

**EU-Turkey Relations and the Mediterranean Refugee Crisis Challenge: Perceptions
on Turkey's regional engagement**

A Master's dissertation delivered for the Department of Balkan, Slavic and Oriental Studies and the Department of International and European Studies of the University of Macedonia for the fulfillment of the Master's Degree Program in Human Rights and Migration Studies.

By: Nikolaos Inglesis

Supervisor: Professor Christos Paraskevopoulos

THESSALONIKI
2023

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratefulness and gratitude to my thesis supervisor. I am grateful to Professor Christos Paraskevopoulos, for encouraging and providing me with considerable guidance on my master's dissertation writing. In addition, I would like to express my appreciation to the Department of Balkan, Slavic and Oriental Studies and the Department of International and European Studies for allowing me to attain my academic goal. Also, warm appreciation to all my professors for the interesting and enriching courses covering scientific theoretical tools coupled with valuable knowledge that enabled me to gain strong skills and competences in research and analysis throughout the Master's Degree of Human Rights and Migration Studies. Special thanks to the University of Macedonia community which has become home for me. Finally, I am thankful to all the people who supported and assisted

me throughout this demanding but satisfying journey. Particularly, I would like to express special thankfulness to my parents for endless support and encouragement and for the fact that they have inculcated in my love for education and scientific knowledge.

Contents

Abstract	2
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Theoretical framework.....	8
2. Literature review	11
2.1 Turkey’s involvement in migration and asylum arena	12
2.1.1 Turkey’s key strategic location and its asylum policy framework.....	12
2.1.2 Turkey’s migration policy performance on human rights standards.....	15
2.2 EU’s engagement in the migration and asylum realm	17
2.1.1 EU migration and asylum policy agenda.....	17
2.1.2 EU’s migration and asylum policy performance.....	19
2.3 The Framework of the EU-Turkey bilateral agreements	22
2.3.1 An assessment of the EU-Turkey bilateral agreements.....	22
2.3.2 An evaluation of bilateral agreements from a human rights perspective..	25
2.4 Human rights consideration in the context of asylum policies agenda	29
2.5 The cooperation framework of the EU-Turkey bilateral relations	32
2.5.1 The refuge crisis and the core of the EU-Turkey relations.....	32
2.5.2 The challenges of the EU-Turkey relations in response to the crisis.....	35
3. Research methodology	40
4. Research and Analysis	42
4.1 An assessment of the EU-Turkey Deal from a human rights perspective.....	42
4.2 The role of Turkey within the context of EU-Turkey relations.....	45
5. Discussion	47
6. Conclusion	52

Abstract

The adherence of refugees and asylum seekers to the pursuit of their lives reflects the existence of continued life-changing visions in questing for sanctuary by reaching EU member states capable of guaranteeing their basic human rights. The recent refugee crisis has brought about a considerable rise in the number of would-be asylum seekers in Europe. This situation has raised pressing challenges involving various critical social, political and economic predicaments that require the design of robust migration and asylum policy frameworks in the region. The character and nature of the refugee crisis determines the development of the policy agenda ranging from security to migration policies which are interrelated with human rights concerns and thereby can serve as catalyst in relation to the EU-Turkey relationship. The applicability of the asylum policy framework which is determined by policy makers' policy preferences and political domestic interests within the EU and Turkey has often come under significant legal scrutiny and frequent criticism. This might be an example of existing conditions that are likely to be inconsistent with the maintenance of security standards in terms of safeguarding fundamental rights norms embedded in the international asylum law and the International Human Rights Law. The issue of human rights remains at the heart of migration and asylum policy discourse because of its complex interplay with the influence of interaction structures between both sides along with policy frameworks that frame bilateral relations within the context of the crisis. At the same time, the EU-Turkey Deal can serve as linchpin of the migration and asylum strategies which are largely interrelated with the shaping of balance of power and national interests regionally. The present study aims to grasp the influence and improvement of cooperation dynamics that increasingly impact both parties by exploring the intense and complex interplay among the effects of the refugee crisis, practices undermining human rights regarding asylum seekers and refugees and interaction dynamics unleashed by EU and Turkey as dominant peripheral actors whose policies are conditioned by ongoing regional political, economic and social developments. The analysis will also investigate a wide range of institutional and organizational perspectives in terms of Turkey's regional engagement by examining its competency in enhancing the prospects of a viable cooperation with the EU.

Key words: EU-Turkey relations, Refugee Crisis, Human Rights, Readmission Agreement (RA), EU-Turkey Deal.

1.Introduction

The increasing Syrian refugee crisis can be interpreted as an intriguing case in point that is interwoven with the proliferation of human rights accounts, especially, by looking at the peculiar nature and complicated character of the EU-Turkey relationship when it comes to the management of the crisis (Adam, 2017). In this respect, the emergence of an ongoing humanitarian crisis in the Mediterranean Sea confirms the interplay of particular spillover effects emanate from the outbreak of the refugee crisis which justifies the need for immediate formulation of a coordinated policy frameworks in response to the unrepresented challenges (Madatali, 2021). More important, one significant source of concern is the outbreak of the Syrian conflict in 2011 which has signaled a wide range of critical social, political and economic transformations and institutional shifts in the Middle East as well as regionally (Saatcioglu, 2019). These situations brought about serious implications that led to a surge of massive refugee inflows the EU had not experienced since the Second World War. Seen in this light, it is, therefore, worth examining in more details the role of the EU and Turkey as they are able to exert enormous political influence with potential to shape political order and balance of power (Ott, 2017). Hence, the ultimate interrelation between the effects of the refugee crisis and shaping of the EU-Turkey relations is both important and telling.

Interestingly, historically and geographically speaking, one can assume that the strategic location of Turkey in the Mediterranean region echoes that is capable of exercising considerable influence in terms of the shaping of policy frameworks in the realm of migration (Adam, 2017). Equally, the implementation of negotiation and discussion patterns between the EU and Turkey in dealing with relevant issues demonstrates the centrality of the problem that deserves further attention. In fact, both actors, operating as crucial intervening variables are pursuing particular migration management policy frameworks and structural adjustment policies as a response to the crisis by partly prioritizing their national security interests through the introduction of wide range of pervasive political, diplomatic and foreign relation practices (Pierini, 2019). In this respect, the

emergence of collective structures derived from the impact of behavioral patterns can serve as catalyst in terms of providing a more comprehensive understanding about the crisis and for this reason it deserves further consideration. Hence, the provision of a thorough investigation that rests upon conduct related patterns and establishment of identity norms can benefit our analysis by providing a helpful point of departure in this regard through captivating insights of political and foreign affairs perspectives that are linked to the establishment of cooperation frameworks and forms of interactions (Icduygu and Aksel, 2014).

More important, the present analysis will also seek to provide an insight in terms of the appropriateness of the EU-Turkey deal in relation to crisis management accounts by looking at the ways under which the implementation of a consistent and integrated approach can facilitate the de-escalation of the situation by focusing on the stabilization of regional migration politics. At the same time, the EU-Turkey relationship is suffered both by technical and practical inconsistencies arise by a wide range of regional geopolitical restrains that need to be addressed, as will be evident from the later discussion (Kilic and Bayram, 2021). Hence, in view of the above, the main focus of the analysis will be on the EU-Turkey relations functioning in the context of the refugee crisis after 2015 by looking at the interplay among socio-political and human rights domains attributable to the shaping of policy making frameworks. Interestingly, among the primary reasons that justifies our key motivations for this analysis relies primarily on the overriding geographical importance of the region in terms of the migration and refugee related developments. Moreover, the examination of arising institutional asymmetries and structural complexities the EU and Turkey might confront, and the underlying implications of multifaceted legal and procedural transactions deserve also particular attention. In addition, the study will, also, shed some light on the role and impact of bilateral agreements in terms of human rights standards concerns.

In considering the formulation of the main research question in the current study, particular responses to a set of explosive questions referring to the degree of successfulness of the EU-Turkey Agreement are a vital part. The direct impact of the EU-Turkey institutionalized relationship is operating in parallel with the key role of Turkey's efforts in fostering a successful and well-structured partnership. Currently, such a question remains critical since it challenges perceptions according to which refugees' human rights are performed within a secure environment. However, contrary to this, relevant evidence suggests a completely different picture. The key research question, thus, is formulated in the following way: In addressing the key question of the likelihood

of further cooperation between both parties, the study will reflect an increased focus on the existing migration policy making that tends to be intermingled with the logic of rapprochement. In parallel with the analysis about the interaction forms that come into play, an overview will be presented in terms of the assessment of the EU-Turkey Deal with a focus on its direct impact upon human rights considerations, especially, when it comes to the principle of non-refoulement. From this core, the study will also look at the way in which guaranteeing of human rights standards can be ensured in the context of the overall readmission procedure.

To this end, a comprehensive response to the main research question is premised on three diverse sub-questions. In terms of the first sub-question, what can be argued here is that implementation of fundamental human rights remains complicated and inherently problematical as the EU-Turkey Agreement is likely to reflect fragmentation of securing the right to have rights. An investigation of the background of contemporary refugee protection problematization will operate in parallel with the ongoing strife between human rights perceptions and national sovereignty perspectives. As far as the second sub-question is concerned, this refers to legal obligations stemming from the EU-Turkey Deal that are intimately tied to the role of Turkey as a guarantor of refugees' protection standards. By responding to this sub-question, we will be able to shed light to the EU-Turkey Agreement and whether it can be applied appropriately by guaranteeing the principle of non-refoulement. In pursuing such questions by putting emphasis upon the bilateral relations we hope to offer a comprehensive pattern for thinking about collaboration units and relationship forms in the region. Indeed, this gains salience on the grounds that Turkey can be seen as a safe third country or first country of asylum and thereby complying with EU legislation frameworks that are consistent with guaranteeing the principle of non-refoulement by providing fair asylum system procedures. Additionally, it deals with tangible security predicaments in relation to readmission issues regarding their protection from deportation or prolonged detention that may result in inhuman conditions and abuse of human rights standards. As regards the third sub-question, it raises issues about potential complexities in the EU-Turkey relations that fed by the applicability of the EU-Turkey Statement. The study explores the availability of institutional means and practical mechanisms to revive relations and facilitate permanent and long-term solutions. More important, in pursuing these questions that focus on the interrelationships between the EU and Turkey and their role in addressing the refugee crisis, we hope to provide a comprehensive framework for thinking about security, migration and foreign

affairs domains in the region. In addition, we will attempt to demonstrate how relevant notions and assumptions about migration security has developed, pinpoint potential gaps in traditional foreign policy frameworks, highlighting lines of thought involving migration policies that will facilitate the encouragement of normative principles analysis in security and asylum arenas.

In conjunction to the significance of the research question, the study will, also, present two key hypotheses: The first hypothesis suggests that, although one party increasingly depends on the other for the management of the crisis, EU-Turkey relations are structurally incomplete and require further improvement based on the possibility of rapprochement. Whereas the second one advocates that the EU-Turkey bilateral agreements seem institutionally and practically incoherent by failing to secure the concept of “a right to have rights” as Turkey has failed to deliver on its promises and its contribution has been inadequate. As a result, it has led to serious implications in terms of safeguarding human rights. These hypotheses will be tested on the basis of identifying the current situation of refugees and asylum seekers that are involved in Turkish and European asylum system procedures. However, one should be wary of claims that the EU-Turkey Agreement is lacking necessary safeguards and independent monitoring mechanisms to cope with potential human rights violations. Interestingly, the principle of non-refoulement and the right to seek asylum has been put at risk because of blatant inconsistencies and weaknesses in internal asylum processes.

Therefore, it is essential that we organize the analysis which would revolve largely around the provision of adequate responses to abovementioned questions. The key structure for doing so can be accumulated into four key sections. The first chapter has already discussed the significance of the current study and the key motivations for analyzing the complex and direct interplay of key subjects engaged in the analysis. Second chapter is devoted to the literature review where the crux here is that the adoption of the EU-Turkey Deal rests upon abundant evidence, underpinning the conclusion that parties are lacking necessary mechanisms for safeguarding human rights and thereby creating a “rightless” situation for refugees and asylum seekers. Chapter three surveys the EU-Turkey relations and offers an assessment based on legal, political and institutional perspectives that come into the fore. Furthermore, it offers an interesting insight about Turkey’s role in relation to the Readmission Agreements while highlight the interplay of powerful driving forces in terms of EU policy-makers intentions in enforcing Turkey to implement readmission agreements. In addition, it shows why it is essential for the EU to spur further cooperation under the EU-Turkey Statement and to what extent this is impactful on the implementation of the

Agreement. Finally, chapter four deals with concluding remarks by summarizing key findings and highlighting the line of argumentation presented in the study.

1.1 Theoretical Framework

The employment of the appropriate theoretical framework in the current analysis rests upon international relations theory by involving pragmatic assessments which rely on data collection and relevant documentation relevant to human rights perspectives. Attention to issues related to policy-making in the Mediterranean was given only to the extent that they are able to influence bilateral relations. The deployment of a range of social and legal perspectives captures the essence of legal aspects, such as relevant legal documentation including legislative decisions and secondary data sources that address pressing social, political and international relations concerns associated with law enforcement by taking into account the profound influence migration issues can exert on the shaping of regional developments. While assessing the role of certain theories of International Relations such as Realism and Liberalism, one can relate current situations in contemporary international system with perceptions that take into account the decisive impact of the Nationalistic approach on the EU-Turkey relations. In this light, a close examination of relevant documentation allows for a greater comprehension of the impact of political developments along with interconnections with the dynamics of EU-Turkey relations. Therefore, reference to the consistency of theoretical approaches linked to particular argumentation is corroborated by the spread of organizational pressures and political initiatives, theoretical approaches of International Relations which can lead to greater understanding of issues that generate assumptions based on particular institutional functions and regulations patterns to attain practically oriented objectives.

The present analysis intends to respond to the question about how regional actors can deal with particular pressing matters by deploying different means of crisis management. Hence, the Syrian refugee crisis seem to be interwoven with the notion of word regime that comes into play. In this context, the international regime theory appears to be conceptually adequate to provide an analysis of relevant issues. In attempting to offer a definition of such a broadened conception, firstly, a range of key assumptions must be taken into account. The idea of regime perpetuates a range of principles, norms and values with particular procedures which allow for the interaction

with convergence dynamics fed by behavioral patterns established by the actors involved (Haggard and Simmons, 1987). In providing the definition of such a notion, it can be assumed that the perception of international regime can be helpful in this regard to thoroughly investigate the character and nature of the EU-Turkey relations, and its increasing interplay, generating profound sharp effects on the Syrian refugee crisis. Thus, it is commonplace to assume that the functioning of the regime is linked to individuals' desires, and that a wide range of political shifts can take place due to a number of interrelated reasons (Bradford, 2016).

