

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT AS A BIOPOLITICAL SELECTION POLICY:
THE ROLE OF REFUGEE BIODATA FOR RESETTLEMENT FROM TURKEY

Ezgi Mutlu

115605031

Assist. Prof. Can Cemgil

İSTANBUL

2020

**REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT AS A BIOPOLITICAL SELECTION POLICY:
THE ROLE OF REFUGEE BIODATA FOR RESETTLEMENT FROM TURKEY**

**Biyopolitik Seçilim Politikası Olarak Mültecilerin Üçüncü Ülkeye Yerleştirilmesi:
Türkiye'deki Mültecilerin Kişisel Bilgilerinin Üçüncü Ülkeye Yerleştirilmelerindeki Rolü**

Ezgi Mutlu

115605031

Tez Danışmanı: Assist. Prof. Dr. Can Cemgil

(İmza)

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyeleri: Assist. Prof. Dr. Şadan İnan
Rüma**

(İmza)

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyesi: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Üstün

(İmza)

Nişantaşı Üniversitesi

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 11.06.2020

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 74

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe):

- 1) Mülteci
- 2) Üçüncü Ülkeye Yerleştirme
- 3) Biyopolitika
- 4) Biyoiktidar
- 5) İlk iltica ülkesi

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce):

- 1) Refugee
- 2) Resettlement
- 3) Biopolitics
- 4) Biopower
- 5) First asylum country

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Can Cemgil for his valuable guidance and continuous support during the process. I would also like to thank the rest of my thesis committee, Assoc. Prof. ıgdem Üstün and Asst. Prof. Şadan İnan Rūma for their insightful comments and contributions.

I owe great debt to my family, especially my mother, for unequivocally supporting me in all that I do and always being there for me. I also want to extend my appreciation to Adil for bringing joy and standing by me in every sphere of my life - both academically and personally.

In addition, I am very grateful to Bal, Elif and Gülce for being such great friends and spending their valuable time to proofread my thesis and provide valuable feedback. I would also like to express my thanks to Begüm for her support during the jury process and to Erman for his last-minute support during the submission period.

Above all, I would like to thank oruh for keeping me sane through the long days of writing and standing by me in any challenging circumstance.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3RP: Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan

DGMM: Directorate General of Migration Management

EU: European Union

ILO: International Labor Organization

IP: International Protection

IPE: International Political Economy

ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham

IR: International Relations

IRO: International Refugee Organization

LFIP: Law on Foreigners and International Protection

MENA: Middle East and North Africa

PDMM: Provincial Directorate of Migration Management

TP: Temporary Protection

UN: United Nations

UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the refugee resettlement instrument which allows certain refugees to leave their country of asylum legally and start to dwell in Western industrialized receiving countries which grant them permanent residence status. Refugee resettlement is described as one of the durable solutions of the international refugee protection system which prioritizes the lives of the most vulnerable in liberal humanitarian migration government discourse. On the other hand, the selection criteria of the resettlement countries on the grounds of deservingness and integration have raised questions on the humanitarian aspect of this policy from the sides of refugees and the authorities of the first asylum countries. Building on the refugee resettlement as a way to implement biopower argument, the inclusion and exclusion of the refugees into the resettlement is analyzed by conducting secondary source analysis in this thesis. Following the ideas of Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben, it is asserted that, the biodata and self-revelation of an individual determine the inclusion or exclusion as a refugee by assessing their capacity to improve economic, emotional and biological well-being or welfare of the host country. By analyzing the resettlement patterns from Turkey as one of the main first country of asylum, it is argued that refugees tend to manipulate their biodata in order to be included into resettlement mechanism. Also, it is revealed that Turkey as a first country of asylum subjugates the resettled refugees in relation with their biodata by establishing a state of exception.

Keywords: Refugee, refugee resettlement, biopolitics, biopower, first country of asylum

ÖZET

Bu tez, mültecilerin ilk sığınma ülkelerinden seçilerek yasal bir şekilde üçüncü bir ülkeye yerleştirilmesi uygulamasını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu üçüncü ülkeler, genellikle çatışma alanlarında uzak, endüstrileşmiş Batı ülkeleri olmaktadır. Liberal insani göç yönetimi söylemi, üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirme politikasını uluslararası mülteci koruma sistemi içerisindeki en kalıcı çözüm olarak addetmektedir. Bu sistem, en hassas durumdaki mültecileri koruma iddiasındadır. Buna karşılık; bu ülkelerin kişileri, değerlilik ve uyum potansiyeli üzerinden değerlendirme ve seçme kriterleri, bu uygulamanın insani boyutu hakkında mülteciler ve ilk sığınma ülkeleri yetkililerinde şüpheye mahal vermektedir. Bu araştırmada, üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirme kavramının biyoiktidar yaratma yöntemi olarak kullanılması tezine dayanarak, mültecilerin bu politikaya dâhil edilmesi veyahut dışarıda bırakılması incelenmiştir. Michel Foucault'nun geliştirdiği biyoiktidar ve biyopolitik seçim ve takiben Giorgio Agamben'in çıplak hayat ve istisnai hal kavramları temel alınarak, bir mültecinin üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirilmesini etkileyen faktörler incelenmiştir. Bunun sonucunda, bir mültecinin üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirilme uygulamasına kabulünde, yerleştirilecek olduğu ülkenin ekonomik, duygusal ve biyolojik refahına yapacağı katkının değerlendirildiği saptanmıştır. Bu katkının değerlendirilmesi, mültecinin eğitim seviyesi, dini ve uyruğu gibi kişisel bilgileri göz önüne alınarak yapıldığı tartışılmıştır. En çok mülteci nüfusuna sahip olmasının yanı sıra ilk sığınma ve geçiş ülkesi olan Türkiye'deki mültecilerin ve ülkenin yetkililerinin üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirme politikalarına yönelik tavırları incelenmiştir. Mültecilerin, üçüncü ülkelerin biyopolitik seçim yaptıkları düşüncesiyle kendi kişisel bilgilerini manipüle ettikleri görülmüştür. Ayrıca, Türkiye devletinin de üçüncü ülkelerin mülteci seçim politikalarına karşı geliştirdiği eleştirel tavırla istisnai hal yaratıp, mülteciler üzerinde tekrardan bir biyoiktidar kurmakta olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mülteci, üçüncü ülkeye yerleştirme, biyopolitika, biyoiktidar, ilk iltica ülkesi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Research Question and Rationale	3
1. PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION AND CONCEPTUALIZATION... 6	
1.1. Turkey as the Main Host and Transit Country for Refugees.....	6
1.2. Refugee & Asylum Seeker & Migrant	10
1.3. Refugee Resettlement	16
1.3.1. Historical Evolution of the Resettlement	19
1.3.2. Resettlement Figures	22
2. LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ...	23
3. THEORITICAL BACKGROUND	29
3.1. Biopolitics / Biopower	29
3.2. Governmentality	31
3.3. Homo Sacer and Bare Life	32
4. RESETTLEMENT AS A WAY TO IMPLEMENT BIOPOLITICS / BIOPOWER	35
4.1. Resettlement from Turkey – Refugees’ Perspectives.....	38
4.2. Resettlement from Turkey - Government’s Responses.....	44
CONCLUSION	49
REFERENCES	52

INTRODUCTION

Beginning from 2011, the Arab world in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region have experienced a series of protests, civil uprisings, and armed rebellions against the post-colonial authoritarian regimes. The series of such events triggered a phenomenon that is known as the “Arab Spring”. Following Mohamad Bouazizi’s self-immolation after his unlicensed vegetable cart was confiscated by police in Tunisia, “perhaps thinking that he might be better off dead than living under such conditions” (Lageman, 2016), uprisings against former leader Zine El Abidine Ben Ali started. These uprisings reflected poverty, high unemployment and corruption in Tunisia and have spread over the Arab region.

It is widely discussed that Arab Spring started as peaceful demonstrations as a response to restrictions of political rights and civil liberties instituted by many Arab autocrats as well as social and economic grievances, as popular demand for free expression and as a reaction to the stagnation of liberalizing reform programs (Hochman, 2013). These peaceful demonstrations demanding “bread, freedom and social equality” have evolved into a violent clash between the security forces of incumbent governments and the people in a short period. Following these developments, there have been regime changes in minor or non-oil exporting and non-hereditary regimes such as Egypt, Tunisia and Yemen in the first place. On the other hand, there have been elite cohesion and crackdown that resulted in continuation of existing hereditary or major oil exporting regimes such as Gulf States, Jordan, Morocco and Syria. (Brownlee, Masoud & Reynolds, 2014) Focusing on the consequences of the so-called “Arab Spring”, there has been an ongoing debate on this term whether it was an Arab Spring or “Arab Winter” (Israeli, 2013; Munzer, 2015; Hannapi, 2016). As one of the most dramatic examples of these events, we can adduce the peaceful protests in Syria that started in various provinces and did not actually gained public attention at first but then evolved into an extremely violent civil war after the imprisonment and inhuman treatment of students who were around fifteen years old for writing slogans on the wall against president Bashar al-Asad. Protests spread to different provinces

demanding the emancipation of political prisoners and the ending of the 48 years of state of emergency. These protests were encountered with brutal reprisal from the government forces. Many regional and international actors from the Middle East and beyond were and are still involved in the Syrian conflict which led to hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths and displacement of millions of people.

After the breakout of the Syrian Civil War, “we are now witnessing the highest levels of displacement on record. An unprecedented 70.8 million people around the world have been forced from home” (United Nations, 2019). According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)’s report, “Turkey hosts the world’s largest number of refugees and asylum-seekers” for fourth consecutive year followed by Pakistan, Uganda, Sudan and Germany, while Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey are the hosts of largest refugee populations in conjunction with their population respectively” (United Nations, 2018). First countries of asylum and top refugee hosting countries tend to be placed close to the conflict zones and the refugees and asylum seekers desire to travel towards Europe or other industrialized parts of the world in order to have better life conditions in terms of financial and educational standards, cultural and religious freedom.

In line with the ‘burden-sharing’ argument, we can consider “resettlement” of the refugees to third countries and “relocation” concept within the European Union Member States as the main objectives of international humanitarian governance and responsibility sharing together with the family unification prospect. According to UNHCR’s Resettlement Fact Sheet, “less than 1 per cent of the refugee population in Turkey was submitted for resettlement in 2016. In 2017, this number dropped to under 0.6 per cent as a result of the global reduction in resettlement quotas” (United Nations, 2018). Despite the enormous number of refugees outside of the EU border mostly in the developing and underdeveloped countries, there are quite a few refugees who can be granted a resettlement status. According to Kirişçi, there has been very limited resettlement of Syrian refugees from Turkey to the EU leading to bitter criticism of the EU’s approach to burden-

sharing. (Kirişçi, 2020) Thus, resettlement is considered as a “pipe dream” for most of the refugees.

There are few studies on the topic of resettlement of the refugees from Turkey, and these widely focus on migration strategies. I will discuss these studies in the following chapters, following the literature review on refugee¹ resettlement and the theoretical discussion of biopolitics.

Research Question and Rationale

Focusing on the concept of the resettlement introduced above, this thesis is going to discuss the concept of resettlement as an essential instrument for refugees whose main aim is to reach Europe and/or to offshore industrialized countries such as Canada, Australia and the United States. Thereby, this thesis will investigate the politics of the resettlement by indicating the relationship between government and individual body of a refugee or an asylum seeker. The methodology of this thesis will be borrowed from the biopolitics/biopower literature, as it provides a common theory that demonstrates the networks of sovereign power over death and life. This theory will introduce the regulatory control of the sovereign over the populations and enable an analysis of its effects on the refugee and migration management strategies of the governments. According to this theory, the refugees are surveilled, protected, looked after and sometimes let die. Resettlement allows full, permanent membership in the community, which makes it an important tool for migration management. Therefore, the documentation, biodata and self-revelation of an individual will determine the inclusion or exclusion of the refugee by the resettlement countries by assessing their capacity to improve economic, emotional and biological well-being or welfare of the host country.

¹ Note that the term of “refugee” in this thesis includes applicants and status holders of the International Protection (non-Syrian refugees and asylum seekers) and the Temporary Protection holders (Syrian refugees) to abridge the repetition of the terms.

Employing the theories of biopolitics/biopower literature, this thesis will ask the following question. How do refugees' biodata and self-revelation affect their resettlement prospect from Turkey? Refugee biodata includes a person's personal, educational and professional information which can be obtained from self-revelation² of an individual. This question will be answered by analyzing various contents such as articles, researches and media coverage on the main tendencies of refugees who desire to be resettled, the situation of the refugees who are accepted to be resettled and the government's responses on the resettlement process of refugees. This thesis aims to contribute to the studies, in which the refugee issue will be examined as a form of forced migration from the IR literature's scholarly perspective, while questioning the effects of the resettlement practices of industrialized countries and the response of the first countries of asylum to the refugee resettlement politics.

In the following chapter, how Turkish government manages migration into Turkey as a current main host and transit country globally and how emigration outside is governed will be briefly addressed. Afterwards, the terms of refugee, asylum seeker and migrant will be described and distinguished. After the historical perspective on resettlement, in what follows a systematic view of the resettlement concept as a durable and permanent solution to the so-called '*refugee crisis*'³ is going to be investigated from different perspectives. As a theoretical background, Foucault's terms of biopolitics, biopower and Agamben's notions of homo sacer and bare life will be explained which are common theories of the migration studies. In the last chapter of this thesis, the biopolitics of the resettlement as an instrument of the humanitarian government will be analyzed by investigating the resettlement

² In this regard, self-revelation means the statement of an individual concerning his/her grounds to seek refugee including their religion, ethnic identity, membership of a particular political group and vulnerabilities.

