



MAGYC
Migration Governance and Asylum Crises

From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled': Re- Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Fiona B. Adamson
SOAS, University of London

MAGYC: The MAGYC (**Migr**Ation **G**overnance and **AsYlum C**risis) project seeks to assess how migration governance has responded to the recent “refugee crises” and has since been influenced by it, and how crises at large shape policy responses to migration. This four-year research project (2018–2023) brings together twelve international partners: the Hugo Observatory from the University of Liège (Coordinator), Sciences Po, the University of Economics in Bratislava, the GIGA institute of Global and Area Studies, Lund University, the IDMC, SOAS University of London, the University of Milan, the Lebanese American University, the University of Macedonia, Sabanci University, IfPO/CNRS.

Website: www.themagycproject.com



This project has received funding from the European Commission's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant agreement number 822806.

Lead author: Fiona B. Adamson, SOAS, University of London

Principal reviewers:

Lea Müller-Funk (GIGA/Danube University, Krems); Christiane Fröhlich (GIGA)

This deliverable will not be available online (journal article submission)

Version History:

Version No.	Date	Changes
1	06/05/2022	Initial version submitted as deliverable to the European Commission

Disclaimer: *The information and views set out in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance
in Turkey

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled' Migration Governance	3
Entangled Conflict and Security Dynamics	6
Diasporic Entanglements	8
Migration Diplomacy as Entanglement	11
Conclusions	13
References	14

MAGYC Journal Article Submission

Abstract

Policy actors engaged in migration governance operate in complex environments characterized by spatial entanglements that bring together different levels and jurisdictions. While “levels-of-analysis” and multi-level governance (MLG) frameworks capture some of this complexity, they undertheorize the extent to which migration and mobility are both causes and consequences of other forms of spatial entanglement. This article sets forth an “entangled” approach to migration governance, and applies it to the Turkish case. It discusses how historical legacies and regional ties produce enduring cross-border connections, examining diaspora engagement policies; migration diplomacy; and conflict and security in Turkey through the lens of multi-level entangled migration governance.

Introduction

Migration is inherently a trans-spatial phenomenon that connects different geographical contexts via human mobility. Yet the political institutions that manage migration are often highly spatialised, operating within particular geographical and territorial jurisdictions – whether local, national or regional. The inherent spatial complexity of migration governance is increasingly being recognized via models that examine the multiple actors, venues and levels in which migration policy-making takes place. Contemporary migration policy-making goes far beyond questions that have traditionally dominated the migration policy-making literature – such as state border control, citizenship policy and migrant or refugee integration -- but increasingly extends to include the management of policy complexities that emerge from the ways in which cross-border mobility connects different political spaces and jurisdictions.

Some contemporary examples of migration management that involve complex forms of spatial entanglements include: state-led diaspora engagement policies that affect populations living in the jurisdiction of other states; forms of migration diplomacy such as the trans-state externalization of migration controls; and the impacts of transnational migration networks on regional and cross-border conflicts. Yet, whereas multi-level governance (MLG) approaches can identify how migration policies take place at different scales and are shaped by a range of actors and interests, they are often

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

insufficient for understanding the complex linkages, dependencies and blow-back effects that emerge from trans-local forms of migratory entanglement.

The case of Turkey is particularly illustrative of this problem, as it involves all of the above-mentioned forms of spatial entanglements. Turkey's location at the intersection of multiple regions and migration routes makes it a key player in regional migration governance, but also subjects it to numerous forms of geo-political entanglements. Turkey is connected to Europe via historical migration patterns and interests in "diasporic" populations abroad, as well as being deeply entangled with neighbouring countries, both as a result of its historical relationships, but also via complex transnational networks, trade patterns and conflict configurations. Some of the most significant migration management issues that Turkey has faced in the past years – such as the hosting of more than 3 million Syrian refugees who fled the civil war in neighbouring Syria or its negotiations with the European Union on issues of border control and migration management – are illustrative of the extent to which cross-border mobility issues are trans-locally "entangled" in ways that stretch across multiple political jurisdictions and are entwined with multiple other concerns and dynamics linked to Turkey's history, geographic location, domestic politics, security concerns, and foreign relations.

This article examines some of these complex dynamics, arguing for the utility of moving from a "multi-level" to a "entangled" approach of analysing migration governance. Such an approach highlights the spatial complexity that accompanies migration-related processes. Building on recent work in international relations, it suggests the need to theorize migration governance as the management of complex and enduring cross-border and trans-local policy entanglements. The argument is made in the following manner: I first define and make the case for an "entangled" approach to migration governance, including the potential it brings for researchers and policy-makers to incorporate a broader range of factors, such as the influence of enduring historical legacies and geographical ties, into migration governance frameworks. I then provide examples of three broad areas of complex and spatially entangled policy-making in Turkey: the relationship between migration, security and conflict; diaspora engagement policies; and migration diplomacy. I conclude by discussing some of the broader implications of an entangled migration governance framework.