More importantly, such a theory underscores the idea of distribution of power among a wide range of different agents, such as state actors and international organizations, to name but a few, with structural proclivity to functioning as integrated coalitions that are referent objects to particular procedural underpinnings and desirable results. Seen in this light, both the EU and Turkey are forced to effectively address potential repercussions of the refugee crisis and given Turkey's geographical position, it can exercise a dominant role through shaping the agenda in terms of establishing policy priorities and strategic objectives. The functioning of the theory is boosted by perceptions that facilitate a greater comprehension of relevant issues which can be described from an international relations perspective (Buzan, 1993). Moreover, one can assume that the idea of interdependence can serve as a conceptual means to our understanding about Syrian refugee crisis provided that sustainable resolutions can become easily discernible. This rests upon the idea of dislocation that concern massive numbers of individuals. Such an assumption is well-founded when it accords with assumptions according to which these people do not have to end up in a particular country. More interestingly, widespread allocation of individuals should be carried out appropriately by the EU where, for example, each member state should be able to uphold alleged responsibilities and compromises. But in case some member states demonstrate further commitment to enhanced cooperation compared to others, this may result in situation which can lead to serious implications in terms of the very existence of the EU (Drezner, 2009).

It is noteworthy in this context that the theory incorporates three principal approaches that can be helpful in this regard by shedding light on the settlement of issues that are under examination. To begin with, the power-based theoretical approach suggests that the construction of international regimes rests upon the complex interplay of behavioral patterns of the actors involved with the international system regardless of the degree of power they might demonstrate (Drezner, 2009). It offers a comprehensive analysis about international regimes in relation to the

impact of power distribution among international players that have great salience within the purview of international relations. Such a regime may experience concerns regarding foundation, preservation, modification or abolishment ideas provided that it operates in accordance with the desires of key influential actors. To this end, regime's sustainability rests upon the ability of preparedness of international actors in terms of achieving a degree of compliance. On the other side of the coin, the interest-based approach fits to international subjects reflecting the same problematical conditions, that is, refugee and migratory inflows where self-interest considerations can only be taken into account through sustainable cooperation frameworks (Haggard and Simmons, 1987). Such an approach suggests that among the principal aims of rational actors is to ensure absolute gains which can be met through long-term cooperation structures. Establishing a reliable partnership can be feasible only when actors are confronted with predicaments within a common environment. In principle, regimes that are recognized efficient are likely to create fertile ground in which actors would disregard temporary gains so as to maintain the benefits of a long-term cooperation. For instance, such an approach might adapt to the fact that one actor is presented keener to legalize massive numbers of migrants provided that the other actor is willing to accept a particular number of migrants back (Buzan, 1993).

Finally, the knowledge-based approach highlights the important role non-state actors can play and it can be helpful for the purposes of our analysis. However, one should clarify the significance of the direct interplay between international regime and international system where one variable is incapable of operating appropriately without the interaction of the other (Buzan, 1993). The interconnection among different referent objects can be viewed as an integral part of the international system. Such relevant dynamics stemming from this linkage represent the ability to increasingly generate particular national interests of different states justified by actions taken which are fully consistent with the resurgence of such national interests (Haggard and Simmons, 1987). Consequently, such agreements that are produced as a result of political developments, including the Syrian refugee crisis, whose significant characteristic features rest upon actors' national interests is a clear manifestation of how international regime can have a decisive and influential role in the international arena (Buzan, 1993). An international regime consists of different political referent objects or units which are presented as substantive parts of the international system where the latter requires the exhibition of behavioral norms developed by the units in their interplay with the international regime. Hence, one can assume that the notion of

international regime deserves particular attention and, in this context, further investigation is worth taken. As a result, although such ideas largely shape particular set of actions, interaction forms entail certain commitments that are determined by diverse self-interests each time that does not necessarily involve any hierarchical legal framework (Drezner, 2009).

2. Literature Review

The refugee crisis period in the Mediterranean Sea was marked by a preoccupation of regional migration study scholars with interesting accounts focusing on the EU-Turkey cooperation, Turkey's engagement in constructing an alliance with the EU to address the crisis as well as the content of migration policy frameworks in devising long-term and applicable solutions. Given the complexity of nature, multiplicity of developments and diversity of integral parts of the construction of the theoretical discourse, a wide range of migration policy challenges and crucial security questions arise that are associated with the role of policy-makers in the increasingly important context of regional politics arena. Indeed, within the academic infrastructure, what was presumed mainstream emphasized on the importance of security debate which is reflected in migration accounts. However, it is clear that traditional approaches and theoretical orientations of refugee crisis management policies that has dominated the literature, and are associated with the shaping of the EU-Turkey relations, seem deeply inadequate to provide further explanation about the multi-faceted and multidimensional nature of the matter.

In fact, unfortunately, few analyses have built on the idea about the interrelation between widely recognized causal claims pertaining to the refugee crisis and the policy frameworks pursued by both parties. In essence, when it comes to the linkage between regional politics and migration related perspectives, the majority of academic scholars have fundamentally failed to address, much less adequately explain, the fundamental interplay among bilateral relations, Turkey's involvement which is interested in securing its self-interest, and human rights standards adaptability to established migration mechanisms and practices in the context of policy making. Hence, such an analysis is required to add to the debate and broaden our understanding of policy making considerations in the migration agenda regionally. Of course, it is in this context that we attempt in this chapter to provide an alternative perspective in relation to the abovementioned matter under investigation. As a consequence, an in-depth assessment of conducts and policy behaviors

necessitates the adoption of a systematic and consistent approach aimed at the reformulation of existing policy frameworks premised on theoretical conceptualization and empirical foundations. In other words, this would result in the maintenance of a more comprehensive and adequate understanding of ongoing policy making trends that justify the pursuit of a long-term sustainable resolution.

2.1 Turkey's involvement in migration and asylum arena

2.1.1 Turkey's key strategic location and its asylum policy framework

Approaching the critical role of Turkey in the region, Erdemir's contribution (2016) makes an interesting point by highlighting the salience of Turkey's geographical position as the largest and most politically pervasive regional country in the Middle East that is responsible for offering accommodation to vast numbers of Syrian refugees. Turkey's strategic approach conflates with the shaping of regional affairs where close interaction with the EU fuels the formulation of integration dynamics and the interplay of cooperation structures. Turkey's access to consistent funding and systematic economic aid that are provided by EU actors seems helpful for the introduction of long-term preventive mechanisms that function in the context of the EU's crisis management toolbox aimed at the systematic reduction of massive inflows. For example, the introduction of the financial package of 15 million was of vital importance in achieving accommodation improvement and restoration of Turkish asylum camps and settlements by enhancing human and material recourses capabilities. In this light, of particular interest is the words of UN High Commissioner for Refugees Antonio Guterres, about the seriousness of the situation by arguing that such a refugee crisis with nearly 7,000 people fleeing the Syrian war on a daily basis is likely to outweigh that of the Rwanda Genocide that took place in 1994 (Erdemir, 2016). In a similar vein, focusing on the dominant role of Turkey in regional politics, Kaya's (2021) goes on by stressing the vitality of Turkey's regional position by arguing that from historical and geographical perspectives, Turkey holds a unique position as regional refugee destination largely affected by a wide range of massive migration movements attributable to particular factors including its peculiar geographical location, colonial heritage adaptability, and exposure to ongoing nation-building procedures (Kaya, 2021).

Interestingly, one can assume the significance of strategic role of Turkey which is based on its ability to yield significant political outcomes by determining regional policy powers and foreign affairs power balances. For example, Bal's analysis (2016) adds further insight to this approach. He argues that policy assessments that refer to the role of bilateral relations would fit nicely with the idea of Turkey's stance in relation to the potential impact of a long-term relationship in the future. On this issue, for instance, one can assume that in terms of the effectiveness of a migration policy framework, it requires proper implementation of agreements that are consistent with mutual policy objectives. From this perspective, some possibilities exist for a productive cooperation can be achieved on the basis of a fruitful partnership that is able to bear mutually advantageous outcomes by relying upon the logic of political reliability and ethical trustworthiness. However, it should be pointed out that Turkey's role in the context of a robust relationship is more a reflection of its strategic robustness rather than ideas related to the logic of integration regarding the accession procedure (Bal, 2016). Consequently, Saatcioglu (2016, p. 9) rightly argues: "Indeed, as the European Council President Donald Tusk put it, after the EU-Turkey summit of 29 November: "Turkey remains a key strategic partner for Europe, but also a candidate country for the EU". At the present juncture, EU-Turkey relations seem to be evolving towards a strategic partnership rather than Turkey's full integration into the Union".

Interestingly, Turkey's behavior in conjunction with key structural elements of its asylum system reflect ideas that are in line with the logic of Fortress Europe. In this context, Erder's (2021) contemporary writings suggest that Turkey might be keen to deepen cooperation with additional regional players. More important, its transformation from a refugee-sending state to a migrant-receiving is incompatible with asylum system considerations related to particular policies that thwart refugees to enter the Turkish state. Hence, this fuels a situation where contemporary policy mechanisms and structural adjustments are essential for the establishment of appropriate asylum system procedures. Nevertheless, the introduction of new set of rules that are helpful to the proper management of asylum seekers are undermined because of the problematical policy environment in which phenomena of migration and xenophobia have come into play. For the years to come, one can assume that migration movements might be disconnected with criminal activities, and this, in turn, might facilitate the implementation of appropriate actions that promote humanitarian norms and values as well as guaranteeing social fabric and economic prosperity (Erder, 2012).

Similarly, in the context of examining asylum policy framework in Turkey, one can detect serious shortcomings that would endanger its institutional and organizational design model in comparison to a politically progressive framework that is adopted by the EU policy makers. However, interestingly, Tolay (2014) has long argued that this deduction is probably false as governments remain committed to the enhancement of legislation framework that takes care issues related to foreigner applicants. Nevertheless, this logic seems incompatible with the EU's slow-going procedures about the harmonization process in terms of the asylum legislative framework. The arrival of approximately 600,000 Syrian asylum seekers since 2011 clearly illustrates Turkey's commitment to carrying out inclusive migration policies that are opposed to the EU's exclusive strategic approaches. In this light, some possibilities exist for the introduction of policies towards the reformulation of this framework, setting as priority the maintenance of solidarity among member states through providing appropriate accommodation services and performing sound asylum system procedures (Tolay, 2014).

In terms of the discussion about the logic of "safe third country", according to the Asylum Procedures Directives, Turkey lacks the ability to meet certain requirements when it comes to the ideas of "safe third country" and "first country of asylum". For example, Kaya (2020) thinks about the role of the Statement which vehemently promotes Turkish readmission mechanism related to the examination of asylum claims. However, fundamental human rights violation raises serious concerns about the proper applicability of the non-refoulement principle especially after the adoption of the Turkey-Greece Readmission Protocol (Kaya, 2020). Indeed, as Shamatava (2020, p.5) nicely puts it: "UNHCR, scholars and domestic and international non-governmental organizations state that designating Turkey as a safe third country (without thorough examination) creates the risk of "deportation chains when asylum seekers are transferred from state to state and back to their country of origin eventually amounting to a refoulement chain".

Nevertheless, looking from a different perspective, the problematical situation in terms of Turkey's position within asylum policy discourse is pointed out in Lehner's analysis (2018). Interestingly, he argues that the logic of thinking about Turkey as a safe third country is interwoven with assumptions about the complex interplay between the refugee crisis and Common European Asylum System (CEAS). However, the latter suffers from long-standing constitutional complexities and obvious structural inconsistencies. In other words, reduction of inflows would reignite the migration discourse within the EU by cultivating fertile ground towards the

introduction of necessary institution building policies along with the implementation of administrative reforms. Nevertheless, the issue of safe third country raises serious concerns by setting significant obstacles to the implementation of agreements and discussions procedures that would be benefited by the logic of a close and direct cooperation (Lehner, 2018).

2.1.2 Turkey's migration policy performance on human rights standards

The emergence of security challenges about coping with mass migration can lead to serious repercussions internally where ongoing military tensions across Turkish borders may jeopardize domestic security framework. For example, Pierini (2019) makes an interesting point by arguing that this situation can lead to serious implications in terms of the management of refugee flows in the context of its alliance with the EU. Moreover, one can assume that given the fact that Turkey is incapable of fostering liberal democratic principles, this may result in certain conditions under which sustainability of bilateral relations could be easily attained (Pierini 2019)

Interestingly, in a similar vein, Weber's contribution (2018) goes on by articulating the vital issue of democratic deficiencies in Turkey's migration strategy, raising persisting challenges for the EU-Turkey relations. This situation clearly necessitates a concentrated structural and institutional reform planning. In the face of it, constructive criticism by the EU policy makers suggests the emergence of institutional barriers that disrupt domestic asylum system procedures. Given these difficulties, the EU should present itself flexible, from an institutional perspective, to effectively overcome such predicaments. Its set of intentions are in line with demands that pursue further progress. Thus, one can argue that among key components that can ensure the development of sustainable partnership is, in part, the establishment of reliability norms and transparency principles. Indeed, as Erdemir's analysis (2016, p.10) nicely puts it: "Turkey's democratic governance deficit and the basic absence of domestic consensus-building efforts, present substantial risks for the long-term sustainability of Ankara's current refugee policy as well as the envisaged collaboration with the EU".

Political progress of Turkey depends largely upon the level of collaboration with the EU. In this light, one can attach great importance to the visa liberalization issue that is linked to Turkey's capability when complying with European regulations in border control policy sector.

For instance, what Demirsu and Tetik (2018) make clear in their work is that political concerns are raised in terms of the level of the EU's competence so as to advance its role in international relation arena, particularly, after phenomena of erosion of human rights standards within the Turkish state. Therefore, there is a need that EU policy makers have to make efforts towards the revitalization and reformulation of relations for achieving successful control of migratory inflows (Demirsu and Tetik, 2018). Hence, one can clearly assume that the abovementioned argument is in line with what Cinar and Sirin's (2017) suggest about Turkish government intentions in seeking to pursue social, political and economic transformations especially in the context of the EU accession process. This can bring about key structural shifts that would be conducive to continuing institutional progress. Despite the adoption of a harmonized legislative framework embraced in the conclusions of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), institutional, normative, and practical aspects related to major shifts reveal technical instabilities resulting from rejection practices through community mechanisms that encase the logic of security apparatus (Cinar and Sirin, 2017).

In terms of Turkey's role within the context of its relations with the EU, one can point out particular policy intentions and political aims of Turkish foreign policy as reflection of the dual character of its core strategy. For example, Koma (2017) adopts an interesting approach which brings enlightening perspectives in the foreign policy discourse. In particular, he argues that the existence of a robust collaboration along with Turkey's insistence on the logic of the EU membership could be enhanced by the strengthening of bilateral relations. However, Turkey's intentions to intensify its efforts in terms of the logic of the European identity are weak since its migration policy framework structurally lacks proper planning. In this light, the centrality of strategic planning that would enhance successful relations on a regional scale can be viewed as key requirements for the maintenance of common burden-commitments through the adoption of productive communication practices (Koma, 2017).

Nevertheless, from a socio-political perspective, one can assume that a wide range of economic and political resources are not functionally suffice within Turkey, and that limited integration dynamics are lacking effective mechanisms. In this light, Tsakonas's analysis (2021) focuses on the elimination of exploitation methods in terms of gaining political leverage by technically supporting the EU-Turkey Deal which is associated with widespread deportation practices. This constitutes a clear reflection of the role of Turkey as a transit state which is under

severe criticism and thereby providing new opportunities for additional corridors for those seeking to reach the EU member states (Tsakonas, 2021). Similarly, Hassib and Nounou (2016) provide an opening for critical thinking, however, from a different perspective, by highlighting Turkey's institutional and organizational weaknesses. In particular, they argue that ineffective asylum system procedures and limited resource capabilities may hamper the creation of sustainable social and political integration dynamics which can contribute to social stability and economic prosperity partly through the preservation of human rights standards (Hassib and Nounou, 2016).