³ The wording is problematic which has a pejorative meaning to describe the movement of people fleeing from their countries of origin in order to seek asylum. As people are on the move due to generalized violence, extreme poverty or personalized fear of persecution in their country of origin, prioritizing the difficulties associated with the reception of large number of refugees over what those refugees go through makes the term contestable.

eligibility criteria and selection patterns of the receiving countries. Correlatively, the patterns of self-revelation of refugees in Turkey will be illustrated by using content analysis method. And lastly, the responses of the government of Turkey as a transit country to the resettlement practices of the industrialized neo-liberal receiving countries will be examined by using the concepts of biopolitics. It will be concluded that, constructing on the neoliberalism and selectiveness aspect of the resettlement, this concept is analyzed as a way to implement biopolitics / biopower to the sovereign, as it enables a regulatory control of the population, inclusion and exclusion of specific groups in the population by establishing norms, and power to establish a state of exception.

1. PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION AND CONCEPTUALIZATION

1.1 Turkey as the Main Host and Transit Country for Refugees

As a current top refugee hosting country, Turkey continues to be one of the critical places for immigration, yet mostly as a transit country to reach a third country due to its geographical location bridging Europe and the Middle East and Asia (Kirişçi, 1996, p.385). As a matter of fact, starting from the foundation of the Turkish Republic as a nation-state, there have been waves of immigration directed through Turkey. In the 1960s, Turkey was started to be described as a “country of emigration” due to labor migrations with the signing of the worker recruitment agreement between Turkey and the Federal Republic of Germany. Movement towards Europe was followed after the 1980 Coup by dissident Kurds and leftists due to rising state violence against them. Besides, in the wake of the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979, the Gulf War in 1991, the Bosnian War between 1992 and 1995, and also migration movements from Afghanistan, Sudan and Somalia due to ongoing wars and turmoil and currently is an important transit country for refugees, asylum-seekers, and migrant laborers (İçduygu & Yüksek, 2010, p.441), Turkey was started to be considered as both migrant-sending and migrant-receiving country. UNHCR’s data shows that, “more than 48% of refugees were granted refugee status and resettled in countries such as Canada and the US” (Aksel & İçduygu, 2012) between 1997 and 2007. This provided the refugees a type of ‘legalized transit’, in the sense that they entered illegally but ended up leaving Turkey legally (İçduygu & Yüksek, 2010, p.449). Accordingly, Turkey was a transit country for irregular migrants rather than a destination asylum country. The statistics indicate that over 750,000 irregular migrants, who are mostly from Iran and Iraq, were apprehended in Turkey between 1995 and 2008 (Clerk et. al., 2014, p.30). Before the Syrian Civil War started, almost half of the refugees in Turkey have been resettled abroad, in addition to the others, who were using Turkey as a path to reach the European territory.

From the very early period of the Civil War in Syria, which Turkey shares its longest border with; Turkey has implemented an open-door policy for Syrian asylum seekers. Aras and Mencütek (2015) argue that Turkey's open-door policy differs from the policies of previous refugee crisis, such as Kurdish refugee influx from Iraq. This influx was argued to be due to "the country's ambition to become a regional power had an impact on its approach to Syrian refugees" (Aras and Mencütek, 2015, p.194). Therefore, some suggest that Turkey's enthusiasm to become a key regional power in the MENA has shaped its refugee policies from the beginning of the conflict. Later, the conflict between Bashar Al-Assad and Turkey's former Prime Minister (current President) Recep Tayyip Erdoğan indicated that Turkey can strategically shift from a humanitarian discourse and emphasize the securitization aspect. Burcu Toğral describes Turkey's shift in its refugee policies as it directs "from sacred mission to foreign policy instrument or that the Syrians are repositioned from the status of guests to enemies" (Toğral, 2016). Although Turkey's discourse has generally stayed humanitarian, the border policies have returned to intense securitization starting from 2017 (Okyay, 2017, p.830). But still, Turkey's role as the largest host for Syrian refugees hasn't changed for several consecutive years, beginning from the early periods of the conflict. EU – Turkey Agreement on the stricter border regime and control mechanisms in exchange of the "financial solidarity", promise of visa-free travel for Turkish citizens and revival of EU accession negotiations has enabled Turkish government to host the considerable number of refugees.

Besides the historical and political aspects of the migration receiving and sending from Turkey, it is essential to draw the legal framework to see the status of the international protection holders in Turkey. Then, it will be possible to examine the patterns of refugee resettlement. The most important legal framework regulating the rights and obligations of the migrants and refugees is the Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP) which has come into force in April 2013. According to this legislation, the term of refugee is described as in the Article 61 that;

“A person who as a result of events occurring in European countries and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his citizenship and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it, shall be granted refugee status upon completion of the refugee status determination process” (LFIP, p.23).

Definition of the term “refugee” builds on the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees with the geographical limitation. Turkey’s retainment of “the geographical limitation to its ratification of the Refugee Convention means that only those fleeing as a consequence of ‘events occurring in Europe’ can be given refugee status” (Turkey: Protecting Refugees, 2020). The ones who flee from their country “as a result of events occurring outside European countries” (Art. 62) obtain a “conditional refugee” status.

According to Ongur & Zengin (2019), considering the reality of “living in limbo, poverty, and struggling to make ends meet without the prospect of a more stable future” many asylum seekers from Syria would risk dangerous journeys to Europe with the hope of recognition as refugees, based on the expectation that this status will provide a prospect for the stable pathway towards full citizenship (p.13). Because, there is no possible legal path to obtain a citizenship for refugees in Turkey, the conditional refugees and subsidiary protection holders as per the LFIP and related regulation, the Temporary Protection Regulation, that concerns the mass influx of people who flee from the Syrian Arab Republic due to generalized violence. As the name implies, “temporariness” of the Regulation which concerns the persons from Syria can be seen in the Article 25 which states “the temporary protection identity card shall not give admission to apply the holder to the Turkish citizenship” (TPR, Art. 25). Although the structure of their daily lives differs, what mainly unites Syrian and non-Syrian refugees/asylum-seekers in Turkey are their rights and the implementation of rights for education, work and healthcare as well

as their non-allowance to become fully members, namely, to get citizenship and have political rights.

At this juncture, it is important to state that International Protection status applicants and holders shall accommodate in their assigned “satellite cities” and shall ask for the permission of the Provincial Directorate of Migration Management (PDMM) in case they need to travel another city. Likewise, Temporary Protection status holders shall reside in their registration cities and shall not leave this city without proving their exit reasons to the PDMM under the Ministry of Interior of Turkey. This regulation demonstrates the “incarceration” aspect of being refugee in Turkey in the simplest form. Therefore, resettlement remained as the best option for refugees who are incarcerated in Turkey which can be described as “permanent temporariness” (Yiftachel, 2009) without any prospect to become a citizen and have a stabilized future.

Refugees in Turkey have drawn significant attention of scholars for the last decade beginning with the Syrian Civil War. This literature includes descriptive reports which include the employment, living conditions in camps and satellite cities and their presence in informal labor market, (Özden, 2013; Korkmaz, 2017; Kavak, 2016) and emphasize the abuse of refugees as unregistered and cheap labor force. Studies focus on the national and international service and rights-based protection practices that are mostly not solidarity practices but NGO activities but promoted services by Western-origin INGOs, UN or EU (Bahadır et. al., 2013; Çorabatır, 2016) also takes place in the literature. In addition, overview of the legal framework (Açıkgöz & Arner, 2014; Kirişçi, 2012; Soykan, 2012) and government’s responses to the crisis and integration policies (Ferris & Kirişçi, 2015) are the mostly touched upon subjects in the academic literature on migration and refugees in Turkey. According to Çağlar’s comprehensive research on the asylum seekers in Turkey in 2011, before the Syrian asylum seekers arrived, the main problems were identified as challenging living conditions in terms of health and education services, accommodation and nourishment in conjunction with

difficulties of obtaining work permit and hard living conditions in some satellite cities (Çağlar, 2011). Situation has remained similar after the arrival of Syrian refugees, while the efforts of service-based NGOs and IOs and humanitarian funding from the EU has increased immensely.

UNHCR Turkey has been implementing one of the largest resettlement operations in the world since 2014. Between the start of the Syrian crisis and September 2018, UNHCR Turkey has submitted “56,702 Syrians for resettlement which is less than 2% of the population of Syrians under the temporary protection regime in Turkey” (United Nations, 2018). This significant decrease in comparison to the 2000s, during which almost 50% of refugees have been resettled, can be explained by the mass movement of Syrian asylum seekers and growing number of individuals and their demands for resettlement as a result of the influx patterns.

The so-called *refugee crisis* of the European Union, challenges that refugees face in neighboring and transit countries, irregular migration between Middle East and Europe, human-trafficking and huge amounts of asylum seekers who died in the Mediterranean Sea on their way to Europe became one of the most prominent topics in the media and also on the agenda of the politicians. The year of 2015 is considered as the year of “Europe’s Refugee Crisis” since almost a million refugees and migrants had arrived on the shores of Europe following the routes of Turkey – Greece and Libya – Italy. While this enormous displacement of the people who had been living in Syria created a huge humanitarian crisis, “the most striking weakness is the failure of the international community to demonstrate solidarity in burden-sharing with the neighboring countries hosting the bulk of the Syrian refugees” (Kirişçi & Ferris, 2015).

1.1. Refugee & Asylum Seeker & Migrant

The term refugee is defined as a person who “fled their country of origin and is unable or unwilling to return because of a well-founded fear of being persecuted by reason of their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular

social group or political opinion” (Amnesty International, 2019). Historically and legally, the term is widely accepted after the Second World War as a consequence of the Holocaust and started to be recognized around the world, pursuant to the internal conflicts of the Cold War, followed by the occupations in Afghanistan and Iraq. People had to flee from their country of origin in order to seek asylum in another state due to general state of war, which might lead to mass influx or individualized fear of persecution based on five abovementioned reasons: race, religion, nationality, and membership of a particular social group or political opinion. The definition of the term and the standard rules for protection are designated in 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and after amended by lifting the geographical limitation in the definition of the term of “refugee” only limited the events occurred inside of Europe with the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees with the emergence of new refugees after the decolonization period. It is important to state that, although most of the migrant and refugee receiving states are signatories of the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol -some of them with some reservations- nevertheless they tend to generate restrictive policies and practices which leads to discriminative conditions (Kneebone et al, 2014). In line with the definition of the refugee, asylum seeker is described as a person who thinks s/he falls under this specification and applies for the international protection in a country out of her/his country of origin. If an asylum seeker’s application is approved after the assessment by the country of asylum, s/he gains the refugee status eventually. Refugee status is usually granted by the national authorities of the governments sometimes with technical support of the UNHCR. These two concepts, asylum seeker and refugee, are sometimes employed interchangeably (Bischoff, et. al., 2003; Cheng, Drillich & Schattner, 2015). However, this does not seem problematic since the difference is more technical than content related.

On the other hand, interchangeable usage of the terms “refugee” and “migrant” seems more problematic and the difference between two terms has been emphasized by the authorities of the UNHCR and other international organizations.

The UNHCR highlights the notion that “refugees are not migrants. It is dangerous and detrimental to refugee protection to confuse two groups terminologically or otherwise” (Feller, 2005, p.27). While there is a stress on the ‘voluntary’ and ‘noncompulsory’ side of being a migrant, the refugees and asylum seekers are perceived as they had no choice but to flee from persecution. “Across many historical and geographic contexts, the discursive framings of the causes of displacement—particularly those involving the overlapping dichotomies of voluntary/forced, (im)migrant/refugee, and economic/political - have shaped how states and other actors have responded to displaced people” (Holmes & Castenada, 2016, p.16). While refugees are considered displaced because of the compulsory reasons such as war or fear of individual persecution, migrants are seen as voluntarily migrated people to have better life conditions. Relevant to this matter, there are some criticisms over this strict distinction as pointing out “poverty and persecution at the source are often interconnected” (Long, 2013, p.8). However, economic migration can also be perceived compulsory in the context of poverty, unemployment and famine which affects the very life of the individuals in a cumulative ground in the neoliberal world order which led to great economic insecurity and inequality.

Nevertheless, migration studies and therefore forced migration, along with the refugee issue are the most frequently studied topics as “we are currently witnessing the highest levels on displacement on record” (United Nations, 2018). The number of studies in the area has accelerated after the breakout of the Syrian Civil War. Migration has taken scholarly attention from different field of studies including economics, sociology, psychology, education, anthropology, political science and international relations. Even then, the literature has directed comparatively little attention to the international politics of forced migration. Most of the work on refugees in world politics literature is based on archival research and has fully benefitted from the concepts and theories suggested by the IR literature (Betts & Loescher, 2011, p.3). Therefore, I believe, it is important to study forced migration and refugee issue, which have challenged the modern understanding of

sovereignty, the nation/state/territory trinity, and the possible solutions offered by the international organizations and the states should be investigated from an IR perspective.