From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled' Migration Governance

There is a growing recognition of the complexity of migration governance. Once studied largely as a domestic policy issue, the field is currently awash with approaches that recognize the multiple actors, levels and players that shape the dynamics of migration management. In the field of European Public Policy, for example, migration management is increasingly viewed as a problem of multi-level governance (MLG) which takes place at local, national and regional levels, involving multiple policy actors at these different scales (Zincone and Caponio 2006; Scholten and Penninx 2016; Caponio and Jones-Correa 2018). While states may set national migration policies, these policies are often shaped by regional level EU processes and directives, and implemented or interpreted at federal and local levels, in conjunction with a variety of local actors ranging from civil society organizations to networked cities. Moreover, national policy-making is shaped and constrained by numerous factors above and beyond the state, including by regional dynamics; where the state sits in the international system; and the extent to which it is a migration-sending, receiving or transit state (Adamson and Tsourapas 2019; Lavenex 2016).

As such, migration governance can be understood as being as much an issue of international relations, foreign policy and diplomacy as it is a matter of domestic politics. Within this context, international relations theories and methods can be helpful in providing analytical leverage in understanding many of the geopolitical dynamics of migration governance. For example, traditional "levels-of-analysis" frameworks used in international relations can provide a starting point for analysing the relationship between international-systemic level factors (such as linkages between migration, security, aid and foreign policy alliances); domestic political factors (such as bureaucratic politics, political parties, domestic interests, electoral politics and public opinion) and individual level factors (such as the preferences and viewpoints of particular leaders and policy-makers) (Singer 1961). However, a purely "levels-of-analysis" approach misses some dynamics that are unique to issues of international migration due to the way in which migration and mobility dynamics create enduring historical interdependencies and connections that cross state borders. For example, migrants to one state may retain transnational links and ties with actors and networks in their state of origin; state interests in migration are often bound up with other economic, political and foreign policy preferences and interests; and migration flows can be both cause and consequence of regional or international events that have repercussions that transcend domestic-international divides.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

In other words, the dynamics that policy-makers confront with regard to migration governance extend beyond the management of migration itself. Migration is unique is not just a policy issue that can be managed at multiple levels, it is also a social process that connects different political spaces and policy areas with each other. Enduring transnational ties, social media links, return and circular migration, and diaspora politics all challenge the notion that migration management is limited to managing entry, settlement and integration. Migration management also increasingly involves managing the geopolitical complexities that come with such forms of entanglement, such as the emergence of new forms of linkages across domestic and international policy areas; changes in policy actors' interests and bargaining leverage across issue areas; and the transnationalisation and diffusion of domestic political dynamics and conflicts across international borders.

Some of these complex dynamics may be embedded in or interact with enduring historical legacies – in other words, in addition to being spatially entangled, the dynamics produced by (or that produce) cross-border migration are also affected by deeper historical entanglements that pre-date contemporary state borders and national migration regimes. In the case of Turkey, there are long histories of mobility, shared identities and networks in the region that precede the emergence of modern nation-states. In many respects, the emergence of migration as a central area of contemporary state policy needs to be understood in this broader historical context of state formation and consolidation (Torpey 2000; Hollifield 2004; Klotz 2013; Vigneswaran 2013; Vigneswaran and Quirk 2015). For example, European colonial and imperial histories have had a profound impact on the development of contemporary migration governance regimes and have shaped migration flows between Europe and the rest of the world (Buettnner 2016; Mayblin and Turner 2020; Sadiq and Tsourapas 2021). Similarly, Turkey can be understood as a *post-imperial* migration state, with its migration governance regime shaped and influenced in part by the historical legacies of its predecessor state, the Ottoman Empire, which significantly transcended the geographic space of contemporary Turkey, stretching from the area of modern Algeria in the West, to Hungary, the Balkans and the Black Sea region in the North, to contemporary Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel/Palestine, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq in the South and East at the height of its power (Adamson 2022). Modern state borders between Turkey and Syria or Turkey and Iraq, for example, exist side-by-side with long-standing translocal networks, activities and identities that precede the emergence of modern states.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Altogether, Turkey shares land borders with eight countries and is linked to and part of migration systems in Europe, the Mediterranean and the broader Middle East as well as the Caucasus and former Soviet Union. Its geographical location is significant for understanding the entangled nature of the migration dynamics it faces. Simultaneously a country of immigration, emigration and transit migration, Turkey has “sent” both high-skilled and low-skilled workers to Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere. It receives low-skilled workers from neighbouring countries, especially those in the Balkans, Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. And it is a major transit state for migrants from countries further afield such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Iran who are trying to get to Europe (Içduygu and Yüksekler 2012).

The geopolitical challenges that such entanglements bring surpass frameworks that treat migration management as a technical policy challenge or coordination game across different levels (Fakhoury 2019). While a multi-level governance framework provides a useful starting point for understanding where migration policy-making takes place, and moves beyond approaches that have focused on migration management as a largely domestic issue managed at the national level, the geopolitical complexity of contemporary migration management suggests the utility of moving from a 'multi-level' to 'entangled' approach. All migration states must to some extent contend with dynamics of social and political entanglement, but Turkey's migration management challenges are particularly illustrative of these dynamics. With its history as a post-imperial and labour-sending state on the border of Europe, in a neighbourhood that has been marked by multiple violent conflicts over the past decades, Turkey presents a critical and information-rich case for examining how migration networks and relations create enduring spatial entanglements (Patton 2014).