As a consequence, the corollary of the aforementioned line of argument may lead to what Women's Refugee Commission (2016) argued about the inconsistencies in accelerated refugee assessment procedures and whether the possibility of return back to Turkey will ensure proper protection and free access to legally fair asylum procedures. The Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) assumptions are opposed to the logic of imprisonment as refugees are entitled to proper treatment where safety standards are ensured and are in accordance with international law framework. From this core, one can assume that Turkey is unable to stick to its commitments to ensure the principle of safe third country, and, additionally, its whole stance has persistently ignored fundamental human rights protection standards (Women's Refugee Commission, 2016). In other words, one can use the words of Ozkanca (2019, page 83) who has argued in a blunt tone in his latest work that: "the refugee crisis is far from being solved." Nevertheless, one might still argue that Turkey effectively uses it to threaten the EU. The outcome of the EU–Turkey Deal on refugees will serve as a good litmus test on whether Turkey will switch from challenging to breaking its boundaries with the EU. If the Deal falls through, there will be important ramifications for both European security and Turkey–EU relations”.

2.2 EU's engagement in the migration and asylum realm

2.2.1 EU migration and asylum policy agenda

Interestingly, Cetin and others' research (2017) concentrates on the security agenda of the EU that involves complicated and challenging security issues such as Muslim minorities and the destabilizing danger of terrorism which can harm peace and destabilize the security sector. The

role of public opinion can be decisive by reflecting the linkage between unemployment and social inequality concerns where political fissures among member states were intensified by a growing economic crisis and the escalation of migratory movements at an international scale. According to such claims, migration can cause serious imbalances in the economic activity of the EU while disrupt employment prospects, leading to fragmented social benefits services (Cetin et al., 2017).

The EU member states should undertake coordinated actions through the encouragement of policy initiatives to boost the logic of the centrality of shared responsibility. Indeed, Muiznieks' analysis (2017) is oriented around such assumptions, highlighting, for example, in practical terms, this enterprise that would involve the need for the construction of registration centers accompanied by the establishment of a fair and legally binding distribution system regarding the examination of asylum claims. Interestingly, EU's commitments seem to be in line with the core liberal tenets of European Convention on Human Rights and the United Nations Refugee Convention in the sense that the preservation of ethical and legal commitments presuppose policy strategies consistent with relevant fundamental legal frameworks (Muiznieks, 2017).

In a similar vein, Zagora-Cristiani (2017) underscores the centrality of refugee flows management mechanism in the construction of policy agenda that is situated among the primary objectives of the EU migration strategy. In pursuing such policy objectives, the logic of "the end justifying the means" should come into play. Moreover, another reason for paying close attention on how migration can be properly tackled is that by doing so we will be able to enhance our understanding in relation to the interpretation of crisis management mechanisms and practices. However, some possibilities exist that this might be de-linked with the logic of fortress Europe and relevant policy frameworks about externalization ideas. Instead, this can be product that stems from fortification and buffering policy deficiencies. Hence, the potential establishment of a contemporary policy framework in the migration realm would remain questionable (Zagora-Cristiani, 2017). Based on the aforementioned line of argument, one can observe that considerations in terms of EU-Turkey relations in the migration realm confirm a dominant external aspect of the EU migration policy framework. For example, Altafin and others (2016) go on by advocating that potential implementation of coordinated policy practices and widespread policy tools entails an enhanced European approach against the crisis. However, contrary to this logic, trends pertaining to the adoption of short-term policy responses have led to a glaring neglect of the respect for fundamental human rights. This might be attributed to the lack of powerful political

will and ethical commitment when addressing serious threats against human rights (Altafin et al., 2016).

Equally, Alpes and others' contribution (2017) illustrate an interesting argument, however, from an administration policy perspective. They argue about shared commitments in security field as important elements for successful migration procedures. In this context, international protection trends in conjunction with long-term policy options are involved, incorporating supervisory tools and detecting mechanisms for appropriate human rights monitoring. For instance, widespread practices such as long-term detention in Greek asylum system are not in line with international laws. Furthermore, security guaranties pertaining to the examination and processing of asylum claims must be consistent with ideas of proportionally. Consequently, appropriate technical administrative support is required to ensure, for example, that reception facilities are able to provide fair assessment of asylum claims through guaranteeing free and adequate access to legal aid provision (Alpes et al., 2017). However, in contrast, in his contemporary contribution, Elmas (2021) argues about the omittance of significant interaction dynamics regarding structural disparities in policy orientations. This can affect the EU's foreign policy credibility levels in a fairly systematic way and thereby harming its structural coherence in terms of crafting policy making. Seen in this light, the absence of a consistent policy framework that could promote mutual compromises and shared commitments may endanger political engagement with Turkey, implying, also, that interaction with different actors might be poor and not easily maintained (Elmas, 2021).

2.2.2 EU's migration and asylum policy performance

The EU's migration pragmatic approach denotes its commitment to encourage the Turkish government to follow particular policies that may jeopardize fundamental democratic norms and values. This is particularly well illustrated in Kfir's analysis (2017) according to which this situation is likely to set institutional barriers to asylum seekers who seek to reach EU member states. In this light, such conditions are likely to empower the Turkish government, raising, simultaneously, serious implications to European security structures when attempts come into play in consolidating close relations with Turkey that suffers from democratic deficit (Kfir, 2017).

Equally, one can argue that Martin's contribution (2017) illuminates similar assumptions that would fit nicely with the aforementioned interesting line of argument. In particular, he argues that the EU's response to the crisis might not be in line with liberal ideas and democratic principles enshrined in international laws especially in conditions under which the existential threat the crisis poses is difficult to be handled appropriately. In this respect, bilateral cooperation could lead to potential erosion of the European liberal model and its fundamental democratic principles might be undermined. However, one might claim that the complexity and volatility of this situation may serve as justification for particular political activity in the sense that EU actors can take advantage of crisis management mechanisms, implying that the production of long-term effective resolutions might be viable (Martins, 2017). Indeed, As Moldovan (2017, p.15) nicely put it: "The scale of the current crisis is testing the unity and solidarity of Europe and its institutions. But it should not prevent Europe from taking the necessary steps to ensure that all refugees and migrants who arrive on its shores are protected and assisted". But perhaps the most unusual perspective is that of Scazzieri (2021) whose exploration takes seriously the salience of the EU's role in building powerful relations through the promotion of internal and external political interests. Nevertheless, member states should not neglect the existence of threat posed by Turkey and its underlying intentions to politically, socially and economically destabilize EU member states through instrumentalization and exploitation of refugees and migrants (Scazzieri, 2021).

Interestingly, the abovementioned argument has been highlighted in the work of scholars such as Gadd and others (2020). They think about a proper policy response towards the crisis where the EU requires to stimulate a cooperative spirit especially with states that have poor human rights records such as Turkey. However, this situation can trigger further skepticism and raises particular challenges because it might be associated with practices of gross violations of human rights. Furthermore, in the lack of desired policy outcomes in the migration realm, serious challenges can be raised concerning the democratic legitimacy of the EU both domestically as well as regionally. On the one hand, from an internal perspective, poor policy performance in migration realm can raise particular concerns and brought about political skepticism in terms of the EU's democratically ineffective governing institutions. Nevertheless, direct and consistent engagement of national actors in monitoring the asylum legislative activity might increase the degree of policy transparency. On the other hand, from an external perspective, multifaceted migration structures are likely to undermine the EU's reliability on a global basis. With the potential fragmentation of

the EU's migration policies and the possible disruption of externalization dimension of the policy framework, political activity may result in the undermining of human rights enshrined in international legislation (Gadd et al., 2020). However, contrary to this, the analysis of Marcilly and Garde (2016) brings various and interesting perspectives regarding the outbreak of the economic crisis which brought about serious implications that affected the ideas of solidarity and consensus building process. Furthermore, the pursuit of diplomatic maneuvers on the part of the EU suggests limited economic resources and poor policy mechanisms, implying that among primary strategic options for the EU should be the acceptance of Turkey's political positions in the migration realm (Marcilly and Garde, 2016).

Nevertheless, seen from another perspective, the role of policy practices in terms of pre-accession procedure is of vital importance. In this context, EU's policy makers pursue strategies that promote economic and technical support helpful for the Turkish government to achieve productive policy outcomes in the crisis management field. For example, Ianni and others' (2021) analysis contributes to the reinvigorated debate that compels scholars by highlighting particular protective policies that are linked to voluntary return considerations and asylum seekers repatriation claims that concern irregular migrants, contributing to the bolstering of asylum system procedures and decision-making processes. Furthermore, the EU's political intentions mirror the strengthening of efforts to regulate and combat irregular channels through the enhancement of border protection mechanisms that could decrease massive inflows (Ianni et al., 2021).

But taking this point further, Peel and others (2018) in their work challenges the character and nature of the Turkey-style deals, highlighting the ineffectiveness of administrative instruments that derail attempts towards proper responses to the ongoing refugee related challenges. Hence, EU policy-makers not only has to pursue policies aimed at the reconstruction of inefficient migration administrative structures, but also to initiate the discussion for the establishment of a contemporary and fair European asylum legislation framework (Peel et al., 2018). Nevertheless, one can assume about the EU's beliefs in terms of Turkey's role by pointing to what Nas (2019, p.25) has greatly demonstrated: "The EU's perception of Turkey underwent a transformation from a candidate to a partner country: the increasing instability in the wider neighborhood as most severely experienced in the case of the Syrian crisis. This transformation presented the EU with another dilemma: how to persuade Turkey to continue contributing to EU security and act as a

bulwark against potential threats in the neighborhood without a realistic prospect of accession to the Union in the near future”.

2.3 The Framework of the EU-Turkey bilateral agreements

2.3.1 An assessment of the EU-Turkey bilateral agreements

Interestingly, one can argue that the EU-Turkey Deal is subject to a wide range of political compromises. For example, according to Adam’s analysis (2017) EU policy-makers are presented unable to ensure applicability of sharing responsibility conception since they allow Turkish policy makers to cope with the migratory inflows. This situation raises particular concerns about the viability and successfulness of the Deal. Moreover, it touches issues related to Turkey willingness in controlling the inflows and strengthening accession negotiation procedures. More important, the Deal has yielded controversial political results. While recent evidence suggests a reduction of migratory flows at a regional scale, the maintenance of protection safeguards and the performance of relevant policy mechanisms based on international legislative context remain highly questionable. The absence of a productive discussion framework accompanied by limited accession negotiations may result in unsuccessful compromises by weakening relations in the sense that diplomatic initiatives can be jeopardized and thereby undermine Turkey’s position in accession procedures (Adam, 2017).

Similarly, Muiznieks (2017) has found that the Deal has failed to offer an appropriate response, particularly, to smuggling phenomena since Syrian refugees and smugglers continue to invent new alternative pathways for reaching the EU. Bilateral negotiations for a politically viable resolution regarding Syrian conflict can help regional actors in pursuing common policy objectives. Considerations about relocation procedure within Europe are interwoven with fair and successful processing of asylum claims where asylum seekers not eligible for international protection were deported. Interestingly, the EU has to play a meaningful role by providing further technical and administrative aid particularly to Greece and Macedonia asylum authorities in order to address issues related to the increasing humanitarian crisis (Muiznieks, 2017) Adding to the abovementioned line of argument, one can assume that the Deal has been unable to respond

appropriately to the crisis for several interrelated reasons. Indeed, Weber's (2016) insight underlies the factors responsible for creating this situation. To begin with, firstly, some possibilities exist for an inefficient European domestic legislation framework that is interwoven with the spread of fundamental liberal principles. Secondly, potential fragmentation the EU's foreign policy along with weakening of international norms can be easily discernible. Thirdly, the disruption of the European enlargement strategy has been intensified by the inability of pursuing necessary democratic reforms. And fourthly, structurally incomplete burden-sharing instruments including the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) has led to inadequate intervention policies (Weber, 2016).

Furthermore, one can focus on Aragall's attempt (2019) at portraying a wide range of political outcomes flowing from the Agreement. This involves the incorporation of restrictive measures, especially, in eastern and western corridors through the establishment of viable cooperation on issues intimately related to externalizing border management policies regarding Turkey. The primary purpose of such practices suggests the encouragement of a set of restrictive policies to thwart free and easy access to Europe. Under these conditions, policy makers tend to demonstrate reluctance to acknowledge potential unsuccessful policy interventions that some transit states have pursued in safeguarding fundamental human rights principles. In this framework, Hassib and Nounou (2016) suggest in his analysis that the failure of the agreement to meet long-term and sustainability criteria results from policy-makers' reluctance to promote the logic of mutual benefit and interdependence by strengthening burden sharing practices. As such, attempts for the reformulation of migration resettlement system are essential for the maintenance of the logic of fairness (Hassib and Nounou, 2016).

Interestingly, from a legal point of view, Gadd and others (2020) argue that although the Deal can be viewed politically efficient, legal inconsistencies related to international law are discernible. For instance, Greek asylum authorities are responsible for inhumane living conditions flowing from administrative and organizational flaws in its asylum system that prevent policy makers from effectively address migration issue (Gadd et al., 2020). Within this framework, Rygiel (2016) correctly observes that the content of the Deal raises concerns about the condition of "one to one initiative", implying that EU policy-makers tend to demonstrate their reluctance in appreciating the refugee issue along with legal compromises flowing from it at the international scale. In terms of Turkey's approach, the establishment of temporary protection regime in response

to large migratory inflows can threaten protection arrangements in security realm, offer limited access to employability opportunities and disrupt proper living conditions, leading to increasing poverty and human exploitation. Under such conditions, an asylum policy framework prevents Syrian asylum seekers from having access to adequate legal aid that would ensure their basic human rights (Rygiel, 2016).

In an attempt to assess the Deal from a legal perspective, one should take account the degree of member states' commitment to exercise a more active role in sharing the logic of "burden" by upholding relevant obligations that have to be fulfilled. For instance, Dimitriadi (2016) observes that free and fair access to asylum protection framework that is boosted by sufficient safeguarding standards constitute central features to this enterprise. Alpes and others (2017) go on by suggesting that the Statement is unlikely to serve as a politically viable response despite the fact that policy makers are undertaking efforts for maintaining its proper functioning by interacting under intense political pressure. Policy efforts on the part of EU should be focused on the improvement of relevant policies in relation to sharing responsibilities considerations through the strengthening of fairness related aspects and the maintenance of legal obligation and compromises. In addition, one would expect that the agreement has led to serious implication in terms of the infringement of international law for a number of reasons (Alpes et al., 2017). In this context, Poon's enlightening analysis (2016) argues that, firstly, for the EU Turkey is presumed a "safe third country," which means that asylum seekers are entitled to submit claims for international protection. Secondly, while Turkey is not an EU member, EU's rules and regulations are not applicable to the Turkey's asylum system and thereby protection mechanisms operated under EU actors appear to be inconsistent with the asylum policy framework of Turkey. And thirdly, Turkey has a poor track record in providing fair and adequate access to asylum system processes with unsound legislative instruments needed further improvement for the protection and respect of basic human rights. Moreover, preservation of fundamental liberal values that constitute key elements to the maintenance of political stability and social fabric is of vital importance (Poon, 2016).