Table 1: Typology of the Relationship between IR and Forced Migration Studies (Betts & Loescher, 2011)

Level of Analysis	Topics of Relevance	Contribution to IR Theory	Contribution to Forced Migration
Causes	International Political Economy (IPE) International Order	Critical IPE Mutual Constitution of Westphalia	Root Causes Historical Emergence of the refugee
Consequences	Security and Conflict Conflict Terrorism Trans-nationalism	“New Wars” “Spoilers” Conflict Diffusion Diaspora Mobilization	Human Security Peace-building Impact of 9/11 on asylum Remittances
Responses	International Cooperation/Institutions Normative	Biopower Arendt/ Agamben	Third World Security Predicament Normative and Ethical Analysis of Asylum

The literature provides three levels of analysis to discuss refugee studies in international relations, as can be seen in the Table 1 above. The most frequently studied topics of relevance are “IPE and international order with regard to causes, security and conflict, terrorism and trans-nationalism as consequences and international cooperation/institutions and securitization in relation with the

responses” (Betts & Loescher, 2011, p.13) Since this thesis is going to analyze the concept of resettlement as a response to the refugee issue and as a way of migration management, it would be useful to go through the studies on the responses of the forced migration. The emphasis on “humanitarianism” is one of the most common arguments in the literature. While there is a strong endorsement of refugee protection under the name of ‘humanitarianism’, which is ‘above politics’ from the perspective of the UN organs, international organizations and NGOs (Jubilut & Carneiro, 2011; European Commission, 2019; Barnett, 2013; Anderson, 1999); critical studies on humanitarian approach also occupies a significant place (Agier ,2011; Hyndman, 2000; Long, 2013; Lippert, 1998; Kohl, 2016). Didier Fassin asserts that “humanitarian government determines a mode of governing precarious lives – such as the lives of unemployed and the asylum seekers, sick immigrants, people with AIDS, etc” (Fassin, 209, p.2). In conjunction with today’s so-called “European Refugee Crisis” and the considerable increase in the number of displaced persons around the world; responses to this crisis from a humanitarian approach brought criticism. As Mavelli (2017) points out “the humanitarian government encompasses dynamics of depoliticization, as the language of compassion and emotions turn ‘domination’ into ‘misfortune’, ‘injustice’ into ‘suffering’, and ‘violence’ into ‘trauma’” (Mavelli, 2017, p.3). While there are consequential political implications of the international migration and forced migration, international organizations reduce this issue to a technocracy without providing a causal link to the international politics. (Pécoud, 2015, 553) Therefore, the humanitarian discourse has decreased the refugees to individuals who are needed to be taken care of and humanitarian government can be described as the politics of individual.

In addition to the depoliticization aspect, it is asserted that humanitarianism is “simultaneously a politics and antipolitics” (Mavelli, 2017, p.6). The politicization aspect can be explained as “the term humanitarian is used to describe pleas for states to offer neutral and impartial protection from persecution. This doesn’t preclude the notion that the decision to recognize such claims may be in

fact highly political, particularly in terms of determining what constitutes persecution”. (Long, 2013, p.6) For example, a person’s sexual orientation may be accepted as a reason of persecution and discrimination in one country; while another state may be ignorant to this issue because of its own political agenda and norms. Despite the international legal acquis on the protection of refugees, official ideology of the states may affect the decision concerning what is persecution and what is not. On the other hand, depoliticization of migration by the humanitarian government can be seen in the strong emphasis of the UNHCR’s migrant & refugee distinction “by establishing what constitutes legitimate suffering and turns suffering bodies as victims without a perpetrator – individuals as objects of care and compassion rather than equal citizens” (Ticktin, 2011, p.11). While “liberal and humanitarian discourses of citizenship portray immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers as invariably human beings in need to be cared for” (Papastergiadis, 2006, p.); on the other hand, they tend to present asylum seekers and refugees as ‘others’ who are threat to national identity and needs to be securitized. The hypocrisy can be deduced from Bretherton’s argument that “general populace of many nation-states in which great compassion is demonstrated by donating millions of dollars to fund humanitarian aid, while showing great hostility to those same suffering faces when they are more proximate strangers” (Bretherton, 2006, p.). Parallel with this argument, externalization of migration management by supporting asylum seekers in the third countries outside of Europe has become more prevalent in order to “prevent the arrival of asylum seekers aftermath the 11 September 2001”. (Garnier, 2013, p.946)

Securitization of the international politics has also penetrated the refugee protection regime especially in the post 9/11 period. Following the end of the Cold War, and especially after the 9/11, the influx of refugees has increasingly been presented as a security threat by policy makers, the media, and even the UNHCR. (Hammerstad, 2011, p.237) Not just by the political elites of the asylum countries and media coverage, but even the secretary generals of the UNHCR as world’s most important refugee agency adopted to the securitization aspect of migration

movements. Similarly, states across the globe strengthened their border controls, increased restrictions on passports, and became willing to take measures to repress the movement (Muller, 2004, 50). In addition to the undergoing securitization of migration in the EU (Buonofino, 2004; Léonard, 2010), we can identify an increase in securitization of the forced migration with the EU – Turkey Readmission Agreement by operations at sea by Frontex and also NATO’s presence in the Aegean Sea “to stem illegal trafficking and illegal migration in the Aegean Sea” (NATO, 2019) since 2016.⁴

“The failure to question the separation of humanitarian concerns from politics – and thus the treatment of immigrants / refugees as bare life, excluded from the political community and exposed to death every turn – signals a ‘secret solidarity’ between humanitarianism and the powers” (Zembylas, 2010, p.34). Humanitarian government notion has been started to widely deploy in the literature in order to harmonize the humanitarianism and security aspect in governing vulnerable lives in need of care and protection. Critical views on humanitarian aspect and securitization of the refugee studies led the way to another critical aspect, which will be the focus of this thesis. This approach suggests that, the international refugee protection and migration management provide ways to implement biopolitics / biopower to the sovereign, as it enables a regulatory control of the population, inclusion and exclusion of specific groups in the population by establishing norms, and power to establish a state of exception.

1.2. Refugee Resettlement

Refugee resettlement “is the process by which some refugees are allowed to leave a country of asylum and start life anew in a third country that is willing to receive and protect them on a permanent basis” (Newland, 2002; Garnier, 2014, p.943). UNHCR accordingly defines the procedure as “the transfer of refugees from

⁴ Securitization of migration is not a phenomenon which is specific to the EU. We can see the examples globally such as Australia’s ‘stop the boats’ policy which “claims to save lives by not saving lives in order to discourage ‘irregular’ migrants from undertaking dangerous sea voyages” (Mavelli, 2017, p.3).

an asylum country to another State that has agreed to admit them and ultimately grant them permanent residence status” (UNHCR n.d.). In addition, some scholars describe the resettlement system “a tool of international protection, as a durable solution, and as an expression of international solidarity and burden and responsibility sharing”. (Garnier, 2014, p.945) Along with the additional procedures such as voluntary repatriation if feasible and local integration where refugees can reach administrative assistance, freedom of movement, the rights to work, education, health care and family unity, resettlement is considered as a durable solution for refugees in the context of the international protection. While there is no consensus on the definition of the local integration, it can be described as a three dimensioned process which contains “legal process, whereby refugees attain a wider range of rights in the host state. Secondly, it is an economic process of establishing sustainable livelihoods and a standard of living comparable to the host community. Thirdly, it is a social and cultural process of adaptation and acceptance that enables the refugees to contribute to the social life of the host country and live without fear of discrimination” (Crisp, 2004). Among these three durable solutions described by the UNHCR and adopted by many intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, resettlement has been described as a “life saving measure” by Grainne O’Hara, UNHCR’s Director of International Protection for “refugees at most risk and whose lives often depend on it” (Press Release, 2019).

Technically, refugee resettlement procedure from Turkey is actualized through Turkish migration authorities’ referral to UNHCR for Syrians refugees under TP. For refugees from other nationalities, the procedure is initiated after granting conditional refugee status following the refugee status determination process by the DGMM. While there had been a parallel procedure on refugee status determination until September 2018 collaboratively by the Turkish authorities and UNHCR, there are also many resettlement cases from UNHCR’s mandate. The duty to conduct interviews for resettlement is still under UNHCR’s mandate. In short, we can summarize that pre-identification and assessment of the refugees for

resettlement is determined by DGMM in collaboration with UNHCR while final decision is taken by the authorities of receiving countries.

The selection criteria, quota of the resettling countries, implementation of the procedure and the transfer of the resettling refugees are not codified in any international hard law instruments such as 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. On the other hand, there are soft law instruments such as the Resettlement Handbook written by the UNHCR that includes suggestions on “managing resettlement effectively, identification of resettlement needs, basic procedures to following processing resettlement submission and the submission categories” (“UNHCR Resettlement Handbook”, 2011). In the handbook, seven categories are identified, namely “people with legal and/or physical protection needs; survivors of violence and/or torture; people with medical needs; women and girls at risk; family reunification; children and adolescents at risk; people who lack of alternative foreseeable durable solutions” (“UNHCR Resettlement Handbook”, 2011, p.287). The document suggests, people under these categories should be prioritized and submitted to resettlement countries at the outset. Michel Agier (2011) introduced a very thought-provoking term of the ‘hierarchy of a misfortune’ stating that “being classified as highly vulnerable is advantageous for acquiring a deserving refugee status” (Fine, 2018, p.87). Thus, the author stressed the concept of deservingness and its evaluation by comparisons of diverging vulnerabilities and sufferings. Parallel with the notion of the ‘hierarchy of misfortune’, the people who are on the top of this hierarchy deserve the resettlement primarily according the UNHCR’s formulation of resettlement. Therefore, the organization not only describes resettlement but also sets the criteria for who deserves.

However, considering the Resettlement Handbook as a soft law instrument, “getting on the UNHCR list of candidates does not automatically mean resettlement, and certainly not immediately” (Garnier, et. al, 2018, p.4). The handbook and UNHCR’s implementation are more advisory than definite. There

are also national eligibility criteria which are established by the resettling states that “limit the ability of UNHCR to manage the resettlement process according to commonly constructed criteria of fairness and need” (Garnier, et. al, 2018, p.247). Lack of legally binding provisions in case a country suspends the resettlement quota for refugees and absence of any appeal mechanism in case a refugee is withdrawn from submission without an accurate reason, provoke suspicion on the accountability and transparency of the resettlement as an important tool of international protection.

1.2.1. Historical Evolution of the Resettlement

Prior to 1951, refugees were seen as groups that belong to specific nationalities and their country of origins were unwilling or unable to protect them (Long, 2013) “Although relatively informal and highly dependent on the ad hoc and discretionary contributions of individual states, the inter-war refugee regime nevertheless set out structured international rules to ensure the protection of refugees” (Betts & Loescher, 2011, p.39). For example, “between the two World Wars, resettlement was used as the principal or partial solution for a number of refugee situations. During the early 1920s, for example, some 45,000 White Russians who had fled to China after the Russian Revolution were resettled elsewhere” (“UNHCR Resettlement Handbook”, 2011, p.47). Even in default of the generalized international refugee protection regime, there were some tools such as Nansen Passports for refugees as identity cards and resettlement of refugees.

In the post WWII period, in 1946 states formed the International Refugee Organization (IRO) which is “a non-permanent organization with functions including resettlement. The IRO implemented the resettlement of more than 1 million refugees under the leadership of the US during the late 1940s” (UNHCR, 2019). While there is an emphasis on the humanitarian causes from the Western-liberal side, the Soviet Union authorities criticize that “the refugee camps were being turned into a slave market where representatives of the US, UK, France, Australia and so forth came to recruit labor... The IRO presided over this market,

and had been reduced to a mere employment agency and acting in the interests of the capitalists” (United Nations 1949). Profitability and the value of the refugees as a strategic political tool remained as main critics towards US’ resettlement policy during the Cold War period especially after the authorization of Displaced Persons Act in 1948 which “regards refugees as objects of political concern, not simply as suffering humanity, for it focused on them as anti-communist migrants” (Wyman 1994, p.4). In addition to their contribution to the Western war-torn economies as cheap, skilled or unskilled labors, asylum seekers had also been benefited in order to prove the ideological superiority of Western liberal democracy. Therefore, admission of refugees is usually framed by political humanitarian interests with a strong agenda of economic and scientific contributions in the West during the Cold War Period.

There are significant resettlement programs during the Cold War period such as “the Cuban Refugee Assistance Program, Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program and the ‘Soviet and the other’ domestic refugee program” (Zucker, 1983, p.175). Considering almost all refugee admissions are from the Communist bloc countries; some scholars stresses that the main driver of the resettlement in the context of the Cold War remains as foreign policy of capitalist countries and refugees are seen as “brave anticommunists” (Zucker, 198, p.173), while others assert that “refugee resettlement remained the most prominent instrument of international protection until 1980s in the Cold War period” (Garnier, 2014, p.944) Based on the rivalries in the Cold War period, we can deduce that refugee protection regimes and therefore resettlement went parallel with the prevalent international developments.

Resettlement is considered as an important tool for refugees in the mostly underdeveloped first asylum countries to reach the industrialized and developed states in a legal way. But, “after the Cold War, since there was at present no shortage of labor, it was time to rethink the solution of resettlement in other than the limited Cold War context”. (Chimni, 2004, p.58) There was a significant decrease in the

numbers of individuals who were resettled towards the end of the Cold War period. Beginning from the late 1970s, even the UNHCR oriented itself towards repatriation which might -if not implemented with absolute attention and fairness- come out to be a practice that is contradictory with the principle of non-refoulement. Accordingly, Hyndman (2000) states: “The decline in political will in industrialized countries to accept large numbers of refugees is, arguably, an expression of neoliberal politics in many countries in Europe and North America combined with the absence of Cold War rivalries” (p.60).