In the rest of this article, I illustrate this by briefly identifying three forms of cross-border entanglements that complicate the multi-level governance (MLG) paradigm in the case of Turkey: 1) the trans-border nature of conflict dynamics in the Syrian refugee, asylum and protection 'crisis' 2) the historical effects of earlier labour emigration policies and their resulting “diaspora” populations in Europe and 3) migration control externalisation policies and the dynamics of EU-Turkey 'migration diplomacy.' Each of these three areas create complex cross-state spatial and societal entanglements that are not always fully captured in actor- and policy-based MLG governance frameworks.

Entangled Conflict and Security Dynamics

Turkey is simultaneously a NATO member and, as of April 2022, host to the largest refugee population in the world (with Poland in second place following the Russian invasion of Ukraine). As in the case of Ukraine, the refugee flows which have affected Turkey have not come out of nowhere, but have been products of broader geopolitical conflicts in the region. Refugee flows from Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria can all be viewed to some extent as “externalities” and blowback effects of great power politics in the region (Adamson and Greenhill 2022). Moreover, the Syrian conflict emerged from a context in which the two countries' security interests were already entangled, via historical conflicts over water politics, energy and the long-standing regional dimensions of the Kurdish conflict. Thus, when the conflict in Syria led to a massive outflow of refugees and displaced persons beginning in 2011, with Turkey hosting the largest number of refugees in the region by 2018, the situation Turkey faced was not simply a cross-border migration management issue, but was also closely entangled with its (and other actors') broader security interests.

One of these factors was Turkey's own domestic security situation, including the long-standing conflict between the Turkish state and the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK). A legacy of the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres, Kurdish populations are spread out across several states -- inhabiting areas of Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran. There are strong and enduring cross-border links in the region, stemming from the Ottoman era and including family and other ties that transcend state borders. The PKK, a militant political organisation and armed rebel group, has always operated across national borders: in the 1980s and 90s the leadership of the PKK was based in Damascus, operated training camps in Lebanon and had mountain bases in parts of Iraqi Kurdistan. Policies of border liberalisation in the 2000s, which allowed free movement between Syria and Turkey, combined with the building of new trans-local structures in the Kurdish population, strengthened ties across the borders of Turkey, Syria and the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) a region which obtained increasing autonomy following the 2003-11 Iraq war (White 2000; Güneş 2013; Saeed 2017).

In Syria, Kurdish groups closely affiliated with the PKK became involved in the Syrian civil war, especially in the fight against the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and also established an autonomous quasi-state in the region called Rojava (Dal 2017). In the Kurdish-dominated areas of Southeastern Turkey, there was also concern that the influx of Syrian Arabs was

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

linked to government policies designed to change the ethnic balance in the region, thus undercutting bids for increased Kurdish regional autonomy (Dogus 2017; Ruegger 2018). Moreover, the conflict between the Kurdish YPG and ISIL in Syria was viewed as having the potential to spill over into Turkey, which had a history of Islamist-Kurdish conflict in the Southeast (Kurt 2017). Syrian Kurdish groups and ISIL both sought recruits from Turkey, raising the spectre of domestic religious radicalisation. At the same time, Turkey hosted the main Syrian opposition groups, which created an additional element of “security entanglement” between migration governance in Turkey and the Syrian conflict.

The impacts of security entanglement thus create real dilemmas and pressures on policy actors which go beyond “migration management.” In addition to Turkey becoming an active participant in the Syrian conflict, these dilemmas could be seen in the contradictory pressures that Turkey faced in managing the Turkish-Syrian border. On the one hand, the Turkish state had an interest in limiting the cross-border mobility of both Kurdish and Islamist fighters in the region. Southeastern Turkey became a gateway for foreign fighters entering the conflict in Syria – both for Islamist fighters supporting the Islamic State and anti-Islamist fighters fighting on the side of Kurdish groups. In addition, the spillover of the conflict in Syria included the spread of ISIL activities in Turkey. Between 2013-16 Turkey suffered numerous suicide bombings and terror attacks across the country, many of which were attributed to ISIL-linked groups. During this time there were contradictory pressures coming from the international community with respect to the Turkish-Syrian border. Keeping the border open potentially facilitated the activities of the Islamic State and other armed groups in the region, allowing for ISIL to bring in new recruits and supplies, sell oil and other commodities, and to receive medical treatment and other assistance in the border regions of Turkey (cf Salehyan and Gleditsch 2006; Braithwaite et al 2018). Yet closing the border prevented refugees fleeing the conflict from crossing into Turkey. In a sense, the Turkish-Syrian border was an extreme example of the dilemmas faced by states in how to simultaneously facilitate the flows of some border-crossers while limiting the access of others (Andreas 2003).