Basically, the element of political criticism about certain legal claims of the Deal is interrelated with the possibility of abuse of human rights as a result of the push-back practices particularly against Syrian refugees. For example, Okyay and Cristiani (2016) in their analysis give powerful voice to such an interplay that affirms the problematical nature of the relationship,

especially, in conditions under which the EU policy makers adopt the “safe country of origin” conception by carrying out deportation practices and sending back Syrian refugees to transit states. Even more fundamentally, the most surprising aspect of the Deal suggests that the existence of bargaining procedures reflects Turkey’s critical geostrategic position next to the Syria and is characterized as “gatekeeper”. To consider Turkey’s capabilities in reversing critical power balances by exercising a decisive role as gatekeeper vis-a-vis the idea of divided Europe, is to take account of structural implications, flowing from the productive engagement with the EU which is associated with emergence of regional and peripheral relations structures (Okay and Cristiani 2016).

Ultimately, Liempt and others (2017) provide an analysis by looking at useful examples which indicate that the agreement lacks coherence in practical terms. To begin with, firstly, fast-tracking asylum procedures tend to be aligned with particular preventive measures designed to deal with the crisis in general. The potential replacement of quality assessment mechanisms with the exceptional policies that take care of safe and free access to asylum procedures is not feasible as it can put at risk the idea of fairness related to fast-tracking asylum procedures. Secondly, nationality discriminations are identified in processing of asylum claims through the operation of policy mechanisms. Asylum seekers having low and high recognition rates are largely affected by policy mechanisms which facilitate the use of discriminatory practices. Under such conditions, individuals are in detention with limited information provision and absence of legal aid that disrupt their asylum claims for international protection. Seen in this light, discriminatory practices suggest the prioritization of returns and are linked to potential breaching of fundamental because it raises obstacle related to the right to request asylum within the EU. Thirdly, thinking about Turkey as far as the agreement is concerned, the idea of "safe third country" is connected with the possible undermining of European liberal and democratic values resulting from Turkey’s reluctance for intervention to ensure fundamental human rights. In other words, the EU’s stance is considered problematical because the refugee issue and the following violation of human rights have received little attention (Liempt et al., 2017).

2.3.2 An evaluation of key bilateral agreements from a human rights perspective

The Agreement entails the continuation of externalization aspect regarding the EU's border protection practices. For example, Ustubici (2017) argues that Turkey's candidacy status in conjunction with its intention to apply key elements of EU legislative framework can serve as powerful driving force for enhancing cooperation efforts. However, asylum seekers in EU borders are faced with phenomena of brutality that can result in human rights violation especially in situations under which border management mechanisms are subject to strict monitoring and control (Ustubici, 2017). In this framework, the content of Readmission Agreement (RA) reflects a meaningful shift in terms of the EU policy stance towards Turkey within the context of discussion and negotiations procedures. Indeed, Yavuz (2019) in his analysis argues that under these conditions, this is the product of the EU's approach to combat irregular migrants who should be deported back to their countries of origin. It, also, subjects to the peculiar elements that determine the multifaceted EU-Turkey partnership. Such characteristic features associated with accession discussion suggest that the adoption of Readmission Agreement can serve as a meaningful instrument of EU membership, allowing the EU to pursue an alternative approach on negotiation procedures by affecting the nature and the scope of the Agreement overall (Yavuz, 2019).

However, Kappers (2017) in his seminal work argues that potential policy shifts can only be performed by meaningful policy makers, pursuing policies that exercise a decisive impact on administrative procedures through the support of coalitions based on ACF (Advocacy Coalition Framework) theory. Furthermore, power structures are central to the production of policymaking processes. In this light, the agreement can be viewed as a meaningful instrument where the role of EU member states can be critical through encouraging close relations with Turkey. Deployment of institutional progress and political clout can be helpful in optimizing policy preferences and political objectives in the context of discussion procedures. Power politics arrangements can precipitate policy making procedures and thereby transform the EU into a powerful economic and political actor (Kappers, 2017). Interestingly, by adding to this line of argument, however, from a different point of view, Kaplan's analysis (2018) demonstrates that to consider the readmission agreement, one might assume that EU policy-makers respond inappropriately when dealing with human rights principles. At the same time, the Turkish government seeks to adopt a full membership related approach, however, such an attempt requires the implementation of long-term, multifaceted and non-hierarchical institutional policy interventions by the EU (Kaplan, 2018).

It is commonplace to argue that the Deal permits the deployment of the refoulement principle in conditions under which Turkey can be characterized as “safe-third country”. Indicative to such a point is the analysis of Cancilic (2021) which provides an account by suggesting that potential infringement of non-refoulement principle is a violation of article 3 of European Convention on Human Rights pertaining to the prevention of physical torture. Turkey’s continued adherence to “safe third country” considerations necessitate the legal re-examination of guarantees that suggests proper protection in line with international human rights law while ensuring preventive measures aimed at elimination of brutal and humiliating practices. The Statement, thus, came to be seen as having temporary and short-term character which can serve as a means of combating undocumented migration and not as a concerted policy response that involves adequate and efficient actions to contribute to devising solutions on issues related to the economic stability, social cohesion and legal coherence (Cancilic, 2021). For example, Women’s Refugee Commission’s analysis (2016) shows that exposure to gender-based violence is further escalated by the absence of proper protection and safeguarding mechanisms, whereas asylum procedure instruments have been poorly designed and as a result lead to family separation phenomena with extension of legal aid provision. Under such conditions, the EU is essential to consider a reevaluation of its key humanitarian assumptions that would enable proper protection while ensure functioning of safety rules (Women’s Refugee Commission, 2016). More important, in the same vein, Karakoulaki and others (2018) underscore that the nature of the Deal echoes potential violations of non-refoulement principle and return of asylum seekers and refugees back to Turkey which lacks effective and fair asylum system procedures. This also sets impediments to appropriate processing of asylum claims that need to be overcome. Moreover, its asylum processing system has failed to undertake procedural safeguarding measures which can lead to fragmentation of human rights standards. Hence, it is clear that Turkey is not considered "safe third country" and thereby this can raise serious implications as EU policy makers might address effectiveness and fairness issues in coping with migrants (Karakoulaki et al., 2018).

With reference to bilateral interactions, one can assume that potential reconstruction of the Statement goes hand in hand with the reformulation of the asylum system. Adding to this line of thought, Tsakonas (2021) emphasizes on the fact that under such conditions, the possibility of response to the structural deficits is linked to Turkey's primary policy objectives related to practices of migrants’ exploitation. Moreover, policy makers can pursue an integration-oriented

policy framework in dealing with Syrian refugees that would enable adequate access to protection safeguards for asylum seekers located in Turkey as long as they have the ability to take advantage of a wide range of economic and labor opportunities and prospects (Tsakonias, 2021). In this context, according to Hofmann's analysis (2016) the solidarity concept is central to political intentions and policy objectives in efforts to tackle particular institutional weaknesses of European asylum system. However, it raises concerns about how such an idea can be functional and presumed as a pragmatic alternative solution. Hence, the Statement lacks coherence and cannot be considered as a primary alternative approach against the crisis, despite the fact that elements of inclusiveness and restriction related policy approaches have been employed as a response to the crisis (Hofmann, 2016). However, as Ianni and others (2021, p. 48) have written in a recent work, "Although there are discontents, criticisms and challenges about the Statement, some argues that this agreement becomes "a blueprint for Europe's strategy of externalizing migration management to its neighbors" and "a strategic partnership based on mutual interest and interdependence resulting in normative and material concessions as opposed to Turkey's progress in meeting membership criteria".

With reference to gradual reduction in relation to number of inflows, the Deal has brought about important transactional trends, proclaiming a constructive strategic partnership that could largely affect the structures of interplay. Therefore, one can assume that Madatali's argument (2021) is accurate as relevant developments point to the promotion of fundamental principles and construction of ideological orientations that correspond with EU's traditional cultural perceptions. Moreover, they might precipitate the emergence of an imbalanced structure and thereby render EU policy-making bodies more heavily dependent on border management mechanisms of Turkey. The EU membership procedure and matters surrounding the rule of law and fundamental rights considerations have disrupted EU's efforts in the pursuit of strengthening the custom union. Yet there is much skepticism from the EU about how decision-making process must be implemented over Turkey's accession procedure as EU policy makers remain doubtful about the actual political objectives of Turkey and potential undermining of relations that emanate from refugee-related concerns and regional security uncertainties (Madatali, 2021). In other words, one would expect what Jennequin (2020, p. 19) has precisely argued: "To conclude: as the 2015-2016 EU-Turkey migration agreement exemplifies European weaknesses on migration issues, and as it materializes as a concrete exposure of the EU to further uses of Coercive Engineered Migration, strong stances

must be adopted. A constructive solution to the weaponization of refugee should, by no means, be rooted in far-right fantasies and populist fairy tales. The appropriate answer is to be conditioned by a significant reversal of the apprehension of migration”.

2.4 Human rights consideration in the context of asylum policies agenda

Interestingly, Badalic (2019) in his analysis focuses on The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and UN General Assembly Resolutions along with the UN General Assembly 1948 about the centrality of fundamental rights for asylum seekers. While Turkey has demonstrated its strong commitment to pursuing inclusion migration policies through maintaining open borders for Syrian migrants, in fact, the development of anti-refugee practices involving the implementation of stricter border controls in conjunction with prevailing inhuman detention and illegal deportation practices set barriers to administrative procedures by disrupting the free access to fair and safe asylum procedures (Badalic, 2019). In this context, indeed, one can argue that the words of Woolard (2018) are more than accurate: “Overall respect for human rights is undermined through questioning the universality of human rights. Human rights are universal; they are not just for particular groups – for ‘us’ but not for ‘them,’ for the ‘deserving’ but not for the ‘undeserving.’ A threat to the rights of some is a threat to the rights of all because anyone could one day find themselves in the ‘undeserving’ group”.

Phenomena of human rights infringements are observed in the migration realm in parallel with the absence of effective accountability mechanisms that could address such practices against asylum seekers. For example, Costello and Mann (2020) provide an interesting analysis according to which the development of successful regulatory instruments framed by the functioning of a consistent legislative framework could largely contribute to the improvement of such conditions. Such need for more forceful actions would include the engagement of management control tools in the context of international legislation, however, the insufficient scope of international refugee legislation with the deployment of widespread externalizing control tools have yielded negative outcomes while progress has been limited (Costello and Mann, 2020). Interestingly, the work of

Kapartziani and Panathanasiou (2016) is adding to the abovementioned argument by suggesting that EU asylum policy framework might put at risk democratic values while undermine international legislation by downplaying human rights principles. Political efforts lacking efficiency, blame games phenomena, and potential legitimacy crisis in relation to institutionally weak mechanisms can endanger political stability by undermining the effectiveness of the enterprise, even though the EU seeks to promote the reformulation of relevant asylum policies. Moreover, cultural, ethnic or religious tolerance is institutionally ensured and aligned with policy preferences expressed by the EU including multifaceted integration dynamics that take advantage of refugees' potential in contributing to a variety of economic functions (Kapartziani and Panathanasiou, 2016).

Moreover, some possibilities exist for the breach of fundamental human rights that derive largely from flawed design of the Statement. In particular, Alpes and others (2017) highlight the potential erosion of ethical principles and human right norms are connected with the poor performance of asylum procedures where asylum seekers are subject to inhumane deportations practices and the absence of any provision for an alternative option available. Deportation practices that are politically prioritized might raise institutional barriers, negatively affecting the quality and successfulness of administrative functions in general (Alpes et al., 2017). Equally, Duarte (2020) in his recent analysis suggests that, from a legal perspective, potential infringement in relation to international legislative framework denotes that key elements of both Refugee Convention and 1967 Protocol are undermined. The Convention rests upon three core principles such as non-discrimination, non-penalization, and non-refoulement. The principle of non-penalization tends to spur host countries to disregard criminal offences or apply detention measures arbitrarily to applicants seeking international protection. Moreover, the non-refoulement principle is downplayed and not applied by Turkish actors that are prone to return back or follow push back practices. For example, phenomena of violation are discernible in the Greek asylum system where asylum seekers are sent back to Turkey. The characterization of Turkey, therefore, as safe country is increasingly challenged because of clear manifestations of human rights violations in Syrian borders with reports of multiple deaths of children highlighted by the Syria Observatory of Human Rights.

The existence of flaws in the implementation of legislative framework pertaining to human rights embraced in Amnesty and Human Rights Watch reflects indiscriminate violation of the

principle of non-refoulement occurred through forced deportation of Syrian refugees. For instance, Tunaboylou and Alpes (2017) emphasize that Turkey is subject to the logic of legal accountability for dealing with asylum seekers who pursue international protection particularly in Greece. For instance, such a situation involves asylum seekers who lack the ability to submit asylum claims for international protection or are rejected in the first or second instance throughout asylum procedures. Moreover, a return back to the country of origin constitutes an optional choice as the possibility of a rejection of the asylum claim indicates that Turkey is considered “first country of asylum or “safe third country” (Tunaboylou and Alpes, 2017). More important, in this context, Adam’s analysis (2014) has gone a step further by arguing that the EU should demonstrate its commitment to ensuring fundamental human rights norms which are embedded in 1951 Refugee Convention by facilitating the identification of possible human rights infringement by Turkish government. In this light, state actors are responsible for boosting its asylum system operations through creating favorable conditions under which justice instruments and norms pertaining to the rule of law can function properly within the relevant legislation framework. Moreover, among the central elements of EU’s policy-making objectives should be the encouragement of the Turkish government towards the lifting of particular geographical restrictions that are compatible with the 1951 Refugees Convention so that Syrian asylum seekers can be able to receive refugee status (Adam, 2014).

In a similar vein, Schoenhuber (2018) observes that EU actors tend to downplay Turkey’s reluctancy to implement the principle of non-refoulement and thereby disregarding undemocratic practices followed by Turkey. Fundamental human rights principles including the right to freedom, democracy, equality, and the rule of law are downplayed. Therefore, this raises serious concerns in relation to EU’s ability to ensure that institutional structure operate appropriately and whether it is competent to apply the relevant legislation framework defined by its economic capabilities and ethical obligations. The EU relies upon its self-preservation considerations for the justification of any unsuccessful attempts in complying with obligations and compromises on accountability in terms of providing protection framework and avoid rejection of asylum claims (Schoenhuber, 2018). Indeed, as Shamatava (2020) has concisely put it: “The most urgent need of refugees is to secure entry into a territory in which they are sheltered from the risk of being persecuted”. Therefore, principle of non-refoulement, which covers admission and non-rejection of the asylum seekers at the border of a state constitutes cornerstone of the international refugee law”.

Consequently, the maintenance of political order to ensure stability and preserve acts of reconciliation constitute critical steps in addressing the inherent roots of the humanitarian crisis. In this context, Csicsmann (2016) correctly argues that particular focus should be placed on dealing with the deteriorating situation in the neighboring states. In this respect, Turkey as a host and transit state can exercise a decisive role in a multiplicity of ways. However, the current legal framework with the absence of productive and quality outcomes has failed to address the complexity of the situation. Although, the agreement seems to be a crucial step in the right direction, there is a possibility that the strategy could not deliver its policy objectives as policy makers downplay the need for further steps towards a more consistent, holistic and well-designed approach. For example, from a practical perspective, Turkey is responsible for the accommodation of asylum seekers from Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan and has hosted approximately 2,6 million Syrians in 2016. Interestingly, its strategic orientation remains in stark contrast to its foreign policy doctrine of “zero problems with neighbors” and the adoption of an approach of an open-door policy through the provision of “temporary protection” status (Csicsmann, 2016).

