external borders, with all the usual restrictions. Schengen was strongly criticised for casting a negative light on migration. Migration is seen as a threat, but it should mainly be viewed as providing great benefit to Europe. The European Pact on Migration and Asylum, adopted during the French Presidency of the EU in October, tries to craft a working partnership between the country of origin, transit country and destination country.