The outcome of such pressures has had potentially negative impacts on post-conflict migration governance as Turkey joined the trend in other parts of the world in recent years in trying to manage its border issues by building walls. In 2017 Turkey completed a 700-kilometer wall along most of its 900-kilometer border with Syria at a cost of 400 million US dollars. The wall includes a “system comprising of sophisticated lighting, sensors and security cameras.” A further

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

wall on the Iranian border was started in August 2017 as part of a new Integrated Border Security System. The wall is designed to deter smugglers and disrupt cross-border operations by Kurdish militants, but it also has the effect of separating local villages and families, disrupting long-standing trading routes and making circular and seasonal migration more difficult (Akinci 2017).

Diasporic Entanglements

A further source of spatial entanglement is the connections that exist between the Turkish state and Turkish citizens (and their descendants) who reside outside the borders of Turkey. A Global North bias in migration studies has meant that migration governance is often assumed to focus on the governance of *immigration*. Yet, for many states, the governance of *emigration* has been as significant a policy issue over time as regulating immigration (Adamson and Tsourapas 2020). This has certainly been the case for Turkey, in which the influx of economic migrants from neighbouring regions to Turkey, especially since the 1990s, stands in stark contrast with Turkey's history as an emigration state (Kirişçi 2007). Starting from the 1960s and 70s, Turkey encouraged the export of labour as part of its overall economic development strategy, sending migrant workers to Germany and other states in Western Europe in the 1960s as part of a managed labour recruitment and "guestworker" policy (Martin 1991). Turkish migration to Europe was largely tied to industrial manufacturing jobs and organized via recruiting schemes as a means of addressing post-war Germany's need for additional labour during a period of rapid economic growth.

German employers established a recruitment bureau in Istanbul in July 1960 in order to channel workers to firms in West Germany and Germany and Turkey signed a bilateral labour agreement in 1961. The bilateral agreement created an official framework for workers' migration, regulating issues such as migration levels, worker benefits and the responsibilities of both the sending and receiving countries. It was revised in 1964 and similar agreements were signed with Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands (1964) followed by agreements with France (1965), and Australia and Sweden (1967) (Akgündüz 1993, 155). These arrangements were a common feature of labour migration during the period – in addition to Turkey, European countries such as Greece, Spain, Portugal and Italy sent labour migrants to Germany and other European countries, just as former colonies such as Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco; and India, Pakistan and Bangladesh during this same period were sources of labour migration to France and Britain respectively. Labour remittances came to play a significant role in Turkey's economy. Between 1973 and 1975, for example, official labour

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

remittances equalled between 93.7 and 99.8% of exports in Turkey (Richards and Waterbury 1990, 390–91).

This group of workers in Germany and elsewhere – along with subsequent migration of high-skilled workers, political exiles and others -- form the basis of a considerable population of Turkish (and Kurdish) origin people in Germany (approx. 3 million) and Europe (approx. 5 million), now sometimes referred to as “Euro-Turks” but which also are increasingly seen by the Turkish state as constituting a diaspora to be engaged with (Kaya 2011). Even in the early days of migration, however, the Turkish state was involved in the everyday lives of its citizens abroad in Europe. Thus, there were numerous forms of migration governance that related to the emigration of workers abroad – including policies that managed their exit and recruitment, policies directed toward them while abroad, and the policies related to their potential “return” to Turkey (Tsourapas 2020).

The management or courting of populations abroad can be seen as a type of migration governance that is common to labour-sending countries of emigration. Indeed, Turkey’s policies towards its citizens abroad resemble the type of governance mechanisms that have been used in Europe by other emigration states in the 1960s and 70s, such as those of Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco in France (Brand 2006). From the onset, Turkey treated emigrants to Germany and elsewhere in Europe as temporary labour migrants who would remain citizens of Turkey and eventually return. During this period Turkey was involved in the governance and management of its citizens abroad via the provision of state religious, educational and consular services in Europe (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003). Turkish citizens living in Germany and elsewhere in Europe registered births, marriages and deaths with Turkish consulates, and received advice on pensions (Aydin 2014).

Turkey also sent state-funded teachers to teach Turkish lessons in German schools, as well as sending religious leaders or imams to Germany to cater to the growing population. It established the Turkish Islamic Union of the State Office of Religious Affairs (DITIB) in Cologne Germany, which was organized under Turkey’s Ministry of Religious Affairs (Diyanet) and which sent imams and other religious figures to Germany (Aksel 2014, 202; Bruce 2020). Turkey also for the first time passed a law allowing dual citizenship in Turkey in 1981 and included Turkish citizens abroad within its constitution in 1982, as well as establishing the Higher Coordination Council for Workers, which included the Social Affairs and Economic Affairs Committees, which were designed to foster the attachments of citizens abroad to Turkey (Aksel 2014: 203-4).

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Turkey's ongoing engagement with citizens abroad can be seen as a form of state "diaspora management" or "diaspora engagement" policy that has become increasingly common around the world, especially in states in the Global South (Adamson 2019; Gamlen 2014; Délano and Gamlen 2014; Ragazzi 2014; Mylonas 2013; Varadarajan 2010). In 2010, a formal Office for the Turks Abroad and Related Communities (YTB) was established in Turkey. The office combined elements of earlier policies that had been aimed at Turkish citizens abroad in Europe as well as Turkish "ethnic kin" in the Balkans or Former Soviet Union, in addition to managing international students on government scholarships (Öktem 2014, 13–16). Part of this strategy included leveraging the diaspora as a resource that could be utilized as a tool of state economic and lobbying power in order to increase Turkey's presence and influence in Europe (Aksel 2014, 205).