2.5 The cooperation framework of the EU-Turkey bilateral relations

2.3.2 The refuge crisis and the core of the EU-Turkey relations

It is commonplace for one to assume that the refugee problem could add to the richness of the understanding about the interaction dimension as it clearly delimits the scope of issue and thereby rendering it more intellectually manageable. In this light, Haferlach and others' insight (2017) focusing on the interconnection of the refugee crisis management and the discourse of EU-Turkey relations in the sense that the EU should resort to the use of widespread information resources by analyzing meaningful data about Turkey's foreign policy objectives that would facilitate the development of consistent policy approaches in response, for example, to frozen accession negotiations (Haferlach et al., 2017). Moreover, the need for coordinated and forceful actions should rest upon political realism assumptions where orientations about structural consistency should be aligned with productive cooperation patterns both at a domestic and international scale. For example, Kaya (2021) argues that the EU-Turkey relationship can be easily

understood as an illustration of the rise of migration policy tensions in Turkey's refugee strategies that correspond with the proliferation of Europeanisation and de-Europeanisation dynamics. Simultaneously, there are disruptions in Europeanization process in terms of responding to Turkey's migration problem by taking into account Syrian migration problematical and bilateral interaction considerations. Based on this, one can assume, for example, that only the construction of shared interests, without taking into account the absence of common values flowing from an overlapping approach, can play a significant role in meaningful ways (Kaya, 2021).

Furthermore, focusing on the policy connectedness between the effects of the crisis and the profound implications that the latter brought about regarding the determination of the relationship Kale's analysis (2016) is enlightening in this respect. He particularly argues that both the nature and inherent characteristics of the crisis are largely conditioned by legal and political dimensions of bilateral relations, reflecting policy-related complexities and strategically controversial approaches and orientations. More important, from a technical perspective, the intensity of the problem requires the development of innovative and pragmatic cooperation dynamics accompanied by policy steps which are harmonized with the core tenets of the Action Plan formed during German Chancellor Angela Merkel's visit in Turkey in 2015. Interestingly, the Action Plan has attracted much political criticism and legal scrutiny as it is characterized as goal-oriented while any effective implementation is likely to contribute to the reformulation of a promising and well-structured bilateral partnership (Kale, 2016).

As far as the nature of the relationship between the EU and Turkey is concerned, this perspective has been summed up very well by Saatcioglu (2019), who has argued convincingly that the 2015 refugee crisis serves as a game changer in the symbiotic EU-Turkey relationship. It is marked by the logic of diversification framed by the idea of functionalism which continues to determine relations. Basically, on this basis shared interests and political preferences tend to be formed by the functioning of intense interconnectedness. Nevertheless, persisting functionalism is incompatible with positions about future EDI (external differentiated integration). While this situation can produce positive outcomes in terms of building a viable partnership since Turkey's ability to deliver membership obligations is clear, it constitutes a difficult task because of the emergence of political and institutional barriers in relation to Turkey's flawed politicization capabilities (Saatcioglu, 2019). Similarly, Ela and Aras's contribution (2019) goes on by raising, also, the logic of the game-changer, however, focusing on different conditions under which Turkey

tends to resort to the logic of instrumentalization of the refugee crisis that can serve as a means in pursuing integration-related objectives in relevant policy sectors including the domain of migration as well (Ela and Aras, 2019).

Of course, approaching the vital role of the complex interplay between the parties, one has to weight the centrality of refugee-related matters that are placed at the core of bilateral negotiations agenda and are associated with the maintenance of shared social, political and economic structures. For example, Aksel and Icduygu (2014) argues about this line of thought by suggesting that the negotiation framework has decisively impacted the improvement of Turkish bureaucratic sector with the adoption of a consistent migration policy approach by policy makers. Although the nature of the relationship can be viewed as problematical and complicated given, for instance, the candidacy issue, policy actions that are concerned, for example, with readmission and visa negotiations procedures are likely to remain at the top of the agenda for the years to come. Seen in this light, such a deep Turkey's unwillingness to facilitate visa-related procedures for its citizens and promote issues related to readmission of third country nationals can play a key role in determining the degree of progress of the whole procedure generally (Aksel and Icduygu, 2014). Indeed, as Cetin and others (2017) have correctly put it: "While refugee issue has brought the sides closer, the crisis should not be made a part of the unstable negotiation process anymore, since many of precious refugee lives are put in danger for the sake of national interests and daily politics. This should rather be perceived from a broader humanitarian perspective and be considered as a long-term problem that needs to be solved with the greater motivation and cooperation of both sides".

Nevertheless, the primary concern of security policy framework derives from what Dincer and Kutlay (2013) have called the logic of the economic self-interest which drives member states to rely on the logic of cooperation. In this context, interaction with authoritative governments is likely to conflate with intentions to combat illegal migration channels that undermine social coherence, political stability and economic prosperity. But to construe the complex nature of bilateral cooperation as a matter that is compounded by the absence of politically consistent and institutionally flexible EU actors is to put at risk stability and productivity of Turkey's political and economic structures. In this light, therefore, accounts of one-sided rhetoric associated with exclusion considerations have to retain a balanced approach that can be useful for the promotion of negotiation framework in the pursuit of prolonging the formulation of mutual *détente* policies

(Kutlay, 2013). In contrast, Kaplan's work (2018) demonstrates that regardless of particular economic determinants that have contributed to the escalation of migration, one can assume that this can serve as conflictual factor. This, in turn, can produce forms which can lead to instability by raising systemic constraints to the homogenization and institutionalization foundations of the relationship. Consequently, with the absence of political stability that can serve as key element with a decisive role to play in an unpredictable and challenging policy environment, it is unlikely that a comprehensive vision of mutual interconnectedness will flourish (Kaplan, 2018). Therefore, in this context, Kilic and Bayram (2021, p. 15) have summarized the significant role of fostering direct bilateral relations by arguing that: "Further enhancing EU-Turkey cooperation on migration matters, through a structured migration partnership, is a win-win recipe. Such a partnership, among others, should aim to develop a concerted regional migration agenda, embracing a whole-of-route approach and secure effective cooperation with countries of origin".

2.3.2 The challenges of the EU-Turkey relations in response to the crisis

The nature of bilateral relationship is built upon security-related and mutual self-interests foundations. For example, in their analysis Hassib and Nounou (2016) rightly argue that the EU's securitization strategy is interwoven with the paradox dilemma between notions of security and human rights considerations in which Schengen area might affect social cohesion which can largely be explained on economic burden related grounds. However, on the other side of the coin, Turkey's strategic vision reflects primary policy objectives to maintain its status as a key influential actor, however, it demonstrates its reluctance to take account of the significance of legal mechanisms in the pursuit of the construction of integration dynamics. This situation can lead to inhumane living conditions, persisting poverty, legally problematical conditions for Syrians refugees, lack of institutional capabilities and limited educational standards (Hassib and Nounou, 2016). In this context, it would be important to note the analysis of Pierini and Uglen (2014). They, basically, argue that direct bilateral engagement in the migration domain can be mutually beneficial for the actors involved, leading to further organizational improvement of the EU's policy framework. In this light, a unique opportunity arises in which both parties should take advantage of contemporary policy practices that can be deployed on a regional basis. The EU's neighboring

strategic intentions are consistent with the control of institutional policy commitments that go beyond membership rhetoric. These meaningful shifts can make a contribution to stimulating a pragmatic structural relationship underpinned by the promotion of a shared agenda that encourages an anti-trust discourse which is delinked with local affairs institutional constraints.

Hence, to quote Dincer and Kutlay (2013), “If the EU continues to treat Turkey as simply a “crisis to be managed” and sticks to a short-term vision in the way it views this country, the EU will have missed an important opportunity and may remain a side-line spectator in the Middle East. But if Turkey insists on playing a solo-game, it may come across the expectations-capabilities gap that disappoints domestic audiences as well as the peoples of the region”. In this context, the analysis of Ela and Aras (2019) has undertaken largely from the perspective of the nature of bilateral relations conducted on the basis of the theoretical conceptions of “Europeanization” and “externalization”. In this light, EU strategic policy frameworks in different domains are likely to have a decisive impact on the construction of policy ideologies of third states such as Turkey. Progress in bilateral cooperation remains limited and cultivation of ties lacks successful patterns of interaction. Nevertheless, policies that promote collaboration would continue to be the locus in foreign relation agenda and serve as a key driver for the resolution of issues in different domains including the migration realm (Ela and Aras, 2019).

However, it can be argued that commentators on migration including, for example, Ott (2017) have observed that the complicated partnership between the EU and Turkey suffers by inherent complexities that can trigger political uncertainty in terms of undermining bilateral interactions that rest upon the elements of imbalance of power, political preferences and policy objectives. Simultaneously, the migration realm can be easily described as evolving, raising multiple challenges that can contribute to the introduction of contemporary policy related elements such as the affiliation agenda and new trends in accession procedure. Nevertheless, the primary concern is whether bilateral collaboration can be regarded as a critical turning point in the EU-Turkey relationship. Seen in this light, relations are still stuck in the "hedgehog's dilemma," in the sense that parties feel politically uncomfortable with one other. However, it should be noted that they both seek to maintain a powerful relationship by fostering truthful bonds that would be helpful in dealing with the emergence of future social, economic and geopolitical challenges (Ott, 2017).

Interestingly, in a similar vein, Thym’s work (2016) identifies a wide range of practical difficulties and technical constraints arise from bilateral negotiations that must be addressed to

ensure effective implementation of the European project. European normative status might come into contradiction with other international realist players including, for example, the US and Russia. Such a concept of idealism may cover a wide range of EU's fundamental goals. However, this does not mean, in theory, that the main challenge for the EU has to do with its self-image considerations. Such an issue continues to have a dominant role in the negotiation process between the EU and a regime that is called oppressive. Return of Syrians back to Turkey is a clear indication of the EU's willingness to ensure protection of human rights by maintaining a close and direct collaboration with regional and local actors and remain committed to the pursuit of its political aims that are related to the logic of legitimacy (Thym, 2016). In other words, one can highlight the relevance of Tsakonas's analysis (2021), of a leading analyst in the field who has clearly argued that the EU-Turkey symbiotic relationship will become prevalent in the future especially in the security context. While the emergence of normative complexities related to Turkey's behavior is discernible, the establishment of strategic plan is designed on the basis of a balanced rapprochement to ensure that Turkey is committed to European and transatlantic paths. This is likely to hinge upon international legislation to enhance interaction based on coordinated unneighborly engagement (Tsakonas, 2021).

It is noteworthy that in approaching the emergence of a wide range of ethical concerns and practical predicaments, one can has to weight whether cooperation can be understood as sustainable for the future through the establishment of a durable framework as a long-term response against the crisis. In this light, for instance, Ustubici (2017) argues that both sides have to put more effort into an efficient implementation of operational procedures to defend gross violations of human rights standards and norms. Also, one has to ensure that the direct presence of dignified living conditions is strong enough to enhance the fair processing of asylum claims from a legal perspective (Ustubici, 2017). Therefore, in that sense, Icduygu (2011) observes that insufficient collaboration raises constraints to the context of negotiation procedures, disrupting efforts in addressing appropriately the migration crisis. However, the use of crucial diplomatic means including discussions and negotiations frameworks that hinge on productive channels of communication define appropriate set of rules and norms for stimulating direct engagement to attain sustainable policy outcomes. Therefore, active and powerful accession negotiations can serve as a meaningful means in overcoming organizational and administrative barriers arise in this context (Icduygu, 2011).

Within such a framework, one can assume that Elmas's analysis (2021) constitutes an enlightening example in terms of this problematic, which clearly resists the essence of EU-Turkey cooperation in terms of an evaluation based upon a set of particular values. In contrast, it tends to rely on short-term shared national interests and in the sense that the establishment of an agreement would reflect more an idea of de-Europeanization than the emergence of Europeanization considerations. Consequently, such a situation qualifies subsequent effects related to the capacity of enlargement strategy aimed at the transformation of candidate states and thereby exercising an impact on regional stability. Even though the agreement becomes a key institutional instrument, for example, in the Balkan region, one can assume that the maintenance of regional stability goes hand in hand with the successful management of the migration issue (Elmas, 2021). Indeed, Nas (2019), for example, observes that the Istanbul Summit in October 2018 including Turkey, Russia, Germany and France pursued the implementation of long-term resolutions as effective response to cope with the tensions. For instance, the introduction of a functional settlement that would aim at the rebuilding of Syria suggests particular presuppositions including a certain degree of cooperation with ongoing efforts to dealing with Turkey's accession and the interaction framework of the general reversion.

Nevertheless, the core line of the argument of this analysis rests, above all, upon the acceptance of Yabanc' logic (2016) that refers to the logic of relationship progress where among key drivers are claims of relevancy, degree of effectiveness and methods of applicability. Interestingly, interaction of mutual policy objectives becomes a challenging task with border patrolling and readmission instruments that are riven with practical difficulties noticeable in Commission reports. For example, the issue of visa liberalization is crucial for Turkey especially when it comes to the delivery of political obligations and promises aimed at enhancing cooperation dynamics of the agencies involved in the procedures. However, productive and quality political movements can be seen as prerequisite for the attainment of a practical and workable deal. From this perspective, for instance, Germany demonstrated its strong commitment to dealing with the humanitarian crisis and towards this goal it attaches considerable weight to the creation of a consistent and results-driven interaction. More important, among EU's strategic priorities is the preservation of powerful political, diplomatic and economic ties without disregarding the important perspective of Turkey's candidacy. This might have serious implications for foreign

relations and raises the possibility of unsettling the influence the EU might exercise upon Turkey (Yabanc, 2016).

Equally, for the purposes of our argument, in his seminal analysis Seufert (2016) attempts to bring to the discussion the potential effects of the crisis as causal factors of instability that are fully consistent with the revitalizing of foreign relations structures and strengthening of bonds. In this respect, the provision of additional economic aid and the deployment of humanitarian resources in response to Turkey's organizational inconsistencies should be among key policy priorities of EU policy makers. Foreign affairs considerations and security-related dynamics are interlinked with attempts for further cooperation engagement. Moreover, for example, the degree of state fragmentation may play a key role in the shaping of political developments in the Middle East (Seufert, 2016). In sum, assessing the crux of bilateral relations one can use the words of Elitoc and Straubhaar (2012, page 22) who have provided a succinct summary of what the character of an appropriate long-term strategy for migration should be: "Both the European Union and Turkey should realize that, through the policies they have drafted and will draft in the future, international migration is not a problem, but "a phenomenon that requires governance" through social transformation. Both polities must further realize that this governance is only possible through "sharing problems and liabilities" related to migration and that the current approaches adopted by both parties, such as "passing the buck to the other", will not provide any solutions". As complementary, one can, also, quote Kilic and Bayram (2021, page 15) words according to which: "Rather than focusing solely on a possible revision of the 2016 EU-Turkey Statement, the cooperation framework between the EU and Turkey on managing migration in the region needs to be enhanced through a combination of ongoing and possible additional initiatives including cooperation on structural issues such as border management, combatting irregular migration and migrant smuggling, and having sustainable voluntary return/reintegration programs and a stronger asylum system, as well as on immediate or emerging challenges".