In 2000, the European Commission suggested adopting a joint EU resettlement scheme as part of measures facilitating the safe arrival of refugees to EU territory (CEC 2000, 9)”. (Garnier, 2014, p.946) However, Garnier (2014) argues, 9/11 terrorist attacks decreased the willingness of states to admit refugees as security concerns became more prevalent, consequently EU member countries focused on establishing solutions to protection outside of their territories and formed restrictions to refugee movement to their countries. On the grounds of securitization, “protection” of refugees outside of the European border is prioritized instead of strengthening durable solutions such as resettlement. Betts & Loescher (2011) accordingly state “While in theory burden-sharing is about solidarity and cooperation, in practice it has mostly boiled down to financial contributions from rich countries in the North to help host states and humanitarian organizations cope with refugee situations in poorer regions of the South” (p.252). So, “western countries (usually promoting a neo-liberal adjustment programme) are sustaining an unjust international system manifested periodically in crisis and conflict in the countries of the South by mobilizing the enormous commitment of the humanitarian community”. (Chimni, 2004, p.72)

1.2.2. Resettlement Figures

Although resettlement is declared as one of the most important instruments in the international refugee protection, the proportion of the resettled refugees fall short of the expectations especially after the high refugee movement following the Syrian Civil War and the so-called “European Refugee Crisis”. Garnier et.al (2018) accordingly suggest, resettlement numbers are significantly lower compared to the number of refugees admitted by countries of first arrival that are commonly the countries of global south.⁵ According to UNHCR’s Resettlement Fact Sheet, “less than 1 per cent of the refugee population in Turkey was submitted for resettlement in 2016. In 2017, this number dropped to under 0.6 per cent as a result of the global reduction in resettlement quotas” (United Nations, 2018). If we consider Turkey is the biggest host country for refugees for six years consecutively (2019), we can deduce that resettlement needs from Turkey also do not correspond the actual necessities. Thus, resettlement is considered as a “pipe dream” for most of the refugees.

⁵ In the context of the Syrian Crisis, forced displacement has reached its highest level in the world history. (Abellan-Matamoros & Marques, 2019)

2. LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

Garnier et al. (2018) claim that in the international refugee management field, resettlement was a less studied topic and research on it expanded lately in their newly published extensive book on the topic of refugee resettlement. Also, “as an ‘instrument of migration management’, resettlement has been insufficiently the object of critical enquiry, yet a study of it has much to reveal about the intersection of security with refugee governance” (Fine, 2018, p.91). Therefore, there is a need to comprehensively analyze the logic behind the resettlement instrument from an academic perspective.

Five prominent themes on the concept of refugee resettlement are identified in the academic literature including the fields of international relations, political science, anthropology, psychology, social services and sociology. First one is the focus on the specific resettlement policies of the nation states and certain refugee groups. The United States’ evolving policies of resettlement (Zucker, 1983; Nawyn, 2006), Denmark’s unexpected suspension of the resettlement quota and critical approach on the national criteria for resettlement with an emphasis of the ‘integration potential’ (Kohl, 2016) and Latin American States’ adoption of the resettlement in solidarity (Jubilut & Carneiro, 2011), Japan’s entrance to resettlement area in 2010 as a first country in Asia and government’s mismanagement (Lee, 2018), “Australia’s Resettlement Policy for South Sudanese Refugees” (Losoncz, 2015) and “comparative analysis of two distinctive groups: Afghans and Kurds living in New Zealand and Australia” (Sulaiman-Hill & Thompson, 2011, p.2) are some of the research which focus on either a specific resettlement country or specific ethnic or national group of resettled refugees. These studies focus on the historical evolvement of resettlement politics of some countries, the criteria and selection process of resettlement of the refugees from the first countries of asylum, the right and regulations of resettled refugees after the resettlement process, political economic reasons and results of resettlement which are going to be scrutinized in detail.

Secondly, acculturation, adaptation and integration of resettled refugees and the relation between the host communities and refugees (Colic-Peisker & Waxman, 2005; Nawyn, 2006; Hyndman, 2000; Losoncz, 2015) are one of the most studied aspects of the resettlement of refugees. The obstacles and challenges during and after the resettlement procedure “from inadequate resettlement policies, high levels of xenophobia in the host population, lack of language proficiency and qualifications recognition” (Waxman & Colic-Peisker, 2005) are presented by the several authors from economics to education. Governments’ engagement to enable refugees’ social and economic inclusion has been analyzed by different authors. Waxman and Colic-Peisker concluded their analysis that “war trauma, the language barrier, age and other factors seriously impede the possibility of successful resettlement” (ibid, p.16) of Bosnian refugees in Australia. Nawyn tries to find out the relation between religion of resettled refugees and the amount of assistance obtained and deduces that the religion of the refugees do not affect the assistance they obtain from faith-based NGOs in the US which religion is serving more like a cultural marker to build bridge between different belief groups (Nawyn, 2006). On the other hand, Losoncz examines the institutional responses of the resettlement countries and economic and social inclusion of resettled refugees in order to see how the successful resettlement can be achieved (Losoncz, 2015). He concludes that the adaptation processes of resettled refugees who are largely working in the menial jobs and lack of economic security are not successful because of the exclusionary space created by the social structures by adopting a critical realist grounded theory design. These studies are mostly descriptive and demonstrate the circumstances, challenges and support mechanisms for refugees after the resettlement process has been completed. They investigate how come integration of the resettled refugees can be achieved and what are the obstacles in front of the acculturation and adaptation without examining or questioning the notion of the resettlement itself.

Thirdly, as another notable topic in the resettlement literature, there are researches on the theme of resettlement as an element of labor regime of capitalist

system. In addition to the critics by some politicians such as from the Soviet Union during the Cold War period, some academics are also suspicious of resettlement, labeling it as a tool for recruiting labor for capitalist countries which are in need of qualified and young workers. It is asserted that “refugee resettlement is largely consistent with immigration policies that seek to ensure migrants become a docile form of labor as required by the changing needs of the national economy”. (Lippert, 1998, p.400) Parallel with this argument, Garnier, Jubilut and Sandvik remark in their comprehensive book on the topic of resettlement which is published currently that “the willingness of Western states to engage in large-scale refugee resettlement dwindled in the context of diminishing labor needs”. (Garnier et. al, 2018, p.8) This claim can be seen in the writings of various scholars such as Chimni. Accordingly, the author argues that “after Cold War, since there was at present no shortage of labor, it was time to rethink the solution of resettlement in other than the limited Cold War context”. (Chimni, 2004, p.58) Especially after the World War II, resettlement has become an important tool for the reconstruction of demolished parts of some European countries. In accordance, Stoessinger (1956) declares “following the attempt of repatriation, the IRO began to resettle refugees as manual laborers who could contribute to post-war reconstruction. Like an international employment agency, the organization tried to match the skills of refugees to the needs of each receiving country in Europe, South and North America and Australia”. As a more current phenomenon, private sponsorship for resettlement that Canada implements has started to be discussed from the critical neoliberal approach. In her study called *Civil Society, the State, and private sponsorship: the Political Economy of Refugee Resettlement*, Ritchie argues “private sponsorship may appear as a humanitarian solution to precarious migration, it simultaneously furthers the deeply political project of privatizing immigrant welfare, localizing consciousness, and depoliticizing the experiences of refugee youth” (Ritchie, 2018, p.663). She concluded her research by analyzing the refugee status “within the broader context of European colonialism, as well as US and Canadian forms of imperialism” (ibid, p.672) pointing out that while privately sponsoring refugees to

be resettled in Canada seems humanitarian and just solution for refugees, it aids “the neo-liberalization of social reproduction” (ibid, p. 673). Parallel with the neoliberalism argument, Dykstra-DeVette has adopted critical rhetorical analysis and post-colonialism theory. Thus, author identifies the resettlement agencies as neoliberal organizations that construct and expose the conditions of the refugee by focusing the refugee empowerment rhetoric of self-sufficiency and ableism which are the components of the individual self-governance of biopolitics. Self-sufficiency and empowerment rhetoric support the idea that every refugee is individually responsible with their own well-being both economically and socially and it is their responsibility to promote their status in the new resettlement country. In addition, it was argued that, resettlement organizations are using the American dream narrative that is a “social mobility and equal opportunity for wealth and freedom for every honest person” (Hardt & Negri, 2005, p. 381). Therefore, refugee resettlement strategy of the United States is described as an acceptance of valuable and productive subjects who can promote the proliferation of the neoliberal biopolitical order. As Dykstra-DeVette insightfully states, the biological well-being of the American population will grow in virtue of the successful resettlement programs as a neoliberal migration management technique. Parallel with this argument, it can be asserted that, the ones who do not have the potential to promote their well-being are excluded from the resettlement instrument, and therefore left out in the first country of asylum.

Fourthly, resettlement as a form of humanitarian governance and burden sharing between states occupies a significant place in the literature. This view has been supported mainly by the international organizations and UN bodies emphasizing resettlement as a “tangible expression of international solidarity and a responsibility sharing mechanism, allowing States to help share responsibility for refugee protection, and reduce problems impacting the country of asylum” (United Nations, 2018). European Parliament similarly described resettlement as a “durable solution which includes selection and transfer of refugees from a country where they seek protection to another country. Its aim is also to strengthen solidarity and

responsibility sharing between countries” (Radjenovik, 2017, p.1). Along with UN agencies and EU Parliament, some scholars such as Jubilut and Carneiro also see resettlement “based on the principle of non-discrimination, meaning that preference would be given to refugees from the region without closing the doors to other refugees” (Jubilut & Carneiro, 2011, p.72). However, considering the growing gap between the actual resettlement needs and the resettlement figures; burden-sharing argument has been criticized by the scholars rather than supporting it. It is mainly argued that, ‘burden-sharing’ narrative of the refugee protection is enabled by the huge amount of financial donations from the industrialized North countries to the Global South in order to ‘protect’ the asylum seekers and refugees outside of their territory rather than resettling them as a durable solution.

Fifthly, an assessment and accountability problem of the resettlement emerges as an important theme both in academic and media coverage on the topic of resettlement. Although there is an emphasis on the admission of the most vulnerable populations from the UNHCR and other international organizations, the integration criteria of the Netherland and Canada (Garnier et. al, 2018), “Danish selection missions in refugee camps in Jordan at one point were specifically looking for Kurds for resettlement, rejecting Palestinians on UNHCR’s list” (Garnier et. al, 2018, p.), “Portugal’s offer to take in several hundred of the 2500 Yazidi refugees living in Greece” (2017), “Australia’s immoral preference for Christian refugees” (Patrick, 2017), Japan’s excessively restrictive integration criteria of “accepting only (Buddhist) Karen refugees who were young and had few children” (Garnier et. al., 2018) attract attention of journalists and scholars and challenge the ‘humanitarianism’ in the resettlement concept. The rising issue of “cherry-picking” of refugees under the name of resettlement was explained with demographic, economic and political benefit aspect in various articles (Kohl, 2016; Garnier et, al, 2018; Long, 2016; Lindt, 1959) and challenges the transparency of the selection processes. Sara McKinnon asserts that “certain refugee bodies are not rendered sufficient citizens by the state and these standards are used as the basis of selective exclusion and inclusion” (McKinnon, 2011) for the resettlement process of the

refugees. Politicians' speeches also revealed this logic under the resettlement policies of resettling countries. Harry Truman - the former president of the U.S. once stated that; "resettlement is the most begrudging method of accepting useful and worthy people ... this will necessarily deprive many other worthy people of an opportunity to come to the US in future years" (Truman, 1952). Openly pledges of some European countries such as Hungary, Luxembourg and Austria to accept only Christian refugees (Fine, 2018, p.89) also increased the suspicions on the selection of the most vulnerable on the basis of humanitarian governance. These implementations corroborate McKinnon's writings which state that "refugees were permitted to resettle when their displacement was positioned in a way that did not challenge the complicity of the state in root cause conflicts and did not conflict with gendered and racial stereotypes" (McKinnon, 2011).

3. THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

3.1. Biopolitics / Biopower

The notion of biopolitics is first observed in the studies of Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellén as a “continuation of nature at another level and therefore destined to incorporate and reproduce nature’s original characteristics” (Esposito, 2008, p.17) while it was commonly associated with the notion of race in Germany by scholars like Ratzel and Haushofer. Yet, Foucault brought into discussion in 1974 a distinguished notion of biopolitics which was later to be published in his essential works as “The Birth of Social Medicine” (Foucault, 2000). In this book, social medication in the West and the logic under the administration and control over the medicine system was summarized as follows, bridging the words “bio” and “politics” together:

“The English system of Simon and his successors enabled three things to be established: medical assistance of the poor, control of the health of the labor force, and a general surveying of public health, whereby the wealthy classes would be protected from the greatest dangers. Further— and this is where its originality lies— it enabled the creation of three superimposed and coexisting medical systems: a welfare medicine designed for the poorest people; an administrative medicine responsible for general problems such as vaccination, epidemics, and so on; and a private medicine benefiting those who could afford it” (Foucault, 2000, p. 155).

As a combination of two words “bio” and “politics”, this term has been used in order to explain state policies of great divergence and span from not only asylum strategies to prevention of AIDS but also promotion of medical research to legal regulations on abortion (Lemke, 2011, p.1). Later, Foucault reconfigured his notion of biopolitics as focusing on the intertwining of biological and political lives of the individuals from the late 18th century onwards as an outcome of the historical and political changes in the Europe such as Industrial and Agricultural revolutions, growth in population, scientific knowledge and the birth of liberal economy. Herein, the concept of biopolitics and biopower can be understood in Foucault’s

own words as the sovereign power's "right to take life or let live" (Foucault, 1978, p. 136) which has evolved to "a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death" with the emergence of modern politics and the development of capitalism (Foucault, 1978, p. 138). That means, the sovereign does not only hold its power to take lives when necessary, but this power is diffused everywhere by way of 'letting' some precarious individuals die, such as irregular migrants, psychiatric patients and unemployed people. Biopolitics is about the interference, surveillance and regulatory controls over the people which in return implies the "subjugation of bodies and the control of populations" (Adams, 2017).