However, whereas in the 1960s and 1970s, it was expected that migration from Turkey to Europe was a temporary form of labour migration, current diaspora engagement policies are largely based on the premise of permanent populations based in Europe. This leads to a spatial entanglement of Turkish and German state interests that places pressure on Turkish citizens and their descendants in Europe (Arkilic 2020; Unver 2022). At the same time, Turkey has stepped up its political engagement activities in Europe in ways that have been seen as creating diplomatic tensions. For example, in the lead up to the April 2016 referendum in Turkey, Germany and the Netherlands tried to limit political campaign rallies in the Turkish diaspora, while Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan accused Germany and the Netherlands in return of being "fascists and Nazis" (Reuters 2017). Since the July 2016 coup attempt, there have also been tensions over Turkish demands to crack down on opposition groups in Europe as well as over its arrest of German citizens in Turkey. In August 2017 Erdoğan was viewed as trying to intervene in German domestic politics by suggesting that Turks living in Germany should not cast a vote for any of the three major political parties – Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU), the center-left Social Democratic Party (SDP) or the Greens -- calling them all "enemies of Turkey" (Usta 2017).

Turkey has increasingly turned to "its" diaspora as a potential source of soft power and influence – at the same time as it has more generally been drawing on its imperial past and its identity as a majority Muslim country as a way of projecting a more expansive national identity both at home and abroad (Mügge 2012; Adamson 2019). In this context, the state has at times positioned itself as the protector of Turks in Europe, arguing that it is standing up for their interests in the face of discrimination or anti-Muslim sentiment, echoing in some respects some of the rhetoric employed by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

positioned Israel vis-à-vis Europe's Jewish population following such incidents as the January 2015 Paris attacks (Lazaroff 2015). This use of Islamic identity as a form of soft power has been married with an explicit attempt to leverage the diaspora as a tool of state economic and lobbying power – to make (in the words of a member of the TYB Advisory Committee) “the Turkish diaspora among the most influential diasporas in the world” (Aksel 2014, 205).

Additionally, there has been a security dimension to some of the Turkish state's diaspora policies. Like many other states, Turkey has engaged in forms of transnational repression vis-à-vis some members of its diaspora, seeking to monitor and police opposition groups that operate in diaspora communities beyond the borders of the state (Moss 2016). The Turkish state has for many years engaged in the surveillance and long-distance policing of opposition political activists in Germany, France and elsewhere. The Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which has been involved in an armed conflict with the Turkish state since 1984, has been the main target of Turkish state activities, although the state has also targeted other leftist organizations, dissident Islamist organizations and –since an attempted coup in July 2016 – members of a broader Islamic movement linked to Fethullah Gülen – a cleric residing in Pennsylvania, USA whom President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has accused of being behind the coup attempt (Adamson 2020).

The case of Turkish emigration to Europe helps demonstrate the complexities of entangled migration governance. While much of what is considered to be “migration management” in Europe and North America involves immigration policy and border control or, alternatively, policies of integration, naturalization and citizenship, labor-sending states have an additional layer of migration governance policies that can be conceptualized as the management of emigration and the governance of citizens and diasporas abroad. This adds an additional layer to models of “multi-level migration governance” as it points to the ways in which the management of migration can at times lead not just to the governance of flows of people across state borders, but also to the transnationalisation and de-territorialisation of some functions of the state as it adapts to a situation in which increasing numbers of its citizens live beyond its territorial borders (Adamson and Demetriou 2007).

Migration Diplomacy as Entanglement

Just as Turkey's diaspora engagement policies create spatial entanglements with states in Europe, so too do dynamics of migration diplomacy between the European Union and Turkey (Içduygu and Aksel 2014; İçduygu and Üstübcü

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

2014). Migration diplomacy can be defined as “the use of diplomatic tools, processes, and procedures to manage cross-border population mobility” including “both the strategic use of migration flows as a means to obtain other aims, and the use of diplomatic methods to achieve goals related to migration.” (Adamson and Tsourapas 2019; Tsourapas 2017). The migration and asylum policies of European states, the border control policies of the European Union, and the external pressures that Europe exercises on Turkey as a candidate country to join the European Union all have significant effects on Turkey’s approach to migration and its formulation of domestic migration policy.

On the one hand, Turkey has faced pressure from the European Union to liberalise its migration and asylum policies in order to bring it into line with EU asylum laws as part of the overall process of accession, and in the broader context of EU harmonization of its asylum laws (Kirişçi 1996; Çetin 2020; Müftüler-Baç 2021). Following Turkey’s acceptance as an official candidate for membership in the European Union it began the process of negotiation and accession, which included the adoption of sets of laws and constitutional amendments to bring it into line with the requirements for EU membership, known as the *Acquis Communautaire* or the *acquis*. In 2005 Turkey produced a plan to modernize and update its migration and asylum laws to bring them into harmony with EU requirements. This eventually led to the 2013 Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP), which was officially adopted in 2014 and which replaced the earlier Law on Settlement (Içduygu and Üstübcü 2014).