Consequently, the aforementioned literature has demonstrated that the EU-Turkey relations has been explored through a wide range of different perspectives and majority of academic scholars have adopted theoretical approaches providing explanations in terms of its structure, evolution and future progress. However, it is clear that it has failed to take into account important aspects related to serious implications that derive from the formulation of policy-making processes while disregarding the driving factor of self-interest principle that would assist them in reaching more

well-structured conclusions. Only the recognition of an approach that is securely grounded in international regime theory can correct this glaring deficiency in literature, particularly in the field of international relations theories. As a result, the study of bilateral relations as an analytical and conceptual enterprise will attempt to contribute to the existing literature through the provision of in-depth analysis in terms of the performance of policy making that conflate with the effects of international relations dimensions in response to the refugee crisis management approaches.

3. Research Methodology

The primary objective of the methodological approach applied in the present study suggests the deployment of a qualitative research pattern and, simultaneously, the application of a descriptive research design. Against this backdrop, this chapter will attempt to achieve two main goals. The first is to provide a broad outline about the role of a wide range of significant policy information and scientific data presented and analyzed throughout this study. And the second is to focus on the ideas that are extracted by the deployment of content analysis technique. In this regard, such steps incorporate the followings. Analysis of elements of primary documentation, the use of secondary information data, and content and discourse analysis from selective resources. These include electronic journals, books and online platforms, official websites of relevant national and local entities, official texts and speeches of political leaders. The reliance of the present analysis, particularly, on secondary statistical data from these resources with the use of numerous relevant core reports and documentation is directly linked to the purposes of the pursuit of a comprehensive understanding. Such attempts rely upon the critical assessment in terms of the centrality of the EU-Turkey relations in the context of the regional migration challenge. For example, the acknowledgement of the assumption that the outbreak of the Syrian crisis serves as turning in the geopolitical and migration developments regionally mirrors its decisive impact by being conceptually challenging and highly debatable as an issue under investigation.

More importantly, in this light, a wide range of research methods and designs can be applied including case-study approaches aimed at offering a comprehensive understanding of core migration policy frameworks through analyzing the role and functioning of relevant working groups, regional organizations and key actors. In this context, one should expect that the provision

of an analysis based on European and Turkish asylum policy frameworks and policy responses against the crisis tend to shape decisively relations structures and vice versa. This enterprise is attempted through the use of important resources including, also, official technical reports produced by political and non-political entities such as the UNHCR, the UNDP as well as the EU Commission.

In addition, this interesting and enlightening report evaluation in conjunction with comparison data are key components of our analysis. This reflection is structured by regional developments and the proliferation of accounts about the refugee populations, the role of financial aid as well as the level of best possible living conditions and humanitarian assistant for asylum seekers. While addressing the main research question, sub-questions while dealing with the two key hypotheses, the involvement of dual key structural parts of the study present mixed outcomes in relation to our research. To begin with, this incorporates the expansion of literature review in terms of the international refugee protection environment where the legislative framework that affect EU-Turkey relations plays a vital role. The detailed analysis is concerned with the impact and contribution of the EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement that attempts to offer a critical evaluation in relation to scholars' ideological orientations and conceptual approaches. Within this framework, qualitative discourse analysis that is based on official statements, media resources, and a wide range of different policy-related documentation demonstrates complicated and interrelated patterns of foreign policy frameworks. Therefore, the analysis of European and Turkish policy problematization trends are interrelated with behavioral patterns, cultural and ideological mindsets that are at the core of our study.

Of course, in defining the case study as a key research method, the analysis is based on the interrelated cases by fostering mutual awareness in terms of the impact of referent objects that are under investigation. The primary units of analysis involve the EU and Turkey whose actions are affected by the enormous implications of the refugee crisis and are compatible with the key purposes of the case study. In this sense, one can assume that salience of case studies in terms of analyzing foreign relations patterns are conceptually reasonable and attention-oriented and thereby being consistent with readers' experiences. The present thesis, therefore, can be seen as reflection that is structured by the motivations of analysis of the particular case studies previously discussed. Ultimately, our analysis can further be expanded by the employment of additional research methods. For instance, a doctrinal method that takes into account primary legal resources, foreign

relations cases and international legislation paradigms can be underpinned by a theoretical framework that rests upon international relations theory. It provides an analysis that rely on data collection related to human rights law and democracy discourse. Seen in this light, for example, the assessment of the EU-Turkey Agreement is bolstered by an additional methodological approach that deals with human rights conceptions, simultaneously, leaving enough room for higher degrees of transparency and clarification about our line of argument that is consistent with the logic of rightlessness when it comes to asylum seekers. Moreover, the acknowledgment of socio-legal perspectives that go beyond a wide range of issues including legal documentations and legislative decisions enables our study to effectively combat potential practical socio-political and economic constraints with negative implications for law enforcement practices. Therefore, such a research method will attempt to perpetuate the establishment of a multidisciplinary approach through examining whether international legislation is viewed in the scope of social framework and whether it is effectively operating in practical terms.

5. Results and Analysis

5.1 An assessment of the EU-Turkey Deal from a human rights perspective

The abovementioned striking features of migration and asylum policy framework constitute a highly relevant explanatory framework for providing an analysis of major sources of policy-making decisions and agreements reached (Weber, 2018). To begin with, the functioning of EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement might lead to prolonged detention of asylum seekers by being exposed to harsh living conditions and treated as irregular migrants due to the fact that Turkish asylum legislative framework is insufficient for ensuring fundamental rights of asylum seekers and refugees (Shoenhuber, 2018). Simultaneously, domestic administrative authorities present limited capacity in terms sound asylum system procedures. In addition to these situations that currently exists, several institutional constraints arise that concern the notion of the right to seek asylum. For example, it is noteworthy the fact that safeguarding the ideas of refoulement and accessibility when it comes to dignified living conditions embedded in 1951 Refugee Convention

can be of paramount importance in safeguarding fundamental human rights of asylum seekers (Ustubici, 2017).

Moreover, from a human rights perspective, UNHCR reports have identified limited capacity of consistent monitoring tools that is likely to generate serious implications regarding the quality level of accommodation, including, for example, the problem of harsh living conditions that is observed within the camps (Poon, 2016). Seen in this light, persisting weaknesses concerning, for example, the readmission process constitutes a matter of immediate concern by exposing difficulties and serious impediments the asylum seekers are likely to confront in their daily lives. Indeed, with reference to the unprecedented humanitarian crisis that is taking place, particularly, in the Greek islands, one can assume that this was the result of an inefficient Deal with limited success (Nas, 2019). Around 2016 approximately 16,000 asylum seekers and migrants experienced inhumane living conditions in hotspots and asylum centers with the emergence of extremely violent tensions among different ethnic group of asylum seekers within camps and accommodation facilities. As a result, a wide range of activist groups and humanitarian organizations attributed these developments to local extremist and far-right groups that ignited widespread tensions among local people and migrants. This has led to destabilizing phenomena that could endanger political stability and social fabric domestically (Weber, 2017). From this perspective, one can assume that a case can be made which would suggest that although the EU acknowledges that the Deal can partly bolster its humanitarian dimension when it comes to the prevention of possible deaths of asylum seekers in the sea, this might be a misconception. Available evidences clearly indicate that lacks adequacy in terms of applying necessary safeguards practices against the idea of refoulement by ensuring dignified living condition within Turkey (Poon, 2016).

More important, the EU-Turkey Statement underpins, also, the idea of readmission. This situation currently exists by clearly denoting the fact that the primary objective of the Deal remains the prioritization of national security interest through the implementation of ongoing protective measures related to the maintenance of territorial integrity (Duarte, 2020). Furthermore, the interplay of security dynamics accompanied by identities reflections are associated with the need for the suppression of far-right and extremist voices. For example, practices and mechanism that encourage the reduction of arrivals in the EU is likely to mitigate such a situation. Of course, the Deal can be viewed as backbone that pursues the enhancement of cooperative spirit, having a

humanitarian dimension that is likely to contribute to the strengthening of capabilities related to the provision of humane living condition. However, unfortunately, one should note that the Statement has failed to incorporate the logic of burden transfer. In fact, among its primary objectives is to put forward certain actions, for example, the provision of economic aid aimed at facilitating the improvement of living conditions through the expansion and development of resettlement capabilities while, at the same time add to the economic resources of Turkey (Duarte, 2020). In this context, also, the implementation of policy frameworks takes into account humanitarian considerations, reflecting radical shifts in the formulation of domestic security responsibilities. Interestingly, some analysts characterize this development in terms of attempting to ensure the creation of fruitful conditions that can be conducive to a workable and consistent Deal. In this context, one can assume that among critical preconditions are to overcome political and socio-economic barriers together with the logic of acceptance of refugee claims that is in accordance with international humanitarian legislation while avoiding practices that are connected with the logic of preventing migrants from reaching the European borders (Adam, 2014).

Nevertheless, in light of our data analysis, it feels more correct to argue that, border protection arrangements and tangible national security framework have become the core issues of concern for migration and foreign policy discourse. However, particular considerations stemming from the above tend to prevent states from pursuing an inclusive refugee policy agenda. Although a wide range of international, regional and domestic developments have taken place, one can assume that policy makers are preoccupied with the creation of institutional barriers so as to prevent refugees from reaching European borders (Duarte, 2020). In assessing such restriction-related practices, readmission agreements that are concerned with safe third country concepts have become decisive tools with particular aim to integrate asylum seekers in the region of origin. Moreover, even though policy makers are under a lot of pressure to assure that the EU-Turkey Statement appear as a successful tool against the crisis, in fact, the Statement cannot function properly from a practical perspective. Hence, one would expect that there is a need for a sustainable EU approach to address the migration problem by facilitating the change from shifting responsibilities through the logic of returns to third countries. This would increasingly encourage the logic of fairly sharing protection responsibilities among the EU member states as well as internationally (Alpes et al., 2017)

There is, however, a good reason to put emphasis particularly, upon the conception of safe third country for Turkey that is largely doubted in the sense that in terms of the idea of non-refoulement Turkish actors are rejecting Syrian asylum seekers, providing only short-term, temporary international protection. Although there are assumptions and theoretical orientations within the EU that affirm the adherence of Turkey to the concept of safe third country, returns of refugee suggests the legitimization of procedures in practical terms where Turkey seeks to pursue a viable safeguarding legislative framework. In this context, of most immediate concern is, thus, the possibility of profound effects the refugee Deal might brought about related to the conditions under which asylum seekers can enjoy free and fair access to asylum procedures in general. As a result, the aforementioned concerns and the corresponding doubts about the role of Turkey raise the fundamental issue of whether regional policy makers involved are likely to ensure the safeguarding of fundamental human rights of refugees and asylum seekers while respect their ultimate right to request international protection (Duarte, 2020).

In this context, although loss of citizenship status for refugees can be visible, unfortunately, they are not able to be granted with citizenship or refugee status from any other country. Moreover, some evaluation exists according to which the institutional responsibility and legal obligations that countries perform emanate from the prohibition of the principle of non-refoulement in the international and human rights legislation framework. In this light, one has to take account burden-shifting efforts that come into contradiction with the right to seek asylum and the essence of the 1951 Refugee Convention. Noteworthy in this respect is the requirement that states are obliged to ensure an effective protection framework for securing fundamental rights of refugees. Such a movement not only incorporates the characteristic element of protection against *refoulement* but also takes account the logic of important provisions in relation to humane living standards of refugees. Nevertheless, the idea of the principle of non-refoulement is a huge and complex one, and we have no room to offer further analysis here (Karakoulaki et al., 2018).

5.2 The role of Turkey within the context of EU-Turkey relations

One of the assumptions in our analysis is that the formulation of viable solutions tends to be compatible with the underlying issue of Turkey's accession process that is still in play where

EU-Turkey relations become further complicated and unclarified within the context of the crisis (Adam, 2014). Therefore, the focus on the crucial interplay has meant radical changes in identity structures and major shifts in relation to behavioral patterns of the actors regarding the dominant relationship forms. Of course, these features of the problem will be addressed in more details below (Peel et al., 2018).

It should be further pointed out that our data findings, which is a key part of this study, reveal that there is fragmentation of protection standards of refugees after Turkey has accepted increasing asylum seeker protection responsibility (Adam, 2014). In this respect, accessibility to fundamental living standards, reception and accommodation conditions and integration facilities have become problematical as Turkey is conceived as structurally weak as far as migration policies are concerned, with limited material, human and institutional capacity (Erder, 2021). Furthermore, such obstacles are compounded by insufficient economic resources which make the situation even more difficult to handle through dealing effectively with these issues. Although Syrian refugees have spent several years in Turkey, they are not able to receive refugee citizenship status and they are undertaking efforts to cope with access to fundamental socio-economic rights, such as accommodation, education, health services and labor market (Peel et al., 2018). Here, it might be argued that the Agreement turns a blind eye to a form of invisible violence against refugees and asylum seekers who enter Turkey. This means that despite the fact that they have a right to seek asylum and enjoy accessibility to dignified living conditions that are in line with the international human rights legislation, unfortunately, they are still not able to safeguard their fundamental rights. In fact, this situation exists because of Turkey's impositions in terms of geographical limitations and the existence of deficiencies in economic and structural adjustment mechanisms (Adam, 2014).

Indeed, one can assume that an effective EU-Turkey cooperation is associated with the provision of humanitarian assistance that would enable the achievement of long-term solutions. In this light, one would expect that securing a close cooperation is likely to promote mutual trust and strengthen initiatives for reformulating Turkish foreign policy approaches (Demirsu & Bac). Thus, one can take into account that fact that the asymmetrical character of the EU-Turkey relations is largely conditioned by the centrality of national politics discourse (Pierini, 2019). However, it would be wrong to assume that the establishment of such a highly ambitious cooperation plan that seeks, for example, to cope appropriately with the emerging solidarity crisis unfolded among

member states is delinked to concerted efforts whose primary objective is the assistance with the elimination of further arrivals so as to support Greek actors with the successful processing of massive numbers of asylum claims (Adam, 2014).

Nevertheless, one can assume that the effects of bilateral diplomatic engagement in conjunction with the evolution of regional relations between both sides remain questionable and to some extent have systematically deteriorated. This has led gradually to the creation of an unsecure environment that is incapable of providing pragmatic solutions to refugee-related issues. At the same time, internal political stability is also vulnerable to challenges from within (Ott, 2017). However, here it is also worth noting that the outbreak of the crisis increasingly signifies the adoption of a wide range of key policy shifts that are in line with significant alterations in rethinking of the existing cooperation perceptions. This would lead to the implementation of effective practices in response to the management of massive inflows and thereby contributing to the increase of safeguarding human rights. As such, it is commonplace to regard that the successful handling of the refugee crisis presupposes the establishment of an efficient and productive cooperative framework between Turkey and the EU (Karakoulaki et al., 2018). Moreover, it is broadly accepted that bilateral interaction patterns have been highly debatable as a result of devastating effects of emerging dynamics of conflicting interests about the evolution of their relationship (Bal, 2016). As such, it is worth looking at the way relevant policy frameworks are pursued in attempts to overcome persisting negotiation complexities and procedural and administrative barriers that continue to thwart prospects for regional solutions to regional crisis management problems. Relevant developments such as the impact of policy-making will be illustrated and there is possibility that it will be disrupted by the influence of practical and legal factors along with the emergence of impediments posed by Turkish and European actors that would endanger the maintenance of fundamental human rights (Ott, 2017).