Foucault did not make a clear distinction between the concepts of biopolitics and biopower and at times used these terms interchangeably. By reason of the fact that "Foucault deals essentially with 'contestable claims', he tries to open up, rather than complete, a line of thought" (Keeley, 1990, p.85) as an apparent antipositivist. It is not easy to conceptualize his notions and terms in a very systemic way. In addition, by reason of his inconsistent use of the term "biopolitics", its meaning constantly shifts in the texts (Lemke, 2011, p.34). Thus, at the first glance, it might be complicated to analyze the political and social issues employing the notion of biopolitics. However, there are three ways to discern his ideas which are categorized by Lemke as follows; firstly, "biopolitics stands for a historical rupture in political thinking and practice that is characterized by a rearticulation of sovereign power" (ibid, p.34) as shifting its power over death to over life. Secondly, "Foucault assigns to biopolitical mechanisms a central role in the rise of modern racism" (ibid, p.34) which differentiates the normal and the abnormal. Finally, the last meaning refers to "a distinctive art of government that historically emerges with liberal forms of social regulation and individual self-governance" (ibid, p.34).

Considering the variable and extensive use of the term biopolitics adopted by Foucault while developing his ideas, biopolitical racism approach which "redraws the boundary between 'valuable' (to be included) and 'not valuable' (to be excluded) lives" (Mavelli, 2017, p.1) is one of the main drivers of the theoretical

framework of this thesis. Modern biopolitical racism as an important subsidiary of biopower is considered as “a way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power’s control: the break between what must live and what must die” (Foucault, 2004). While there is not just one source of power between the oppressor and oppressed, biopower can be seen as one of the networks of power which disciplines bodies over life through producing knowledge (what is knowable and what is not), establishing categories of normal and abnormal, regulating and surveilling the lives of populations. Although, Foucault did not exclude the use of violence while formulating power relations, biopower is used in a positive meaning as a shift from repressive traditional sovereign power towards a more regulatory power of individual bodies with the advancing capitalism which sought to enhance the level of productivity of individuals in the late 18th century. According to him, “the absolute power of the sovereign, is now carefully hidden behind the administration of bodies and the calculated control of life” (Gomez, 2016, p.6). In other words, the production of the knowledge, discourse determination and disciplining bodies through schools, hospitals, prisons or mental institutions for becoming productive means became the new tools of implementing power over the individuals.

3.2. Governmentality

Foucault’s studies have eventually gravitated toward the notion of governmentality. Indeed, Thomas Lemke positions the term of biopolitics under the liberal governmentality framework. Foucault described it as a modern technique of the sovereign which includes “organized practices and techniques used to produce, care for and/or dominate individual subjects” (Foucault, 2009, p.108). A substantial number of scholars have further demonstrated that the political rationality of the governmentality draws the boundary between the inferior and superior and therefore includes some groups of people while excluding some others based on their age, race, gender, religion, ethnicity, educational and professional background and so on. This indication of the distinction between valuable and invaluable

emerges from the neoliberal logic. Mavelli argues that, in biopolitical terms, “valuable lives are those that can be transformed into value, in the form of commodity and capital and can adapt and contribute to the reproduction of the neoliberal biopolitical order, thus generating surplus life that may strengthen the life of the population” (2017, p.13).

In addition, empowerment and self-governance are the most important components of the governmentality as a synthesis of two words ‘government’ and ‘mentality’. (Liberal) mentality of government seeks to implement its power by disciplining and regularizing people in their own free will and not by prohibition or restriction. Hence, there always is an emphasis on the personal liberty and self-control. Furthermore, governmentality is formulated as the administrative practices of the sovereign in pursuance of proliferating wealth and enabling the order by means of “exercising of this very specific, albeit very complex, power that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument” (Foucault, 2009, p. 108).

3.3. Homo Sacer and Bare Life

Following the logic of the biopolitics and biopower, Giorgio Agamben argues that the simple lives of the individuals are the concerns of the politics. Emanated from Foucauldian legacy: “the personal is the political”, Agamben reasons that “politics is now literally the decision concerning the unpolitical” (Agamben, 1998, p.98). Giorgio Agamben borrows “biopolitics” from Foucault with a disagreement on the time of the birth of biopolitics. He focuses on the distinction between the two forms of life as *zoe* and *bio* which have their roots from ancient Greece. Aristotle identified “*zoe* as life rooted in nature; but, *bio* as ‘good life’ which since the Greeks, has been understood as the political way of life. For Aristotle, what distinguishes humans from other animals is our capacity to speak and engage in political praxis” (Owens, 2009, p.569). Therefore, the notion of *bio* becomes significant and distinctive for human existence.

In his distinctive book, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (1998), Agamben introduced the term “homo sacer” into the discussion of biopolitics which is described as “a metaphorical figure of the sacred man – a criminal whom the state deems worthy of death, but whom it bans from being either legally executed or religiously sacrificed. Instead, the sacred man may be killed by anyone without impunity” (Nikolopoulou, 2000, p.124). Originated from the Roman law, the concept of “homo sacer” is being used by Agamben in order to describe the current situation of refugees and asylum-seekers in terms of the exclusivist policies of the nation states. Since the sovereign decides who is a legal person and who is illegal through its inclusionary and exclusionary regulations and politics, citizenship as identity and membership of a society remains as an important concept. Therefore, categorized as unwanted migrants, asylum seekers and refugees by Agamben, non-citizens are stripped of the national legal and juridical rights in the modern nation state system. Although, refugees are represented in the national and international regulations and laws, they are not considered as political subjects. As a result, “they turn into a population consisting of the human beings who are deprived of the "right to have rights” and excluded from the family of nations” (Öztürk, 2017, p.17). The exclusion from the political system led to state of exception which sovereign can declare anytime outside of the legal and judiciary system. Agamben declares that sovereign’s power is beyond the law since it does not need a law to create or suspend the law. “Growing numbers of people are vulnerable to this specific form of violence. The suspension of the law, the creation of emergency conditions that legitimize torture, open-ended incarceration and/or killing without punishment all lead to death that is not honored, mourned or memorialized” (Owens, 2009, p.572).

As Agamben argues, the lives of refugees and asylum seekers resemble to the “homo sacer”, due to them being subjected to inhumane treatments in the detention camps and removal centers. These at times occur without any allegation and discrimination by the host population, becoming a daily practice. There are open-ended incarcerations in the transit countries with very limited access to health, education and social services and restrictions to access to country’s labor

market. Therefore, Agamben suggests that, refugees and asylum seekers can find themselves in the state of exception any time in their asylum countries as they are what Arendt (1973) claims “citizens of nowhere in the world” (p.290). This is due to the fact that sovereign power decides and declares what is normal and legal and what is not alongside with what is the exception. Thus, it is to be comprehended as a break from Western liberal political thought of ‘norm of law’ as a prerequisite for the sovereignty and state power.

While Foucault underlines clinics, prisons, schools, hospitals and mental institutions as places to implement biopower, Agamben pays attention to the concentration camps and refugee camps in his version. He asserts that “there is a continuum, not a fundamental disjuncture, between camps because there is a continuum between constitutional democracies and the Nazi regime; both reduce populations to 'bare life', one to govern and manage people on grounds of nationality, the other to exterminate on grounds of race” (Owens, 2009, p.574). In his own words;

“Insofar as its inhabitants were stripped of every political status and wholly reduced to bare life, the camp was also the most absolute biopolitical space ever to have been realized, in which power confronts nothing but pure life, without any mediation. This is why the camp is the very paradigm of political space at the point at which politics becomes biopolitics and homo sacer is virtually confused with the citizen” (Agamben, 1998, p. 171).

He asserts that there is a continuum between the Nazi regime and modern democracies and so among the concentration camps, Guantanamo detention camp and current refugee camps such as in Greek islands. In these biopolitical spaces, a person’s life is reduced to bare life which can be described as human life without any political rights and freedoms. Agamben argues that, in modern politics, refugees’ lives are reduced to “bare life” which is governed by the practices of the sovereign in order to protect the well-being of the state.

4. RESETTLEMENT AS A WAY TO IMPLEMENT BIOPOLITICS / BIOPOWER

There are few studies focusing on the biopolitical governmentality aspect of the resettlement. Although there are academic scholars on different aspects of international migration and refugee regime from Foucauldian perspective such as Refugee Status Determination (RSD) process, camps, integration policies of host countries (Diken, 2004; Hardy, 2003; Zeveleva, 2017); refugee resettlement is rarely studied from a biopolitical approach. In order to analyze the resettlement policy from the biopolitics perspective, we should understand the inclusion / exclusion logic of it.

“The inclusion into a political community seems only possible by the simultaneous exclusion of some human beings who are not allowed to become full legal subjects. In order not to be excluded or exempted from the normal limits of the state, individuals who live within the boundaries of a political community primarily aim to be included. Through this formula, to include or exclude is one of –maybe– the most significant weapons of the nation-state, which provides the means to maintain, to legitimize and to justify its existentiality and legitimacy” (Yıldız, 2012).

Following the inclusion/exclusion logic of biopolitics, resettlement as a ‘legal’ way to seek refuge to neo-liberal industrialized countries from first countries of asylum which tend to be close to conflict zones and have poor living conditions can be seen as a way to be included in such states as full legal subjects. While the quotas for resettlement are considerably low in comparison with the figures, this concept has been demonstrated as preventing the most vulnerable lives in the name of higher moral principle of the mostly capitalist offshore countries and giving hope to refugees and asylum seekers in the first country of asylum mostly under poor living conditions. Despite very long waiting periods of personal interview for refugee status determination and low probability to be submitted as resettlement candidate, resettlement prospect gives refugees hope to be alleviated their bare living situation in the transit countries.

We can allude from Foucault's writings that biopower is "a form of power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations" (Foucault, 1990, p.137). Thus, resettlement of refugees can be seen as a form of power on refugees which is expected to influence their lives positively by obtaining them to right to move legally to more industrialized developed countries from the first country of asylum mostly tend to be less developed and hosting much more refugees than the resettlement accepting countries. It is described as a durable solution for refugees to develop and ameliorate their lives which has positively attributed meaning.

"Resettlement is governed through humanitarian reasoning which rests on an act of generosity by states that have the discretion to choose who they consider to be 'desirable' candidates" (Fine, 2018, p.108). Desirable candidates are categorized as the most vulnerable refugees with no further durable solutions in the first country of asylum; but besides, they need to not pose a risk to host state and have a strong integration potential to the society which can be interpreted as a way to implement biopower which is a power over life by establishing "a binary categorization between 'us' and 'them' or between 'the normal' and 'the abnormal' (e.g. illegal immigrants or unqualified refugees)" (Zembylas, 2010, p.35). There are various academic researches which support the idea that receiving countries implement biopower by establishing a binary categorization in the resettlement selection process. Kohl declares that;

"During the resettlement interviews, the officials would assess the integration potential of the refugees interviewed by evaluating their language skills, educational background, work experience, familial situation, network, age and motivation as per Danish Immigration Act 2005 (Section 8(4)). The criteria were supplemented by a list of negative criteria in the Bill's explanatory notes excluding "illiterates", "mentally ill", "substance abusers" and "criminals" from resettlement in Denmark" (Kohl, 2016, p.2).

This passage shows that, receiving countries tend to marginalize the mentally ill, illiterate or non-productive body of an individual and simply exclude

them becoming a member of their society. While the “worthy” refugees’ lives are fostered in the receiving countries, the rest are trapped in a legal limbo waiting for more stable future in the first countries of asylum. Bigo states that “resettlement creates local traps where people are forced to live in places where they do not want to live and where they can be forgotten. In the process, some populations end up being less human than others” (Bigo, 2014). In addition to biometrics of refugees such as educational and professional background, the religion of refugees is discussed to be a factor in order to be selected by receiving countries. It is demonstrated that Christian refugees are favored for resettlement in many countries arguing that the Muslim refugees are less likely to integrate. The more risk of persecution of Christians under the attacks of Islamic state was another justification for the selection of refugees based on their personal spiritual believes. However, this was falsified by the experts like Elanie Pearson – the head of Human Rights Watch in Australia arguing that, “Christians from conflict zones in Syria and Iraq aren’t persecuted more than others. In both Syria and Iraq, Muslims have overwhelmingly borne the brunt of most of the atrocities by Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) and by the Assad regime” (Patrick, 2017). The integration potential of Christian refugees determines the distinction between the valuable and invaluable lives “according to refugees’ capacity to enhance the emotional well-being of host populations” (Mavelli, 2017, p.1) Similarly, Japan has only accepted the Buddhist Karen refugees under the state-driven refugee resettlement policy because of their occupation in the agricultural sector and for this reason their capacity to be integrated into Japanese culture and customs (Lee, 2018, p. 1224). Selection of the refugees based on their ethnic and religious identity can be interpreted as determination of the worthy lives which must be saved and maximization of their lives as a whole population. Fine argues that, the discriminatory dimension of the refugee resettlement process is acknowledged by several experts including the UNHCR asserting that “the UNHCR conducts pre-selection of prospective resettlement candidates based on its knowledge and

interpretation of ‘appropriate’ profiles by assessing the narratives of persecuting and individual’s biodata” (2018, p.92).