At the same time, Turkey has faced equally strong pressure from Europe to control its borders and limit migration flows. The EU has often treated Turkey as a buffer zone between Europe and migration source countries to the south and east, especially the war-torn states of Syria and Iraq. This has occurred both within the overall accession process of strengthening the external borders of the European Union, but also within the larger policy of the externalization of EU migration control and its delegation of border control responsibilities to third party states (Lavenex 2006; 2016). The EU’s externalisation policies have therefore directly affected domestic policy-making in Turkey, producing new institutions, such as the Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM), as well as new forms of differentiated legal statuses (Üstübcü 2019; Müftüler-Baç 2021)

The conflict in Syria and the subsequent refugee crisis further entrenched EU-Turkey’s migration diplomacy, leading to intensified cooperation via the 2013 Readmission Agreement, the 2015 Joint Action Plan and the 2016 Refugee Statement (Müftüler-Baç 2021). In November 2015, Turkey signed a Joint Action

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Plan with the European Union in which the EU committed to giving Turkey EUR 3 billion to assist with managing the refugee crisis. In return, Turkey committed to using sea patrols and border restrictions to prevent the exit of migrants and refugees to Europe, as well as to crack down on passport forgeries and human trafficking and return those who failed to meet refugee determination criteria to their countries of origin. The Joint Action Plan was supplemented by the March 2016 EU-Turkey Deal, in which Europe agreed to take one registered Syrian refugee in Turkey for every Syrian asylum-seeker crossing the Turkish border into Greece who was subsequently returned – the so-called “one-in, one-out” deal. In exchange, Europe committed to speeding up the liberalization of visas for Turkish citizens and committed an additional EUR 3 billion in assistance to Turkey – bringing the total assistance package to EUR 6 billion.

The European Union's policy of externalisation its migration controls has had a number of re-spatialising effects that create further linkages and entanglements between foreign policy, security interests, the EU accession process and migration governance. As other scholars have noted, the EU's policies of externalisation have a re-spatialising effect by the shifting and outsourcing of border control practices to third party states, but also by their broader geopolitical effects reshaping regional interests around migration (Zardo 2020; Fakhoury 2021). Processes of externalisation also create shifts in the relationship between the EU and bordering states – creating new constraints and pressures, but also new sources of contention and opportunities for bordering states to use migration issues as sources of leverage, bargaining and issue linkage in their diplomatic relations with the EU (Greenhill 2016; Adamson and Tsourapas 2019; Karadag 2019).

Conclusions

This article has provided examples of the spatial complexities that surround contemporary migration governance. Far from being simply a domestic state policy issue of managing admissions, borders, citizenship regimes and integration, migration governance should instead be conceptualised as a multi-faceted policy issue characterised by complex geopolitical and spatial entanglements. Whereas “multi-level governance” (MLG) frameworks have gone some way in highlighting the roles played by policy actors at different local, national and regional scales, they are not able to fully capture the spatially “entangled” and complex geopolitical aspects of migration governance.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

An “entangled” perspective on migration governance highlights the significance of historical legacies and regional ties, emphasising that cross-border mobility creates enduring social and political ties across different spaces and jurisdictions that have long-lasting effects across a range of policy areas. By examining how these function in the case of Turkey across three areas – conflict and security entanglements; diaspora engagement policies; and migration diplomacy – the article shows how a perspective of entanglement can be useful in uncovering the diverse interlinkages between migration governance and other policy areas and state interests.

While the focus of this article has been on Turkey, an “entangled” approach to migration governance suggests generalisable principles for approaching migration management: an attention to historical legacies, regional neighbourhood and ongoing cross-border dynamics is as relevant for understanding cases as diverse as the US-Mexican border or the current Ukrainian conflict and crisis. Security entanglements, diasporic ties and issue linkages in migration diplomacy are common features in many cases, but they are not the only form of spatial entanglements associated with migration governance. The challenge for policy-makers is to find ways to manage these trans-spatial complexities within a broader governance context characterised by political institutions that are still largely territorial.

References

- Adamson, F.B. 2022 “Migration Governance in Turkey” in J. Hollifield and N. Foley, eds *Understanding Global Migration* Stanford: Stanford University Press: 367-384.
- Adamson, F. B. 2020 “Non-State Authoritarianism and Diaspora Politics.” *Global Networks* 20 (1): 150-169.
- Adamson, F.B. 2019 “Sending States and the Making of Intra-Diasporic Politics: Turkey and Its Diasporas.” *International Migration Review* 53 (1): 210-36.
- Adamson, F. B. and Demetriou, M. 2007 “Remapping the Boundaries of ‘State’ and ‘National Identity’: Incorporating Diasporas into IR Theorizing.” *European Journal of International Relations* 13 (4): 489–526.
- Adamson, F. B. and Tsourapas, G. 2020 “The Migration State in the Global South: Nationalizing, Developmental and Neoliberal Models of Migration

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Management." *International Migration Review* 54 (3): 853-882.