In a nutshell, political developments that tend to have a key role in the shaping of EU and Turkey relations are likely to largely determine the further fate of the Deal since it is increasingly dependent on the political wills of the actors (Bal, 2016). However, on the other side of the coin, one would expect that for the maintenance of a relative degree of political and economic stability, for example, in the key refugee-sending states such as Syrian, Afghanistan, Pakistan, is another determining factor for the settlement of current refugee crisis in general. In this regard, Kilic and Bayram (2021, page 15) are probably right in arguing that: “Migratory challenges in the shared

neighborhood of the EU and Turkey are far from over, while ten years into the civil war in Syria the future of Syrian refugees remains a common dilemma”.

4. Discussion

Approaching the interesting cases cited above, one can assume that the implementation of European asylum policy frameworks is merely determined by key regional geopolitical parameters that take into account the role of traditional cultural and historical parameters. The EU member states have failed to provide a common response to the crisis and seem unwilling to adopt the logic of the equal burden sharing. While considerable efforts have been made to reach a consensus that could encourage the development of a viable solution, member states have failed to maintain their ability to encourage a favorable response and as a result actions have been ineffective. Of course, one can reasonably argue that the Syrian refugee crisis contains a great opportunity for a more meaningful clarification of the nature of established relationship between the two sides while serves as motivation for member states to precipitate the adoption of a shared and enhanced policy approach. However, one should expect that it is difficult for a compromise agreement to be reached with the presence of particular hurdles involving unresolved legislative disputes, policy paths deviations, bilateral tensions interrelated with issue of human rights applicability. Nevertheless, when it comes to the preservation of well-established core objectives including the safeguarding of regional stability, social cohesion, and economic prosperity, the EU is required to speak and act unanimously with one voice.

But, in this context, the logic of our approach forces us to argue that although the implementation of refugee policy frameworks is in concert with the functioning of a widespread humanitarian context, the pursuing and fulfillment of mutual self-interest objectives and political aims are easily to discern. The corollary of this is that both parties have been unable to meet the requirements and to coordinate activities to effectively address the root cause of the problem that has led to this humanitarian tragedy. Policy making tends to largely concentrate on the fulfillment of national self-interest objectives and has illustrated its failure to promote a collective and integrated regional response to ensure sustainable and long-term solutions. Thus, the potential reformulation and reconsideration of refugee policy strategies require actions aimed at fostering

long-term and viable solutions. Seen this light, asylum seekers should be placed at the core of crafted policies and treated accordingly. In this respect, deployment of effective instruments and productive means can play a key role in strengthening attempts toward facilitating the safeguarding of asylum seekers' rights by encouraging access to open and fair asylum system procedures.

At the same time, it needs to be pointed out, however, that although the adherence of the EU policy makers on the materialization of the Deal is defined by particular factors including the logic of the protection of external borders, preservation of regional security, and restoration of territorial integrity, Turkey seems unable to deal with the Syrian refugees that is likely to mar European security structures integrity. This is a clear indication of Turkey's adjustment and commitment to prevailing negotiations and discussions for attaining additional political gains. Hence, the endemic set of problems that led to such insufficient and unsustainable policy responses are largely responsible for the escalation of the humanitarian crisis which is caused by severe violation of human rights and undermining of humanitarian law, including systematic forms of mistreatment coupled to phenomena of physical torture. Interestingly, in considering about the escalation of the Syrian refugee crisis, one would expect that Syrian refugees are the cause for triggering political problems regionally by posing a danger to political stability, economic prosperity and social cohesion. However, it would be erroneous to assume that these individuals are the only responsible because, in fact, unfortunately, they are the ones who are exposed to gross and systematic abuse of their fundamental human rights.

What is important at this point is to see the debate set about what conclusion can we draw, then, as we attempt to provide a telling response in relation to the actual nature of the EU-Turkey foreign relation in the context of the regional challenge arise from the refugee crisis. The foregoing debate has argued that the complicated nature of bilateral relations is partly framed by integration forces that are intertwined with efforts towards the establishment of actors' conduct. This adoption intends to increase the capacity of migration management policies that are undermined by the peculiarity of the crisis, reflecting to some extent volatility and complexity of characteristics of migration issue in general over the years. Interestingly, one should expect that this provides a helpful point of departure for appreciating the direct and profound impact of the refugee crisis on the shaping of bilateral collaboration and the systematic construction of regional policy-making. This perception is crucial to understanding the challenges of migration policy discourse in the context of regional foreign relations. More important, this sets the context in this analysis for what

is surely the most critical conceptual debate, that is, whether the EU-Turkey relationship is likely to grow for the years to come and whether Turkey is likely to be seen as a reliable regional partner. Although, in general, the logic of rapprochement remains substantially valid for the migration and asylum realm, it is still an open question whether the EU and Turkey will succeed in maintaining their relationship and to what extent Turkey can correspond to its regional obligations and commitments.

Interestingly, however, a high degree of controversy surrounds migration and asylum policy making discourse and its deep interplay with the relationship between the EU and Turkey. Indeed, the findings of the above chapters has revealed a more complex picture than the propositions analyzed above suggest. The dramatic escalation of the refugee crisis has led to the emergence of contemporary migration policy dynamics while has raised a wide range of political opportunities that are in line with efforts towards the strengthening of collaboration between the two sides. It has also signaled critical political developments that contributed to the reconsideration of the logic of rapprochement between the sides within the regional neighborhood.

This discussion, also, highlights the existence of a consistent operational framework that involves organizing characteristic elements including active and direct engagement accompanied by productive cooperation dynamics is possible to facilitate efforts towards the achievement of political aims, for example, in terms of Turkey's accession process. In this light, one can argue that the presence of opening accession discussions and visa liberalization issues remain crucial factors. In this respect, one can suggest that the Statement is an important step in the right direction. Both sides are confronted with complex difficulties in their attempts to cope with the crisis, however, some possibility exists that they may not be capable of addressing those problems independently without putting their efforts together. Furthermore, this explanation acknowledges that, from a practical point of view, the Statement has not been implemented in coherent fashion and thereby not producing concrete results. As such, one can assume that its malfunction is likely to give rise to intense political criticism and ongoing legal scrutiny. In addition, the emergence of deteriorating conditions in Greek hotspots are interlinked with weak asylum system procedures where proper functioning of asylum mechanisms constitutes a precondition when it comes to the successful planning of the migration strategy frameworks especially in the Greek islands.

At the same time, it should be recognized that considering Turkey's border management mechanisms and practices, a wide range of organizational elements are considered of particular

importance. To begin with, firstly, the implementation of a diverse policy framework in pursuit of the enhancement of Turkey's soft power within Syria has led to the reduction of foreign aid provision while it has offered limited resources of quality refugee-related services and tools. Secondly, the failure of Turkey to pay attention to long-term consequences and underlying implications that the crisis has brought about deteriorates the task of handling the massive refugee inflows. The outbreak and escalation of the crisis regionally favored the creation of fertile ground for the development and formulation of a close and direct cooperation framework that is presumed inevitably necessary. In the face of it, the signing of the Deal signifies the introduction of considerable efforts in achieving sustainable, long-term solution to combat the crisis, however, it has come under severe skepticism and has been subject to thorough legal scrutiny despite the fact that one can assume its coherent approach in the desirable direction. After all, one can assume the paramount importance of the implementation of an integrated and consistent policy framework favorable to sustainable and long-term solutions that secures successful integration of the asylum seekers, while ensuring fair examination of asylum claims with emphasis on financial aid provision and employability perspectives. Following this understanding and in light of these data, one can point to the viability of this controversial Deal that has been thrown into doubt since it was enforced, regardless of the fact that it was initially perceived as impractical and unenforceable. It is, also, worthwhile to consider that the Deal seeks to pursue international actions in dealing with two key issues, that is the management of the refugee crisis as well as the management in return for the advancement of the EU-Turkey relations, has, nevertheless, resulted in some positive outcomes.

To put emphasis on this part of the discussion, let me reiterate that it is commonplace to regard that the treatment of Syrian asylum seekers as well as efforts to design a consistent and successful strategy plan in response to this situation raises multiples challenges for both the EU and Turkey. European and Turkish policy makers are concerned with various pressing asylum-related issues that deserve particular attention and have to do, for example, with the increasing refugee inflows from Syria to Turkish borders. Consequently, our analysis has reached the following key assumptions: Firstly, the Deal might envisage the resolution of the problem through the adoption of necessary legislative actions for the elimination of potential repercussions of the crisis through the means of resettlement and readmission practices. And secondly, the EU-Turkey bilateral relations have remained unaffected since accessions negotiations processes are grappling

with persisting constraints which largely decelerate the improvement of relevant procedures. At the same time, the key hypotheses of our analysis seem valid.

At this point, thus, it is tempting to conclude this discussion by focusing on the argument that is advanced. The primary argument of this study has been that the revision of migration and asylum policy frameworks together with the impact of direct political engagement, the interplay of actors' attitudes, and the establishment of behavioral patterns that can improve the quality and content of relations in response to the refugee crisis. One can argue that the latter can serve as critical external determinant with ability to wield considerable influence and increasingly shape cooperation processes. As such, our analysis has achieved two key objectives. Firstly, to sketch out a comprehensive and well-founded assessment on how the refugee crisis is likely to exercise considerable impact on the EU-Turkey relations. And secondly, to offer an investigation about how phenomena and practices of severe human rights abuses and violations are likely to take place in this context in which organizational, administrative and legal instruments of migration crisis-management are incorporated. At the same time, this chapter has been but an attempt to highlight such a perspective by referring to its applicability to the analysis of migration policy making in the hope that it will stimulate further thinking and writing on the subject.

6. Conclusion

This study has revealed the complex and deep interplay in the EU-Turkey relations. It has touched upon established migration and asylum policy frameworks as well as the human rights discourse where various multifaceted factors have come in play regionally involving international resources, historical roots, political integrating processes underway and current crisis situations. In this regard, a case can be made that a wide range of political, social and economic predicaments accompanied by uncertain prospects of policy convergence in migration and asylum discourse constitute a powerful testimony to the insufficiencies of existing European and Turkish strategies.

As we have seen earlier in this study, the overall attitude of the EU clearly demonstrates its deep willingness towards the maintenance of positiveness and flexibility in terms of disregarding the criticism about Turkey. This, in turn, would help to the fostering and regulating of bilateral relations processes. In terms of the EU's primary policy objectives, the elimination of

refugee inflows through restoring constructive cooperation channels would aim to resettle to Turkey those who are not eligible for international protection. One can argue that the EU and Turkey political preferences and intentions are driven by the logic of common concern that is rooted in the same causation, that is, the maintenance of the principle of self-interest. Interestingly, their attitudes present a proclivity to disregarding the primary cause of tensions in order to achieve further political gains and attain policy objectives from one another. Seen in this light, the problem of Syrian refugees is framed by the logic of instrumentality rooted in Turkey's political leverage. This operates within the framework of bilateral negotiation processes where forms of constructing engagement are adopted towards the achievement of sustainable remedies against uncertain or unstable situations. Moreover, the consideration of the possibilities that exist about the EU-Turkey rapprochement along with the role of cooperation structures in contemporary migration and refugee crisis discourse can be benefited from a framework that captures a broader range of relevant issues that lie at the heart of security discourse.

Of course, there has been much discussion about the decisive impact and the role of the EU-Turkey agreements as a key referent object within the crisis. Indeed, it touches on long-standing, contested debates about the centrality and importance of the interplay over bilateral interaction perceptions complemented by the profound mistrust and disagreement as to the scope of its applicability. While readmission agreement can be viewed as a well-structured and carefully designed policy instrument in response to addressing urgent and crisis situations, its implementation raises several organizational and structural asymmetries. It has been clearly demonstrated the rising likelihood of Readmission Agreement in bringing about pressing destabilizing and profound effects on the safeguarding of human rights. In this regard, policy-making procedures are becoming increasingly intertwined with rising regional challenges and the effects of balance of power responsible for the emergence of radical shifts in the political, social and economic arenas. Hence, one should focus on the clear ultimate interconnectedness between readmission agreement and likelihood of severe violations of human rights which is manifested when migrants are forced to return back to countries whose asylum system frameworks are incapable of providing fair and well-founded refugee status determination.

Indeed, several accounts have stressed the potential dangers the readmission agreement is likely to pose to fundamental human rights of asylum seekers and refugees. Seen in this light, it is commonplace to regard that EU member states are able to ensure their political commitment with

the implementation of the agreement. However, in practice, evidence reflects signs of fragmentation of the principle of non-refoulement and, in turn, compromises are disrupted. This situation may result in additional administrative and organizational constraints and can lead to the undermining of the right to fair access to asylum procedures. Furthermore, it is increasingly apparent the limited capacity of protection practices and surveillance mechanisms of agreements when one considers the need for safeguarding the fundamental principle of non-refoulement along with the right to request international protection. Of course, one cannot overlook the significant role of burden and responsibility sharing perceptions between EU member states and Turkey. Their existence is complemented by practices of undermining safeguarding standards that are associated with the internal economic environment and its potential fragmentation by structural constraints which have to do with the presence of asylum seekers and refugees.

To sum up, the plain truth is that evidence about limited applicability of asylum legislation may result in poor access to fundamental human rights for refugees and asylum seekers. More interestingly, the clear correlation between the universality of human rights and centrality of state sovereignty perceptions designates the structural proclivity of nation-states to function in accordance with traditional international state system ideas. In this regard, one can assume that steps are taken by actors to increase the effectiveness of asylum policy instruments in response to the challenges of massive migration movements. Adherence to the structurally and institutionally complex nature of the relationship between the EU and Turkey that functions on the basis of international relations dynamics can thus serve to reveal the prospect of further cooperation and the possibility of improvement of bilateral relations. This might rest largely upon the logic of rapprochement between the two sides. Nevertheless, the analysis of the EU-Turkey relations is tempting and constitutes a meaningful route to the opening of alternatives in migration and asylum discourse at a regional scale.

References

Adam, L., B. (2017) The EU-Turkey Deal One Year On: A Delicate Balancing Act. *The International Spectator, Italian Journal of International Affairs*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03932729.2017.1370569>

Adam, L., B. (2016) *The Refugee Card in EU-Turkey Relations: A Necessary but Uncertain Deal*. Istanbul Policy Centre, Global Turkey in Europe, working paper 14.

Akbulut, O. (2017) Turkey: The European Convention on Human Rights as a Tool for Modernization. In: Popelier, P., Lambrecht, S., Lemmens, K. (eds.) *Criticism of the European Court of Human Rights*. Intersentia, pp.413-446.

Akin Yavuz, C. (2019) Analysis of the EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement: A Unique Case. *European Journal of Migration and Law*. DOI:[10.1163/15718166-12340062](https://doi.org/10.1163/15718166-12340062)

Alpes, M., Tunaboğlu, S., Van Liempt, I. (2017) *Human Rights Violations by Design: EU-Turkey Statement Prioritizes Returns from Greece Over Access to Asylum*. European University Institute, Robert Shuman Center for Advanced Studies, Migration Policy Center.

Altafin, C., Haasz, V., Podstawa K. (2016) *Assessing the strategic use of the EU fundamental and human rights toolbox*. Frame, European Commission, Deliverable No. 14.2.