Similarly, Portugal’s pledge on accepting around 2000 Yazidi refugees from Greece in 2017 which are the most vulnerable ethnic minority targeted by the ISIS because of their beliefs has been strictly criticized by Greek authorities. Portugal was ready to accept Yazidi refugees under the EU’s relocation scheme which is a similar concept with the resettlement as “the transfer of the people in need of international protection from one EU country to another” (European Commission, n.d.), Greek officials rejected this offer by declaring Portugal’s pledge as favoritism based on ethnicity and religion. Greek authorities criticize this offer and “worried that other countries might start cherry-picking asylum applications based on religion or ethnicity” (Voanews, 2017). Therefore, Greek officials rejected resettlement of Yazidi refugees to Portugal claiming that there is a selection based on individual’s biodata and determination of deserving people only considering their ethnicity and religion. On the other hand, lack of the right to include in any stage of the decision for Yazidi refugees shows that they have no political rights and freedom and are reduced to bare lives trapped in camps which are considered as the ultimate biopolitical spaces.

Refugee resettlement as a way to reach a permanent membership of receiving countries can be considered as a liberal governmentality and way to implement biopower by picking the individuals with higher capacity to integrate the society and also with higher profile both educationally and professionally. In the following chapter, responses of the refugees and the governments of the first country of asylum towards resettlement policies are analyzed and discussed.

4.1. Resettlement from Turkey – Refugees’ Perspectives

As presented in the literature review of this thesis, prioritization of the Christian refugees for resettlement in countries such as Australia, Canada, Denmark, Hungary, Luxemburg, Portugal and Slovakia in the name of the relatively

better integration potential of the Christian refugees over Muslims and the relatively more vulnerable situation of Christians considering their minority situation in the Syrian conflict context. Parallel with the prioritization of the Christians to be included into Western society by means of resettlement tool, biopolitical selection of the refugees from Turkey as a first country of asylum has been discussed in the academic literature. Shoshana Fine remarks in her seminal book that;

“The containment of ‘undesirables’ in highly precarious states in Turkey has created conditions that encourage refugees seeking resettlement to manipulate their identities for favorably positioned applications. Missioners who hang around in migrants’ associations at the fringes of Europe can be regarded as a type of peripheral bordercrat in that they exploit the conditions of ‘undesirable’ to whom they project imaginaries of freedom and mobility associated with the West and Christianity” (Fine, 2018, p.106).

Conversion from Muslim religion to Christianity among the refugees in Turkey is observed as a significant phenomenon especially among the Iranian population. (Fine, 2018; Leman, 2007; Akçapar, 2007; Yaghmaian, 2005) Akçapar argues in her research “Conversion as a migration strategy in a transit country: Iranian Shiites becoming Christians in Turkey” that, “Iranian asylum seekers use religion – in this case not the religion of their country of origin – and newly acquired social and religious networks within different churches and congregations in Turkey to reach the West as refugees” (Akçapar, 2006, p.817). According to Foucault, there is no central power, but the network of power which can be seen in the micro relations. In that case, the power of religion (being a non-Muslim) opens a door of the West in refugees’ minds and making them to feel “worthy” to be a member of the Western society. Many researches show that Christian refugees are favored for resettlement, while the Muslim people are surveyed through security lens. So, the refugees in transit countries see conversion as a way to increase the possibility to be resettled to western countries. Also, considering the role of the religion as an important value formative, it can be discussed that refugees identify their own self-value in order to deserve to be resettled to Western countries. Akçapar argues that religion plays an important role both in the personal life of the refugees by proliferating the

integration procedure and also “during the transit period in Turkey before the resettlement in a third country” (Akçapar, 2006, p.818). In his research called “A Lucan Effect in the Commitment of Iranian Converts in Transit - The Case of Pentecostal Iranian Enclave in Istanbul”, Johan Lemman summarizes the religious conversion as a self-revelation of refugees by confessing their own personal belief to the migration authorities with expectancy to be included in the Western society. He asserts that,

“Given that both the transit migrant and the religious community are fundamentally transnationally oriented, the convert sees a new continuity emerge in his life between the past, the present, and the future. The more intensely he participates in life within the Christian enclave, the more he approaches his initial objective (i.e. migration to the West). The crossing boundaries in the baptism and in the migration from Turkey to the West is a prospect that seems to shine brightly at the beginning, then temporarily dims during the articulating conversion process, and finally grows much brighter again over time” (Lemman, 2007).

Therefore, conversion to Christianity can also be interpreted as crossing boundaries both spiritually in their minds and also geographically. Following Fine’s argument, “Turkey becomes a site of filtering within this space, between those who can be saved and those who are (figuratively or not) left to die” (Fine, 2018, p.). In our case, Iranian refugees in Turkey perceive conversion to Christianity in order to save their lives to be included by the receiving countries where they can find long-term stable status.

Akçapar argues that Iranian refugees are in a liminal state in Turkey which “is full of ambiguity and refers to a phase between separation (leaving Iran behind, a lost home maybe forever) and reincorporation (resettlement in a third country other than Turkey)” (Akçapar, 2016). This ambiguity stems from the Turkish asylum law which does not allow the refugees to have a stable and permanent status which promises full citizenship in the future and the political economic situation of the country which cannot promise a legal labor market to be included for refugees. To be more specific, the regulations on the resettlement tool are very limited in the context of the Turkish asylum law. In the LFIP, conditional refugee status allows to “reside in Turkey temporarily until they are resettled to a third country” (Art. 62).

With this definition, it is emphasized the temporary aspect of the term of conditional refugee and the importance of the resettlement to a third country as a durable solution. In other words, the conditional refugee does not have access to permanent membership in Turkey. It is needless to say that most refugees and asylum seekers in Turkey are from the outside of the European region and mostly from Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Somali. Refugees' lasting state of temporariness in Turkey as a transit country can be perceived as a legal limbo which they are not able to become a full political and legal member of a society. Acquiring Turkish citizenship is almost not possible for refugees in Turkey according to the LFIP and TPR. Naturalization can only be realized through marriage to a Turkish citizen, residing in Turkey more than five years and exceptional circumstances procedure. Since the time spent under IP or TP is not counted as in the requirement of applying a Turkish citizenship, the only pathway to full naturalization for refugees is through marriage, or exceptional circumstances procedure which is for people who have been considered to contribute Turkish state by their expertise, talents etc. This means, most of the refugees in Turkey need to reside in their registration cities (for persons under TP) or satellite cities (for persons under IP) and approach to PDMMs in order to obtain travel permit if they need to travel inter-cities which contradicts with freedom of movement principle.

In addition to the biopolitical selection of the Christian refugees for resettlement, another trend on resettlement can be found in the literature which is a manipulation of asylum seekers' gender identities or sexual orientations in order to be recognized as refugee and eventually selected to be resettled (Koçak, 2020). Drawing upon Koçak's article called "Who is "Queerer" and Deserves Resettlement?: Queer Asylum Seekers and Their Deservingness of Refugee Status in Turkey" which is a study based on interviews with 94 queer asylum seekers in Turkey; while resettlement prospect of LGBTI asylum seekers are relatively higher, some asylum seekers manipulate their gender identities or sexual orientations which results in requirement for more personal information and details regarding their sexual lives and identities (ibid, 2020). Therefore, it is been discussed that, asylum

seekers have to reveal their experiences as much as possible in order to ‘deserve’ the status and resettlement if deemed suitable. As Foucault points out that, “in order to construct a legible subjectivity at and within the borders of nation-states, one is obliged to reveal as much as possible about their sexuality and gender identity” (Foucault, 1978), resettlement policies obligates persons to reveal very personal and turns the personal into political concern.

Apart from the resettlement trends in Turkey, as it is stated in the resettlement section 1.2.2, almost 1% of the refugees are resettled from Turkey by a majority of Syrian nationals in the recent years. The very low possibility of the resettlement for refugees in Turkey which are trapped in a transit country with very limited access to legal market and possibility of stable status and full rights in the future, Turkey can be perceived as a biopolitical space where refugees have no political status and have been reduced to bare life. Although, there have been attempts to introduce policies and provisions regarding the work permit from the government side,

“the ‘ambiguous state policies’ produced forms of ‘precarity’ and insecurities and challenges for the integration of Syrian refugees as the government overlooked the existing problems in practice. For example, in January 2016, a law regarding work permits took effect, which allowed refugees to apply for work permits but the number of refugees with granted work permits was below 5 per cent of the overall Syrian workforce due to the lack of inspections and regulations” (Sunata & Tosun, 2018).

While NGOs play an important role in the refugee and immigration area in Turkey by providing humanitarian assistance, legal aid, cash-based support and welfare services, their efforts on the facilitation of access to labor market for refugees fell short. Work permit procedure should be initiated by the employers in Turkey. (ILO, 2017) Bureaucratic procedure discourages the employers along with the relatively higher expenditure to hire foreign employees by application fee and obligation to pay minimum wage and taxes. (İçduygu & Diker, 2017) Bahçeşehir University Center of Migration and Urban Studies published a recent report which reveals that, most of the Syrians between the ages of eighteen and twenty five work

in the ‘informal sector’, without any social security and most of them do not receive their full allowances each month (Tokyay, 2020). Omer Kadkoy, a migration policy analyst, comments on this report as stating that, “bureaucracy is marginalizing skilled Syrians and preventing them from fulfilling their potential, hence depriving Turkey of needed, but underutilized, capabilities”. (Tokyay, 2020). Along with the legal amendment of 2019 which states that the health care services are no longer free of charge for asylum seekers and refugees in Turkey, inability to naturalization, very limited access to legal market and limited freedom of movement, Turkey can be considered as a precarious transit zone for refugees.

While the final decision of resettlement is decided by the resettlement countries after having interviewed with the candidates by their own state representatives and completed security check, UNHCR is the main actor which initiates the resettlement procedure for refugees and identifies the vulnerable cases with no further solution in Turkey in collaboration with the DGMM and PDMMs. Although the final decision for resettlement is taken by the resettlement countries, Turkey as a host country has autonomy to decide the departure of a refugee who is accepted by a receiving country to be resettled. Regarding departure and resettlement to a third country, Article 44 in the Temporary Protection Regulation states that; “Temporary or permanent departure of the foreigners under this Regulation to a third country shall be subject to the permission of the Directorate General” (TPR, 2014). Accordingly, in the Implementing Regulation of the LFIP, it is stated that, “the permit to exit to a third country shall be issued by the Directorate General and the governorates; in case the authorization is granted” (2016). Therefore, without permission from the Turkish authorities, one cannot leave Turkey even if s/he has the resettlement admission from the receiving country. These regulations open a pathway to Turkish authorities to deny a person to issue an exit permit even the resettlement right was granted by the receiving country. In this case, sovereign’s power over the lives of the refugees and regulation of the mobility rights of the refugees which is considered to be one of the basic human rights.

4.2. Resettlement from Turkey - Government's Responses

There are increasing numbers of scholarly articles describing the consolidation of power in the AKP era with terms of biopolitics; biopower, sovereignty and state of exception (see Öktem & Akkoyunlu, 2016; Baser et al. 2017; Geri, 2017). Accordingly, discourse analysis of the state concerning Syrian refugees from the biopolitics and sovereignty approach has been researched by several scholars (see Öztürk, 2017; Ongur & Zengin, 2019). However, comparatively few attempts have been made to establish a relationship between biopolitics and resettlement patterns from Turkey.

As it was discussed above, resettlement countries have their own selection criteria, predominantly political and besides include the integration criteria such as education, language, religion, age, medical needs (Fine, 2018, p.92). These unstandardized selectivity criteria raise doubts both among the refugee populations and from the governments of the transit first country of asylum. This biopolitical selection of the refugees has been criticized by the countries of first asylum which are mostly close to the conflict zones and located in Global South as we can see in the example of the Greek authorities' rejection of the selection of Yazidi refugees for resettlement by the Portuguese government.

Drawing on the literature on the transit countries' response to the resettlement policies, Turkey has emerged as a prominent opponent to the policies of resettlement countries blaming their opportunist national eligibility criteria. In 2016, Turkish authorities' non-issuance of exit permit for well-educated Syrian refugees who are resettled to third countries asserting that there is an educational selectivity of the resettled refugees (Feldman, 2016; Ertekin, 2016; Kingsley, 2016) have occupied a significant place in the media. The article of Patrick Kingsley who is a migration correspondent in The Guardian Newspaper starts with pointing out that "more than 1000 Syrian refugees in Turkey have been blocked from resettlement in the US and other countries because they have university qualification" (Kingsley, 2016). UNHCR Turkey commented on this issue stating

that “Turkish government has, in some cases, applied education criteria when issuing exit permits to Syrian refugees selected for resettlement from Turkey” (Kingsley, 2016). Likewise, German media also covered similar issues reporting that “Turkey is not allowing many Syrian refugees who already have visas to go to Germany - and many believe it's the highly educated being held back” (DPA/The Local, 2016). Also, senior official from the European Union Delegation to Turkey stated that “the Commission is aware that a number of refugees have been rejected by the Turkish authorities during the resettlement process based on their educational level” (Kart, 2016). Representatives from various NGOs in the refugee and migration field also commented on this issue. For example, Metin Çorabatır, former spokesman of UNHCR Turkey and the president of the Research Center on Asylum and Migration (IGAM), an Ankara-based think tank and NGO, told that “they had heard of incidents where well-qualified refugees, granted the right to be settled in EU countries as part of the March 18 deal, were being prevented by Turkish authorities from leaving the country without explanation” (ibid, 2016). Upon the conversation with Turkish authorities, he received an answer regarding non-issuance of exit permit that “this is a ‘policy implementation.’ We, Turkey, also need a qualified labor force” (ibid, 2016) from the government’s side.