Adamson, F.B. and Tsourapas, G. 2019 "Migration Diplomacy in World Politics" *International Studies Perspectives* 20 (2): 113-128.

Akgündüz, A. 1993 "Labour Migration from Turkey to Western Europe (1960--1974) An Analytical Review." *Capital & Class* 17 (3): 153-94.

Akinci, B. 2017 "Spotlight: After Syria, Turkey is Building Second Security Wall Along Border with Iran; Iraq May be Next" *Xinhua Net* 12 August.

Aksel, Damla B. 2014 "Kins, Distant Workers, Diasporas: Constructing Turkey's Transnational Members Abroad." *Turkish Studies* 15 (2): 195-219.

Andreas, P. 2003 "Redrawing the Line: Borders and Security in the 21st Century: International Security in the 21st Century." *International Security* 28 (2): 78-111.

Arkilic, A. 2020 "Empowering a Fragmented Diaspora: Turkish Immigrant Organizations' Perceptions of and Responses to Turkish Diaspora Engagement Policy" *Mediterranean Politics* (online first)

Aydin, Y. 2014 "The New Turkish Diaspora Policy: Its Aims, Their Limits and the Challenges for Associations of People of Turkish Origin and Decision-Makers in Germany." SWP Research Paper RP/10 Berlin: German Institute for International and Security Affairs.

Braithwaite, A., Salehyan, I. and Savun, B. 2019 "Refugees, Forced Migration and Conflict: Introduction to the Special Issue" *Journal of Peace Research* 56 (1): 5-11.

Brand, L. A. 2006 *Citizens Abroad: Emigration and the State in the Middle East and North Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, B. 2020 "Imams for the Diaspora: The Turkish State's International Theology Programme" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (6): 1166-1183.

Buettner, E. 2016. *Europe After Empire: Decolonisation, Society and Culture* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

- Caponio, T and Jones-Correa, M. 2018 "Theorising Migration Policy in Multi-Level States: The Multilevel Governance Perspective" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (12): 1995-2010.
- Dal, E. P. 2017 "Impact of the Transnationalisation of the Syrian Civil War on Turkey: Conflict Spillover Cases of Isis and PYD-YPG/PKK." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 29 (4): 1396-1420.
- Délano, A. and Gamlen, A. 2014 "Comparing and Theorizing State–Diaspora Relations." *Political Geography* 41: 43–53.
- Dogus, I. 2017 "How Syrians in Turkey are Coping with a Polarized Political Climate," *New Statesman* 15 July 2017.
- Fakhoury, T. 2021 "The External Dimension of EU Migration Policy as Region-Building? Refugee Cooperation as Contentious Politics" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (online first)
- Fakhoury, T. 2019 "Multi-level Governance and Displacement in the Arab World: The Case of Syria's Displacement" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (8): 1310-1326.
- Gamlen, A. 2014 "Diaspora Institutions and Diaspora Governance." *International Migration Review* 48(s1): 180–217.
- Gleditsch, K.S. and Salehyan, I. 2006 "Refugees and the Spread of Civil War." *International Organization* 60 (2): 335-366.
- Greenhill, K. M. 2016 "Open Arms Behind Barred Doors: Fear, Hypocrisy and Policy Schizophrenia in the European Migration Crisis." *European Law Journal* 22 (3): 317–32.
- Güneş, C. 2013 *The Kurdish National Movement in Turkey: From Protest to Resistance* London: Routledge.
- Hollifield, J. F. 2004 "The Emerging Migration State." *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 885–912.
- İçduygu, A. and Aksel, D. 2014 "Two-to-Tango in Migration Diplomacy: Negotiating Readmission Agreement Between the EU and Turkey" *European Journal of Migration and Law* 16: 336-362

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

- İçduygu, A. and Ustübcü, A. 2014 "Negotiating Mobility, Debating Borders: Migration Diplomacy in Turkey-EU Relations." In Helen Schwenken and Sabine Russ-Sattar, eds. *New Border and Citizenship Policies*: Berlin: Springer: 44-59.
- İçduygu, A. and Yüksek, D. 2012 "Rethinking Transit Migration in Turkey: Reality and Representation in the Creation of a Migratory Phenomenon." *Population, Space and Place* 18: 441-456.
- Karadağ, S. 2019 "Extraterritoriality of European Borders to Turkey: An Implementation Perspective of Counteractive Strategies." *Comparative Migration Studies* 7 (12): 1-16.
- Kaya, A. 2011 "Euro-Turks as a Force in EU-Turkey Relations" *South European Identity and Politics* 16 (3): 499-512.
- Kirişçi, K. 1996 "Is Turkey Lifting the 'Geographical Location'? – The November 1994 Regulation on Asylum in Turkey." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 8 (3): 293-318.
- Kirişçi, K. 2000 "Disaggregating Turkish Citizenship and Immigration Practices." *Middle Eastern Studies* 36 (3): 1–22.
- Kirişçi, K. 2007 "Turkey: A Country of Transition from Emigration to Immigration." *Mediterranean Politics* 12 (1): 91–97.
- Klotz, A. 2013 *Migration and National Identity in South Africa, 1860-2010*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurt, M. 2017 *Kurdish Hizbullah in Turkey: Islamism, Violence and the State* London: Pluto Press.
- Lavenex, S. 2006 "Shifting "Up" and "Out": The Foreign Policy of EU Immigration Control." *West European Politics* 29 (2): 554-570.
- Lavenex, S. 2016 "Multileveling EU External Governance: The Role of International Organizations in the Diffusion of EU Migration Policies." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (4): 554–570.
- Tovah L. 2015 "Netanyahu to French, European Jews After Paris Attacks: Israel

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

is Your Home," *Jerusalem Post* January 1, 2015
<http://www.jpost.com/Israel-News/Netanyahu-to-French-European-Jews-after-Paris-attacks-Israel-is-your-home-387309>.