Aragall, X. (2019) *2018: Migration in the Mediterranean; Situation, Context and Evolution*. IEMEd. European Institute of the Mediterranean. IEMEd Mediterranean Yearbook 2019. <https://www.iemed.org/publication/2018-migration-in-the-mediterranean-situation-context-and-evolution/>

Badalic, V. (2019) Rejected Syrians: Violation of the Principle of “Non-Refoulement” in Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law in Ljubljana.

Bal, P., G. (2016) The Effects of The Refugee Crisis on the EU-Turkey Relations: The Readmission Agreement and Beyond. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 8 <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n8p14>

Bradford, A. (2016) Regime Theory. Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law, February 2007, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2770647>

Buzan, B. (1993) From international system to international society: Structural realism and regime theory meet the English school. *International Organization*, 47(3), 327-352.

Cancelic, K. (2021) *EU-Turkey Deal in the Context of Refugee Crisis: Humanitarian Perspective from the EU Values*. Academia. <https://www.academia.edu/45620753>

Cetin, S., Turan, E., Cetin, R., A., Hamsioglu, O. (2017) The Impact of the Refugee Crisis on Turkey-EU Relations. *International Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 3, Issue 3 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323919008_THE_IMPACT_OF_THE_SYRIAN_REFUGEE_CRISIS_ON_TURKEY-EU_RELATIONS [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Cinar, O., H. & Sirin, T. (2017) Turkey's Human Rights Agenda. *Journal of Research and Policy on Turkey*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 133-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23760818.2017.1350354>

Csicsmann, L. (2016) The Syrian refugee crisis reconsidered: The role of the EU-Turkey Agreement. *Corvinus Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 1, No. 1. <https://journals.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/index.php/cojourn/article/view/25> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Costello, C. & Mann, I. (2020) Border Justice: Migration and Accountability for Human Rights Violations. *German Law Journal*, 21, pp. 311-334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2020.27>

De Marcilly, C. & Garde, A. (2016) *The EU-Turkey Agreement and its implications: An Unavoidable but Conditional Agreement*. Foundation Robert Schuman, European Issues No. 396.

Demirsu, I. & Muftuler-Bac, M. (2017) The Turkish-EU Cooperation on the Refugee Crisis: The Turkish Perception in the Parliamentary Debates. Jean Monnet Network PACO-Interparliamentary Cooperation in the EU External Action-Parliamentary Scrutiny and Diplomacy in the EU and Beyond, WP07.

Demirsu, I. & Cihangir-Tetik, D. (2018) Constructing the Partnership with Turkey on the Refugee Crisis: EU Perceptions and Expectations. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2018.1506291>

Dimitriadi, A. (2016) *The Impact of the EU-Turkey Statement on Protection and Reception: The Case of Greece*. Eliamep, Athens.

Dincer O., B. & Kutlay, M. (2013) *The Arab Spring: A Game Changer in Turkey-EU Relations?* *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 14:4, 418-430, DOI:[10.3986/dd.v0i49.7255](https://doi.org/10.3986/dd.v0i49.7255)

Drezner, D. (2009). The Power and Peril of International Regime Complexity. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(1), 65-70.

Dursun-Ozkanca, O. (2019) The EU-Turkey Deal on Refugees. In: Dursun-Ozkanca, O. (ed.) *Turkey-West Relations: The Politics of Intra-alliance Opposition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Duarte, M. (2020) EU-Turkey Refugee Deal: Buck-Passing and Bargaining on Human Lives at Risk? *Journal of International Law* DOI:[10.20981/kaygi.705300](https://doi.org/10.20981/kaygi.705300)

Ela Gokalp Aras, N. (2019) A Game Changer in EU-Turkey Relations: The Opportunities and Pitfalls of Migration Policy. *The International Spectator, Italian Journal of International Affairs*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03932729.2019.1670481>

Erdemir, A. (2016) *EU Refugee Crisis: Turkey as an Effective Partner*. Foundation for Defense of Democracies, The Globalist. <https://www.fdd.org/analysis/2016/03/07/eu-refugee-crisis-turkey-as-an-effective-partner/> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Erder, S. (2021) Migration as a “Heated Question” in Turkey-EU Negotiations. In: Pusch, B., Tekin, U. (eds) *Migration and Turkey* pp. 83-92.

Gadd, K., Engstrom, V., Grabowska-Moroz, B. (2020) *Democratic Legitimacy in EU Migration Policies*. RECONNECT – Reconciling Europe with its Citizens through Democracy and Rule of Law, Work Package 13-Deliverable 1.

Haggard, S., & Simmons, B. (1987) Theories of International Regimes. *International Organization*, 41(3), 491-517.

Haferlach, L., Tekin, F., Wodka, J. (2017) Friends. Foes. Frenemies? Unpacking the future of EU-Turkey relations. *Science Direct*, Volume 97, pp. 53-62 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017>

Hassib, B. & Nounou, D. (2016) Blocked by Diplomatic Barriers: Syrian Refugees and the EU-Turkey Migration Cooperation. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, Vol. 7 No 1. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3141546>

Hoffman, M. (2016) *The Emergence of a New Foreign Migration Policy in Europe*. Vienna Migration Conference, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD).

Ianni, A. & Acikgoz, M. (2021) *The Refugee Issue in Turkey's Relations with the EU*. Project report. Unit for Analysis and Policy Planning of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

Icduygu, A. (2011) *Europe, Turkey, and International Migration: An Uneasy Negotiation*. [Presentation] European University Institute, Migration working group, Wednesday, 26 January.

Icduygu, A. & Aksel, D., B. (2014) Two-to-Tango in Migration Diplomacy: Negotiating Readmission Agreement between the EU and Turkey. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, pp. 337-363. DOI:[10.1163/15718166-12342060](https://doi.org/10.1163/15718166-12342060)

Icduygu, A. & Karacay, A., B. (2012) Demography and Migration in Transition: Reflections on EU-Turkey Relations. In: Elitok, S., P. & Straubhaar, T. (eds.) *Turkey, Migration and the EU*:

Potentials, Challenges and Opportunities. Hamburg University Press, publishing house of the Hamburg State and University Library Carl von Ossietzky, Germany.

Jennequin, A. (2020) *Turkey and the Weaponization of Syrian Refugees*. Policy Brief, Brussels International Centre (BIC). <https://www.bic-rhr.com/research/turkey-and-weaponization-syrian-refugees> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Jill Alpes, M., Tunaboylu, S., Van Liempt, I. (2017) *Human Rights Violations by Design: EU-Turkey Statement Prioritizes Returns from Greece Over Access to Asylum*. Migration Policy Centre, Issue 2017, 29. European University Institute. Robert Shuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

Kale, B. (2016) *The EU-Turkey Action Plan is Imperfect, But Also Pragmatic, And Maybe Even Strategic*. The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF).

Kapartziani, C. & Papathanasiou, K. (2016) The Refugee Crisis as a European Democratic Crisis. *Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation*. DOI:[10.12893/gjcpi.2016.2.6](https://doi.org/10.12893/gjcpi.2016.2.6)

Kappers, Y. (2017) *Circumstance or powerplay? Explaining the policy process of the EU-Turkey Deal*. Master Thesis International Public Management and Public Policy. Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Kaplan, Y. (2018) Analysing instability as a future for an institutionalization process: the EU, Turkey and the issue of migration. *European Journal of Futures Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-018-0144-x>

Karakoulaki, M., Southgate, L., Steiner, J. (2018) *Critical Perspectives on Migration in the Twenty-First Century*. E-International Relations Publishing, Bristol, England. DOI:[10.15804/kie.2019.02.13](https://doi.org/10.15804/kie.2019.02.13)

Kaya, A. (2021) Europeanization and De-Europeanization of Turkish Asylum and Migration Policies. In: Reiners, W. & Turhan, E. (eds) *EU-Turkey Relations: Theories, Institutions and Policies*. Palgrave Macmillan, Istanbul, Turkey.

Kaya, H. (2020) The EU-Turkey Statement: a challenge to human rights? In: Kaya, H. (ed.) *The EU-Turkey Statement on Refugees: Assessing its Impact on Fundamental Rights*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., Massachusetts, USA

Kfir, I. (2017) A Faustian Pact – Has the EU-Turkey Deal undermined the Human Rights in Turkey and threaten its own security. *SSRN ELibrary*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2985217>

Koma, A. (2017) An Unusual Development of Turkey-EU Relations in 2015-2016. *Songklanakaran Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3767735>

Kilic, T. & Bayram, A., A. (2021) *Revisiting the EU-Turkey Cooperation on Migration: Roadmap for an Enhanced Partnership*. International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD).

Lehner, R. (2018) *The EU-Turkey Deal: Legal Challenges and Pitfalls*. International Organization for Migration (IOM) <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/imig.12462>

Madatali, H., A. (2021) *Peace and security in 2021: The EU's evolving relations with Turkey*. Briefing, European Parliament Research Service (EPRS).

Martin, N. (2019) From Containment to Realpolitik and Back Again: A Realist Constructivist Analysis of Turkey–EU Relations and the Migration Issue. *Journal of Common Market Studies (JCMS)* <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcms.12947>

Moldovan, C. (2017) *Is the EU-Turkey Action Plan an Effective or Just an Apparent Solution to the Refugee Crisis?* Working papers, Volume IX, Issue 3, Centre for European Studies (CES).

Muiznieks, N. (2017) *Human Rights in Europe: From Crisis to Renewal?* Council of Europe

Nas, C. (2019) The EU's Approach to the Syrian Crisis: Turkey as a Partner? *Journal of ULUSLARARASI ILISKILER-International Relations*, Vol. 16, pp. 45-64

Okyay, A. & Zaragoza-Crisitiani, J. (2016) The Leverage of the Gatekeeper: Power and Interdependence in the Migration Nexus between the EU and Turkey. *The International Spectator, Italian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 51-66.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2016.1235403>

Ott, A. (2017) *EU-Turkey Cooperation in Migration Matters: A Game Changer in a Multi-Layered Relationship?* Centre of Law and EU External Relations (CLEER), Cleer Papers 2017/4, ASSER Institute, Centre of International and European Law.

Peel, M., Hope, K., Pitel, L. (2018) *The migration dilemma: EU weighs impact of its deal with Turkey*. The Financial Times. <https://www.ft.com/content/179de308-2c2b-11e8-a34a-7e7563b0b0f4> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Pierini, M. (2019) *Options for the EU-Turkey Relationship*. Carnegie Europe <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2019/05/03/options-for-eu-turkey-relationship-pub-79061>

Pierini, M. & Uglen, S. (2014) A Moment of Opportunity in the EU-Turkey Relations. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2014/12/10/moment-of-opportunity-in-eu-turkey-relationship-pub-57459>

Poon, J. (2016) EU-Turkey Deal: Violation of, or Consistency With, International Law? European Papers, *Journal of Law and Integration*, Volume 1, No 3, pp. 1195-1203.
<https://www.europeanpapers.eu/en/europeanforum/eu-turkey-deal-violation-or-consistency-with-international-law> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Rygiel, K., Baban, F., Ilcan, S. (2016) *The Syrian Refugee Crisis: The EU-Turkey Deal and Temporary Protection*. Global Social Policy, Vol. 16(3), 315-320.

Saatcioglu, B. (2016) *Turkey and the EU: Strategic Rapprochement in the Shadow of the Refugee Crisis*. E-International Relations. <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/01/21/turkey-and-the-eu-strategic-rapprochement-in-the-shadow-of-the-refugee-crisis/> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Saatcioglu, B. (2019) The European Union's Refugee Crisis and Rising Functionalism in EU-Turkey Relations. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, Volume 21, Issue 2 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2019.1586542>

Scazzieri, L. (2021) *From Partners to Rivals? The Future of EU-Turkey Relations*. Centre for European Reform.

Seufert, G. (2016) *Turkey as Partner of the EU in the Refugee Crisis*. German Institute for International and Security Affairs. https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/comments/2016C01_srt.pdf [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Shamatava, T. (2020) Legal Analysis of the Non-Refoulement Principle in the Context of the EU-Turkey Deal. *Levan Alexidze Journal of International Law (LAJIL)*, Vol. 1, No. 1. <http://laf.ge/journals/index.php/test/article/view/7> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Shoenhuber, M., P. (2018) The European Union's Refugee Deal with Turkey: A Risky Alliance Contrary to European Laws and Values. *Houston Journal of International Law*. <https://international.vlex.com/vid/the-european-union> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Thym, D. (2016) *Why the EU-Turkey Deal Can be Legal and a Step in the Right Direction*. <https://eumigrationlawblog.eu/why-the-eu-turkey-deal-can-be-legal-and-a-step-in-the-right-direction/> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Tolay, J. (2014) *The EU and Turkey's Asylum Policies in Light of the Syrian Crisis*. Global Turkey in Europe, Istanbul Policy Centre, Policy Brief 10.

Tsakonas, P. (2021) *EU-Turkey Relations and the Migration Challenge: What is the Way Forward?* ELIAMEP, Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy.

Tunaboylu, S. & Alpes, J. (2017) *The EU-Turkey Deal: what happens to people who return to Turkey?* Forced Migration Review. <https://www.fmreview.org/resettlement/tunaboylu-alpes> [Accessed 15th December 2021].

Ustubici, A. (2017) *EU-Turkey Cooperation on Migration*. European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed). Euromed Survey, Management of Human Movement and Migration in the Euro-Mediterranean Region.

Van Liempt, I., Alpes Jill, M., Hassan, S., Tunaboylu, S., Ulusoy, O., Zoomers, A. (2017) *Evidence-based assessment of migration deals the case of the EU-Turkey Statement*. Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), Utrecht University.

Weber, B. (2017) *The EU-Turkey Refugee Deal and the Not Quite Closed Balkan Route*. Policy Paper by FES Dialogue SEE.

Weber, B. (2016) *Time for a Plan B: The European Refugee Crisis, the Balkan Route and the EU-Turkey Deal*. A report from Democratization Policy Council (DPC).

Weber, M. (2018) EU–Turkey Relations Need an Honest New Start. Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies. *Sage Journals*, Vol. 17(1) 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1781685818765095>

Wollard, C. (2018) *Has the Mediterranean Refugee Crisis Undermined European Values?* European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed)

Women’s Refugee Commission (2016) *EU-Turkey Agreement Failing Refugee Women and Girls* Womensrefugeecommission.org, New York.

Yabancı, B. (2016) *The Future of EU-Turkey Relations: Between Mutual Distrust and Interdependency*. F|EU|TU|RE, The Future of the EU-Turkey Relations: Mapping Dynamics and Testing Scenarios, Online Paper, No. 1

Yavuz, A. (2019) *Analysis of the EU-Turkey Readmission Agreement: A Unique Case*. European Journal of Migration and Law.

Yilmaz-Elmas, F. (2020) EU's Global Actorness in Question: A Debate over the EU-Turkey Migration Deal. *JSTOR Journal Database, Vol. 17, No. 68, 2020, pp. 161-177*. DOI: [10.33458/uidergisi.856887](https://doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.856887)

Zagora-Cristiani, J. (2017) Containing the Refugee Crisis: How the EU Turned the Balkans and Turkey into an EU Borderland. *The International Spectator Italian Journal of International Affairs*. DOI: [10.1080/03932729.2017.1375727](https://doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2017.1375727)