Although there is no clear statement from DGMM’s side regarding this issue, in September 19, during the interview with Christiane Amanpour; Turkey’s Minister of Foreign Affairs Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu stated that: “We are against the selective approach to resettlement. No one can say ‘I want to get the Christian ones, the best educated ones, the able-bodied and not the disabled ones. You cannot select people like selecting sheep and goats from the market” (Feldman, 2016) with respect to the question on blockage of educated Syrian refugees. Contrastingly, Mr. Çavuşoğlu has been criticizing the developed countries which accept resettlement that they cannot ‘select’ people while the Turkish government is blocking the well-educated Syrian refugees from resettlement and therefore ‘selecting’ and subjugating them using its power as a nation-state. At the same time, President Erdoğan offers to confer citizenship to Syrians and Iraqis in Turkey stating “there

are highly qualified people among them, there are engineers, lawyers, doctors. Let's make use of that talent ... Instead of letting them work illegally here and there, let's give them the chance to work as citizens like the children of this nation" (Aljazeera, 2017). Although this offer was mostly discursive, by using his power positively as sovereign still creates the distinction between the valuable educated people and the rest. And therefore, the refugee population is subjugated outside the legal area where they cannot appeal for non-issuance of the exit permits since there is no formal rejection regarding the issuance of the exit permit. This policy of the Turkish authorities can be perceived as both the critical strategy towards the biopolitical selective approach of the Western receiving countries and at the same time, it results to incarceration of the accepted refugee population with no means to appeal or opposition.

This policy of the Turkish authorities can be interpreted as a political reflection towards the selection criteria of the resettlement countries which tend to be designated by considering the biodata of the refugees. Therefore, Turkish authorities decided to suspend the law on the granting exit permit for those who are accepted to be resettled and created a state of exception which "maintains itself in relation to the rule in the form of the rule's suspension" (Agamben, 1998, p. 13). It can be discussed that, sovereign has positioned to decide the state of exception for the refugees which is not totally against the law; but outside the normal legal legislation. Kingsley also reports that, a senior Turkish official made a statement to the Guardian as disclosing they believe "the most vulnerable need to be helped before others" (Kingsley, 2016). This statement can be overlapped with Foucault's concept of biopower which is "the practice of modern nation states and their regulation of their subjects through an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations" (Foucault, 1976). The people with university qualifications are considered as "valuable and productive" by the Turkish authorities and therefore, they block these refugees from resettlement and subjugate the resettled refugees by not issuing exit permits.

Similarly, in the article of Emily Feldman which is published in Politico – a US based political journalism organization, she stated that, “for some of the very reasons the United States was willing to accept Sameer – his family’s unblemished background, his wife’s university degree and their potential contribution to society – Turkey wants to keep him for itself” (Feldman, 2016). “Their potential contribution to society” as valuable and productive subjects is blocked by the Turkish authorities and therefore, refugees’ bodies are incarcerated and regulated by the sovereign power. Thereby, we can infer that this implementation is about the categorization of migrants and their envisaged “serviceableness” to the Turkish Republic. In other words, one can assert that the Turkish government desires to extract utility from these people as high-qualified labor force. Referring to Foucault, “the nation states capture the bodies of the people and control the population through its instruments” (Foucault, 1978). Relatedly, we can discuss that Turkish government prevents the movement of these resettled refugees by using its power as a nation state. According to Feldman’s article, a senior Turkish official said that; “it would be incorrect to characterize Turkey’s actions as preventing some Syrians from leaving. You are not supposed to cherry-pick candidates but focus on helping people” (Feldman, 2016). While there was a focus on the humanitarian aspect of this issue on the surface, it can be asserted that it is mostly discursive, if we take into consideration of the situation of the Syrian refugees in Turkey regarding the work permit policies towards Syrian and also other refugees from other nationalities.

This implementation of the Turkish authorities also conflicts with the Geneva Convention’s prescription on the international cooperation in the field of resettlement. And also, the convention urges governments to issue the travel documents and “facilitate the movement of refugees and in particular their resettlement” (p.10). Non-issuing an exit permit for refugees without indicating any grounds can be interpreted with Agamben’s notion of state of exception which uses the *lacuna* in the juridical system and reducing the refugees to bare life as human

life without any political rights and freedoms as animals in the natural habitat. In the article of Kingsley, one of the refugees whose exit permit has denied stated that;

“In Turkey, we’ve never had a job contract or a work permit. You need to work 13 hours a day just to eat. That’s why people prefer to go in the sea rather than living here. We don’t have any rights. We don’t even have the right to decide whether we leave or not. Why do we have to stay here? Why do they have the right to force us to stay here? How can they do this to us” (Kingsley, 2016).

In this statement, the biopower of the sovereign can be inferred clearly which is “a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (Foucault, 1978, p.138). Also, not having any means to decide their future demonstrates that refugees’ lives are excluded from political community and the domain of law. While it has been discussed that “Turkey becomes a site of filtering within this space, between those who can be saved and those who are (figuratively or not) left to die” (Fine, 2018, p.121) because of the resettlement policies of the western powers and obviously with the help of the promise of 6 billion Euros to Turkish government in order to host and protect migrants and refugees within the border of Turkey, thus preventing the arrival of the people to EU. Lack of control over their lives shows that, refugees are reduced to “bare life” which are governed by the practices of the sovereign in order to protect the well-being of the state. Therefore, Turkish authorities’ decision to exclude well-educated Syrian refugees from resettlement instrument shows that the sovereign can decide the exception which affects the lives of refugees.

CONCLUSION

Refugee resettlement has been considered as one of the durable solutions in the liberal governmental discourse on protection and resilience of the refugees. Considering the other two durable solutions such as voluntary repatriation and local integration, it can be assumed that the durable solutions are altogether subjected to the protection, and sometimes subjugation of a specific nation state. Resettlement is conceived as an important tool for refugees in the first asylum countries which are usually close to the conflict zones to reach the industrialized and developed states in a legal way. While resettlement is coded in the soft law as a way to protect the most vulnerable in the first country of asylum, the selection criteria, quota of the resettling countries, implementation of the procedure and the transfer of the resettling refugees are not indicated in any international hard law instruments such as 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Because of the lack of the international hard law instruments on resettlement, it became more open to manipulation of the receiving states and the selection procedure has been critically analyzed in the literature. Resettlement procedure is identified as a tool of neoliberal politics of the receiving countries which desire to extract utility from refugees economically and the selection procedure is based on the refugees' deservingness by looking her/his religion, ethnicity or educational level. Therefore, "refugees are subjected to social sorting" (Aradau & Tazzoili, 2019) that the ones who deserve and who are governable can only benefit from the resettlement. Constructing on the neoliberalism and selectiveness aspect of the resettlement, this concept is analyzed as a way to implement biopolitics / biopower to the sovereign, as it enables a regulatory control of the population, inclusion and exclusion of specific groups in the population by establishing norms, and power to establish a state of exception.

By focusing on Turkey as one of the most prominent transit and first asylum countries, resettlement patterns from Turkey have been analyzed by utilizing from the Foucauldian view of politics and power and also the concepts of Agamben such

as state of exception and homo sacer. Resettlement of refugees is perceived as a positive form of power on refugees which is expected to influence their lives favorably by obtaining them to right to move legally to more industrialized developed countries from the first country of asylum. This positive form of power is described as biopower which is a shift from repressive traditional sovereign power towards a more regulatory power of individual bodies with the advancing capitalism that sought to enhance the level of productivity of individuals and therefore nation states. In this thesis, it is discussed that in the selection process of the resettlement, the possible contribution of resettled refugees to the level of productivity of the nation-states and its subjects is taken into account. Despite the humanitarian reasoning of the resettlement, the integration criteria of the receiving states are criticized as the selection of the refugees by looking their biodata – ethnicity, religion or educational level. Following the logic of the biopower which establishes a distinction between the valuable and invaluable by creating norms, nation-states decide who are the “worthy” refugees whose lives are fostered and the rest are trapped in a legal limbo waiting for more stable future in the first countries of asylum.

In order to see biopolitical aspect of the resettlement, patterns from Turkey as a first country of asylum are scrutinized from the perspective of refugees and also from the perspective of the Turkish government which can be considered as a contribution to the resettlement studies. It is discussed that, according to Turkish asylum context, conditional refugee status only allows to stay in the country until the person is going to be resettled to a third country. This regulation reflects the asylum politics of the Turkish Republic which does not intend to integrate or include the refugees in the system. So, why did Turkish authorities not issue an exit permit for those who are accepted for resettlement in spite of the requirements in the legal framework? This policy is interpreted from the biopolitical perspective. It is discussed that, Turkish authorities decided to suspend the law on the granting exit permit for those who are accepted to be resettled and created a state of exception which by suspending the “maintains itself in relation to the rule in the form of the

rule's suspension" (Agamben, 1998, p. 13). In summary, Turkish authorities' response to the resettlement policies are interpreted as both the critical strategy towards the biopolitical selective approach of the Western receiving countries and at the same time, it results to incarceration of the accepted refugee population whose existence is reduced to "bare life" with no means to appeal or opposition to the decisions that affects their entire life.

REFERENCES

Abellan-Matamoros, C., & Marques, J. V. D. S. (2019, June). Over 70 million people forcibly displaced around the world: UNHCR. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.euronews.com/2019/06/19/over-70-million-people-forcibly-displaced-around-the-world>.

Açıkgöz, M & Ariner H.O. (2014). Turkey's new law on foreigners and international protection: An introduction. Briefing Paper 2, Turkish Migration Studies Group at the Centre on Migration, Policy, and Society (COMPAS). University of Oxford

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer, Sovereign power and bare life*. (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Agier, M. (2011). *Managing the undesirables: refugee camps and humanitarian government*. (D. Fernbach, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Al Jazeera. (2017, January 7). Erdogan offers citizenship to Syrian and Iraqi refugees. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/01/erdogan-offers-citizenship-syrian-iraqi-refugees-170106195134961.html>.

Amnesty International. (2019, June 19). What's the difference between a refugee and an asylum seeker? Retrieved July 2019, from <https://www.amnesty.org.au/refugee-and-an-asylum-seeker-difference/>.

Aras, N. E. G., & Mencütek, Z. S. (2015). The international migration and foreign policy nexus: The case of Syrian refugee crisis and Turkey. *Migration Letters*, 12, 193- 208.

Barnett, M. (2013). Humanitarian Governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16, 379–398. doi: Barnett, Michael, Humanitarian Governance (May 2013). *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 16, pp. 379-398, 2013. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2265144> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-012512-083711>

Betts, A., & Loescher, G. (2011). *Refugees in international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bigo, Didier. 2006. Protection: Security, Territory and Population. In *The Politics of Protection: Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency*, ed. Jef Huysman, Andrew Dobson, and Raia Prokhovnik, 84–100. Oxon: Routledge.

Bischoff, A., Bovier, P., Rrustemi, I., Gariazzo, F., Eytan, A., & Loutan, L. (2003, September). Language Barriers between Nurses and Asylum Seekers: Their Impact on Symptom Reporting and Referral. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57(3), 503–512. doi: 10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00376-3

Bretherton, L. (2006). The duty to care to refugees, Christian cosmopolitanism, and the hallowing of bare life. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 19(1), 39–61.

Brownlee, J., Masoud, T., & Reynolds, A. (2014). *The Arab Spring Pathways of Repression and Reform*. Oxford University Press.

Cheng, I.-H., Drillich, A. D., & Schattner, P. (2015). Refugee experiences of general practice in countries of resettlement: a literature review. *British Journal of General Practice*, 65(632), 171–176. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp15X683977>

Chimni, B.S. (2004). From Resettlement to Involuntary Repatriation: Towards a Critical History of Durable Solutions to Refugee Problems, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, Volume 23, Issue 3, Pages 55–73, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/23.3.55>

Colic-Peisker, V. & Waxman, P. (2005). ‘Human and Social Capital in the Process of Economic Adjustment of Bosnian Refugees in Australia’, in P. Waxman and V. Colic-Peisker (eds) *Homeland Wanted: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Refugee Resettlement in the West*, 43–68. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Crisp, J., (2004). ‘The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis’, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.102, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 1.

Dinçer, O. B., Federicci, V., Ferris, E., Karaca, S., Kirişçi, K., & Özmenek Çarmıklı, E. (2013). Turkey and Syrian Refugees: The Limits of Hospitality. Turkey and Syrian Refugees: The Limits of Hospitality. Brookings Doha Center Publications.

DPA/The Local (2020). TheLocal.De. <https://www.thelocal.de/20160621/turkey-wont-let-syrians-travel-even-with-german-visas>

Dykstra-DeVette, T. (2018). Resettlement Rhetoric: Challenging Neoliberalism in Refugee Empowerment Initiatives, *Southern Communication Journal*, 83(3), 179-191. DOI: 10.1080/1041794X.2018.1437925 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2018.1437925>

Ertekin, S. (2016, September 26). *Üniversite mezunu Suriyeliye çıkış yok*. Al Jazeera Turk - Ortadoğu, Kafkasya, Balkanlar, Türkiye ve Çevresindeki Bölgeden Son Dakika Haberleri ve Analizler. <http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/al-jazeera-ozel/universite-mezunu-suriyeliye-cikis-yok>

European Commission. (2016, December 6). European Solidarity: A refugee relocation system. Retrieved 2019, from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/e-library/multimedia/publications/european-solidarity-a-refugee-relocation-system_en.