Mayblin, L. and Turner, B. 2020 *Migration Studies and Colonialism* Cambridge: Polity.

Martin, P. 1991 *The Unfinished Story: Turkish Labour Migration to Western Europe: With Special Reference to the Federal Republic of Germany*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.

Moss, D. M. 2016 "Transnational Repression, Diaspora Mobilization, and the Case of The Arab Spring." *Social Problems* 63 (4): 480–98.

Müftüleri-Baç, M. 2021 "Externalization of Migration Governance, Turkey's Migration Regime, and the Protection of the European Union's External Borders." *Turkish Studies* (online first).

Mügge, L. 2012 "Ideologies of Nationhood in Sending-State Transnationalism: Comparing Surinam and Turkey." *Ethnicities* 13 (3): 338–58.

Mylonas, H. 2013 "The Politics of Diaspora Management in the Republic of Korea." Issue Brief No. 81. Seoul, SK: The Asian Institute for Policy Studies, 1–12.

Öktem, K. 2014 "Turkey's New Diaspora Policy: The Challenge of Inclusivity, Outreach and Capacity." Istanbul Policy Center, Stiftung Mercator Initiative: Istanbul: Sabanci University.

Østergaard-Nielsen, E. 2003 *Transnational Politics: The Case of Turks and Kurds in Germany*. London: Routledge.

Patton, M. Q. 2014 *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrative Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications.

Ragazzi, F. 2014 "A Comparative Analysis of Diaspora Policies." *Political Geography* 41: 74–89.

Reuters 2017 Erdoğan Brands Dutch Government "Nazi remnants and Fascists" 11 March 2017.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Richards, A. and Waterbury, J. 1990 *A Political Economy of the Middle East: State, Class, and Economic Development* Boulder: Westview Press.

Ruegger, S. 2019 "Refugees, Ethnic Power Relations and Civil Conflict in the Country of Asylum." *Journal of Peace Research* 56 (1): 42-57.

Sadiq, K. and Tsourapas, G. 2021 "The Postcolonial Migration State." *European Journal of International Relations* 27 (3): 884-912.

Saeed, S. 2017 *Kurdish. Politics in Turkey: From the PKK to the KCK* London: Routledge.

Scholten, P. and Penninx, R. 2016 "The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration." In: Garcés-Masareñas, B. and Penninx, R. (eds) *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe*. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham.

Singer, D. 1961 "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations." *World Politics* 14 (1): 77-92.

Torpey, J. 2000 *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and National Identity* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsourapas, G. 2017 "Migration Diplomacy in the Global South: Cooperation, Coercion and Issue-Linkage in Gaddafi's Libya." *Third World Quarterly* 38 (10): 2367-2385

Tsourapas, G. 2020 "Theorizing State-Diaspora Relations in the Middle East: Authoritarian Emigration States in Comparative Perspective" *Mediterranean Politics* 25 (2): 135-159.

Unver, O. C. 2022 "Transnational Turkish-German Community in Limbo: Consequences of Political Tensions between Migration-Sending and Migration-Receiving States." *International Migration* (online first).

Usta, B. 2017 "Erdoğan tells Turks in Germany to vote against Merkel." *Reuters* 18 August.

Üstübici, A. 2019 "The Impact of Externalized Migration Governance on Turkey: Technocratic Migration Governance and the Production of Differentiated Legal Status." *Comparative Migration Studies* 7 (46): 1-18.

D8.8. From 'Multi-Level' to 'Entangled'. Re-Spatialising Migration Governance in Turkey

Varadarajan, L. 2010 *The Domestic Abroad: Diasporas in International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vigneswaran, D. 2013 *Territory, Migration and the International System* New York: Springer.

Vigneswaran, D. and Quirk, J. 2015 *Mobility Makes States: Migration and Power in Africa* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

White, P. J. 2000 *Primitive Rebels or Revolutionary Modernizers? The Kurdish Nationalist Movement in Turkey* London: Zed.

Zardo, F. 2022 "The EU Trust Fund for Africa: Geopolitical Space-Making Through Migration Policy Instruments" *Geopolitics* 27 (22): 584-603.

Zincone, G and T. Caponio. 2006. "The Multilevel. Governance of Migration." In *The Dynamics of International Migration and Settlement in Europe: A State of the Art* R. Penninx, M. Berger and K. Kraal, eds., IMISCOE Joint Studies Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.