European Commission. (2019, July 12). Humanitarian Protection. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we>

do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_search/humanitarian-protection_en.

Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: a moral history of the present*. (R. Gomme, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feldman, E. (2016, September 30). Turkey hoards well-educated Syrians. Retrieved November 23, 2016, from <http://www.politico.eu/article/turkey-prevent-well-educated-syrian-refugees-from-leaving-migration/>

Feller, E. (2005). Refugees are not Migrants. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(4), 27–35. doi: 10.1093/rsq/hdi077

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline And Punish - The Birth of the Prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House Inc. doi: HV8666"F68r3 1979 361 78-rtz57 ISBN o-629-ztztz-z

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2000). *Power: The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954 – 1984 (vol.1)*. (Paul Rabinow, Edit.) London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2004). *Society must be defended: lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. (D. Macey, Trans., A. Fontana & M. Bertani, Eds.). London: Penguin. doi: 9780140270860

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78* (G. Burchell, Trans.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garnier, A. (2013, December). Migration Management and Humanitarian Protection: The UNHCR's 'Resettlement Expansionism' and Its Impact on Policy-making in the EU and Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(6), 942–959. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.855075>

Garnier, A., Jubilut, L. L., & Sandvik, K. B. (2018). *Refugee resettlement power, politics, and humanitarian governance*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Gometz, J. (2016). *Refugee Biopolitics: A Discourse Analysis of the Swedish Government's Recent Shift in the Speech on Refugees* (dissertation).

Haddad, E. (2008). *The refugee in international society: between sovereigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00223433090460030907>

Hammerstad, A. (2011). UNHCR and the Securitization of Forced Migration. In A. Betts & G. Loescher (Eds.), *Refugees in International Relations* (pp. 237–260). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hanappi, H. (2016, April). Arab Spring - Islamic Winter - North-African Exodus. An explanation of the political economy of Mediterranean long-run dynamics. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. doi: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/70515/>

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2005). *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire*. London, UK: Penguin Press.

Hardy, C. (2003). Refugee Determination. *Administration & Society*, 35(4), 462–488. doi:10.1177/0095399703254949

Hochman, D. (2013). *Roots of the Arab Spring Contested Authority and Political Change in the Middle East*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Holmes, SM, & Castañeda, H. (2016). Representing the "European refugee crisis" in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, 43(1), 12-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/amet.12259> Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0xr0m9rr>

Hyndman, J. (2000). *Managing displacement: refugees and the politics of humanitarianism*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

İçduygu, A., & Diker, E. (2017). Labor Market Integration of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: From Refugees to Settlers. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi The Journal of Migration Studies*, 3(1), 12–35.

ILO, ILO's support to refugees and host communities in Turkey. (2017, April 5). [Www.Ilo.Org](http://www.ilo.org). Retrieved from: https://www.ilo.org/ankara/projects/WCMS_379375/lang--en/index.htm

Israeli, R. (2017). *From Arab Spring To Islamic Winter*. Place of publication not identified: ROUTLEDGE.

Jubilut, L. L., & Carneiro, W. P. (2011). Resettlement in Solidarity: A New Regional Approach Towards a More Humane Durable Solution. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 30, 63–86. doi: 10.1093/rsq/hdr010

Karcı Korfalı, D., Üstübici, A., & De Clerck, H. (2014). *Turkey: Country and Research Areas Report*. (A. İçduygu, D. Sert, Z. Özler, & C. Timmerman, Eds.) *Turkey: Country and Research Areas Report*. İstanbul: MireKoç.

Kart, E. (2016, June 20). Turkey accused of holding back resettlement of refugees based on education level - Turkey News. *Hürriyet Daily News*. <https://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-accused-of-holding-back-resettlement-of-refugees-based-on-education-level--100662>

Kavak, S. (2016). Syrian refugees in seasonal agricultural work: A case of adverse incorporation in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 54:33–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/npt.2016.7>

Keeley, J. F. (1990). Toward a Foucauldian Analysis of International Regimes. *International Organization*, 4(1), 83–105. doi: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706810>

Kingsley, P. (2016, September 19). Turkey blocks Syrian refugees from resettlement in the US – for having degrees. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/19/turkey-syrian-refugees-resettlement-blocked-us-degrees>

Kirişçi, K. (2012). Turkey's new draft law on asylum: What to make of it? In *Turkey, Migration and the EU: Potentials, Challenges, and Opportunities*. Edited by Seçil Paçacı Elitok and Thomas Straubhaar. Hamburg, Germany: Hamburg Univ. Press. 63–83.

Kirişçi, K., & Ferris, E. (2015). Not Likely to Go Home: Syrian Refugees and the Challenges to Turkey— and the International Community. Turkey project policy paper, (7). Retrieved January, 2019, from <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Turkey-Policy-Paper-web.pdf>.

Kirişçi, K. (2020). How the EU and Turkey can promote self-reliance for Syrian refugees through agricultural trade. In *brookings*. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Brookings_TENT_Turkey_Report_1.31.20.pdf

Kneebone, S. Stevens, and D. Baldassar, L. (2014) *Refugee Protection and the Role of Law: Conflicting Identities*, Routledge research in asylum, migration and refugee law, Routledge.

Koçak, M. (2020). Who is “Queerer” and Deserves Resettlement?: Queer Asylum Seekers and Their Deservingness of Refugee Status in Turkey. *Middle East Critique*, 29(1), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2020.1704506>

Kohl, K. S. (2016). The evolution of Danish Refugee Resettlement Policy, 1978-2016. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.humanitarianstudies.no/2016/11/24/the-evolution-of-danish-refugee-resettlement-policy-1978-2016/>.

Korkmaz, E. (March 2017). How do Syrian refugee workers challenge supply chain management in the Turkish garment industry. *International Migration Institute. Working Paper 133*:1–18. Oxford: Oxford University.

Lageman, T. (2016, January 3). Mohamed Bouazizi: Was the Arab Spring worth dying for? Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/12/mohamed-bouazizi-arab-spring-worth-dying-151228093743375.html>.

Lee, S. K. (2018). The State, Ethnic Community, and Refugee Resettlement in Japan. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 53(8), 1219–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909618777277>

Leman, J. (2007, November). A “Lucan Effect” in the Commitment of Iranian Converts in Transit. The case of the Pentecostal Iranian Enclave in Istanbul
L’effet “Saint Luc” dans l’engagement des convertis iraniens en transit. Le cas de l’enclave pentecôtiste iranienne à Istanbul. *Evue Des Mondes Musulmans Et De La Méditerranée*, 101–114. doi: URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/remmm/4323> ; DOI : 10.4000/remmm.4323

Lemke, T. (2011). Critique and Experience in Foucault. *Critique and Experience in Foucault*, 28(4), 26–48. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411404907>

Lemke, T. (2012). *Foucault, governmentality, and critique*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Lippert, R. (1998). Rationalities and refugee resettlement. *Economy and Society*, 27(4), 380–406. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085149800000026>

Long, K. (2013). When refugees stopped being migrants: Movement, labour and humanitarian protection. *Migration Studies*, 1(1), 4–26. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mns001>

Losoncz, I. (2015). Goals without Means: A Mertonian Critique of Australia’s Resettlement Policy for South Sudanese Refugees, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 30(1), 47-70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fev017>

Manfreda, P. (2016, October 09). Definition of the Arab Spring Middle East Uprisings in 2011. Retrieved January, 2019, from <http://middleeast.about.com/od/humanrightsdemocracy/a/Definition-Of-The-Arab-Spring.htm>

Mavelli, L. (2017, December). Governing populations through the humanitarian government of refugees: Biopolitical care and racism in the European refugee crisis. *Review of International Studies*, 43(5), 809–832. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210517000110>

McKinnon, S. L. (2011). Positioned in/by the State: Incorporation, exclusion, and appropriation of women's genderbased claims to political asylum in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 97(2), 178–200. DOI: 10.1080/00335630.2011.560176

Muller, B. (2004). Globalization, Security, Paradox: Towards a Refugee Biopolitics. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 22(1), 49-57. <https://refuge.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/view/21317>

Munzer, A. (2015). Syria : why is the Arab Spring turning into a long winter (Doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews, 2015). University of St Andrews.

National Legislative Bodies / National Authorities, Turkey: Temporary Protection Regulation, 22 October 2014, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/56572fd74.html> [accessed 25 June 2019]

NATO. (2019, June 20). Assistance for the refugee and migrant crisis in the Aegean Sea. NATO. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_128746.htm

Nawyn, S. J. (2006). Faith, Ethnicity, and Culture in Refugee Resettlement. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(11), 1509–1527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206288462>

Nikolopoulou, K. (2000). [Review of the book *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*]. *SubStance* 29(3), 124-131. doi:10.1353/sub.2000.0038.

Okay, A. (2017). Turkey's post-2011 approach to its Syrian border and its implications for domestic politics. *International Affairs*. 93(4): 829–846.

Owens, P. (2009). Reclaiming 'Bare Life'?: Against Agamben on Refugees. *International Relations*, 23(4), 567–587. doi:10.1177/0047117809350545

Özden, Ş. (2013). Syrian refugees in Turkey. MPC Research Reports 2013/05, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. Migration Policy Centre. San Domenico di Fiesole. Florence, Italy: European Univ. Institute.

Öztürk, A. (2017). The Production of Refugee Subjectivities in The State Discourse: The Case of Syrian Refugees in Turkey (dissertation).

Papastergiadis, N. (2006, December). The invasion complex: the abject other and spaces of violence. *Geografiska Annaler*, 88(4), 363–485. doi: DOI: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00231.x

Pathways Towards Social Inclusion of Refugees in Turkey. (2019, June). Retrieved 2019, from <http://turkishpolicy.com/article/955/pathways-towards-social-inclusion-of-refugees-in-turkey>.

Patrick, A. O. (2017). Opinion | Australia's Immoral Preference for Christian Refugees. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/03/opinion/australias-immoral-preference-for-christian-refugees.html>

Pécoud Antoine. (2015). *Depoliticising migration: global governance and international migration narratives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Portugal Offers to Take Refugees, but Greece Says No, That's Favoritism. (2017, January). Retrieved 2018, from <https://www.voanews.com/europe/portugal-offers-take-refugees-greece-says-no-thats-favoritism>.

Radjenovic, A. (2017). *Resettlement of Refugees: EU Framework*. EPRS European Parliamentary Research Service.

Reid, J., Mezzadra, S., & Samaddar, R. (2013). *The biopolitics of development: reading Michel Foucault in the postcolonial present*. New Delhi, India: Springer.

Ritchie, G. (2018). Civil society, the state, and private sponsorship: the political economy of refugee resettlement. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 37(6), 663–675. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2018.1513429>

Soykan, C. (2012). The new draft law on foreigners and international protection in Turkey. *Oxford Monitor of Forced Migration*. 2(2): 38–47.

Stoessinger, J. G. (1956). *The refugee and the world community*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Sulaiman-Hill, C., & Thompson, S. C. (2011). Sampling Challenges in a Study Examining Refugee Resettlement. *BMC International Health & Human Rights*, 11(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-698X-11-2>

Ticktin, M. I. (2011). *Casualties of care: immigration and the politics of humanitarianism in France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Toğral, B. (2016) Syrian refugees in Turkey: From ‘guests’ to ‘enemies’. *New Perspectives on Turkey*. 54(1): 55–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/npt.2016.4>.

Tokyay, M. (2020). *Survey: Young Syrians plagued by social and economic discrimination in Turkey*. Arab News. <https://www.arabnews.com/node/1681841/middle-east>

Truman, H. (1952). 'Special Message to the Congress on Aid for Refugees and Displaced Persons.', 24 Mar. 1952, The American Presidency Project.

Turkey: Law No. 6458 of 2013 on Foreigners and International Protection (as amended 29 Oct 2016) [Turkey], 29 October 2016, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/5a1d828f4.html> [accessed 27 May 2019]

Unhcr Resettlement Handbook. (2011). UNHCR Resettlement Handbook. Geneva.

United Nations (1949), Summary Record of the 258th Meeting held at Lake Success, New York on 9 November 1949 at 3pm 10 Nov. 1949, A/C.3./SR 258.

United Nations. (2018). The History of Resettlement - Celebration 25 years of the ATCR. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.unhcr.org/5d1633657.pdf>.

United Nations. (2018, December). Resettlement Fact Sheet 2018. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/5c594ddf4/resettlement-fact-sheet-2018.html>.

United Nations. (2019). Figures at a Glance. Retrieved July 2019, from <https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>.

United Nations. (n.d.). Resettlement. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/resettlement.html>.

Williams, Jill M. (2015). From humanitarian exceptionalism to contingent care: Care and enforcement at the humanitarian border. *Political Geography*, 47, 11–20.

Wyman, M. (1994). *DPs: European Displaced Persons, 1946–1951*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Yiftachel, O. (2009). Critical theory and ‘gray space’: Mobilization of the colonized. *City: analysis of urban trends, theory, policy, action*, 13(2-3): 246–263.

Zeveleva, O. (2017). Biopolitics, borders, and refugee camps: exercising sovereign power over nonmembers of the state. *Nationalities Papers*, 45(1), 41–60. doi:10.1080/00905992.2016.1238885

Zucker, N. (1983). Refugee Resettlement in the United States: Policy and Problems. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 467, 172-186. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1044936>